United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 No. 132

# House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your Spirit in the decisions they make and be mindful of the millions of Americans who rely upon them to consider the welfare of the Nation in the negotiations of this day.

All this day and through the week, may they recall Your words spoken through the prophets, to be mindful of the most vulnerable among us, and so to do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARDNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## CONSTITUENTS PLEAD FOR REPRIEVE FROM OBAMACARE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every day, I appreciate concerned constituents reaching out to me and expressing their very real experiences with the health care takeover.

Jennifer from Chapin says:

> ObamaCare will put us out of business and make health insurance unaffordable for our family.

Charlotte from Batesburg writes:

> I do not feel our economy can afford ObamaCare. I am retired, with a history of lung cancer, and my followup care would be denied under this plan.

Terry from Aiken pleads:

> Do whatever you can to stop this. It will be an oppression of the people of this country both in terms of health care and jobs.

Sarah from North Augusta has valid concerns for the Nation's future:

> Our company has already spent time and money to be compliant with the plan, but there are many ''what ifs.'' This cannot be a funded plan.

Melissa of nearby Greenwood is correct:

> Free ticket, no show, putting people in need at risk.

I am grateful the House is making every effort to protect the American people from the unsustainable, unaffordable health care takeover law, which destroys jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

## THE FIRST NAME IN OUR COUNTRY IS ''UNITED''

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, 12 hours. In about 12 hours, we threaten to shut this government down.

Now is the time to exhibit leadership, Mr. Speaker. You are the leader of this body. It has Democrats and Republicans, so we've got to take the best ideas out of both parties. Negotiations can't take place just between conservative Republicans and Tea Party Republicans.

I stand here ready to work with you, Mr. Speaker. We've got ideas. Let's take the best ideas out of both parties. Let's put them together, and put the American people first.

This is the United States of America. The first name in our country is ''United.'' We've got to stop fighting, and we've got to start fixing these problems. We've got to come together and put we, the people, first—the American people.

Take the best ideas from Democrats and Republicans, and let's start working together. Mr. Speaker, my office is open, and I stand ready to work.



Printed on recycled paper.

## OBAMACARE NOT READY FOR PRIME TIME

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as I travel around my district and travel around the country, the American people are worried about their jobs. They are worried about their incomes rising because they are all under pressure. The economy is not growing.

Why isn't it growing?

One of the issues that is standing in the way is ObamaCare—the fact that nobody knows what the rules are. Employers are scared to death to hire new employees and are cutting the hours of many of their current employees.

And for what reason?

This law is not ready for prime time.

The House has done its work. We passed a bill on Saturday night—and sent it to the United States Senate—that would delay ObamaCare for 1 year and would eliminate permanently the medical device tax that is costing us tens of thousands of jobs that are being shipped overseas.

The Senate decided not to work yesterday.

My goodness. If there is such an emergency, where are they?

It's time for the Senate to listen to the American people—just like the House has listened to the American people—and pass a 1-year delay of ObamaCare and a permanent repeal of the medical device tax.

## CLIMATE CHANGE CAUSED BY HUMAN ACTIVITY

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published their latest report, confirming that climate change is happening and that it is the result of human activity.

The report was produced by 259 scientists from 39 different countries over the last 6 years, and it is the most comprehensive and authoritative assessment of the Earth's changing climate. The report shows that climate change is real, and it shows the urgency to reduce humankind's $CO_2$ emissions. The scientists now have 95 percent confidence that their findings are correct.

Mr. Speaker, the science is not up for debate. Human-caused climate change is happening. The evidence is overwhelming. Science shows that, if we fail to curb our carbon emissions, we will face catastrophic consequences.

We cannot continue to ignore this overwhelming scientific consensus. Let's work together to reduce our $CO_2$ emissions and prevent the most severe weather events.

## THE SENATE NEEDS TO HUSTLE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just hours before a critical deadline for this country, the Democrat Senate is MIA.

On Saturday evening, House Republicans sent them a second legislative proposal to keep the government open, and the Senate is sitting on it. They have yet to take action or to even come in to work.

Make no mistake—the House is committed to keeping the government open. We are open to compromise. We know that's required of a Congress comprised of a Republican House and a Democrat Senate. That's why we have taken steps to come to the middle and find common ground. Our most recent proposal to keep the government open fully funds critical services, protects troop pay, provides fairness for all Americans under ObamaCare, and permanently stops ObamaCare's medical innovation tax.

There is so much potential for bipartisan efforts to advance this legislation in the Senate, but Senator REID needs to bring up the proposal and adopt an attitude that is broader than ''our way or the highway.'' There is time left for us to work together. The Senate needs to hustle.

## REPUBLICANS: CYNICAL, NOT SERIOUS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the government shutdown Republicans manufactured by sending a proposal to the Senate they know is unacceptable and is not workable, there is an opportunity for Republican colleagues to show that they are serious and not cynical:

They could eliminate from their budget the savings of a half trillion dollars that ObamaCare would generate;

If they are serious and not cynical, they could bring their own spending bills to the floor. Remember, they abruptly stopped working on the spending bills last summer as they figured out that the T–HUD bill was so bad that their own Members wouldn't vote for it;

If they are truly serious about working in a cooperative fashion and negotiating out differences, then the Republicans should allow a conference committee to be appointed to work out the differences between the House and the Senate Budgets.

If you are serious about working together to solve problems, why don't you work together to solve problems?

## IN HONOR OF JANE CALVO

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor one of my constituents from Henderson County, Jane Calvo, on her retirement after nearly 26 years in a career with the Federal service.

Mrs. Calvo spent the early part of her career in the Foreign Service with the State Department. For nearly 4 years, she served in the U.S. Embassy in Costa Rica. After some time away, she served as an exceptional district caseworker for one of my predecessors, former Representative Charles Taylor, for the entire eight terms of his service in Congress. Most recently, since 2007, Mrs. Calvo has worked at the Social Security Administration in western North Carolina.

Mrs. Calvo first moved to Henderson County 35 years ago, and her exemplary record of service to our Nation in her various roles merits the highest commendation, and I am proud to have her as a constituent.

Madam Speaker, today, I wish Mrs. Calvo all the best in her retirement, where she will have more time to spend with her husband of 40 years, Alfredo, and her two adult sons, Al and Michael. On behalf of the 11th District, I thank Mrs. Calvo for her distinguished career of service to this great country.

## GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, instead of working with Democrats to prevent a shutdown, House Republicans have passed two bills that have no chance of becoming law. They are the 42nd and 43rd votes on undermining the Affordable Care Act.

While the old saying goes, ''if at first you don't succeed, try, try again,'' I say to my colleagues across the aisle: stop trying to shut down the Government of the United States of America.

Democrats have offered a compromise in which Republicans get the spending levels they want. It is time to stop pandering to the Tea Party and to do what is right—pass the Senate compromise and avoid a shutdown driven solely by radical Republicans.

## SUPPLEMENTAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago, one of the chief proponents of the President's health care bill in Colorado said this:

Your health insurance plan is being cancelled, and that's a good thing.

Yet President Obama said, If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health plan—period.

Over the past month, thousands of people around Colorado and this country have started receiving letters, notices, that their health insurance plans

that they liked—that they were promised they would be able to keep—are being cancelled. We heard promises from the President that they could keep them, and yet here we are—cancellation after cancellation.

The House has passed legislation to keep the government open; but to make sure that ObamaCare doesn't continue to be the drain on our economy, let's do the right thing—let's pass a bill, fund the government—and keep ObamaCare from doing harm to the American people.

□ 1015

## OBAMACARE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the Speaker say that the House has done its work by delaying ObamaCare. I'd like to remind the Speaker and all my colleagues on the GOP side that the work that has to be done is to pass a budget to keep the government open.

The issue of ObamaCare is over. It was resolved in the last Presidential election when the President was reelected and said that he was going to continue with it. Why do we continue to talk about ObamaCare? I assure my colleagues on the Republican side that people in my district are clamoring for ObamaCare. They want to sign up so that they can get health insurance and affordable health insurance.

That's not what we should be litigating here today. The fact of the matter is that Republicans are saying, It's my way or the highway. They're saying that if you don't agree to delay ObamaCare, we're not going to pass a budget and we're going to shut the government down. That is not leadership. They're in charge. They're the majority here. They're supposed to do their business and not try to go to the 45th and 46th vote on ObamaCare.

I could sit here and say I'm not going to vote for a budget unless you agree to pass gun safety legislation. That's not the way this place is supposed to operate.

## OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and fellow Members of Congress, 10:15 in the morning. Where is the United States Senate? I was here until 12:30 yesterday morning.

As I recall, we passed a bill to keep the government open and we passed a bill that had compromise. Most Republicans voted over 40 times to repeal ObamaCare, but we agreed to just a 1-year delay in implementation. The President has already agreed to a delay of a year for employers. Why not for the American people in a train wreck that's about to happen to try to get our act together because people do need health care? Where was the United States Senate yesterday?

I say they were AWOL. They were not here. They don't come in until 2 p.m. today, and then they'll jam a bill through the House and Senate and try to make it look good.

## OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we are just a day away from the opening of ObamaCare's exchanges, and it seems like every day there is more bad news that comes out about the health care law.

What the American people will be seeing once ObamaCare begins is a far cry from what they were promised. The American people were promised that ObamaCare would make health care more affordable; they were promised that there would be more choices; they were promised more coverage. For many Americans, it is already proving to be the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of North Carolina, it is expected that individual market rates will triple for young women and quadruple for young men. Recently, my office received a call from a man whose provider told him that his family's premiums were being raised to over $800 a month.

The administration is not ready for this. Small businesses are not ready for this. Doctors and health care professionals are not ready for this. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not ready for this, and they do not want this.

## WHERE CAN THE SENATE BE? GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

The House has offered a compromise. We have passed legislation to fund the government and postpone ObamaCare for a year, but the Senate and the President refuse to work with us, refuse to negotiate, refuse to compromise, even refuse to talk to us.

While we were here until nearly 1 a.m. Sunday morning, the Senate was gone. The President, according to the New York Times, played golf over the weekend. So the President will negotiate with the Iranians, the President will negotiate with the Russians about Syria, but the President and the Senate will not talk to the House. Aren't Americans as important as Syrians, Russians, and Iranians? I guess the Senate and the President have other priorities, but their inaction of talking to us will cause a shutdown.

Where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

And that's just the way it is.

## OBAMACARE

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats who run this town seem to be in denial about the unworkability of this health care law. The President has said it's worked exactly the way it's supposed to, and HARRY REID has even said it's wonderful. If it's so wonderful, why does the administration continue to issue delay after delay of key provisions for key constituencies?

The truth is, this law is not ready for prime time for anyone. What's more, it's not fair. Not only is it not fair to those who own a business, it's not fair to those who work for one. Frankly, it's not fair for anyone at all.

House Republicans are simply requesting a 1-year delay in its implementation for everyone. That seems fair.

## OBAMACARE

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, America's health care system needs reform. There's no denying that. But the law signed by this President is not the answer most Americans are looking for.

We know health insurance is too expensive. The average American family has seen their premiums rise by over $3,000 since 2008. But under ObamaCare, premiums could increase by as much as 413 percent.

We know that young people in America are especially vulnerable. Under ObamaCare, young Americans could end up paying 19 percent to 30 percent more for their insurance.

We also know that far too many of our fellow Americans are left with no insurance coverage at all. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that even after ObamaCare is implemented, 30 million people will still be uninsured.

It's time to defund this law and replace it with commonsense health care reform.

## DON'T STICK YOUR FINGERS IN THE LIGHT SOCKET

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of fighting going on right now in this Chamber, and I can tell you that there's nothing better than when I

get to leave Washington and go back home to see my grandkids. Nothing warms my heart more than Emily, Nathan, and Kathryn running up and giving me a hug.

As a grandfather, I find myself giving commonsense advice to my grandchildren. It's funny to tell them obvious things and realize that it seems like sage wisdom to them. ''Emily, look both ways when you cross the street.'' ''Nathan, if you want to be big and strong, you need to eat your vegetables.'' ''Kathryn, always wear your seatbelt.'' Finally, ''Don't stick your finger in the light socket.''

Since the passage of ObamaCare, the economy has stagnated as businesses try to figure out the new rules and the regulations.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

ObamaCare is turning running our Nation into a country of part-time workers as companies try to fall under the 30-hour threshold for their employees.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Premiums are rising rather than falling.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

By the President's own admission, the systems to implement ObamaCare are not yet ready.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Americans are pleading with the Senate and the President to stop sticking their fingers in the light socket.

## OBAMACARE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. After 41 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the Republicans want the administration to believe that they now want only a delay. Why don't they state that forthrightly? Why don't they say they are now for the Affordable Care Act, but they want to delay it because of certain issues and bring them forward?

Instead, their call for delay is still about their opposition altogether to the Affordable Care Act. One hundred thousand Americans are already receiving benefits under the Affordable Care Act. Do you really want us to yank them back from benefits that they have never received before? That doesn't make a lot of sense.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

## AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3174) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3174

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS.**

The Secretary of Transportation may obligate any funds made available to implement section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, without any limitation on obligations for such projects resulting from a single natural disaster or a single catastrophic failure in a State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3174 is a bill with a clear and simple goal. This legislation allows the Department of Transportation to obligate previously authorized and appropriated funds for emergency relief projects without limitation to the amount a State can receive for a particular severe weather event. This bill does not increase spending and only applies to funds that have been previously authorized or appropriated.

This bill is consistent with the authorizing language in MAP–21, which we passed with bipartisan support last summer. MAP–21 does not limit how much a State can receive from the emergency relief program for a particular severe weather event.

This bill restores the flexibility provided in MAP–21 to the Department of Transportation to determine how funds that have already been authorized and appropriated should be spent. This bill has bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3174. This legislation would lift the cap on the Federal Highway Administration emergency relief program funds that occur in 2013.

Earlier this month, Colorado experienced historic storms that resulted in severe flooding, landslides, and mudslides. As a result of these severe storms, more than 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed and over 200 miles of roads in Colorado have been affected by the flooding.

Initial estimates by the Colorado Department of Transportation are that damage to roads and bridges as a result of the storm could cost between $430 million and $475 million.

To assist States in dealing with unexpected destruction of surface transportation infrastructure because of natural disasters or catastrophic failure caused by an external event, Congress created FHWA's emergency relief program. This program provides funding to States to make emergency repairs and restore Federal-aid highway facilities to pre-disaster conditions.

While the ER program receives $100 million annually from the highway trust fund, demand for funding from this program usually exceeds this amount and requires supplemental appropriations from general revenues to address the backlog of funding requests from States.

Earlier this year, Congress appropriated $2 billion for the ER program in the Hurricane Sandy relief legislation. This $2 billion appropriation was intended to address rebuilding highways in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, as well as other natural disasters across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the House had a vigorous debate about Hurricane Sandy during that relief bill's consideration, with many of my friends on the other side of the aisle actually opposing the bill, including the sponsor of the legislation we are debating today. Thankfully, a majority of the House stood with our colleagues from States that suffered the incredible destruction as a result of Hurricane Sandy.

I would urge that we stand with our colleagues from Colorado today with the hope that prior opponents of such relief will see how important it is when it affects their own home State to understand that we are all in this together in this country when it comes to natural and catastrophic disasters.

□ 1030

Of the $2 billion provided by that legislation for highway ER projects as a result of Hurricane Sandy and other disasters, approximately $550 million remains available.

In addition to providing additional funding for the ER program, the legislation also restricted the amount that a State could receive of these funds to no more than $100 million per incident, with a separate cap provided for highway repair funds for States affected by Hurricane Sandy.

To address the concern that Colorado could not be fully reimbursed for the

cost of restoring its infrastructure, which could cost more than $400 million, in a timely manner, H.R. 3174 eliminates the $100 million cap on ER funds made available in the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act for all disasters that occur in 2013.

This bill is consistent with changes to the ER program made in the most recent Surface Transportation Authorization Act, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP–21, which also eliminated the historical $100 million cap.

Mr. Speaker, no State can plan for the type of destruction Colorado is dealing with as a result of the severe storms and flooding. That is why the ER program was created. That is why this House passed the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act and made additional highway repair funds available to all States that have suffered such natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174. Let us ensure that Colorado has the support and resources that it needs to rebuild its surface transportation infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative GARDNER.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and appreciate his leadership on this important matter as we try to bring relief to the people of Colorado who have suffered as a result of the floods that began on September 11.

I also thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia for her leadership on this issue as well and for her support of the underlying measure.

Thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and the Appropriations Committee as well, Chairman ROGERS, for supporting and making sure that this legislation moves to the floor as expeditiously as it has.

To the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, I would note that I voted for the $17 billion HAL ROGERS amendment on Sandy, making sure that we had emergency funding through FEMA for all victims of that atrocious storm and disaster. But I also tried to make sure that we had funding for another disaster that had happened in Colorado and the western United States, dealing with wildfires and forest fires.

In fact, I tried to amend the legislation with disaster assistance for Colorado that was rejected and was not allowed to go into the bill, and ultimately, I made a decision based on the fact that we were treating disasters differently. But it's important to know that we do come together for disaster assistance, to make sure that we take care of people who have been harmed around this country.

On September 11, just a couple weeks ago, a flood began that destroyed nearly 2,000 homes and damaged over 17,000 homes. Early reports indicate that almost 25 percent of the buildings at the University of Colorado received some kind of damage.

I have toured with other members of the Colorado congressional delegation—Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, our two Senators, Senator MARK UDALL and Senator BENNETT, as well as Governor Hickenlooper—as we have witnessed firsthand, both on the ground and from the air, the devastation that has taken place.

And for people who are rebuilding lives and rebuilding homes or rebuilding businesses that were lost, today this body takes a great step forward in providing at least one key component of certainty. And that certainty comes into those thoroughfares that allow them to get to and from school, to and from work, and farmers to get their goods to market.

Our transportation system was dramatically impacted by the floods. There were 200 line miles of highway affected. It's as if somebody had made a sand castle, built it, and a wave came and washed it away, a crumpled-up piece of paper, destroying hundreds of miles of Colorado highway. Fifty bridges were wiped out.

The Colorado Department of Transportation initially estimated that between $300 million and $500 million worth of damage was done to our highway system and has now settled on a figure closer to $475 million. I commend the Federal Highway Administration, who swiftly released $35 million to help with the cost of the most immediate repairs; but there must be more that is done.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I thank this body for its support of H.R. 3174, legislation that, with a ''yes'' vote, will not automatically lift the cap for other States that experience severe weather events, but allows the Secretary of Transportation to make that determination.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) noted, this is not a new appropriation. There is no new spending, but it gives flexibility to the Department of Transportation to make decisions that will help the people who have suffered in Colorado.

And as I mentioned, the cap was also raised to $500 million for responses in other areas and other hurricanes—whether it's hurricanes, floods, or other events this country will face. We have an opportunity to help the people of Colorado, the people of this country get back on their feet. And I appreciate the support that this body has given this bill today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding time to me so that I can speak about the catastrophe that we had in Colorado 2½ weeks ago.

Some portions of our State received more rain in 3 days than we get in a year and a half, and that amounted to tremendous flooding. Some people say it's a 200-year flood; others say it's a 500-year flood. But it damaged canyons, homes, businesses, roads up and down the front range of Colorado.

So our delegation has come together. There is some controversy as to the origins of this funding and whether or not the Republicans from Colorado supported this assistance for highways. That's in the past. We are together today because our State needs the assistance.

I rise to ask for quick passage of H.R. 3174, which will enable Colorado to quickly begin the process of rebuilding our damaged infrastructure. Almost 19,000 homes and businesses across Colorado were damaged or destroyed. I had friends, neighbors, and family affected by this storm.

I want to start by thanking our first responders—the police, the firefighters, the Colorado National Guard, the United States Army, and FEMA—for their heroic efforts to save lives. Individuals, volunteers, charities, the State, local, and Federal governments responded as one to help the people of the State of Colorado.

I witnessed firsthand, with Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POLIS, and our Senators and Governor, the National Guard rescuing a stranded family. These men and women, without a doubt, prevented these floods from taking more lives.

