Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the calendar year, I am proud that both Chambers have finally come together to pass the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. This important bill will help ensure that the men and women of our armed services have the resources they need to do their jobs and keep our country safe.

I am especially pleased that this legislation includes important reforms to help prevent military sexual assaults by better protecting whistleblowers and holding perpetrators accountable for their actions. This critical reform is an amendment from legislation introduced by my Republican colleague from Indiana, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, and my Democratic colleague from California, Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ, that passed the House with 110 bipartisan cosponsors and nearly 50 Members of our freshmen class.

Because of our joint efforts working across the aisle, this is a great first step in further protecting our heroes in uniform who take the extra heroic step of coming forward to blow the whistle on military sexual crimes. It has been an honor to help build support for this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to continue to work to end sexual violence in our military.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the list of issues that the 113th Congress has failed to address is long: immigration reform, gun violence, long-term joblessness. Yet on this list of opportunities squandered by Republican obstructionism and indifference is also the threat of global climate change. As a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I want to emphasize that this threat is real, and it needs real solutions.

In south Florida, we know that unchecked carbon pollution poses an existential threat to our communities. Rising sea levels endanger the safety of our residents and the viability of our economy. That is why Palm Beach, Monroe, Miami-Dade, and Broward Counties have formed a climate compact dedicated to mitigating climate change.

Local task forces cannot replace national leadership. We need a nationwide effort to limit carbon pollution, speed the adoption of clean energy, and protect our people from unprecedented natural disasters.

Every Member of this House belongs on the Safe Climate Caucus. Don't we all agree that, as Americans, it is our responsibility to pass on a healthier and safer environment to the next generation?

Mr. Speaker, addressing global climate change will take courage. Anything less, I am afraid, is cowardice.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 14, 2013, THROUGH JANUARY 6, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 438

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 amendment 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 the Budget or his designee that the House recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 70 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. 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 chair of the Committee on the Budget may insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the first session of the 113th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the Clerk may conform division, title, and section numbers and conform cross-references and provisions for short titles.

SEC. 4. The chair of the Committee on Armed Services may insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the first session of the 113th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of defense authorization measures for the fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of December 12, 2013, or December 13, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 6. On any legislative day of the first session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress after December 13, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 7. On any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress before January 7, 2014—

(a) the Speaker may dispense with organizational and legislative business;

(b) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved if applicable; and

(c) the Chair at any time may declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 8. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by sections 6 and 7 as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by sections 6 and 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 10. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3695) to provide a temporary extension of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 and amendments made by that Act, as previously extended and amended and with certain additional modifications and exceptions, to suspend permanent price support authorities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 11. 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 December 13, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. As we are doing housekeeping here at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include a section-by-section analysis of provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I won't speak for my friend from New York, but I enjoy the

Rules Committee debate when it begins with such a long reading from the reading clerk, Mr. Speaker, because you know you are involved in something special on a day like today. If it was just an ordinary rule, we would be done with that reading in 15 or 20 seconds, and we would move on to debate. But the rule today, Mr. Speaker, is taking on a number of challenges.

We are trying to move a budget conference report forward. This rule makes an opportunity for us to have that debate here on the floor of the House.

We are trying to move an SGR fix, what they call the sustainable growth rate, Mr. Speaker. That is that provision that threatens to cut double digits from the reimbursement rates of physicians, hindering the access of seniors to their Medicare benefits. We are trying to solve that here today, again, bringing forward a bipartisan, bicameral solution to that.

Also, we are providing for an opportunity to extend the farm bill language. We have gotten so close to a bicameral, bipartisan solution to the farm bill, Mr. Speaker, that those folks who are deeply involved in those negotiations tell us, if they could just get 30 more days, they will be able to get that done for the first time in far, far too long. This rule makes that debate available here on the floor of the House.

Finally, in terms of housekeeping, there are so many other provisions that are being worked on, again, Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan, bicameral way, bills that are almost ready to go to the desk of the President of the United States to be signed into law, to address so many of the issues that are of concern to men and women across this country. This rule makes any provision that the House deems necessary available to be considered on the same day.

Now, I just want to be clear. As my colleague from New York knows, that is not the way we like to do business in this Chamber. There are a lot of serious Members in this Chamber, and every single one of them deserves an opportunity to review legislation before it comes to the floor, and so we have made a very strong commitment throughout this Congress to provide a 3-day layover for folks to review legislation. But during this season, with so many issues so close to fruition, issues that we have been working on, not for a day, not for a week, but issues that we have been working on collectively for months, those issues are almost ready to come to the floor, and so we waived that requirement that those bills lay over to make it possible for us to get as much of the people's business done as is allowable by the agreements that the House and the Senate come to.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of sitting on the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee. In fact, I am only on the Budget Committee as the Rules Committee designee. And the proudest votes that I have been able to take in this House in my 3 years with the voting card of the folks of the Seventh District of Georgia have been on those budgets that we have crafted together in the Budget Committee, that we have brought to this floor