The damage throughout the State is catastrophic and truly unbelievable. I represent two counties of the nine that were declared major disaster areas. Now that the waters have receded, it is time to rebuild. At least 200 miles of State and Federal roads were damaged and 50 bridges were either damaged or destroyed by the floods; and that doesn't include local, county, and city streets, roads, and bridges.

In total, the Colorado Department of Transportation is estimating the damage to our State and Federal roads to be about $475 million. The Denver Post reported:

> The flooding that swept through Colorado is the biggest catastrophe to ever strike the State's infrastructure.

Current law restricts funds from this account to $100 million per State per incident. We know the damage to roads, bridges, and infrastructure in our State will well exceed that $100 million. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3174, with my friends in the Colorado delegation, to make sure Colorado has the resources needed to rebuild.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentlewoman.

This bill does not cost a dollar. It simply allows the Secretary of Transportation the flexibility needed for Colorado and other communities impacted by severe weather events this year to rebuild our roads and bridges.

I'm asking all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174 and help us in Colorado rebuild.

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
*Denver, CO, September 23, 2013.*

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Minority Leader, Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you may know, this month massive rains and heavy flooding left over a dozen Colorado counties in devastation. With the rains, highways, bridges, and culverts were washed away. As a result, even now many communities still are cut off and isolated from the rest of the state. Colorado is in dire need of help.

Communities across Colorado's Front Range and Eastern Plains are starting to deal with aftermath of the flooding and destruction. The affected counties include Boulder, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, and Washington—an area so expansive, that it surpasses that of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode Island combined. Early analyses show that the flooding was so severe that it may not occur again for 500 to 1,000 years.

Thousands of Colorado families are without homes, potable water, or power. Before the state can fully restore essential services to impacted towns and cities, and allow residents to permanently return home, we must repair our devastated highway system. Early estimates are that at least 50 bridges will need significant repair—30 of which must be fully replaced. Approximately 200 highway lane miles must be reconstructed. Temporary crossing structures are needed in the interim. And, today, numerous state highways and local roads remain closed, cutting off primary, and in some cases the only, access to Colorado cities and towns. Assessing the damage to Colorado's highway system is underway. But early assessments are that the damage will be several hundred million dollars.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Public Law 113–2, the U.S. Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) Emergency Relief Program (ERP), received over $2.02 billion to help states rebuild and repair damages to their highways and bridges. In this bill, states impacted by Hurricane Sandy could receive up to $500 million per disaster in ERP funds; however, all remaining states—including Colorado—were capped at $100 million per disaster.

Given the widespread devastation to our state highway system, we are respectfully asking that Congress raise this $100 million cap for Colorado as well. As the Colorado congressional delegation stated in a letter to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, there are precedents for waiving or raising this cap. For example, the $100 million was waived in response to damage caused by Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, and Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. Recently, the cap was raised to $500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy.

Based on Colorado's anticipated highway needs and the precedents mentioned above, we ask that you raise this cap for Colorado. Time and again, Congress has answered the call to help communities during times of disaster and loss. The September 2013 floods may prove to be the worst natural disaster in the history of our state, and is likely the worst we shall ever see in our lifetimes. Before we rebuild our homes and businesses, we must rebuild our roads to reopen our communities. On behalf of all Coloradans, please raise this cap to $500 million, so that we may begin this process.

Sincerely,

JOHN HICKENLOOPER,
*Governor.*

---

STATE OF COLORADO,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
*Denver, CO, September 25, 2013.*

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you know, this week Colorado begins the process of rebuilding. Over a dozen Colorado counties were devastated due to record-setting rains and heavy flooding. Today, thousands of our neighbors are without homes, power, or drinking water. For us to begin the rebuilding process, we must repair our roads, bridges, and culverts that were swept away by the floodwaters. We need the help of Congress to begin this process.

Multiple counties received over a foot of rain, which turned to floodwater. Those floodwaters destroyed many critical transportation connectors throughout our state. This week, the waters are receding and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has begun to assess the damage. At this time, we have identified a number of bridges in need of significant repairs or replacement, and approximately 200 state highway lane miles that washed away. In the interim, CDOT is working with the National Guard to restore access to communities severed from the rest of the state. This includes installing temporary crossing structures and gravel roads.

Although cost estimates will certainly change as we continue to inspect our infrastructure, CDOT's early estimate indicates that approximately $475 million is needed to rebuild our highway system. This estimate includes materials, maintenance, reconstruction, and contracting costs. Last week, the Colorado Transportation Commission directed over $100 million—CDOT's entire contingency funding line—to begin reconnecting critical roadways and communities. The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) also acted swiftly to release $35 million in emergency funds. While these contributions provide critical initial repair funds, CDOT has already secured 19 contractors and have dedicated the advanced funding from the FHWA. It is clear that existing resources are inadequate to fix highway damage of this magnitude. Furthermore, CDOT's $475 million estimate does not include costs to rebuild destroyed city and county roads that are also eligible for FHWA emergency funds.

Approximately $1 billion is available from the FHWA Emergency Relief Program. States rely on this program in times of crisis and disaster to provide needed funding to repair federal aid highways. Unfortunately, although adequate funds are available, under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Colorado may receive no more than $100 million in program relief. This is a significant hurdle for Colorado as we anticipate damages to exceed this limit by four times or more. In recent years, Congress raised the $100 million cap for the most severe disasters. For example, the cap was raised by Congress to $500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy. And, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, the cap was waived entirely for affected states. This flood was of a magnitude that Colorado will likely never see again and the total devastation will easily surpass several billion dollars. For this reason, we urgently need help from Congress.

I join Governor John Hickenlooper and the Colorado congressional delegation in asking for your leadership in raising the program limit to $500 million for Colorado. Before Coloradans can begin rebuilding their homes and lives, we must rebuild the roads to their communities. Increasing this cap swiftly is of the utmost importance so that we may restore Colorado's transportation network. Please contact Kurt Morrison or me should you have questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HUNT,
*Executive Director.*

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative COFFMAN.

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership, as well as our own Congressman CORY GARDNER from the State of Colorado whose district was very significantly impacted by this.

I had the opportunity last Monday to go up with the Vice President, the Governor of the State of Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS, and Congressman CORY GARDNER, whose districts were both severely impacted by the flooding, to see that damage. And it was extraordinary how much—certainly the houses were lost, and we mourn for the people that were lost—but the road damage was extraordinary. There were miles and miles of roads that we saw with whole sections missing.

So this legislation, H.R. 3174, is vital to the State of Colorado to get those roads back to where they're usable and so that, in fact, our residents in those affected areas can get to and from their homes and their businesses.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

As you can tell, not just from what everybody from our congressional delegation has said but also from the many, many news reports that we've seen in the last week, this flood really was one of the worst floods in Colorado's history.

I'm a fourth-generation Coloradan, and I remember some of the previous floods: the flood in 1965 when I was a little girl. In the terrible Platte River flood that flooded Cherry Creek and the Platte, my home was right by there, and we had flood damage. And then, of course, the tragic Big Thompson flood where many, many people

were killed. This is what happens to us in the West sometimes.

Colorado's recent flood is so dramatic that it really was a 500-year flood, or worse. And we feel terrible for the eight Coloradans who have died. Many are still unaccounted for, and we pray for all of them that they may be safe and that their homes may be preserved by the time the snow flies, which is any minute now.

On September 15, President Obama issued a major disaster declaration for Colorado, ordering Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts.

You just cannot overstate the scope of this damage. As you heard from the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), Mr. GARDNER's and Mr. POLIS' congressional districts were severely impacted by this; but all the rest of us were severely impacted in our districts, too.

Boulder had over 16 inches of rain in the course of 5 days. Communities in El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, Washington, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, and Denver were all impacted by this. It really was a State issue. Residents have lost their homes. Businesses have been devastated. Communities have been destroyed. Our friends, relatives, and neighbors still are without power. Many of them can't drink their water.

□ 1045

And as you've heard from all of my colleagues, the devastation goes everywhere, from mountain highways to agricultural properties on the plains.

Over 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed, and over 200 miles of Colorado roads have been impacted by the flooding. In the mountain areas, what happens is the roads go along the creeks; so when the creeks turn into raging rivers from this terrible rainfall, then the roads are completely wiped out and the mountain communities are isolated.

As you've heard from my colleagues, the funds for the Emergency Relief program under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 are restricted to $100 million per State per incident, unless the funds are being used to repair damage caused by Hurricane Sandy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I'm pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. If we remove the cap on the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds, Colorado can get the assistance and relief we need to rebuild. And since this does not authorize new appropriations, is not an earmark, the budget score is zero.

So I really respectfully request that we all come together and vote for this legislation. It's much needed.

And by the way, this is a good example, Mr. Speaker, of how, if Congress really wants to put its mind together to work on something, we can do it in a civil and efficient and speedy way. This is a thought we should keep in mind as the week progresses in front of us.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I appreciate the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill introduced by my Colorado colleague, CORY GARDNER, to help Colorado rebuild from the floods that have ravaged our State in recent weeks.

The flooding damaged at least 17,000 homes and other structures, several thousand of which were destroyed outright. Millions of dollars of public infrastructure have been washed away. Specifically, over 200 miles of Colorado roads, and at least 50 bridges, have been damaged or destroyed. The floods consumed an area of Colorado that is twice the size of Rhode Island.

Currently, the law caps emergency funding for highways and bridges at $100 million per State. According to a preliminary estimate from the Colorado Department of Transportation, the cost to rebuild our State's roads and bridges is several times that amount.

We are not asking Congress to appropriate any additional funds. We are simply asking that we be able to access money that Congress has already appropriated for reconstruction after a natural disaster. This legislation has a Congressional Budget Office score of zero, meaning it does not add a dime to our national debt.

The flooding was worse in the northern part of the State, but there were heavy rains and flooding even in the southern part of the State, which I represent, and two people, unfortunately, were swept away and lost their lives.

I do thank my colleagues for their consideration of this bill to help the great State of Colorado to rebuild.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this House should be proud to stand with Colorado. Anyone who saw the State seeming to be washed away and floods the likes of which I've never seen in my life would have her heart go out to the residents of the State.

Mr. Speaker, also I know that last week there was a United Nations report that found that, when they surveyed scientists from throughout the world, there was a 95 percent agreement, a 95 percent certainty that climate change is having its effects right now. That is a very high percentage for scientists to give to any issue. We know that a combination of factors produced these thousand-year floods, whatever you want to attach to them, in Colorado. But they certainly were aided and abetted by climate changes.

This House needs to take climate change seriously. As difficult as it is, we're going to see more and more catastrophes like this and, as usual, they will be in places we never expected them. In places where there are not tornados, we will see tornados. In places where there have not been floods, that is what we have seen in just the last few years.

So I certainly am pleased, and I'm sure every Member of this House will be pleased, to stand with the residents of Colorado as they try to recover from this flood which has devastated so many of their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3174 makes funds already appropriated to the Emergency Highway Relief program available for response to the devastating floods in Colorado this summer. Critically, the bill accomplishes this without providing additional budget authority on net, or increasing the deficit over 10 years.

Under our budget rules, discretionary appropriations that the Congress designates as an emergency are not subject to budget limits and do not have to be offset with other spending reductions. To ensure emergency appropriations are only devoted to emergency requirements, our budget rules do not allow emergency funds to be used as an offset for non-emergency purposes. If this were allowed, it would provide a backdoor means of allowing funds for non-emergency purposes to escape budget limits.

This legislation is attempting to make available funding for flooding in Colorado using funds already appropriated and designated as an emergency by Congress. However, this bill is not an appropriations measure. From a budget scorekeeping standpoint the effect of the bill is to decrease emergency discretionary budget authority and increase non-emergency mandatory budget authority. If this bill instead amended the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–2) and designated the funding for Colorado floods as an emergency, then the purposes of this bill would be accomplished without any scored increase in budget authority. Because there is no effective process for designating mandatory spending as an emergency, the non-emergency mandatory budget authority increase in this bill cannot be offset by the decrease in emergency discretionary budget authority.

In the end, this bill intends to meet new emergency needs making use of existing emergency funds. For that reason, I am going to support this legislation. However, I do not view this as a precedent and will not view a reduction in emergency spending as an appropriate offset for non-emergency funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3174.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S.

1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1348

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

**SEC. 2. TERMINATION.**

Section 108 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2013'' and inserting ''October 1, 2018''.

**SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1348.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1348, the Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1979, Congress enacted the Congressional Award Act to promote initiative, achievement, and excellence among young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old. To earn an award, participants must complete a self-designed program of challenging goals in four program areas: voluntary service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

Program participants can work toward a congressional award certificate or medal. In either category there are three achievement levels: gold, silver, and bronze. Minimum requirements must be met regarding the number of hours devoted to each of the four program areas, total hours worked toward the award, and the duration of the participant's efforts.

Senators and Representatives present the awards at local, city, or State ceremonies. It has been my great pleasure to make such presentations many times. The latest was a presentation of the silver medal earlier this summer to one of my constituents from Lewisville, North Carolina, Shelby Birkedal. Shelby worked more than 200 hours of community and 100 hours of physical activity to earn her very well-deserved honor, and we are very proud of her achievement.

As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would surely agree, it is of great importance to provide support and encouragement to America's young people, particularly when they're learning the value of giving back to their communities and becoming productive, upstanding citizens.

The legislation before us today provides an opportunity simply to extend this worthwhile program through the fiscal year 2018, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the majority and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for bringing this legislation to the floor. This is bipartisan legislation which promotes initiative, achievement, and excellence among young people.

The Congressional Award Act empowers young people to take greater responsibility for their own lives, to discover new talents, to advocate on behalf of others, and to take positive action in the community.

The Congressional Award Program has helped thousands of young people, including some of the most disadvantaged youth, find ways to get involved in public service. It shows young Americans how to set goals and to achieve them. Through this program, these young people gain self-confidence, problem-solving skills, and the ability to work as part of a team, traits that are valued by employers and institutions of higher education.

Since its inception in 1979, this program has grown substantially. Today, total participation in the Congressional Award Program exceeds 35,000 participants. In my home State of California, 6,491 participants have enrolled since 1979, completing over 450,000 hours of community service.

As a nonprofit organization that operates almost exclusively through private donations, the Congressional Award Act is an excellent example of successful public-private partnerships, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Again, I thank the committee for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I'd like to thank my Senate colleagues, and Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware in particular, who worked diligently to ensure this important program is renewed in a timely manner.

Providing these awards to young people in my district has been a great honor and privilege for me throughout my tenure representing North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District. The participants of this program continually inspire me, and I look forward to many more ceremonies in the years to come.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on S. 1348, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1348.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1719

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 2:53 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the resolution H.J. Res 590.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 4:02 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3210.

That the Senate passed S. 1560.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–239) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 367 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 367

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendments to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House recede from its amendments and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 7, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). 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 dear friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, 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 367, of which we're here for today, provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Speaker, at midnight tonight, just a few short hours from now, the Federal Government will shut down if Congress, that is both the House and the Senate, do not act to provide the necessary appropriations to run our government. The legislation before us today will ensure that a shutdown does not happen, and we will take important steps to ensure that ObamaCare, known as the Affordable Care Act, does not have the opportunity to hurt American jobs and continue to drag down our economy by delaying the individual mandate for 1 year. Additionally, this CR will ensure that Congress is not exempt from ObamaCare and that Members and their staffs do not receive a special taxpayer-funded health care subsidy.

These are important issues, Mr. Speaker. They're being talked about all across America today. They were talked about on Sunday at tables all across America as families gathered together about the rightness of what we, as Republicans, are attempting to do, and that is we are attempting to save this country and the American people, the free enterprise system, and free people from having to have a government-run health care system.

This government-run health care system has already been estimated to cost twice what it was expected to do, and since this health care law has come into play, for every one full-time job, there have been six part-time jobs created. We do not want a part-time working America, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, our country cannot be the greatest Nation in the world if we're a part-time working society.

Mr. Speaker, the American people did not agree with this bill at the time it was passed. Despite that, the Democrats rammed this through the House and the Senate, and it was signed by the President in record time while millions of Americans were protesting all across America the same day it was passed in the House.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, this has been an issue that has harmed American businesses. Business leaders, businessmen, unions, and union leaders are all gathering together to say this is the wrong thing to do.

The law takes advantage of those people who have health care today. It is a direct violation of what the President said it would do; and in my State of Texas, if you have a deceptive trade practice, if you sell something one way and the product is another, it is talked about in a way that it would be against the law.

What we're trying to do is change the law. Republicans, over the last few years, have tried to delay it, defund it, get in the way of it, change it, talk about it, and to engage the President of the United States at the highest levels.

We are now at a point where there is a must-pass piece of legislation. Republicans do not intend to shut down the government; but we are insistent, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation that we bring forth today will level the playing field on a terrible piece of legislation.

The American people sense the unfairness, and they have seen it take place in their marketplace, in their workplace. And as we all become unemployed or move to part-time work, we will see that this devastating law of a ''one-size-fits-all for everybody'' health care plan, run by the government, is not a wise way to go. So that's why we're here on the floor today.

Republicans are on the floor today. We were here earlier in the week. We were here last week. We've been here ever since the day it was passed. We are consistent in our behavior. Every single Republican believes this is a bad way to do things. I think business sees that too.

The American people, in a poll of The New York Times and in a CBS poll just last week, 60 percent of those who responded to The New York Times and CBS said that they are not supportive of this bill.

So will someone stand up for the American people? Dadgum right: it's called the Republican Party. Our great Speaker and our great leader, JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, have asked us to come to the floor today to move a bill; and the Republican Conference is there. We're hoping that the United States Senate and the American people all get together on this, and then President Obama will see the wisdom behind learning from mistakes that have been made in the past.

I have every reason to believe that what we're doing here will be good for the American people. We will listen to the voices, and we will move forth together. We're giving everybody a chance to be heard from today, and tonight will be an opportunity for the American people to know that it was

the Republican Party that stood up on their behalf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague is certainly right: we have been here time after time after time on this issue. But we are standing on the brink of the worst government shutdown in modern history. Unlike 1994, the pending government shutdown would reach across the entire Federal Government. In 1994, half of the congressional appropriations bills had been signed into law by the President; and as a result, those Federal agencies were able to operate through the shutdown.

But this year, because of the draconian budget levels included in the misguided sequester, the majority was unable to pass a single appropriations bill into law. In fact, they ran out of money about halfway—well, certainly after we got through the Defense budget and, for the first time since I have been in Congress, were unable to pass the Transportation bill. And because of that, again, we find ourselves in this terrible position. Now as a result, should the government shut down, it is going to be more harmful and more widespread than the last one.

Mr. Speaker, these are very real and very serious consequences that we face, and it is in the face of these consequences that the majority has chosen to continue what can only be described as dangerous partisan games. We have, indeed, been here before. The first time, the majority wanted to defund the Affordable Care Act, and second, they decided to just delay it. But then on that bill, they threw in a chance to do away with the medical device tax, which will create a trillion-dollar deficit increase over the next 10 years and will hit women's reproductive rights next time.

Just today, we saw the first lady of Texas, Ms. Anita Perry, who said in an interview that abortion should be a woman's right and that she believed that women should have the right to choose; and we thank her for that and couldn't agree with her more.

But now what are we coming up with today? Well, we are not going to back away from anything. We are just going to try to kill the health care bill, which we know we can't do. It's taking effect tomorrow morning.

What we are going to do now, they say, is to delay the mandate, which is a large part of the funding for the bill; and in addition to that, they have decided that Members of Congress and our staff will not be able to get the government copay that most people get. In fact, most people who have health care in America get it from their employer. And we aren't going to be denied from being able to do that because the gentleman from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, who claimed that he made a mistake, inserted that into the bill when he said just this week that he did not mean for us not to be a part of the government health care system, but that somebody had misinterpreted his idea and wrote it wrong. So that's where we are with that today.

But the majority's proposal before us today is going to do that, and they are going to say to all these young people who come to Washington with such promise and such energy and such verve, really, to try to do something good for their country and who look forward so much to being able to have the great privilege of working in the Capitol of the United States that they're not going to have help with their health insurance, driving many of those, I think, to leave and to find other work and others to really not be able to get the health care that they need.

So why did we do that? Heaven only knows. But, frankly, I would be embarrassed—and I have mentioned this in the Rules Committee—to look around the room at the staff that we praise all the time for their ingenuity, for their faithfulness, for their willingness to stay, as we did Sunday morning until 12:30, without ever making a complaint at all and punishing them through health care.

As offensive as this proposal is, it's a fitting example of the vision for America that the majority has. It's a vision of an America where insurance companies are put back in charge of the health care system, where price-gauging and price discrimination go unchecked, where the most vulnerable among us, including cancer patients, the victims of domestic violence and children born with preexisting conditions, could be denied access to health care.

The New York Times did some wonderful pieces on that in The Sunday Times yesterday, talking about people who have been burdened so much that they are literally bankrupt from the cost of health care. This bill takes every step to avoid that in the future.

I'm not sure that people understand that what happens is that we have turned around what used to be the yearly cap that insurance companies would charge their clients and now say that if you are a single person with health insurance, that once you have paid out of pocket $6,400 for medical procedures and medicine, the insurance company then for the rest of the year will pay your costs. What's not to like about that? If you are a family, $12,000 is the cost.

After seeing what we saw yesterday and reading in The Times that people with cancer many times were unable at all to try to even get the care and that we know—and I know from the work that we have done with cancer patients—that many of them go untreated. If there's anything worse than getting cancer, being diagnosed with cancer, it has to be being unable to pay for treatment.

These are the things that the majority wants to do away with. I've never seen so much work in all my life to try to prevent 30 million Americans—our brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, everybody—from being able to have health insurance, many of them for the first time in their lives.

I met a woman in the last campaign who told me that she was so excited because she had just signed up for Medicare. The woman was born with cerebral palsy; and under the present insurance laws, she was not at all insurable. So she went through her whole life, bringing up children, running a household, driving a car, all the things that could cause the kinds of accidents that leave you permanently impaired without a dime's worth of health insurance.

She was not alone in that. Children who had head injuries or other members of the family could often use up their lifetime limit of about $1 million in less than a year, and they were never insurable again in the United States. We're not going to go back to that.

So there's something we can do here today. What we can do is vote this down, go back to the Rules Committee, take up the Senate's clean bill, which is over here at the desk, pass that bill in the House and the Rules, bring it here, pass it in the House in a bipartisan way—by the way, that wouldn't hurt. And then lo and behold, that bill is ready to go to the President's desk, and we could get that signed. A shutdown would be averted. Health care would be available to people who desperately need it and desperately want it.

We should not continue to be the only industrialized country on the face of the Earth that does not provide health care for its people. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and the underlying legislation and demand that we pass the Senate bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from New York, my dear friend, makes many, many important points about not only the law that was passed but about maybe some comments about what we're doing here.

I have great sympathy, respect for men and women, people, children, seniors who are born with diseases that sometimes emanate during their lives, great respect for that. And I do agree with the gentlewoman that our government, in a public-private partnership—we are working with States—should, needs to, must create a better system to take care of those who are uninsured, or maybe had been ''uninsurable.''

And this is where, for years, there had been a big debate in Washington about how to best do that. And the facts of the case are real simple: that every time we had an opportunity in the Republican Party to try to get that

done, it became a point of decision-making by the Senate, and they blink. The House many times passed all sorts of bills that would allow people to be insured across State lines, better ways to make larger team sizes for insurance so that risk pools would have a better opportunity to be managed.

But instead of us taking care of some 23 million to 30 million people who were in this circumstance, the bill aimed at 230 million people. And it put rules and regulations and restrictions on business and hiring. And it was less about coverage and more about a hammer from Washington, D.C. There are lots of examples of this; but one of them might be the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which the Democrats wrote into the law that it could not receive any legislative or judicial updating. You could not challenge the law that they decided on of benefits and payments. That's just one part of this outrageously expensive and overbearing health care bill. We've talked about that. We've talked about how expensive it is and how it's causing business—

Delta Air Lines, as an example. And Delta Air Lines has a very good plan. But they came to the administration in February this last year and said, it's going to cost Delta Air Lines $100 million more in just the first year.

□ 1745

Now, that's not helping people. That's highway robbery. That is harming business, harming the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I'm for balance. I'm for reasonableness. I'm for opportunities, and so is my party. But we are not for diminishing the greatest economy in the world by arbitrarily doing it with a one-size-fits-all ObamaCare that not one Republican voted for and that Democrats are still gleeful about.

So we're here today; we've been here for quite some time, as the gentlewoman admitted, yes, day after day. We're kind of relentless about this because we're worried about what's happening. We've seen employment figures, higher taxes, more spending, more government. Oh, by the way, indecision along the way, where the administration really can't figure out what they're doing.

So what we're saying is that we think everybody ought to be into the same bucket that employers are in, and that is we've already delayed it, so we should do the same for individuals.

And we're going to shut down the government over that?

That's the question. We're going to shut down the government, Republicans, because we want to put individuals on the same footing as what President Obama gave a pass to business?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm from Texas, and I recognize that we like freedom and opportunity and less taxes and more opportunities. By golly, we employ a lot of people. But I think the whole country sees this, and what the whole country sees is the reasonableness that the Republican Party comes to the floor—and we're going to keep the battle going—to say we think everybody, at least the individual, ought to be treated the same as business. We think the President of the United States made a mistake, and we're politely, today, trying to say: Mr. President, can we please fix that mistake? Can we please give to the individuals of this country, men and women who pay their taxes and work hard, can we give them equal representation with what you gave to people who run businesses?

Now, I'm a business guy, but I'm also an individual, and that's why the Republican Party is doing what we're doing, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking for anything that's unreasonable. As a matter of fact, we're going to—if I'd hurry up, we could get it quickly to the floor to where we could vote on this, but an explanation's necessary.

Reasonableness, common sense, and doing the right thing, and that's what the Republican Party is here doing. That's what our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, is doing. That's what our awesome majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, is doing.

We are going to bring to the floor—our Republican majority will be here—and we're going to pass this that says we believe the same thing that happens to business, where the Obama administration was not ready for them and so they gave them a pass for a year, we think the same thing is true for individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. As we look up at the clock, we see that there is only 6 hours and 10 minutes to a completely unnecessary and economically harmful government shutdown.

Now, I don't see the junior Senator from Texas on the floor, but I presume that he has signed off on the latest feeble Republican strategy since he seems to be the one calling all the shots around here.

So I say to my Republican friends: Enough. Enough of the gamesmanship; enough of the legislative ping-pong; enough of the high fives and cheers on the floor. It's time to put on your grown-up pants and do your jobs.

It's a job, by the way, that should have been done months ago. The House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. But instead of going to a conference committee to hash out the numbers, the Republican leadership refused to appoint conferees; they refused to negotiate. And, as a result, we are here on the edge of the cliff.

And here's the irony, Mr. Speaker: It's clear to me, at least, that there was a majority in this House, Republican and Democrat, for passing the clean CR sent to us by the Senate. Here's another irony: That clean CR contains the numbers of my Republican friends' beloved sequester, numbers that I believe are far too low.

For the life of me, I don't understand why the Republicans don't declare victory and let us get on with the business of governing. Part of that governing is ensuring that the Affordable Care Act works as well as possible for all the American people. It's the law of the land. It's going to stay that way, and neither the Senate nor the President is going to accept any changes.

Let me just say a word about the so-called Vitter amendment that is included this bill. Unlike what my Republican friends say, the Vitter amendment doesn't make the people who work for us live like everyone else. In fact, it singles them out for special punishment. It says to the people who help us draft legislation, who answer the phones in our offices, and who respond to constituent mail, who help a veteran get his benefits or a high school student apply to the military academies that, unlike every other Federal employee, their employer will not contribute a share toward their health insurance. It's a lousy, lousy thing to do.

And I say to my colleagues, if you want to see an exodus of smart, dedicated people away from Congress, of both parties, if you want to see this place get even dumber, then, by all means, pass the Vitter amendment. Otherwise, we should treat it like the cynical talking point that it is and vote it down.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it's time for my Republican friends to put on their grown-up pants and do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule, reject the underlying bill, and pass a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying continuing resolution to keep the government open, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

This rule, and the bill it brings to the floor, also makes sure that people know that we, in the Congress, will not receive any type of exemption or special benefit under ObamaCare.

For some reason, the national media has given the President a free pass by not calling on him to compromise, or even negotiate at all, to help keep the government open. The Republicans have compromised and have voted to fund the entire government except for only one bill—ObamaCare. If a Republican President were refusing even to negotiate, he would be criticized to high heaven by the national media.

We simply are trying to treat ordinary individuals the same way and give the same delay to individual Americans that was given to big business. I

think this is a very reasonable and moderate approach that Republicans in the House have taken.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, T minus 6 hours and 7 minutes till a shutdown of our Federal Government, the greatest country on the face of the Earth with such a dysfunctional Congress that we can't even keep our own government open. We'll be voting on a bill tonight that will lead to a government shutdown.

Now, look, why will it lead to a government shutdown? It's because we have a separation of powers in our Constitution. This House of Representatives does not unilaterally run the country. We have a House; we have a Senate; we have a President. It takes compromise and working together to move forward as a country. These kinds of positioning bills are fine a month or two before a crisis, but with 6 hours left, all this bill that we will be voting on tonight will do is cause a government shutdown.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this rule so that we can get to a serious discussion about keeping the Federal Government open rather than forcing a shutdown of the Federal Government tonight, which is what will occur if the House of Representatives passes this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the favorite son of Humble, Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House, again, will vote to fund the government, not shut it down. And when we fund the government, we're going to do two things that are in fairness, that do not discriminate against folks:

One thing, we're going to let everybody get a postponement for a year. Why should big business be treated better than the individual citizen? It shouldn't, so let's postpone the whole plan for 1 year.

And also, why should special folks in Washington get exemptions, like the White House, the White House staff, Members of Congress, Members of Congress' staff, leadership staff, committee staff? We should all be under the rules of the law that is passed.

It's interesting, ObamaCare, and Obama is not under ObamaCare, neither is the White House, neither are the Cabinet Members, neither are the staff. Why not? Let's treat everybody alike, not discriminate.

And that's just the way it is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of a shutdown, a brink of sending this Nation over the cliff.

Tonight, I speak to the American people and to my colleagues. We have a very simple task—a task of mercy and grace, a task of adulthood and recognition of our responsibility to keep this government open.

I'd like to shun the party of Marie Antoinette and let them eat cake, or those who would say let's work and play while Rome is burning, or maybe even the former Republican Presidential candidate Bachmann, who says: We're smiling; we got just what we want, a shutdown of the government. I would like to shun that kind of attitude and ask my colleagues to join together in a simple task—to support the clean continuing resolution that would fund this government as we are obligated to do under the Constitution.

We have the purse strings in the House, to make sure that the government works, to make sure that our women and children are served and our veterans are served, to make sure that our parks are open. So all we have to do is a simple task—to stop going over the top and be able to respond as Americans.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I felt obligated to come to the floor tonight to try to set a few things straight. All the words that have been spoken about the amendment from the Senator from Iowa that was in the original Affordable Care Act that was signed by the President in March of 2010, but like so many things that were in the bill that was signed by the President, there were errors. It really wasn't ready for prime time. It was hastily pushed through the Senate, never went through any sort of process in the House after that point, and then got signed into law.

As a consequence—and Senator GRASSLEY has been concerned about this, and he spoke just last week—he said that the original amendment required lawmakers and staffers to enter the ObamaCare exchanges, but he didn't intend for them to lose the employer subsidy. And he said it's frustrating. It's frustrating because if they had let those of us who knew anything about health care draft this amendment, we wouldn't have the controversy.

The Senator said that the Democratic majority leader did not properly draft the statutory language for his amendment, omitting language that would have allowed the staff to keep their employer contributions while in the exchanges. He said repeatedly that the Office of Personnel Management rule was in line with the original intent of the amendment, despite the amendment not being his.

And then Senator GRASSLEY went on to say: You understand that when we adopt an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee, unlike other committees, it's not in legal language. We describe it, but then it went to the majority leader's office, and when they put the statutory language in, they screwed it up.

He said: If you want to know the truth, they had people who didn't know what they were doing. I don't know what their intent was, the Senator continued. My goal, regardless of how the amendment was worded, was that we in Congress need to go into the exchange so we'd have to go through the same red tape as every other citizen.

And that's really what we're doing here tonight, saying that that concept, that Members of Congress go through that same red tape as every other citizen in this country is required to do.

Now, we can talk about things that have been delayed in this bill. Maybe we should spend a few minutes talking about that.

Republicans have tried to short-circuit parts of the Affordable Care Act, but it's actually been the President himself who's been the delayer in chief. Many people forget that there was a Federal preexisting program set up under the Affordable Care Act, but that preexisting program closed its doors to new applicants the 1st of February of this year.

□ 1800

That means for 11 months people are frozen out of the Federal preexisting program. The press has never held the President to account for that.

We heard comments as this debate started off about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses. But, Mr. Speaker, did you realize that those caps on out-of-pocket expenses were in fact suspended by the administration earlier this year? There was very little press about that.

So all of the heralding of good things in the Affordable Care Act, you don't know what it's going to contain when it finally kicks in because the President may stop any part of it, at his discretion.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, a simple question: Why is the Speaker of this House denying this House the opportunity to have an ''up-or-down'' vote on a clean continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government operating tomorrow and beyond? Why is he not allowing a vote? Why is he not allowing Democrats and Republicans together to have a vote on keeping the government open?

Because, Mr. Speaker, if he had that vote, it would pass. It would pass on a bipartisan basis and the government would still be operating. So, apparently, the Speaker is afraid that we

would actually pass a bill to keep the government going.

So why is he not allowing the people's House to do the people's business? Well, we've been seeing this playing out around the country in the last couple of weeks. You've got a far-right extreme Tea Party element in the Republican Party that is dictating what's happening here on the floor of this House. Senator CRUZ is running the show on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, why don't you just quicken it up and pass Senator CRUZ the gavel and let him run the House?

Now why is it that this group of Members wants to shut down the government? Because tomorrow, millions of Americans are going to get access to affordable health care. Millions of Americans are already benefiting from the protections of the Affordable Care Act. But tomorrow, millions more will get access to affordable care.

Republicans are so bent—at least this Tea Party faction—on blocking that from happening and preventing those millions of Americans from getting access to affordable care, they're prepared to shut down this government. That is a scandal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The other thing that's really puzzling is while our Republican colleagues want to shut down the government to prevent the American people from getting access to the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and access to the exchange, where you have a marketplace of different plans being offered and a little help for those who are stretched thin and can't afford it, while our Republican colleagues want to shut down that part and other important parts of the Affordable Care Act, guess what the Republicans kept in their own budget? They kept the Medicare savings. I remember Mitt Romney and the Vice Presidential candidate saying how those were going to be the ruin of the country.

Well, guess what? In the Republican-passed budget that virtually every Republican Member of this House voted for, they kept those savings. And guess what else they kept? They kept the same level of revenue that would be generated by ObamaCare. Just check the Heritage Foundation statement. Every penny of revenue from ObamaCare, that level of funding is assumed in the Republican budget.

So here we have Republicans running around the country saying they've got a balanced budget, which is balanced because of ObamaCare, and now they're here saying they want to defund ObamaCare. You just can't have it both ways.

Don't shut down the government. Let's pass the bill that came out of the Senate, send it to the President, and get it done tonight.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland, coming to the floor and speaking. But I want to say something real fast, if we can, Mr. Speaker. This is to fund the government.

The second part. This is to say that the President of the United States gave a pass to business. The pass was because the President has not provided enough content and information to business to let them know how it's supposed to work. But we're not going to do the same for individuals.

And that's what this legislation says. We're going to fund the government. We're not trying to stop having people from receiving things. We're trying to say, Give us the same opportunity. Because the individuals that it does help, I do have a sense of responsibility about them. But those times thousands of more who will be harmed by what we're doing is not a balance that Republicans can put up with—the overriding effect.

So, in fact, we're here, and I can look myself straight in the mirror, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to do the right thing for the American people.

At this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and a very bright young man.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time. I thank him for his leadership in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here night after night after night, I say to my chairman, trying to keep the government open. And to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have an opportunity to work together.

I'm a hardcore, right-wing Georgia Republican, and I'm here to tell you I want to keep the government open. And I don't think there's one of you over there who questions my word that I'm here today to keep the government open, not to bring the government to a halt.

But there are also other concerns. And the biggest frustration I've had, Mr. Speaker, in my 2½ years here in the House is that the President doesn't want to talk with me and my 700,000 constituents about our priorities for America.

I carry a copy of the Constitution in my pocket, Mr. Speaker, and it lays out clearly our bicameral system here in Congress: our article I, the Congress; our article II, the White House; and our article III, the courts.

The President has been saying over and over and over again as we come upon this brink of a government shutdown, I will not negotiate. Over and over again, Mr. Speaker. I will not negotiate.

So often it's so easy for my friends to characterize Republicans as being folks who are just looking for a fight. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues as they have passed a bill to fund the government and completely repeal ObamaCare. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues when they came back and they passed a bill to fund the government but just delay the most troublesome parts for a year. And now I'm back down here again with my Republican colleagues with a bill that will fund the government but simply prevent the individual mandate from compelling individuals to engage in behavior they didn't want to engage in and to ensure that all Americans have access to the same set of rules that are applying to Congress. I don't know how to be any more fair than that.

HARRY REID said, We don't need to have any more conversations. Folks, we have more serious problems than keeping the government open if the rule book for how this place is to operate no longer means anything.

Mr. Speaker, if the President just gets to decide how it's going to be and that's going to be the way America runs, we no longer have a constitutional Republic. We have something very, very different.

We're here on the floor today to keep the government open. We're here on the floor today to continue to try to negotiate.

I'm very proud of what my chairman has done in the Rules Committee in terms of bringing us together and trying to build a program that unites people rather than divides people. You have to be seeing the same headlines I'm seeing. Delta Air Lines is dropping employees, Home Depot is dropping employees, UPS is dropping, Kroger is dropping employees. You have to be seeing that. And it has to hurt you in the same way it hurts me.

Let's come together and solve that problem. This is a step in that direction. There is much more negotiation to be done, and I hope we'll do it over the next few weeks.

Support this rule, support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been told that when elephants fight, the grass is bruised. And when Democrats and Republicans fight beyond what is reasonable, people are hurt. And many of them will not survive.

It's time for us to move beyond this debate.

Somebody said the other day that justice delayed was justice denied. I can tell you that treatment for a stroke victim that's delayed, treatment for cancer, treatment for dialysis, and treatment for liver ailments that's delayed, all of those are trips to an early grave.

It's time to vote in the Senate resolution, forget about shutting down the government, and breathe life into our process and life for the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, some of my favorites in the Democratic Party

are taking their chances to come down tonight in this spirited debate and opportunity—the very best of the Democratic Party is here. I admire these men. I began serving with Mr. DAVIS some 17 years ago. He's one of the most honorable and respected Members of this body, and I'm delighted that Danny has come down.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Sixth District of Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the realities of ObamaCare is that millions of Americans are going to lose their employer-provided health insurance and be put into exchanges. And as you look through the 2,500-pages, there's actually a provision that makes Congress eat its own cooking. It takes Congress—who voted on it in 2010, and it was signed by the President—out of the congressional and Federal plan and puts them into ObamaCare exchanges.

Well, as we get close to the day of reckoning—October 1, and January 1, when the exchanges fully take effect—a lot of people around here don't like that. And so as we were leaving for August recess, the administration issued a ruling through the bureaucracy granting subsidies to Members of Congress, essentially rewarding their political friends, without any basis in the statute, and indeed subsidies that Americans who get removed from their employer plan will not be allowed to get in the private sector.

And so I think this rule allows Members to go on record. Does Congress deserve this bailout? The statute wasn't read and understood. They're looking for an easy escape. You need to go on record and say whether you want to get this bailout.

Should Congress receive benefits for its Members that are not available to private sector employees who are in the same situation? I think the answer to that is ''no.'' And I'll cite James Madison in Federalist 57. Madison said that the beauty of a constitutional system is that the ruling class can make no law which does not have its full operation on them and their friends as on the great mass of society.

Congress should not be treated differently. This rule allows Members of this body to go on record. So I'm glad that the chairman has written it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. For well over a year, Republicans have forced our country to lurch from one politically manufactured crisis to another. Last year, they cost us over a billion dollars in a manufactured crisis over the debt limit. They began New Year's Day with a last-second pullback from a plunge over the fiscal cliff. And now they're up to their old shenanigans of shutting down the government—and that manufactured crisis is just a few days before the next one they've manufactured over the full faith and credit of the United States. This is no way to run a Congress, and it's no way to run a country.

The only path out is the same path that allowed us to escape the disaster on New Year's Day, the same path that we took that finally got relief for the Hurricane Sandy victims and the only way we passed the Violence Against Women Act—and that's to let majority rule apply on the floor of this House. And until we do that, we will have a crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. What we have to do is end the hammerlock of the ''shutdown caucus'' in the Republican Party.

□ 1815

When the Speaker finally lets a majority of this House, a bipartisan majority of Republicans and Democrats, vote on continuing the necessary operations of our government, if they'll do that tonight, it will pass in 5 minutes. It's just a question of whenever they decide to stop letting the ''shutdown caucus'' control what happens to the future of this Congress. It's the way we got relief on New Year's Day. It's the way we addressed the concerns of the Hurricane Sandy victims. It's the way we passed the Violence Against Women Act. And it's the way this country must move forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the springtime, the Republican Party passed a budget in the House; and a few weeks later, the Senate passed a budget in the Senate. And there was an attempt to bring the two parties together in a conference to work out the differences so there could be a budget before the year begins tomorrow. Now, House Republicans refuse to start that negotiation.

So when we came back after Labor Day, it became pretty obvious that we were going to reach this point on September 30 of a government shutdown unless something was done. The Republicans opened the bidding, as they always do, by saying, we want a lower level of spending, and we want to get rid of the health care bill. What's happened since then between the House and the Senate is the Senate has said, all right; we'll take the lower level of spending, but we'll keep the health care bill. You get one thing you want; you don't get both things you want. That's the compromise. Now, we could be voting on that compromise this evening and end the government shutdown because if it were on the floor, it would pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady. We have a chance in a couple of minutes to make that happen.

If the Members vote ''no'' on the question that is about to come up, it will have the practical effect of getting rid of this proposal and putting on the House floor the Senate bill that could pass and end the government shutdown.

Let's vote on the compromise. Let's give everyone here the chance to let the people work their will and end this ridiculous government shutdown that looms over the country.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the House GOP has once again exposed its extremism for all of the American people to see. The resolution that underlies this rule is dead on arrival in the Senate and will not be signed into law by the President. And so what we have embarked on is a futile legislative joyride that will only end in a government shutdown, that will hurt children, hurt families, hurt the military, hurt senior citizens, and hurt our economy. This is an unnecessary Shakespearean tragedy.

Why are we continuing to fight a battle that you have already lost? You lost it in 2010 legislatively when this Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. You lost it jurisprudentially in a court of law when the Supreme Court in 2012 declared the Affordable Care Act constitutional, and then you lost it politically last November when the President was reelected to a second term. Why are we continuing to litigate an issue that has already been resolved?

It's time to confront reality. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. Let's move on and get back to doing the business of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is—and everyone in this free world for that matter knows it—these amendments are intended for the soul purpose of shutting down the government. They're not going anywhere. Everybody knows it.

To deny this House of Representatives an opportunity for an up-or-down

vote is an affront to the American people, it's an affront to this institution, it's an affront to this democracy and every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, reject this rule so we can have a vote on a clean resolution and fund our government going forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our Congress. Our colleagues across the aisle have chosen to pursue a pointless path of petty politics that will shut down the government of the most powerful Nation on the Earth and damage the world's largest economy.

It is the height of irony that the extremists who have taken control of the Republican agenda speak of listening to the will of the people. The will of the people? The will of the people was to vote for the Presidential candidate who promised to preserve the Affordable Care Act and to reject the Presidential candidate who promised to repeal it on day one.

The will of the people was to cast a million more votes for Democratic candidates for the House than for the Republican candidates, And the will of the people is to keep this government open and to vote on a clean CR that does not have a lot of stuff added to it unrelated to preserving our government and having our government function.

Shutting down the government will raise borrowing costs, slow the recovery, and cause financial instability. Let's get a clean CR and vote for a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the former mayor of Corning.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is an opportunity to send a message across America that there will be no special treatment in Washington, D.C. for Members of Congress and Washington insiders.

It is only fair that what we do is that we treat everyone equally under the law. That is what we're dealing with here today, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about is if the President of the United States has said to Big Business, you get a pass for 1 year under ObamaCare, all we're saying is if it's good for Big Business, it's good for Americans and that every individual in America should be treated the same.

I'm asking my colleagues to join me. Don't vote to protect your own self-interest and this special contribution under ObamaCare that Members of Congress get. Treat us equally. Treat us the same. It is only fair that we keep this government open and we keep the law of the land intact for everyone equally.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership on this very important issue. And what is that issue? Do we, as Members of Congress, intend to honor our responsibilities to the American people by making tough choices to keep government open and working for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, in the dead of night, the Republican majority had a simple, but clear, choice to make: they could make a choice to accept Democrats saying ''yes'' to them on their budget number to proceed to the negotiating table to come up with a budget for our country, or they could choose in the dead of night to continue, like hounds baying at the Moon, once again—for like the 44th and 45th time—to try to overturn the Affordable Care Act. And what did they choose—and I say this with great apology to hounds because I love dogs—they chose to bay to the Moon. It was a sad thing because so much is at stake.

We should all, as Members of Congress, have confidence in what we believe in and debate full throttle the issues that are important to our country and to our constituents. We shouldn't take hostages because of the weakness of our ideas. We should go confidently to the table of policymaking to debate them, but to say we're going to shut down government unless you overturn the law of the land—that has been upheld by the Supreme Court and validated by the last election—we are going to shut down the government.

Now, the decision that they made the other night—baying night—they're continuing today, attempting to put on the floor a resolution that has no possibility of becoming the law.

We as Democrats say, you have put forth two really unpleasant proposals; one, to overturn the Affordable Care Act; and the other is hiding the terrible budget bill that they are putting forth, which even their own chairman says does not enable government to function, does not even enable us to do the job that we're here to do for the American people.

Two ''noes'' do not make a ''yes.'' Two ''noes'' make matters worse. Democrats are absolutely, totally opposed and determined that we will not shut government down. We will not be party to shutting government down, and so we're willing to take your budget figure, with the accompanying 6-week opportunity to go to the negotiating table, and develop a bill that will get rid of sequestration and all the harm that that does to our national security and to our investments in the future. Take ''yes'' for an answer.

This debate is about the budget. Keeping government open is about passing a bill, a continuing resolution to do that. Don't be insecure about your own ideas and say the only way we can prevail is if we threaten to shut government down if we don't have our own way—if we don't have our own way, we're going to shut government down. You and that attitude are a luxury this country cannot afford.

So again I say, this is an explicit offer to the Republicans in the Congress to agree to your number in this legislation and take the next weeks ahead to come to the table and negotiate—something we should have done 6 months ago. In March, the Republicans said they wanted regular order. Regular order means you pass a bill in the House and a bill in the Senate, and you go to conference—at least that's what the book says. That's what regular order is. The Republicans wanted regular order. That's what they told the President of the United States in the Oval Office. How would you like to proceed, the President said. We want regular order, said Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCONNELL.

The House passed its budget bill. Republicans started saying things like ''no budget, no pay'' to the Senate, the taunt. The Senate had planned to—and did—pass its budget bill. That would be the regular order. Now we go to the table to reconcile our differences.

The minute the Senate passed its bill, the Republicans abandoned any interest in the regular order. Why? Maybe they were afraid that people would see the contrast of what they want to do in their budget compared to the investment in the future, the statement of our national values that our Democratic proposal had under Chairwoman PATTY MURRAY in the Senate and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN in the House.

Whatever the reason, for 6 months they have not wanted to negotiate, and for 6 months they were saying the President doesn't want to negotiate. But they are the ones who have the responsibility, under the regular order of the House, to come to the budget table to reconcile our differences.

I salute the President for saying that the full faith and credit of the United States is not negotiable. We will not default on the debts that we have all incurred already.

□ 1830

That is over here. So when he says that's not negotiable, that doesn't mean that we won't negotiate on the budget which is in the form of a continuing resolution, a separate issue.

You can only conclude that ''insecure'' because of the poverty of ideas or ''just determined to shut down government,'' maybe because they don't fully understand the consequences of it.

The Republicans have once again come to the floor with a bill which they know will shut down government. 5½ hours from now—5½ hours from now—we either bay to the Moon again or we'll make the right decision to take ''yes'' for an answer, we agree to your number for the purpose of going to the negotiating table.

Our number is what we agreed to with you in the Budget Control Act, a

bipartisan agreement—$1.58 trillion versus $986 billion. That's an $80 billion comedown. That number was a comprise to begin with. That wasn't like plush with spending. It was a comprise to begin with. Now we are underfunding government; and that's not good enough for you, to underfund in meeting the needs of the American people. You want to shut down government.

I would hope that all who think this is not a good idea will express themselves on the rule, because the rule does not allow us to have a vote, a clean vote, on your suggestion for a continuing resolution at $986 billion. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their number. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their proposal, and let's do it in a way that is clean and does not place in doubt whether government will be open in the morning to meet the needs of the American people.

I hope that in the previous question enough people will reject what the Republicans are putting forth, and certainly on the rule we can do that. Otherwise, we'll go time and time again—46 times—to vote against undermining the Affordable Care Act. Instead, we could have passed an immigration bill. We could have passed a bill to make sure we had background checks for people who are legally able to purchase guns to make sure that they are. God willing, we could have passed legislation creating jobs, investing in the future for our country.

But all of those things can be the legitimate—not all, but the stuff about the job initiatives and investing in the future are the legitimate debate of priorities that is the budget debate. That is what I hope the Republicans will allow: something they asked for—the regular order; something they asked for—$986 billion in the bill; something I think we all want—keeping government open.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, not only for coming down, but for her kind words about many commonsense things. I think she also knows that this bill that's before us tonight is not to shut down the government.

I come from a family that the former Speaker has known for a long, long time. She knows a lot about me. I'm a part of this bill. I was taught by my father, yes, but also others, that you stay at the table until you get something done. It may be a little bit late at night; it may take a little bit of hard work; it may take some creative thinking. And then the athlete in me says you run through the tape. As a track guy, I always ran through the tape. As a football guy, I ran until the clock went out.

I think what the Republican Party is here trying to say is we are here at work. We are going to get our work done. We are challenging the United States Senate to do the same. We are going to pass this bill tonight because it's the right thing to do. We will stay open tonight and we'll receive their, in ping-pong terms, the ping and the pong back and forth, and we'll be ready.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you'll stay on duty. You may drink a couple cups of coffee, but you're doing the right thing for the people of Johnson County, Kansas. I know where you are from and I know what kind of man you are.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I've been in this institution for 2½ years. The minority leader from the other side of the aisle talked about hounds. I heard a lot of howling from the other side of the aisle—howling about fairness and howling about equality.

Well, talk is cheap, because today you have an opportunity to live and vote ''fairness'' and ''equality.'' For months, big business has come to this town and they have asked for an employer exemption, an exemption from the employer mandate. All we are doing tonight is saying let's treat individuals in America the same way you are treating big business. They may not have as much money or as powerful lobbyists, but they have us fighting for them. Join us so we can treat individuals like the big businesses that you give an exemption.

The President talks about how great ObamaCare is, but we have to note that he has excluded his administration. The Press Secretary, Mr. CARNEY, he gets up off and then talks about how great this bill is. If it is so great, what we do tonight is we allow the administration, like us in Congress, to come into ObamaCare and we remove the subsidy from us and from the administration. Let's treat Congress with the same equality and the administration with the same equality as the American people, and let's treat the American people the same way you are treating big businesses in America.

This is easy. Walk the walk; don't just give us the talk.

Let's vote for this rule and let's pass this bill tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, bring us some leadership.

There is only one issue before the United States Congress, and that's the issue to keep government open. The bill to do that is in this House. The bill to keep the government open is in this House. If it were on the floor, we would pass it in 1 minute. It would go to the President and he would have it signed before he went to bed. That's all we have to do.

But this rule brings all kinds of other baggage and says, no, we don't want to keep government open; we want to get into other issues. Well, aren't all the other issues what we are about for all the other part of the year? This is the only day and the only moment when we can keep government open. It's the last chance.

They say: Oh, do you know what? Well, you know, this is a partisan thing. I heard the chairman say: You know, it was a mistake to pass, the President made a mistake. That's what you said.

Well, we thought President Bush made a mistake in invading Iraq. In fact, the majority of Democrats fought against it, argued against it, and voted against it. But when we went to Iraq, we didn't try to stop the whole Congress to block the budget. No. In fact, on the appropriations to pay for it, the Democrats voted for it. We admit it—we lost.

You lost on the ObamaCare, or whatever else you want to call it. It's the law. Some reports declared it. If you want to deal with other issues, put it in other bills, but don't attach it to this bill.

Reject this rule that brings the baggage. Bring the clean bill. Let's pass it in the next hour and, Mr. President, have it signed by midnight, and let's keep this government open. It does so much damage otherwise. So many kids, so many women, so many poor people really get hurt.

This is not leadership. This is meanness.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

I would like to advise the gentlewoman I have no further speakers, and I'll wait for her to run through her time and close, then I will do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one further speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that if we want the government to stay open for just another 45 or 75 days, we should torpedo the Affordable Care Act. Then what happens in November or December? Are we told that to keep the government open any further we have to strip-mine Yellowstone, we have to abolish Medicare?

The fact is it is wrong to take hostages. It is wrong to say that the government will shut down if that is the only way that you can achieve your legislative objectives.

What would the country think of us if we said we are going to shut down the government unless we get gay rights, gun control, cap-and-trade, immigration reform? Or what would the country think of us if we said gay rights, but only for 1 year; keep the government open for 1 year, get gay rights for 1 year.

Taking hostages is wrong. Holding hostage the greatest country in the world is wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I had a chance earlier today—because we are not doing a whole lot other than arguing for the last few days—to run up The Mall and go for a little jog. I went by the Washington Monument, the World War II Memorial, ran all the way out to Arlington where the Iwo Jima Memorial is.

I got to thinking about all the great people in this country who have built this government and invested so much, sacrificing their very lives to preserve this government and to elevate it to a point where it is respected around the world. I thought about the debate that's going on here today. We should not be disgracing their memory, all of those people from Jefferson to FDR and others, by dissolving this government, by defunding it and allowing it to fail. We owe the American people better than that. There's a solution here.

Hey, look, I didn't vote for the Affordable Care Act either. I thought it was a flawed bill. But that's a different argument about how to make that work best for the American people. We are failing the American people by allowing this government to shut down. It's a terrible precedent to set. It's disgraceful, and the American people deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague has no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. That would be correct.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today is a truly shameful day in the distinguished history of this House. Far from the noble mission that some from the other side may claim, what is before us is an extreme—and extremely cynical—attempt to extract a ransom from the American people. They have issued their demands knowing full well they will not be met. Yet they are taking another step towards a government shutdown in order to deny 30 million uninsured Americans health care.

Time has run out. We are down to our last chance. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and ask once more that we be given the opportunity to vote on the Senate bill, a clean bill, that can go directly to the President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we are here tonight because the Republican Party recognizes that men and women of this country are worried about their future, worried about economics, worried about taking care of their family. We've seen food prices double since the President has been our President. We've seen energy prices double. We've seen more rules and regulations. We've seen a war on coal. We've seen all sorts of things that have taken place.

But taking over your health care is a pretty serious matter. We disagreed with it then, but we've tried to work with the President. We've had seven or eight bills that actually did work, but the President recognized that there were fraudulent parts of the bill that needed to be taken advantage of and we got rid of those.

□ 1845

Tonight, we are here to say ''fairness.'' You should not give one group of people one thing and not give to the others. Likewise, we believe the President of the United States and his administration should be in the exact same health care that Members of Congress are in. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

Best of all, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 367, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on S. 1348, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
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)

NAYS—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Clay
Grimm
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1908

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 204, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
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
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
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)

NAYS—204

Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1915

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 35, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—387

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—35

Amash
Barton
Benishek
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Fleming
Franks (AZ)
Griffith (VA)
Harris
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jones
King (IA)
Kingston
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Schweikert
Stockman
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Chabot
Gohmert
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Royce
Rush
Schrader
Schwartz

□ 1922

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 367, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

*the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:*

*SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:*

*(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–6), except section 735.*

*(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113–6).*

*(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113–6).*

*(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6).*

*(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113–6).*

*(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113–6).*

*(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—*

*(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), including section 3004; and*

*(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—*

*(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112–175); or*

*(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).*

*SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.*

*(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.*

*SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.*

*SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.*

*SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 15, 2013.*

*SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.*

*SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.*

*SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.*

*SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.*

*SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).*

*(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the*

*first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.*

*SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.*

*SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).*

*SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.*

*(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, $273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and $469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.*

*(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113–6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.*

*SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113–6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting ''fiscal year 2014'' for ''fiscal year 2013'' each place it appears.*

*SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''December 31, 2012''.*

*SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for ''Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction'' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.*

*SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.*

*SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''October 1, 2012''.*

*SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20–127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services'' at a rate for operations of $1,012,000,000.*

*SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''October 4, 2013''.*

*SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'', ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'', and ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—*

*(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 113–6;*

*(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and*

*(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 113–6.*

*(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.*

*SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for ''Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management'', there is appropriated $36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That of the funds provided, $15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.*

*SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for ''Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management'', there is appropriated $600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.*

*SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 129. The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.*

*SEC. 130. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.*

*SEC. 131. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading ''Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses'' in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting ''is authorized to collect and retain up to $2,499,000'' for ''may retain up to $1,499,000''.*

*SEC. 132. The first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting ''2014'' for ''2012''.*

*SEC. 133. Amounts provided by section 101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.*

*SEC. 134. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.*

*SEC. 135. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englebardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, $174,000.*

*SEC. 136. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'' at a rate for operations of $2,455,490,000.*

*SEC. 137. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration'' in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.*

*This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.*

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky moves that the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate, and concur therein with the amendment printed in House Report 113–239.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert at the end (before the short title) the following:

SEC. 138. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the date referred to in section 106(3) shall be December 15, 2013.

SEC. 139. For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction'' in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 140. Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section in fiscal year 2014 during the period ending on December 15, 2013 shall be the sum of—

''(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

''(II) 2,000.

''(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

''(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 15, 2013.''.

SEC. 141. (a) DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' in clause (i) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''2016''.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''2016''.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SEC. 142. Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES.—'';

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''and congressional staff'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees''; and

(B) by striking ''or congressional staff'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress'';

(B) in subclause (II), by inserting after ''Congress,'' the following: ''of a standing, select, or joint committee of Congress (or a subcommittee thereof), of an office of the House of Representatives for which the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the office for the year involved is provided under the heading 'House Leadership Offices' in the act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year involved, or a leadership office of the Senate (consisting of the offices of the President pro Tempore, Majority and Minority Leaders, Majority and Minority Whips, Conferences of the Majority and of the Minority, and Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate),''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—The term 'political appointee' means an individual who—

''(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

''(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart D of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee for coverage under this subparagraph.

''(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

''(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.J. Res. 59.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to move forward once again with H.J. Res. 59, the short-term continuing resolution that will keep the government open after the end of the 2013 fiscal year at midnight tonight.

We simply can't wait a second longer. At this late hour, we must move ahead at an accelerated pace to keep the doors of our government open. For the sake of our Nation, we must pass this continuing resolution. Mr. Speaker, the operative word here is ''continuing.''

The bills we've had on the floor, including this most recent version, do not shut down the government, as many colleagues on the other side of the aisle have falsely said. This bill, and the ones before it, continues the important functions of the Federal Government. That means our citizens will continue to benefit from these programs and services, and passing this bill will allow this Congress to continue to make progress on our important legislative work, including finding meaningful, responsible, bipartisan solutions to our fiscal problems, like the debt ceiling, sequestration, and the most immediate issue at hand, funding the government for the 2014 fiscal year.

We did not bring a resolution to shut down the government, Mr. Speaker. We brought a continuing resolution to continue the government.

A shutdown will help no one. It will only harm our Nation's security and

our economy. It will hurt our people, who rely on the Federal Government's programs and services in some way or another and who put faith in their government to act in their best interests.

Mr. Speaker, the House is not the body that is refusing to act. We aren't the ones who are not willing to budge. This is the third or fourth compromise we've offered to the Senate. They simply ignore us, throw it in the trash can.

House Republicans have now offered multiple bills, including one with just a repeal of the widely unpopular medical device tax. We've even incorporated changes that the Senate had proposed, but the Senate still refuses to engage, as does the White House. Today we offer yet another piece of legislation designed to keep the government open.

As with the previous CRs that the House has considered, this continuing resolution will fund the government through December 15 at the current post-sequestration funding rate.

□ 1930

It will incorporate most of the Senate's changes to our first CR, and include the few additional changes that I proposed as an amendment and that were added in the House on Saturday night. It will also delay for 1 year ObamaCare's individual mandate, and eliminates the employer subsidy for the health insurance plans of Members of Congress and our staffs and for political appointees at the White House.

No one, Mr. Speaker, is going to like everything in this bill. I don't like everything in this bill. But the continuing resolution before us today is the most immediate path to avoiding a shutdown. I expect that the House will do the right thing and approve this CR today.

I remain hopeful that the Senate will work with the House and pass this legislation. The people of this great Nation deserve more. They deserve a government that works for, not against, them. At the very least, that is a government that keeps its doors open.

So I urge all Members, every single Member, to vote ''yes'' on this continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Republicans insist on including riders that do not belong in an appropriations bill. Both the Senate and the President already made clear they will not accept these provisions. Still, the majority insists on taking the country toward a shutdown in a few short hours.

As the clock ticks toward midnight, when appropriations will lapse and the government will shut down, Republicans have put forward the third version of a bill that is designed to shut down government unless we delay, defund, and deny affordable health care to American families.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim Democrats refuse to negotiate. Let's review the history and Democrats' support for a compromise to keep government running:

Republicans pushed us to the brink of default in the summer of 2011, resulting in a credit downgrade;

Republicans walked out of negotiations with the President last December aimed at reaching a budget deal for this year;

Republicans have refused to work with the Senate on the budget all year long;

Republican leadership caved to the Tea Party and withdrew a plan that, in all likelihood, would have ended this standoff by separating health care legislation from a bill to keep the government running;

And now Republicans refuse to say ''yes'' to the great concession made by Democrats in the Senate and the White House on the Republican spending level.

The shutdown isn't only tarnished by Republican fingerprints, it is entirely of their making. We could avoid a shutdown by allowing a vote on the Senate's clean bill, but Republicans just won't allow it.

This is no way to run the House of Representatives. This is no way to serve the hardworking people of the United States of America whom we represent. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I never supported ObamaCare because it's not sound policy. But if my fellow Americans have to endure this law, then why should not the Congress, the President, and the Vice President endure it as well?

You see, today's vote is about fairness. It's why I introduced my amendment to the continuing resolution, to make sure that we would eliminate the ObamaCare fix that was given to us by the Office of Personnel Management.

The American public understands what's going on. They understand that Congress always carves out their own little special interest, their little special treatment. The amendment today, this CR, would eliminate that. It would do one thing that this Congress so desperately needs, and that's to gain the sense of credibility that the American people are looking for.

It's not about gamesmanship. They're tired of that. This is about leading by example.

And while I laud my colleagues for allowing us to have this vote here today, I stood on this floor on Saturday explaining why this was so important to the American people, why it is so important to Congress. And therefore, I will say to you, even though it's politically difficult and sometimes politically hard to do the right thing, doing the right thing is always the right thing to do.

I would urge support of this CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, within hours of shutting down most of the programs that this Congress has approved or funded.

Do my Republican friends know how silly it sounds to threaten shutting down the government just to ensure that Members of Congress, our staff and White House staff don't receive the same health care benefits as other federal employees do?

To gamble with valuable federal programs should be embarrassing.

Here are just a few examples of programs that will be affected if the GOP pursues this strategy that I doubt they'd want to see happen.

The GOP shutdown would mean that the Centers for Disease Control would be unable to support annual seasonal influenza program.

Also, in the event of H7N9 influenza or Middle East Respiratory Syndrome related incident, preparation and response could be delayed.

The GOP shutdown means we rely more on foreign energy as the issuance of permits for energy production on federal lands stop. I certainly know that my Republican colleagues wouldn't want to see that happen.

Head Start centers around the country will close. During FY12, an estimated 1,600 Head Start agencies served over 950,000 children, including 71,963 children in Texas. Apparently, our children are okay to target in this political debate.

Under the GOP shutdown, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives will be affected and gun permits will not be processed.

And very importantly, veterans' educational, compensation, and pension benefits processing would likely be delayed, as happened in the 1995–96, shutdowns. Texas has the second highest number of veterans in the country at nearly 1.7 million.

To make this even more unreasonable, the Affordable Care Act, which you hate, will continue to go forward even if you shut down the United States Government since it's mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to be reasonable and pass a clean CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We are hours away from a shutdown of the Federal Government that will damage our economy and make life harder for millions of families, especially families living on the edge.

If the majority continues down this path, hundreds of thousands of workers will be sent home; many others will

continue to work without pay; antihunger and nutrition support for women, infants, and children will dry up; home and small business lending will freeze; lifesaving research will be put on hold; parks and museums will close.

The one thing this will not stop is the Affordable Care Act going into effect. That act is the law of the land, passed by the Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and endorsed by the American people last November. Tomorrow, regardless of what the majority tries to do here tonight, enrollment begins so that affordable health insurance coverage is available.

Instead of working with Democrats to move a budget forward, the majority's leadership is allowing the fringe ideologues in their party to turn the budget process into a hostage crisis. Kill the Affordable Care Act, they argue, or America gets it. This is not responsible leadership.

Nonpartisan studies have shown that the delay in this amendment will cause higher health insurance premiums, higher costs for the government, and worse health care coverage for everyone.

The majority knows exactly what they are doing. Two days ago they introduced amendments that were poison pills. Now we see an equally poisonous amendment to the budget today. They are rooting for a shutdown. One Republican Member even said, and I quote, ''We're very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.''

Another said, and I quote, ''It's wonderful.''

It is not wonderful. It is terrible for our economy and for our families.

This is extortion and this is hostage-taking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together as we, the people, to solve the serious challenges facing our country, yet we find ourselves on the precipice of a GOP-driven government shutdown.

The standoff between the Tea Party and other Republicans is now leading to a GOP shutdown of our entire Federal Government. Extreme partisanship threatens our economic recovery and job creation across our country. Thousands of workers at Ohio's largest employer, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, are about to be furloughed. Most NASA employees, including the NASA Glenn Research Center at Brook Park, near Cleveland, will be sent home.

Here in Washington, World War II veterans on their way here with Honor Flights across this country to visit the World War II Memorial on The Mall will find the Visitor Center closed.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to govern by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis. The madness must stop. America needs leadership, not extreme partisanship. We need statesmanship, not brinksmanship. America has work to do putting our people back to work, educating the next generation, curbing crime, and improving health care.

So the Republicans want to shut down the government? This will deeply hurt our country. It will hurt Ohio. There's no reason for it beyond shameful, partisan politics. It's time for the Republicans in Congress to come to their senses.

Vote against the GOP shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lexington, Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my neighbor.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House is voting once again to fund the government and to prevent a shutdown. The House is also continuing the effort to listen to the American people and give a voice to those who want to limit the harmful impact of ObamaCare.

The President said that the House is shutting down the government, but the House has acted multiple times to prevent a government shutdown. It is the President and the Senate majority leader who are refusing to negotiate, refusing to compromise, refusing to seek a bipartisan solution or a middle ground.

The President will negotiate with Vladimir Putin, the President will negotiate with the leaders of Iran, but he won't negotiate with the duly elected Representatives of the people in Congress.

In divided government, the only way forward is to negotiate. The American people witnessed one-party rule in 2010 when Congress rammed through ObamaCare on a party-line vote, and they didn't like it. The only thing that was bipartisan about ObamaCare in 2010 when it was enacted was the bipartisan opposition to it, and so they elected a different Congress and they divided power. So when you have divided power in government, the only way forward, when there is a difference of opinion, is to negotiate and compromise.

I come from the district, Mr. Speaker, of Henry Clay, a great Speaker of the House. Henry Clay is a model for this President and this Congress. We need to come together and negotiate and abandon the stubborn refusal to lead, which will guarantee a government shutdown. The President needs to work with House Republicans to find a middle ground, and this bill is the middle ground, Mr. Speaker.

When I found out that Members of Congress, the President, members of his Cabinet, and the political elite in Washington got a special exemption from ObamaCare, I introduced a simple, two-page piece of legislation, and it's called the Live by the Laws You Write Act, and it's a simple concept:

Why should we allow the administration to delay ObamaCare for large employers and exempt Members of Congress, himself, and the elite, but not also provide relief for individuals and families?

I believe that the President and Members of Congress should live by the same health care law that they have imposed on the American people. And so I call on my colleagues in the House, both on this side and that side of the aisle, to support fairness for the American people. If ObamaCare is what the President insists on, then it should apply to everyone, and that includes the politicians in Washington.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of discussion about the budget. I have heard a lot of discussion about a continuing resolution, and I have heard a lot about the Affordable Care Act; but I see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee here on the floor, and I see the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee on the floor, and I don't hear a lot of discussion about what I would call the operative word tonight, and that is ''appropriations.''

In article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the Congress is charged with constituting tribunals, courts, inferior to the Supreme Court. In the very next section, we are told we need to appropriate those monies to do so. We are told in article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution that Congress must provide and maintain a Navy. In section 9, we are told, absent an appropriation from the Congress, that will not happen.

The fiscal year begins tomorrow, and my great fear is that when a resolution of this continuing resolution occurs, if the date is December 15, we are going to make every agency and every department of United States Government operate just as they did last year—and, of course, last year we made them operate the way they did the year before—and have them wait for another 2½ months before we tell them what we are going to do.

□ 1945

I would suggest the operative word tonight is ''appropriations.'' We should do the Defense appropriations bill. We should do the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We should do the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We should do the Military Construction/VA appropriations bill.

We should do the other appropriations bills that are necessary to fund the operation of the greatest country on the planet Earth, and we should stop what we're doing here.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fact one: ObamaCare passed the House with 219 Democrats. Thirty-four Democrats joined the Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many of those will join us in this upcoming vote.

Fact two: Republicans have been and are poised to fund everything in government at the current levels—and are eager to do so.

Fact three: polls show that Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of defunding ObamaCare.

Fact four: the House, like it or not, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is the keeper of the purse under the Constitution, and we are well within our authority to defund an ill-conceived and unpopular program in the law.

They say that the Republicans are going to shut down the government, but I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: the Democrats began to shut down the government in 2010, when they passed ObamaCare without bipartisan support. They not only began to shut down the government but the recovery of the American economy. And for them to come now and say that this is a Republican shutdown is unbelievable. We stand ready, willing, and able to fund the Government.

There's only really one question that remains, Mr. Speaker. Four facts, one simple question. Will those same Democrats that voted in opposition to ObamaCare and the Senate listen to the American public, will they listen to their constituents, and will they vote with us this time so that our government can be funded, no shutdown will be necessary, and the American economy can continue to thrive?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, apparently we're here, largely, because a bunch of folks on the Republican side—Tea Party folks—fancy themselves strict constructionists. But I would remind them that the Founders set up the Senate to ensure that the House would act rationally and responsibly on a consistent basis.

George Washington warned us against factualism. They expected us to fund the government, to pay our debts, and they underscored the fact that when you have a disagreement, it ought to be resolved democratically.

So here we have a bill that passed the House and the Senate. The conference report passed the House and Senate. It was signed by the President. We had two national referenda, called Presidential elections. President Obama wins by 5 million votes.

We don't have the right to repeal ObamaCare. Call it what you want, it's the law of the land.

But now I understand that we are being told that unless you gut this legislation for an entire year, the Republican majority will not even fund the government for 45 days. Really? What kind of a deal is that? That's not reasonable.

The idea that you would send 800,000 people home tomorrow, not knowing when they can come back to work, not even allowing them back to their offices, and take billions of dollars out of this economy, erode the confidence that people in the United States and around the world ought to be able to have in the United States, and you are going to do all this because you want to repeal a bill that is the law of the land, just because you have the leverage that you can hold up the government from being able to operate for 45 days? That's nuts.

Our Founders would be ashamed of what this Congress has become. We're dysfunctional. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. This ought to be defeated.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker we're now just hours away from the Tea Party-inspired government shutdown. Here our Republican colleagues go again, holding the economy hostage to their ideological demands and their take-it-or-leave-it politics. This isn't the behavior of responsible legislators or of a serious political party willing to do what it takes to govern.

The only party that has actually compromised on the bill before us is Democrats, who have agreed to a short-term funding level below the Senate budget resolution, despite our belief that we should be replacing sequestration instead of locking it in.

By contrast, Republican leaders have steadfastly refused to go to conference to work out a budget with Senate Democrats. They walked away from negotiations with the President on a comprehensive budget deal in December. And now it is Republicans, as the President said, who are demanding a ransom merely for doing their job of keeping the government open. That ransom, incredibly, is health insurance for millions of our fellow citizens.

The Affordable Care Act has been upheld as the law of the land by a majority of Congress, a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a majority of Americans at the ballot box. If the junior senator from Texas and his acolytes think they can overturn those decisions unilaterally, I suggest they consult the Constitution. I'd be happy to loan them a copy.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to reject this latest Republican ploy, and this body, this country, has got to get back to the basics: keep the government running, pay the country's bills, and negotiate a comprehensive budget plan that ensures our fiscal future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Congresswoman LOWEY, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for those that may not understand what we're trying to do, all we have to do is pass one simple bill that was here in the House—the Senate gave it to us—and let's keep the government up for a number of days and continue to argue the other issues. But no, that's not what we're doing. We're taking that bill and just loading it up with a bunch of stuff that's been rejected time and time again. The consequence of that is you're not going to have a bill to the President tonight and the government will have to shut down.

It's a huge mistake. And it's not something we do. We've never done it. In fact, in the time I've been here, we've had big partisan disputes. Our party fought vehemently against President Bush's decision to go to war in Iraq. We thought it was without evidence and certainly was going to cost the government a lot of money and probably not have a great outcome. We didn't shut down the government after we lost that debate. Instead, we tried to make it work.

We fought against welfare reform. We thought that that reform of making everybody go to work even though they didn't know how to read and write—and mothers should be taking care of their children—we fought vehemently against it. And we lost. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

We fought again when Wall Street came in and said, Tomorrow, we fail. We thought, Well, it's the Republican watch. They're responsible for this. Wall Street is their business. They like that. But when we were told that this was going to bring down the economy of the Nation and the world, we helped get it passed. In fact, there were more Democratic votes than Republican votes. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

Tonight, we're on the verge of shutting down government. It's going to hurt a lot of people. It's going to hurt farmers who want to export food. It's going to hurt 8.7 million mothers in this country who want to feed their children on the WIC program. It's going to hurt 13 million children who go to school and will lose access to a school breakfast. It's going to hurt 31 million children who will lose their school meals. It will hurt 47 million low-income people who will not have food stamps.

It's a mean, reckless, ill-conceived idea to shut down the government.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me just say: here we go again, Mr. Speaker. It's really no secret that the Tea Party Republicans came here not really as public servants but to destroy and to decimate our government. We are only hours away from Tea Party extremists achieving their goal of shutting down the government. This is their dream goal. They want to shut down the government and declare victory.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is shameful, and it is downright wrong. Their dream of shutdown will create a nightmare for millions. What about the government workforce, who have families to feed and mortgages or rent to pay? What about small businesses that stand to pay the costs of these Tea Party antics? And yes, what about women and children who will lose nutrition assistance? This is downright mean.

Make no mistake, the unnecessary GOP shutdown will have serious consequences for millions. And it's entirely unnecessary. It's not enough that the Republicans already voted 45 times to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. It's not enough that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and was upheld by the Supreme Court. Tea Party extremists now want to violate this law in a very sinister way.

It's not enough that their shutdown will hurt families and our economy. This Tea Party obsession—and it's an obsession—to kill the government and to deny health care to millions of Americans must end. They need to do their job and keep the government open.

As President Obama said this afternoon:

> You don't get to extract a ransom for doing your job.

This hostage-taking must end. We must vote ''no.'' We must keep the government open. I urge all of us to think about those people who will wake up tomorrow morning with their lives in such disarray and the uncertainty that's going to exist. We should not do this. The American people don't deserve this. We need to keep the government open. We're pleading with the Tea Party extremists, Do not shut the government down.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are here tonight to keep the government open. I keep hearing that we want to shut the government down. And yet this is actually our third attempt to send something to the U.S. Senate to give them an opportunity to negotiate with us.

And why are we here talking about a continuing resolution to begin with? We're here because this year, the House Appropriations Committee, with my colleagues on the other side, has passed five separate appropriations bills. There are 12 in total. Unfortunately, during the time period that we've passed five, the Senate has passed zero. Last year, the House passed seven and the Senate passed one.

After a while, you see there's a pattern. The Senate doesn't want to work on regular order. The Senate really does prefer continuing resolutions because then they can pull stunts like the one HARRY REID is doing now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, where were they yesterday? Where were they this weekend? The Senate adjourned. Where was the President? He was playing golf. He was so concerned about the government being shut down.

Now, what is the issue with ObamaCare? The Speaker at the time, Ms. PELOSI, said we need to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it.

□ 2000

Now, that bill has grown to 7.5 feet in height, and we are reading what's in it. But two things we know that it does not accomplish is it does not decrease the cost of health care, and it does not increase the accessibility. Those were the two major objectives. Those were the selling points.

Health care is one-sixth of the economy. Therefore, I think it's the right thing to fight over.

This is something that affects every American. We know already that premiums have skyrocketed under ObamaCare and that they will only grow worse. We also know that many major companies and smaller companies are stopping providing insurance to their employees. Accessibility is going down as well.

So ObamaCare has been a failure. Why is it that the Democrat Party believes in it so bad? Even when it fails, they can't let go. I don't think it's a bad thing to say, hey, you know what, we were wrong. We tried to decrease the cost of health care, we tried to increase the accessibility, but we did not achieve that. Therefore, maybe HARRY REID should sit down with Speaker BOEHNER. Maybe the President of the United States can interrupt his negotiations with the Iranians and come and talk to the Americans, i.e., Republican Americans. I think it would be a good thing. Again, Mr. Speaker, this will be our third attempt to work with the Harry Reid Democrats to keep the government open.

But I want to say this also to my friends on the other side of the aisle who have said they want to shut down the government. Let me mention, we had 17 shutdowns since 1976. And often one might say, well, that's when you had split government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. In 1977, the government shut down three separate times—once for 8 days, a second time for 8 days, and another time for 12 days. The Democrats controlled the House, the Democrats controlled the Senate, and there was a Democrat in the White House. Indeed, over the history of the last 25 years, there have been a number of government shutdowns until the Senate, the House, and the White House sat down and negotiated. That's all we're saying tonight is, you know what, we understand we don't control government, but we are willing to negotiate.

It is time for cooler heads to prevail in the U.S. Senate. It's time for the U.S. Senate to have some adult leadership and sit down with House leadership and hammer out the differences. That's why we're here right now, while the Senate, I believe, has already gone home. I guess the President is no longer playing golf. But we are ready to negotiate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as 800,000 Federal employees think about what their fate is going to be in a very few hours from now, we are on the House floor as our Republican colleagues say, well, we'll pay for the government if you accede to these three or four demands. It seems like every day they come up with some new demands, but they don't ever arrive at funding the government.

The American people know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a Senate bill, a CR, a continuing resolution, which is ready that we can put on the floor now and fund the government and avert the shutdown. My question is, Will our Republican colleagues, will our Speaker do that?

There are moments when leadership is at issue, and this is one of them. We need the leadership that will stand here and put the Senate's clean continuing resolution on the floor so that we can avert a government shutdown and make sure that Federal employees can pay their mortgage, can buy groceries, and can have a future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

The American people don't want a shutdown, and neither do I. I didn't come here to shut down the government. I came here to fight for a smaller, less costly, and more accountable Federal Government. But here we find

ourselves in this moment dealing with a law that's causing unknown consequences and unknown damage to the American people and to our economy, and that issue is ObamaCare.

For those of you who don't recall, it was passed in the middle of the night, 2,300 pages that no one had ever read, and it's having all types of consequences for the American people, our constituents; having all kinds of consequences for employers. As a result, over the last couple of years, the President has given his friends in the labor unions some 1,100 waivers to this law.

This summer, the President decided, well, we're not going to enforce the employer mandate. Big employers around the country are all upset about having to make sure they provided health care for their employees, causing big problems. The result of all this is you've got employers all over the country who can't hire people and who are cutting the hours of their workers. It's having a devastating impact. Something has to be done. So my Republican colleagues and I thought we should defund the law for a year. We thought we should delay it for a year. Our friends over in the Senate don't seem to want to go down that path.

But I'm going to tell you what, this is an issue of fairness. How can we give waivers and breaks to all of the big union guys out there, how can we give a break to all of the big businesses out there, and yet stick our constituents with a bill that they don't want and a bill they can't afford? That's what this fight is all about.

I talked to the President earlier tonight: I'm not going to negotiate. I'm not going to negotiate. We're not going to do this. Well, I would say to the President, this is not about me and it's not about Republicans here in Congress. It's about fairness for the American people.

Why don't we make sure that every American is treated just like we are? But, no, under the law and some decision, there's this idea that we're going to get some exemption. No, we're not going to get an exemption.

So the bill before us is very simple. It funds the government, and it says let's treat our constituents fairly. No more mandate for the next year that you have to buy insurance that you can't afford. No more mandate that Members of Congress get some so-called ''exemption.'' Those are the only two issues here. All the Senate has to do is say ''yes'' and the government is funded tomorrow. Let's listen to our constituents, and let's treat them the way we would want to be treated.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, tonight is about the continuing destructive obsession that our Republican friends have and their refusal to recognize that there was an election just some months ago. You made the argument to the American people, and they rejected that argument and reelected President Obama. You have not gotten over that to this minute; and as a result, you are about to shut down the government. You can get up here and say over and over and over and over again, We don't want to shut down the government; but, Mr. Speaker, their actions belie their words.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats—as will surprise no one—are against shutting down this government. It's bad for our people, it's bad for our security, it's bad for our economy, it's bad for jobs. And you all know that.

And you don't have the votes because the people elected Democrats as the majority in the Senate and the President of the United States, and they don't agree with you. Newt Gingrich said when that was the case, you had to compromise.

What compromise are we talking about? We're taking your number—your number—and you will not take ''yes'' for an answer. How sad. What a shameful day this is in the history of the House of Representatives.

A shutdown would be harmful to our economy, our national security, and the creation of jobs, as I just said. That's why we have compromised and said we'll take your number to keep government open while we negotiate over the next 6 weeks.

Nobody in your party rationally believed that you were going to succeed in your objective—nobody. It's a political ploy. It's a message, Mr. Speaker, to their most radical contingent. We are willing to take the next 6 weeks to discuss how we get from where we are to where we need to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We could do that, Mr. Speaker, if only Republicans would take ''yes'' for an answer.

Their Tea Party faction has made clear where it stands. They don't like the Affordable Care Act—I don't think anybody doubts that—but the Affordable Care Act has been upheld by the Supreme Court and remains the law of our land.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now voted twice to send us a clean CR. Now it's time for the Speaker and the majority leader to put the Senate's clean compromise CR on this floor and, in their words, let the House work its will. Have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to have the majority party put on this floor a bill which will keep the government open and which the Senate will pass.

Mr. Speaker, have the Republican Party have the courage of its rhetoric and let the House work its will. I dare you to do that.

Let democracy work. Don't be dictating to America that they're going to shut down the government. Let's vote on it. Put a clean CR on this floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many speakers the gentlelady has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the very distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It's interesting, my colleague who just spoke, the Democratic whip, talked about democracy and insisting that we bring democracy to the House. Well, I would respond to my friend and tell him that democracy is founded upon the principle that there is equal treatment under the law.

So tonight's debate is not about trying to stifle democracy. Tonight's debate is trying to insist that the minority party and its policies, it's trying to stop the administration from carving out special treatment for its special interests. It's about telling this administration and this President that there should be no special treatment for Members of Congress, there should be no special treatment for big business. We all live under the same laws.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans around this country want a government that puts people first. Since ObamaCare was passed—in a highly partisan manner—the President himself and other Members of his party have offered unilateral exemptions and delays for special interest groups and for Members of this Congress. So you've got to ask, Why are Members of Congress exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Why are these special interests exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Shouldn't we also exempt the hardworking families of this country from the pains of ObamaCare?

There should be no special treatment for anyone under the law. That is a founding principle of this country. No special treatment for anyone. Equal application, equal treatment under the law.

Delaying the individual mandate for American families and withdrawing the exemption for Members of Congress is what this bill is about, and it is the right thing to do.

Now is the time for our President to lead. Now is the time for the Senate to act. Their stubborn refusal to work across the aisle is the reason why Americans today are so frustrated by what they see in Washington.

House Republicans have now offered three possible solutions to fund our government and to protect working middle class families from losing a job, from losing their health care, or losing part of their paycheck due to ObamaCare.

□ 2015

Senate Democrats have offered nothing. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, they didn't even show up for work.

No one should shut down the government in order to protect special treatment from Members of this House or

the other body. No one should shut down this government in order to protect special treatment for big business and special interests. It is time for all of us to think about America's hard-working middle class families.

Now is the time to pass this resolution to keep the government working on behalf of the people who sent us here, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolution to fund the Federal. The Senate sent over a Continuing Resolution that would fund the government and included an agreement that the men and women of the armed services should receive their pay.

Unfortunately, the House Rules Committee, which must review and establish a rule for all bills brought before the House has once again changed the Senate bill to require a 1 year delay in the personal mandate for the Affordable Care Act, but added another change that would remove a subsidy for members of Congress and their staff.

What they fail to say is that Congress and Congressional staff are the only group in the nation that is required by the law to only get its healthcare through the Affordable Care Act Health Exchange Marketplace.

Ecclesiastics says that ''To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: There is a purpose or reason for everything that happens, be it called good or be it called bad, by whomever perceives it as such. No matter, there is a time and place for everything.''

The men and women of this Congress know that the time and season for making decisions regarding the budget of our Nation ends at midnight tonight—Monday, September 30, 2013.

The season for making decisions about funding the government began in January of this year, stretched on through the Spring, and was with us during the Summer now the end is upon us.

The majority of this body has not been able to organize themselves to do—or consider anything during the season for budget drafting and appropriations' legislation except to attempt to end the Affordable Care Act.

The members of the United States House of Representatives know the rules for the legislative budgetary process very well, but for the benefit of the millions of people who are watching this debate or listening to it—you might find it helpful to understand why there is so much dissention.

I would like to give you a brief outline of the work we are supposed to do on your behalf regarding funding the government: The Congress is to:

Pass a budget that is agreed to by both the House and the Senate;

Pass 12 appropriations bills that do not exceed the agreed upon budget to fund the entire Federal Government for the next fiscal year;

Complete the appropriations bills with both the House and the Senate agreeing to the language of each before and agreed to by both the House and the Senate and sent to the President's desk for signature; and rarely use Continuing Resolutions when Congress fails to complete all 12 bills before the fiscal year ends to ensure that the business of the Federal Government continues uninterrupted.

For most Americans this may mean very little because it is a Congressional administrative function that often used to help fund a few appropriations measures that may not be completed before the end of calendar year, which is midnight, Monday, September 30, 2013.

This year the use of the Continuing Resolution is different because we have not completed work on a budget bill nor have we completed work on any appropriations bill—not even the Defense Department's Appropriations legislation.

The House and the Senate have found agreement that a Continuing Resolution for the next Fiscal Year that will begin at 12:01 Tuesday, October 1, 2013 should provide that the Armed Forces who risk their lives to protect our freedoms deserve the support and resources needed to perform their duties, and that includes being paid in full and on time so they can provide for their families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary to have to devote the considerable amount of time needed to debate and pass this legislation in the House and Senate and present it to the President if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate.

The CR approved by the Senate funds the government and avoids a shutdown. President Obama has stated that he will sign it into law.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the federal government are paid for the valuable and important service they provide to our nation.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on avoiding a shutdown, which helps no one and hurts our economy.

Those of who were serving in this body 17 years ago remember the harm caused when the Republicans shut down the government on two different occasions, which directly cost taxpayers $1.4 billion. That is $2.1 billion in today's dollars.

The last time Republicans engineered a shut down of the government:

368 national park sites were closed.

200,000 applications for passports went unprocessed.

$3.7 billion of $18 billion in local contracts went unpaid.

My state of Texas would be hit very hard and suffer unnecessarily if a government shut down is not prevented.

Within days Texas would begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the $64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

$518 million in federal highway funds,

$411 million for interstate highway maintenance,

$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor,

$71 million in Homeland Security grants,

$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure and

$97 million in federal adoption assistance.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned over the impact of a government shutdown on operations and activities that protect and secure the homeland Impacts of shutdown in Texas on homeland security.

For example, a shutdown would adversely affect the following:

Law Enforcement and Other Training: Law enforcement training would cease, including those conducted through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new hires into operational service. TSA would also not be able to conduct training for screeners, Behavior Detection Officers or canine units.

Frontline Personnel Hardships: The majority of the workforces in Custom and Border Protection's (CBP) Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, (ICE) enforcement efforts, Transportation Security Administration (TSA) aviation passenger screening, and the Coast Guard, who are heavily reliant upon receiving biweekly paychecks, would not be paid biweekly during a federal funding hiatus

Grant Programs for State and Local Preparedness: All DHS and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) personnel working on grants programs would be furloughed, ceasing any further activity intended to help build state and local resiliency. Should a federal funding hiatus be prolonged, state and local communities may have to eliminate jobs that are dependent upon grants funding. Further activity under the Securing the Cities program would be suspended.

In addition, a government shutdown will hurt children, seniors, working families, and the economically vulnerable:

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around $274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds for Crime Prevention and Prosecution: Funding will be halted to Texas on an annualized portion of the $1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will not receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for personnel who administer programs that provide funding for vaccinations.

Nutrition Assistance for Seniors: Texas would lose approximately $3,557,000 in funds that make it possible to provide meals for seniors.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Continuing Resolution to delay the individual mandate for a year and undue the ObamaCare exemption for Members of Congress. This is about fairness to the American people, who are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the political class.

We are a nation of laws and when the ruling elite are given a free pass while millions of our constituents are forced into a new health care

regime that drives up premiums, erodes the quality of care and puts the government between them and their doctors, we lose the trust of the American people.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said, "No man is above the law and no man is below it." Yet, through administrative ruling the Obama Administration has exempted Members of Congress and their staff from the very health care law that bears the President's name. Meanwhile, the President, Vice President and their political employees are not even required to be part of the new health exchanges. If this law is so great, Mr. President, then why won't you and your political appointees be subject to it?

The answer is simple: ObamaCare is not working and the doctor doesn't want a taste of his own medicine.

Karen, from Cypress, Texas in my district wrote to me this week that "as a benefits department employee of an independent oil and gas exploration and production company, I have major issues with ObamaCare. I abhor the waste of my department's time and expense in documenting our policies just to show Congress that we already comply with the mandates, despite the lack of guidance we get. Seems to me Congress is punishing employers who offer good coverage. How is this going to help anyone? And don't even get me started on the administration exempting themselves all from it. That rankles more than almost anything else."

Another one of my constituents, an insurance agent who also happens to be the Mayor of Tomball, Texas, called my office this week and told me that her clients—which include businesses in and around my district—have no idea what is required of them under the law. The Obama Administration has given thousands of waivers to businesses, delayed implementation of dozens of provisions of the law and no one know what to expect next.

What we do know if that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. We must give our constituents the certainty of a full year delay of the individual mandate. Anything short will only result in more chaos and confusion, not to mention skyrocketing premiums, billions in new taxes and the erosion of the doctor-patient relationship.

Most importantly, elected officials must be treated the same as the people they represent. No exemption for Members of Congress!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 201, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
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
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
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)

NOES—201

Andrews
Bachmann
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Stockman

□ 2040

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2335

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 10:00 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution H.J. Res 59.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–240) on the resolution (H. Res. 368) relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

*Resolved*, That the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, (2) insists on its amendment, and (3) requests a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

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 the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, 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 368 directs the House of Representatives to go to conference with the Senate to resolve differences between the two Chambers on how to appropriately fund the Federal Government. Like any other time the House goes to a conference, Mr. Speaker, the minority will have an opportunity to instruct conferees and have their ideas heard.

For nearly 3 weeks, this body, the United States House of Representatives, has made numerous legitimate efforts to find a compromise to avoid a government shutdown. Unfortunately, Senate Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats have been unwilling to negotiate and have stonewalled any attempt to find common ground.

No one wants a government shutdown, but Mr. REID's unwillingness to work with House Republicans to find a solution is what brings us to a point now this evening. I know that we want to get our work done tonight. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me be clear: the proposal before us is nothing but another way to run out the clock. I think while we're speaking here, in just a little while we will find in 20 minutes—21 minutes, because I think we will go 1 minute after midnight—that this government will shut down.

This amazing government that we are supposed to be overseeing—America, the United States—can't manage its business and shows that to the rest of the world over the fact of trying to stop the bill you hate that is the law of the land, that has already been verified by the Supreme Court as to its constitutionality and where our President won election handily when this was the main idea.

I don't believe anymore that this is the product of a few people with strange ideas. This is the Republican Party. I think people who watch the news, jaded—I do; every idle moment I have to be finding out what's going on in the world—were quite stunned to watch a Republican conference over, and the Members coming out absolutely gleeful, many of them expressing glee—one of them said that he was almost giddy with joy about closing down the House.

Earlier this evening, I saw after the 2010 elections some new Members who were saying on the news that their intention was to shut down the House. Well, they've done it.

At any time we could have taken up a clean bill for the Senate. All we had to do was vote for that Senate amendment resolution and pass that here, which could have been done easily with bipartisan votes. It would then have gone to the President of the United States. Government workers could sleep easier tonight if we had done that. They wouldn't have to worry about paying the rent, or being able to buy groceries, or being able to pay the tuition for their child in college.

What we are doing to the psyche of America—not ''we.'' I'm not going to say that again, the universal ''we.'' What Republicans are doing to the psyche of America will be a long time in healing.

I think the absurdity knows no bounds. We want to say again that if anybody has any mistaken notions that the Democrats were involved in it, there are no Democrats' fingerprints on any of these bills. I'll say that again: Democrats had no input at all at any time on what any of these bills were going to say in the greatest matter before the House of Representatives to keep the government going, to meet our obligation to fund the government.

In fact, by cutting out the people's Representatives on my side of the House, almost half of the people in the United States' voices were stilled throughout this whole process. The only time we got to talk was when we were up here, and we were trying to run and catch up to see what was going on. We had no idea what this was about, that this was coming tonight. We were able to pick up bits and pieces maybe off the floor, and people passing around some things that maybe they heard. But the whole Democrat side has been shut out—not just on this measure, but on everything in the world that we have done in this term and last term as well. Now, I don't want anybody to forget that because everybody is going to yell if something goes wrong here, they're going to try to blame it on us. It's not on us. I have never seen anything like this.

In addition, for well over 6 months this Democratic side has begged, cajoled, done everything they could to try to get this House to appoint conferees and to go to conference with the Senate of the United States on bills that each Chamber had already passed. We couldn't do the farm bill—couldn't do much of anything. And I said earlier today one of the reasons is sequestration. So we had only gotten two appropriations bill. They've run out of money, and there was no way in God's Earth we could have ever done the 12 that we needed to do.

But even that hasn't caused any idea of changing what we're doing. And we want to be a part of that. We would like to take the 6 weeks—imagine, on one hand, we are appointing conferees for a 6-week measure when we wouldn't do it for the budget of the Federal Government.

Now we would like to be as much a part of it as we can while we're trying to deal with the debt limit and certainly to do away with sequestration that even my friend, Mr. ROGERS, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, said was far too draconian and that the government would be seriously underfunded.

□ 2345

But tonight, here we are, tragically here. Let me see now, it's 15 minutes

away from time where it will be useless; so I am not going to say anything more about we could take up another bill, we could pass it, it would go to the President, he would sign it, and we could avoid it. It's simply too late. How could you, with any common sense at all, think that, as we have moved to this point without changing from the left to the right with moving ahead, throwing up every kind of thing on a clean CR that would kill it when it arrived at the Senate.

We are hearing—and I hope it's not true—that when we get to the debt limit in about 2 weeks, that the Christmas list that they want to pass—everything that they wanted all their lives and couldn't get—again, holding the country hostage, is what we have ahead of us.

Now, given a clear choice between serving our country and serving ideology within these ranks, the majority has chosen to stand against the country and shut the government down. Make no mistake about it, there is going to be a lot of hurt.

At this point, all I can do is urge everyone on our side of the House to vote ''no'' for no other reason than because of the rules in the House being broken and regular order being so far from reality. The rules of the House say that any Member can call for a vote on the Senate bill, but this rule takes that away from everybody but the majority leader. Only the majority leader can call for that vote.

Very little is left on our side except to vote ''no'' and to express our great displeasure and hope to goodness that when this is over and all that pain is out there, that we can move as quickly as possible to try to right this dreadful wrong that is about to land on the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope we really find a way to avoid that by agreeing to a conference. I think a conference is important. The United States House of Representatives will be on a vote here in a few minutes where we are asking for that. I believe the American people see what we are doing is trying to legislatively resolve the differences that we have.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our first CR was a clean CR at sequester levels and simply defunding ObamaCare. Our second CR was a clean CR at sequester levels with a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. The third CR was a clean CR with a 1-year delay of the individual mandate and removal of certain benefits for Members and congressional staff.

I have, during these times, found that some of the wise counsel that I have received in the deliberations that I have had, in the duties and responsibilities as the chairman of the Rules Committee, leaned upon several people. One of them is here, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS.

HAL ROGERS has provided me—and I hope I have provided him—some bit of working knowledge of what we were trying to accomplish, a desire to accommodate House and Senate Members to complete more work on appropriations. That is still a part of the goal that we are going to tonight, to go to conference so that we can fund the government and get it done right.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS OF Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those kind words. It is likewise. I have relied upon the gentleman for advice all through this process as well, and I appreciate his leadership in this body, especially as chairman of the very important Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just rejected the House's third attempt to avoid a government shutdown. This body has voted time and time again to keep the lights on in our government and to stop the train wreck that is ObamaCare. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate have rejected these offers and have refused to come to the table to find a solution.

To be absolutely clear, the House has debated and approved three separate continuing resolutions. These bills do what they are named for—they continue government. We do not want a shutdown, and we have done what we can to avoid it. Given the situation at hand and the late hour, we will now vote to send the CR we just passed and a request for a conference to the Senate.

Our challenges are great, but they are not insurmountable. This conference will provide a venue to discuss the differences between the House and Senate, having productive negotiations, and come to a final agreement that most can support.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, this is a logical next step. When the House and the Senate are unable to resolve their differences on other pieces of critical legislation, the appropriate action is to appoint a conference. That is the time-honored way of this great body.

I understand that this is not the first or the second or the third choice of many Members here tonight. It is not my first choice either. But I believe this motion can help us move forward and provide at least a gleam of light at the end of this very long tunnel.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we watch this train wreck in slow motion, this Republican shutdown of government, I ask myself, in trying to understand what the Republican majority is doing: Why—why are they seeking to close down government? Is it because some of them are against government and want to see it closed and—I think it's been quoted—this is exactly what they wanted?

That might be the case for a few of them, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think most Republicans want to abolish the United States of America Government. I think that's a position that very few Republicans hold.

So why are they closing the government? Now, I understand that many of them don't like the health care reform, the Affordable Care Act, a law that was passed by the House and Senate, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court; it's the law of the land. Some of them don't like that.

Do you know what? Some Americans are uncomfortable with that. They want to learn more about it: What does it mean to them? How does it help them afford health care? How does it help their families?

But the American people don't want to see our government close down over disagreeing with a particular law. That seems to be what my friends on the other side are arguing. They are arguing: Do you know what? We've been unable to repeal this law under the process set up by our Constitution. We've been unable to pass a bill in the House, pass a bill in the Senate, send it to the President, and have the President sign it. We've been unable to follow the Constitution to get what we want. So instead of doing that, we're just going to shut down government until we get what we want. By the way, we want a lot. We want to change a law that was passed by the House and the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court that helps middle class Americans afford health care. We want to change the way that benefits are conducted. We want to change different tax systems.

These are all policy discussions to be had through our process. In fact, some of these things have actually been passed by the House of Representatives and either have been rejected by the Senate or are awaiting action in the Senate.

But that is the genius of the Founding Fathers in setting up our constitutional system in the separation of powers. It was to provide for a way to pass laws that had broad buy-in from the American people and had the checks and balances that have kept our democracy strong for over two centuries. Yet here today we are short-circuiting that. The Republicans are seeking to say: We are going to close down the entire Federal Government.

This is the most powerful, strongest country that the Earth has, the freest democratic Nation. We are going to shut down the government. We are going to shut down because we can't pass our laws the way we want them.

Do you know what? The country has had an election. The country has elected a President. This was discussed in the Presidential election. This was discussed in Senate elections over and over again.

In 5 minutes, the government will shut down. This bill does nothing to

prevent that. Until the Republicans change their mind, we won't have an operating Federal Government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just entertained a piece of legislation that came from the Senate. There is a lot of business that needs to be done. We had the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was here, who spoke very favorably not only about his optimism of being able to work through this with his colleagues, not only the gentlewoman NITA LOWEY, his ranking member, but also the working relationship that the Appropriations Committee has with our Senate colleagues.

I think if there is one thing that is a takeaway from tonight, that is that HAL ROGERS, a man who has been in this body for a long period of time and who has great wisdom about not only the intricacies and the running of the government but also, I think, a good bit of esprit that comes with it, not just optimism, but his desire to make sure that good things happen, that is what HAL ROGERS was on this floor talking to us about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself—most Americans do understand the concept of fairness—when did fairness become a partisan issue? Certainly tonight it seems that is the case.

Now, look, no secret I have opposed the Affordable Care Act ever since I heard the first stirrings, the first musings about it in our Energy and Commerce Committee. I opposed it in committee, opposed it here on the floor of the House, opposed the Senate bill that came over to the House. I have opposed it at every opportunity.

Yes, there have been multiple attempts to repeal it since the Republicans took majority in January of 2011. Seven of those times actually got passed by the Senate, went to the President, and he signed them into law. So there have been some restrictions on the Affordable Care Act over the past 3 years.

But honestly, the changes that have occurred to the Affordable Care Act that have been the most dramatic and the most profound are those changes that are brought about by the President himself, by the administration itself. They are sort of like the delayer in chief for parts of the Affordable Care Act.

I've had constituents email me, text me, and say: What blog post do I need to follow if I'm going to keep up with the changes in the Affordable Care Act? I had an HR director say: What Twitter feed should I keep up with? I have had other constituents ask me: Is there an Instagram place I should look at to keep up with the changes that are occurring with the Affordable Care Act? We are all familiar with them. We have discussed them the past several days.

The fact that the preexisting condition program—the Federal preexisting condition program—that the President and Speaker PELOSI talked about with such high regard, the sign-up window has been closed since February 1. No one can sign up for the Federal preexisting program.

There was supposed to be caps on out-of-pocket expenses starting in 2014. Well, guess what? Those got delayed by a whim.

We are all familiar with July 2, when on a blog post the employer mandate was just suddenly set aside, and then 3 days later, all of the reporting requirements were sort of laid aside.

So people are concerned that parts of this law seem expendable, but they just don't know which parts are.

The most egregious one was what happened in the early part of August, right before this body went back to their district work period, where the fundamental fairness, where a different set of rules were going to apply to Members of Congress. Constituents do not understand that.

So this week we have had an opportunity to repair that damage, repair that credibility with our constituents. That went over to the Senate tonight and, unfortunately, it failed. I wish that it hadn't. Perhaps we could be talking now about the funding of the government to December 15 and things could continue on as planned, but it didn't work out that way.

□ 0000

But this issue of fundamental fairness is not going to go away; it's going to be a recurrent theme. People are going to be asking us questions: Why couldn't we settle on the issue of fundamental fairness and do what's right for the American people and, in the process, keep the government open?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is midnight, and the great Government of the United States is now closed.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joke that we are having this debate at all at this particular time now that it's midnight and the government is officially shut down.

My Republican friends say they're coming here to try to keep the government open. They're here, and they're presiding over a Congress that has now shut the U.S. Government down. After 6 months of refusing to go to conference on the budget—18 times I've been told the Republicans objected to going to conference on the budget with the Senate—now they say they want a conference committee. It's too late. It's past midnight now. The government has been shut down. This is both cynical and disgraceful. Republicans have shut down the Government of the United States of America.

I would say to my Republican friends that you own this. This is your shutdown. This represents an absolute failure of your leadership. Real people in this country—your constituents—are going to be hurt by your inability to do your job.

Now, the funding levels in the continuing resolution are unbelievably low. They are at your beloved sequester levels. You should be declaring victory that the Senate actually agreed to your low numbers, but that's not enough. You had to overreach. You had to add in the dismantling of the Affordable Care Act and 1,000 other things that were pet projects of the Tea Party right wing in your party.

The fact of the matter is you knew all along that the President would never sign a bill that dismantled the Affordable Care Act—nor should he—nor would the Senate go along with that, but you did it anyway. You are shutting down this government because you didn't get your way. You didn't get your way, so you're shutting down the government.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that elections in the United States of America still do matter. Your candidate for President lost badly, and this was his No. 1 issue—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Your Senate candidates lost badly. In fact, you lost seats in the House, and the Democrats got a million more votes than you did in House elections, but because of some very clever redistricting, you were able to hold on to the majority.

The American people rejected your call to overturn the Affordable Care Act, and the American people overwhelmingly do not want you to shut this government down, which you just did 2 minutes ago.

This is the people's House. We are supposed to be doing the people's business. We are not supposed to be doing the business of some right-wing Senator from Texas who somehow wants to run for President and wants to get the Tea Party all excited. You are supposed to represent your constituents. We all are. Our constituents—the people of this country—do not want the United States Government to shut down.

This is a failure of your leadership, and I would say there is one way for us to kind of make things better at this point, which is to let us bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—a clean bill, a clean CR. Even with those low levels that I have some problems with, I guarantee you that it will pass with Democratic votes and Republican votes. We can reverse this shutdown now by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Please do it. Please don't shut this government down.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New

York, Congressman REED, a second-term Member and one of the clearest thinkers in our party.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear as to what we did tonight.

We sent a request to the United States Senate to simply treat all Americans equally under ObamaCare. We sent a request to the Senate to keep the government open. Because the President has chosen to give a pass to Big Business for 1 year, we are asking to give that pass to American individuals for 1 year.

The law isn't ready. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it's not ready. Why can't we just treat American citizens—individuals—the same as our President, who, by his executive order, has said Big Business should get a pass?

Most egregiously, why wouldn't you agree with us that Members of Congress should not be treated any differently under the law? You know the truth, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker: Members of Congress are getting special treatment under this law because of what HARRY REID and the President did through the OPM. Our contributions for our health insurance premiums as we go into the exchanges are different and are not allowed to every other American citizen.

So what we stood up for tonight was a simple request: we will keep this government open, but let's just treat American citizens no differently—no special treatment for Members of Congress, American citizens no different than Big Business.

Why don't you join us. Why don't you join us in those commonsense reforms by which Americans across the country are saying, We don't want this law. It's not ready to go.

At a minimum, just treat us the same as Big Business America. Treat us the same, and don't give Members of Congress—yourselves—to my friends across the aisle, special treatment under the law.

That simple agreement would have kept the government open, and I hope that you will heed that fundamental call for fairness. Yet you turned your ear to the American people. In the U.S. Senate, you turned a deaf ear to the American people and said we are going to continue the status quo and that somehow we in Washington, D.C., should be treated differently.

I reject that message. I reject that notion. I stand for equality for all Americans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say that, if the Members of Congress are going to be treated like everybody else in the country, we would be the only group that's forced not to take our employer's health insurance.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, who has tried valiantly to do away with sequestration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, since the very moment the Affordable Care Act was passed, we have heard a massive campaign of misinformation and distortions from our Republican colleagues. From the beginning, we heard about death panels. Then we heard it was going to be the government takeover of health care. That earned them the independent PolitiFact lie of the year in 2010.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the floor, we just hear massive distortions, and what's shameful is that they want to use that now as the cover to shut down the United States Government. They want to use that so that, tomorrow, millions of Americans can't sign up for or access affordable care. Members of Congress—all of us—we have affordable care, but, tomorrow, you want to deny that affordable care to millions of Americans and take it away from the millions of Americans who already have protection as a result of the Affordable Care Act. That is shameful.

Now, this notion that they are going to go to conference on the continuing resolution is a fig leaf that's not going to get them any political cover. The only way to have kept the government open tonight, which is now closed, was to take up the Senate's continuing resolution and fund the government. Yes, then we should go to conference on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to go to conference on the budget to negotiate our differences since March, when this House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. In fact, back in April, I and my Democratic colleagues introduced a very simple resolution saying that the Speaker should obey the regular order and appoint budget negotiators here from the House to meet with the Senate. What did the Speaker do? Nothing. He blocked the ability to have those budget negotiations.

We actually voted on it three times in this House. My Republican colleagues voted against the opportunity to appoint budget negotiators. In the United States Senate, what happened? On 18 occasions, Senator LEE and other Republican Senators blocked the effort to go to budget negotiations.

Now, Senator MCCAIN said that was insane for Republicans in the Senate to do because he pointed out that our Republican colleagues claimed that they wanted to work on these budget negotiations all along. They said ''no budget, no pay.'' What they forgot to tell the American people was that they didn't mean a Federal budget. They meant the House passes a budget and the Senate passes a budget, but then they were going to block the effort to negotiate the differences.

Now, why would you block that, Mr. Speaker? Because, when you go to a budget negotiation, you've got to compromise, and you've got to meet the other party halfway. You've got a Tea Party right wing in this House that refuses to compromise. So what did they say? We're not going to go to conference. We are going to vote three times against negotiations. In May, in June, and in July, no negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady.

So what do you do if you don't want to negotiate, if you don't want to compromise? You back the country up against the wall, and here we are with that strategy.

The idea is, since you don't want to compromise in the regular order, let's try and get what we want by threatening to shut down the United States Government. If that doesn't work, we are going to make sure the United States Government can't pay its bills on time so that we can enact our radical agenda that way because you're not willing to do it through the regular process of compromise.

So nobody should be fooled about this idea of trying to get fig leaf cover on going to conference on this. We should have voted on the bill and kept the government open. It is a shameful day for the United States Government and especially for this Congress.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans came to the floor of the House several weeks ago—we've done it lots of times and have probably had 41 votes on ObamaCare. We've talked about how $716 billion was cut from senior care, Medicare. We think that's a problem. We think that was wrong. We think pushing this off on seniors is the wrong thing to do. We know the cost to employers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that point on Medicare?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

I do appreciate the gentleman because I know what he is going to tell me. He's going to say, Well, we used that money in our budget. In fact, we did, because this was an action that was done 3 years ago, and we are trying to repeal the bill that took $716 billion from seniors. We disagreed with it, but after 3 years, you have to use the money. We promised at that time that we would stay after it.

Look, the gentleman is the one who voted for it. Not one Republican voted to take the money. I know what their dialogue is, and I appreciate the gentleman. He is a very dear friend of mine. I know they're frustrated when we tell the truth about how bad this bill is.

With regard to the cost to employers, Delta Air Lines marched up to the White House in February and said, Hey, guys. Just so you know, you're

going to cost Delta Air Lines over $100 million this year. In the first year, it's going to cost $100 million.

Trust me. They were listening over there. That may be why they said, Whoops, we'll let business off the hook.

They should have done the same thing for everybody. Mr. Speaker, that's part of why we're here—we are here for fairness.

What do Members of Congress hear when they go back home? They hear a lot of things, but here is the one that we hear more than anything. What we hear about is that there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job in America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we were promised. We have talked a lot about what Republicans have said and not said and what's right and wrong. What is true is that the President of the United States stood right here and said: not one dime of taxpayer money, and you can keep the insurance that you've got if you want it. That's our promise to the American people.

□ 0015

Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare has passed, there have been for every seven part-time jobs that were created, only one full-time job. We're becoming a part-time job Nation. Mr. Speaker, you cannot be the greatest Nation in the world as an economic power, you cannot get kids, our young children, to want to go to college for a part-time job. It's just not working well.

That's why the Republican Party is here. That's why we have Members here tonight. That's why we've sent three CRs. That's why we have meeting after meeting after meeting trying to determine how do we best get after this. We didn't stay after the same way. We sent one offer, a second offer, a third offer. We're now asking something very simple: a chance to appoint conferees, get together face to face, talk about the issues and ideas, find room for compromise, and do something better. That's what we're asking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, although what we're doing here is an exercise in futility, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who has been doing a wonderful job.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, now Republicans want to negotiate. After the shutdown clock has struck the witching hour, after weeks of making threats of insisting on your way or the highway, of arrogantly demanding repeal or delay of affordable health care, now the Republicans say, Please negotiate.

This is not a motion to go to conference or a motion to negotiate. There's no time left for that. This is a motion to shut down our government. There's been plenty of time for negotiation, and Republicans said ''no'' at every turn. Forgive me if I remain skeptical that Republicans actually want to negotiate now.

Republicans can stop this shutdown right now if they bring to the floor the Senate-passed continuing resolution that removes divisive provisions that House Republicans insist upon.

This stunt tonight doesn't do one thing to end the government shutdown. We should call it what it really is: a pathetic, last-ditch attempt to not be blamed for a government shutdown. This is too little too late. We should greet this motion with the same cynicism with which it was offered.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, Congressman JOE BARTON, the dean of the Texas Republican delegation.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee as I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is past midnight. Officially, the government is shut down. That is not a good thing, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. We have been arguing politically the last several weeks various proposals to fund the government short term in a continuing resolution. We've been having some debates on the debt ceiling. If you're like me, most of your constituents, regardless of whether they're Republicans or Democrats, they're saying, Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and work things out. I think the Republican leadership in the House has been trying to do that. I know there's some disagreement on the other side about that.

In any event, we've come up with the novel idea of going to conference. I know a lot of the junior Members on both sides of the aisle don't know what a conference is. It's where the Speaker of the House and the House minority leader each appoint a certain number of Members, normally senior Members of the committee of jurisdiction, and the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate minority leader appoint Members of their respective parties. If they actually do it, according to regular order, lo and behold, the Members meet and they discuss things.

House Republicans would put a proposal on the table, House Democrats would; Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans. They would argue over it and debate it, maybe amend it. Then you take a vote. The House Members vote. If they agree, that's the House position, if the majority agrees. The Senate votes, and if they agree, that's the Senate position. If they don't agree, they have a stalemate. At least we'd be talking, and it would be Members, not leadership, rank-and-file Members. And it's just possible, if they open the conference, C–SPAN could cover it and the American people could see what's going on. There's no preordained outcome, Mr. Speaker, but it would be good for democracy.

I can see no reason why my friends on the minority side don't want to go to conference with the Senate. I would assume that the distinguished ranking member, NITA LOWEY, would head the Democrat conferees and that HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would head us. That's up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint that, but I assume that. I trust them. We can disagree on what the solution is, but for Heaven's sake, I can't see why we can't agree that actually doing what the rules say we should do is somehow partisan and somehow is a negative thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I rise in strong support of the resolution that we should go to conference with the other body and hopefully make it an expeditious conference and work this out.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

I've seen this act before, but most Americans don't recall the shutdown under the Clinton administration. What they recall is the 25 million jobs moving our economy forward, having peace and prosperity. And I would bet 20 years from now, this fleeting moment is not going to be recalled by many people in our country. They're going to think about the 42 months of straight employment gains, the return of the housing market, the auto industry, and bringing our young people home from Iraq.

This majority has managed this brilliantly. Now the ObamaCare affordable health care exchanges are open all across the land, but they've managed to shut the national parks and to do a lot of other damage to our reputation even by this meaningless shutdown. Senator MIKULSKI has said she'd be glad to go to conference once we pass a CR so that the government stays open.

What the majority comes to the floor with is, Well, we don't want the government to stay open; we want to go to conference. This is not going to work. The Obama record, from eliminating Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to Wall Street reform, to the stimulus, and, most importantly, for opening the door to health care for tens of millions of Americans who have never had the access to be able to go to a marketplace—those marketplaces are open. They're going to stay open no matter what this majority does. Never again is health care going to be denied to people who are American citizens here in the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Members come from diverse districts all over this country. Men and women get together, we meet, we talk, we have clear voices. We listen to each other about what people are hearing from back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr.

HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He is one of the clearest voices in the discussion that we've had. He represents a largely rural district—people who get up and go to work every day, people who have a lot at risk, people who care about this country, men and women who provide for their children, and their children are part of the military. They believe in this country, and they know that America's greatest days need to be in our future. It requires vigilance, and every day you have to stay after it.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing us to this point with his leadership in trying to get America back to work to take us off the road to bankruptcy and to ensure that there is fairness for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this debate—I'm sure the Americans perhaps on a little bit more Western time zone hopefully are still following this. If they are, I understand how they could get confused. But, Mr. Speaker, we're down to only debating two different matters here.

Should the bosses in America get a better deal than their employees in ObamaCare? That's what we're debating here. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are debating should Members of Congress get a better deal than every other American in ObamaCare? House Republicans say, No, that's not fair. That's not equal protection under the law. Yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle are now saying, No, no, no. They're going to protect this sweetheart deal.

It's not in the law, ladies and gentlemen, yet they want to protect this sweetheart deal. And people wonder why there's cynicism about Congress, about why Washington elites get to have a better deal than everybody else because they know more. Now Members of Congress, thanks to the Obama administration, are going to be the only people in America to get subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Clearly, the other side of the aisle wants to preserve this special deal for Members of Congress granted by the President of the United States. Where is the fairness in that, Mr. Speaker? Again, where is the fairness in letting employers—no, no, we're going to give you a year delay, but no fairness for the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon to make America great. That's what this debate is about.

Here we have one party who, because they won't treat employees as well as their employers because they're preserving a congressional sweetheart deal, are prepared to shut down the government. That's what we're debating. We've got two matters.

Mr. Speaker, we've come time after time after time in the spirit of negotiation, but, no, the President will negotiate with Iranians, he'll negotiate with Syrians, he'll negotiate with Russians, but he will not negotiate with Americans if they happen to be Republicans. No negotiation.

Again, is it any surprise that America gets cynical? Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Is it arrogance? Is it hubris? Is it pride? We know that this law apparently is not perfect already. The President has signed several changes into ObamaCare. Now we've had delay after delay after delay. Income verification, delayed; high-risk pools, delayed; out-of-pocket cost limitations, delayed; small business health options—just 3 or 4 days ago, as the President was extolling the virtues of the great rollout of ObamaCare, 20 minutes later his own administration announced yet another delay; small business health option.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has perhaps realized that his signature law is not perfect.

All House Republicans are saying in a spending bill—and ladies and gentlemen, this does spend money. This isn't some little sideshow. This is what we do in the Constitution. The Congress has the power of the purse. It's not the power of the rubber stamp. It is the power of the purse. ObamaCare is about the purse.

We're saying two things, Mr. President. In a law that you have already delayed time after time after time, if you're going to delay it for the employers, delay it for the employees. And, Mr. President, how can you decide that Members of Congress, to placate them, are going to get a sweetheart deal? This has to end, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are sitting here defending it, refusing to support a conference.

We need fairness for the American people. We need to go to conference. End the sweetheart deals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago, the House and Senate approved and the President signed the Affordable Care Act. Our friends on the other side said it was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court said they were wrong.

They nominated a candidate for President of the United States who said that if he was elected, the first thing he would do would be to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The voters said that was wrong.

And tonight their obsession continues, and they have shut down the United States Government because of that obsession. The American people rise up and join us in saying, you were wrong twice before, and you are wrong again this time. This is the wrong thing to do for the American public.

There's a way out of this debacle. It's to put on the House floor a bill that passed the United States Senate, that the President said he would sign, that most of us believe a majority of this House would vote for right now.

So I want to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if he would agree with me that the right and decent thing to do would be to put on this floor right now the Senate bill so that we can have an up-or-down vote.

Will the chairman agree to do that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. The House has attempted three times to send something over, and it's come back rejected every time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the chairman agree that the fair thing to do would be to put the Senate bill on the floor so that each Member could cast an up-or-down vote?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, the question I have is, Did the Senate pass the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running at your numbers that you wanted in budget.

We are asking, give every Member of this House a fair up-or-down vote on that bill. Will you do that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you put back in the language that we asked for, we will be very pleased to agree to it.

And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people in politics don't want to say ''yes'' or ''no,'' they just keep talking.

We could do a lot more tonight than just keep talking. We could cast a vote that would say to the American taxpayers, the services you are still paying for you're going to get tomorrow morning. The absence of that vote from the majority should tell you all you need to know. They are afraid to put that vote on the floor because they would lose.

Well, the American people are losing because of their bankrupt and invalid choice.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, our great government, on October 1, was going to be open for health care. Mr. Speaker, all anybody has to do is to go online right now and try to sign up for this after years of our friends in the Obama administration

getting ready. And the site says, I'm sorry, your account cannot be done. The system is unavailable.

So here we are at the great day of October 1, at 12:30. Mandatory funding by the government can't get in the way of that. Right here, system unavailable for the American public. Why am I not surprised?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), our side of the Texans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, let me disabuse my friends of any myth. Right now, the Republicans have shut the government down.

SOS message from Texas: we are a diverse State with different opinions. One that says, with so many people that need health insurance, we like ObamaCare.

But another SOS message: Ellington Field right now is shut down. The towers in Ellington Field in Texas are shut down. Why? Because the Republicans are on the floor of the House with a phony procedural vote that is not going anywhere, and the government is shut down.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, shut down. The SBA with no loans, shut down. Projects to improve our transportation, shut down. Federal economic reports and businesses, shut down. Workers in region 6 offices in the State of Texas, shut down. They will not be able to go to work tomorrow.

I only hope that we will have a moment of reconciliation and common sense to speak on behalf of the American people. Please know that Texas recognizes that the American people are important. I don't want a government shutdown. I want a vote on a clean continuing resolution now. Texas believes in the best for America, not special interests.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I've heard a number of the Members on the other side make reference to the notion that we ought to have a conference, and I have heard some eloquent commentary referencing the point that we ought to talk to one another.

Well, I know it's been said before, but I'm a new Member; and I heard a bit of a lecture, that maybe some of the new Members don't know what a conference committee is. Well, we know. We understand. We know how this works, so much so that many of us joined the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), on our side, on April 23 of this year asking that a conference committee be appointed to reconcile the differences in the budgets passed by the House and by the Senate. I didn't hear any of those speeches then about the value of talking to one another. Not until 15 minutes before the government of the United States was to be shut down did suddenly something that a freshman has known for a long time, did it occur to folks on the other side that it might be time to have a conversation. It's too little. It's too late. Bring the Senate-passed CR here, and we will adopt it.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, this is the latest gimmick in the latest game by people who simply cannot govern, and the casualty will be American families and the risk that they are inflicting on our economy.

Tomorrow in my home State and the ranking member's home State, the Statue of Liberty will be closed. The last time the Statue of Liberty was closed, Mr. Speaker, was when a hurricane struck it. And may I add that the majority refused to pass a bill to provide relief assistance when the Statue of Liberty was closed as a result of the hurricane. This time, the Statue of Liberty is going to be closed by their recklessness and their irresponsibility in order to advance a selfish political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect two things from us. They expect the government to stay open and operate efficiently, and they expect their Congress to communicate. Our position is that we should keep the government open and operating efficiently while we communicate and go to conference. Their position is, shut it down, close the Statue of Liberty, and talk later.

The American people want us to talk now, and they want this government to remain open. We have heard over the past several days and over the past 2 weeks our friends on the other side saying, listen to the American people. Our friends on the other side should listen to themselves. They have asked us for a budget today. They said, We want a budget. Take it or leave it. We gave them their figure. They said, Take it or leave it. We said, We'll take it; and they left it.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of chronic chaos continues every day, every night; and the American people deserve better.

Open the Statue of Liberty tomorrow. Keep Small Business Administration loans going to small businesses. Keep college loans going to kids who need the college loans. Keep middle class families afloat. And communicate while the government remains open.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me advise my colleague, Mr. Speaker, that I have one further request for time, and then I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before us this evening, and that question has been proffered by so many on the other side of the aisle. That question, as articulated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), is to do what's fair, to do what's fair for the American people—not Democrats, not Republicans, not Green Party, not Tea Party, but the American people.

The American people in the greatest land, the greatest country in the world deserve to have their government open; and they deserve to know where their Members stand.

Do you stand with your country? Do you stand for your country? Or do you want to take it down this evening?

Stand up for your country. Stand up for America. Stand with us this evening, and keep this government going in the name of fairness.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, I feel such a combination of both sadness and anger that it makes it really difficult for me to express it. On the one hand, the chaos and the lurching from crisis to crisis that this Congress has continually gone through leaves me not just perplexed but absolutely bewildered.

At the same time, I think what overrides everything for me tonight is a sense of terrible sadness that all of us here who have sworn to protect and defend the United States of America have completely given up on that idea. Because the majority has moved so assiduously towards this moment, this is on them. This government shutdown belongs to them for the rest of their lives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the great country of the United States, the beacon of light for almost everybody in the world, the defender of all the people in the world is out of a government now. The most important institution of government anywhere ever devised is now closed.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a night that we will remember. The things that will be remembered about this night are that our party has attempted to work with, reach out, and deal with our colleagues in the United States Senate.

We have sent a CR, a clean CR at sequester levels and defunding ObamaCare. It was shipped back to us. A second CR, a clean CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. A third CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay, and removal

of certain benefits that we believe is fairness.

But the overriding suggestion that we have made tonight goes back to a little bit over an hour ago with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1245

He is asking for the opportunity for us to go to conference to resolve our differences, people working together, people looking at each other. As was suggested by the gentleman, Mr. BARTON, yeah, probably a TV would be in the room and the American people would get a chance to weigh and balance both sides also. We think that's important. That's what we're asking for. That's why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and this is what we stand for.

We're after fairness. We're after an opportunity to get these ideas and the issues resolved for the American people. So I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican majority has decided that appeasing radical Tea Party extremists is more important to them than providing necessary funding for the continued operation of the federal government, even on a temporary basis. Passing a common sense continuing resolution would ensure vital government services for millions of American families and business. These are the basic services provided everyday by federal agencies that keep our communities and country strong.

It is now the early morning hour of October 1st and Fiscal Year 2014 has commenced, but the government is shutdown. Here we are and the Republican majority in the House has failed to pass a simple, common sense extension to fund the government that the U.S. Senate passed three times.

The Tea Party GOP success in shutting down the government tonight means that over 800,000 federal employees will immediately be furloughed and vital federal services will be suspended indefinitely. Government services and functions we all take for granted for things like food inspections, government permitting, and essential scientific research will all immediately stop. They don't need to stop, but Republican House members have made this choice as part of a cynical, dangerous and harmful political strategy intended to appease conservatives, anarchists and those who disregard the value of government.

Why? Why would Congress want the government to shutdown? Because Tea Party Republicans are determined to repeal, defund, or delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), denying healthcare to tens of millions of uninsured Americans, in exchange for allowing the federal government to keep operating. This political stunt is beyond irresponsible, it is irrational when considering the damage it will cause to the economy, job creation, and families all across America.

Despite the fact that ObamaCare is the law, upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional, and was the basis of President Obama's re-election in 2012, House Tea Party Republicans still feel they can ''negotiate'' the dismantling of ObamaCare by holding the entire federal government hostage.

Ironically, the Affordable Care Act's exchanges will open today and this government shutdown will do nothing to deter, delay or derail this critical health program from being implemented. ObamaCare is going forward and millions of Americans will have access to affordable healthcare. House Republicans have voted as many as 45 times, including tonight, to repeal, replace or defund ObamaCare. They are obsessed with this law and it has become a mania that has now resulted in a shutdown of the U.S. government—it is outrageous and it angers me greatly. It is a disgrace.

When will House Republicans end the dangerous game they are playing and put the needs of our Nation above their narrow, backwards, and irresponsible ideological demands? I was optimistic that Democrats and Republicans could find common ground on a clean continuing resolution that passed the U.S. Senate to fund the government for the next six weeks.

It is clear to the American people that the Republican strategy has been to create a crisis and use a government shutdown as a bargaining chip to advance an extreme agenda regardless whether there are millions of Americans who get hurt.

Yesterday in Politico my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho, Rep. MIKE SIMPSON, was quoted as saying, ''We bitched and moaned about the Senate not doing a budget. Then they did, and we didn't go to conference. You need a big plan, Democrats and Republicans in the same room. We should have gone to conference.''

He is right. House Republicans refused to negotiate on the federal budget. The ignored calls from Democrats to appoint conferees.

Tonight the New York Times reported, ''The House's most ardent conservatives appeared ready to see their war over the health care law through to its inevitable conclusion, a shutdown that would test voters' patience. But cracks in the Republican caucus opened into fissures of frustration.''

The Times article then goes to quote one of our colleages: ''You have this group that keeps saying somehow if you're not with them, you're for Obamacare,'' said Representative DEVIN NUNES, Republican of California. ''If you're not with exactly their plan, exactly what they want to do, then you're somehow for Obamacare, and it's just getting a little old. It's moronic to shut down the government over this.''

That's right ''moronic.'' And I could not agree with my Republican colleague more.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the passage of a continuing resolution is about funding the government—not re-writing law to repeal, defund, or derail health reform. Democrats would like to see a Farm Bill, immigration reform, and responsible gun safety legislation passed into law, but we are not holding the federal government and the American people hostage to advance our legislative priorities. It is not responsible. Congress needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, re-open the government, and govern responsibly.

The situation the American people find themselves in at this moment is appalling, it is maddening. This Republican Congress has abdicated its responsibility and duty to the citizens of this country. This federal government shutdown is a manufactured crisis for political gain propagated by the extremists who disdain government itself.

My job as a member of Congress is to govern. I am committed to work With my Republican colleagues, my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and the Obama Administration to pass a clean continuing resolution that funds the government without legislating radical riders or hostage taking.

This great nation is being tested by the irresponsibility of a House Republican majority that refused to govern. I sincerely hope the American people voice their displeasure, disdain, and disgust at the political game playing.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
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
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—199

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Bachus
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Velázquez

□ 0110

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUIZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

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.

## 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 following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1566. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 368, the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 0115

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on House Joint Resolution 59:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

Additional conferees may be appointed on the recommendation of the minority leader.

## REPUBLICAN-LED HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHUTS DOWN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a real sad day in the House of Representatives.

You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. What happened tonight is the Republican-controlled extremists—bullies or hostage-takers—took the American Government and our economy hostage to their demands. This is a shameful day. This Congress makes the Gingrich Congress look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the United States Government because they don't want the American people to have affordable health care. Shame on the Republican Party. Shame on you.

Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time.The American people know that there is a small minority who are controlling the Republican Party in the House, and they are acting like bullies . . . or rather hostage takers. Taking the American government and our economy hostage to demands that will not be met.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republicans. Here we go again: I have been in office for over 20 years and this is the worst, the most extreme Congress I have ever worked with. Today's Republican Party make the Gingrich era members in the mid 1990's look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the government because they don't like the idea of providing health insurance to ALL Americans. And remember: The Affordable Care Act passed both chambers of the United States Congress, was signed into law by the President of the United States, was upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and received a stamp of approval by the American public when they voted to re-elect President Obama. It is now time for House Republicans to accept the ACA and assist their constituents to receive the many heath care benefits that Obamacare offers.

On this day, the President helped move the country forward with open enrollment for the Affordable Care Act, and the GOP moved the country backwards by shutting down the government.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try and act like grown-ups so we can all work together to pass a Continuing Resolution to keep our government open to provide the services that our citizens pay for and deserve.

## NO SPECIAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, all we did is we asked the Senate to negotiate with the House.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, the Majority Leader in the Senate

doesn't even want to talk to the House about as fundamental an issue as funding the government starting an hour and 20 minutes ago, and whether or not there should be no special treatment for anyone under the Affordable Care Act—no special treatment for big corporations at the expense of the average American, and no special treatment for Members of Congress and their staff and the President and the Cabinet and their staff.

Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader should negotiate on those, and I hope he changes his mind tomorrow morning.

## REMEMBERING DR. CECILE HARRISON

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the family of a very, very dear friend who lost her life a week ago, Dr. Cecile Harrison, a professor at Texas Southern University with a Ph.D. in sociology and a heart as large as the world can imagine. She was a professor's professor; a teacher's teacher; she was a mentor to students; and, yes, she loved politics and the process of government.

What I was so grateful for, because it is often not done, is she taught young people the value of this great Nation, the three branches of government, the constitutional interaction given by the Constitution of the United States, and the respect for the three branches of government. She taught students to love the idea of political participation without personal gain.

I was delighted to see her involve herself in campaigns all over the State and in our community, but most importantly, a friend to the Honorable Barbara Jordan and an initial campaign manager for her. A Wheatley graduate.

Dear Cecile, thank you for your sincerity. You are a great American. May God bless you and your family, and may you rest in peace.

## GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, so it's after 1 a.m. on October 1 and the government has shut down. And what's the best that we could get from the House Republican majority? A proposal to invite conferees to sit down and talk about resolving our differences.

The fact is that we've known what our responsibility was—it is to fund the government. It's not to allow 800,000 Federal employees to be told they can't go into work, they can't get paid. It's not to close down our national parks and monuments. It's not to take hundreds of millions—potentially billions—of dollars out of our economy needlessly. It's not to disrupt the stock markets. It's not to create these financial crises. These are crises of our own doing.

We've got a great country, a strong economy, a terrific society, and all we can do is to erode trust and confidence in our government. We should be ashamed of ourselves.

## ''LET'S PLAY TWO!''

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's late back here, but I'm from the west coast, so ''let's play two.''

I'm really disappointed with the rhetoric that's been flying out of here in recent days. You hear all Republicans this, or Tea Party that, or you're in the hold of the Tea Party.

You know, we're in the hold of the American people here because we see this Obama health care plan is not affordable; it's not going to work. We're just trying to go back and take another bite and see if we can revise, delay, or do something different than foist these costs and an unworkable program that's going to ruin people's health care. Let's go back to the table.

Instead, we get ''no'' from the President, we get ''no'' from the Senate, we get a lot of ''no'' from the other side of the aisle.

Aren't we supposed to have a negotiation? Aren't we supposed to have a discussion here? The American people demand that. They're seeing that this program is not going to work. It's going to cost them; it's going to cost their jobs; it's going to make their health care less accessible. And yet all we get are ''no.''

So if we want to look at who's causing this government shutdown, listen to the people yelling the most about it over on the other side of the aisle—yes, yelling.

So we're here. We're ready to play two here tonight if we need to.

## ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say they're for the middle class, but I can't hear what they say because their actions speak far more loudly.

The working man just got a $100-per-month pay cut with the expiration of the payroll tax cut. The President's war on coal will deny our power companies the cheapest fuel and will increase American families' monthly utility bills by another $50 a month.

The administration's energy policy is designed to drive up cost at the pump, up over $1 a gallon in the last 4 years, costing the average American family $150 per month. Every day folks will pay more for medical equipment which they desperately need with the medical device tax.

Now comes ObamaCare. Forbes magazine estimates that medical insurance will cost 90 percent more for the average man, 60 percent more for the average woman, which will cost families in South Carolina hundreds of additional dollars per month. And if they don't want to buy health insurance, they will be fined.

It appears that my colleagues across the aisle have a plan, Mr. Speaker: break the middle class with taxes and higher costs on necessities, and then they will take care of us as we will all be dependent on the government. But, hey, then at least we will get subsidized health insurance.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 1 on account of unavoidable pressing business in district.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 3 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 310. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 27, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 527. To amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. To amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 28, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1412. To improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 30, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3210. Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

## ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3143. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Privacy Protections of Information From Applicant Households [FNS-2009-0024] (RIN: 0584-AD91) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3144. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interstate Movement of Sharwil Avocados From Hawaii [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD70) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3145. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge [Docket ID: ED-2013-OESE-0046] (RIN: 1810-AB18) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3146. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top — District [Docket No.: ED-2013-OS-0050] received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3147. A letter from the Program Analyst, Financial Operations, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2013; Procedures for Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2008 [MD Docket No.: 13-140] [MD Docket No.: 12-201] [MD Docket No.: 08-65] received September 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3148. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Potomac River, Georgetown Channel and Tidal Basin; Washington, DC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0790] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3149. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; York River; Gloucester, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0750] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3150. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Flying Machine Competition, Chicago, IL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0685] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3151. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Suisun Bay Electromagnetic Scan and Ordnance Recovery, Suisun Bay, Concord, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0692] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3152. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Bulk Packaging to Allow for Transfer of Hazardous Liquid Cargoes [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0088] (RIN: 1625-AB63) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0361; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-17527; AD 2013-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0362; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-030-AD; Amendment 39-17531; AD 2013-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1297; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-100-AD; Amendment 39-17285; AD 2012-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. and Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0145; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-17554; AD 2013-16-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1158; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-16847; AD 2011-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0566; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-17065; AD 2012-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller, Inc. Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0130; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-17520; AD 2013-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3160. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disease Associated With Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Peripheral Neuropathy (RIN: 2900-AO32) September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3161. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vet Center Services (RIN: 2900-AN92) received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3162. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Deduction and Capitalization of Expenditures Related to Tangible Property [TD 9636] (RIN: 1545-BE18) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–228, Pt. 2).

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 113–239). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–240). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3219. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide copyright owners in sounds recordings with the exclusive right to negotiate in the marketplace the performance of their works to the public by means of an audio transmission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3223. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224. A bill to withhold the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution requiring reaffirmation of the Affordable Care Act and making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 369. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a ''National Americans of African Immigrant Heritage Month'' in September to celebrate the great contributions of Americans of African immigrant heritage in the United States who have enriched the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, section 8, clause 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Governemnt of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1; Sec 8; Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress can determine salaries and compensation of Members of Congress under Article 1, Section 6 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 68.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this.legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 182: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 184: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 366: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 474: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 523: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 533: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 636: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 647: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 664: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 679: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 685: Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 712: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 719: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 724: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 831: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 920: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 942: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 956: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 961: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 983: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1005: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1015: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1094: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1095: Mr. COOPER and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1130: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1150: Ms. BASS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1179: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1180: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1240: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1295: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1389: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1440: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1461: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1518: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1573: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1587: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1650: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1666: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1763: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1787: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1803: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1878: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1905: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1941: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2053: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2134: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2199: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2224: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2241: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2288: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2328: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2399: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 2429: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2500: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2504: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2510: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2575: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2638: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 2647: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2662: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2669: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2720: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2728: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2735: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2772: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2797: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2809: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2831: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2841: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2866: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2887: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2909: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2916: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2928: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2932: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2974: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2994: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3040: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3076: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3097: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3099: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3103: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3116: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3121: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RADEL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3128: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3152: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YODER, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 3160: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3166: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3172: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3173: Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3178: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3179: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3196: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3205: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3206: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3215: Mr. ENYART.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.J. Res. 64: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 63: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 72: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 104: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 227: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 281: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 353: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 356: Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 363: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.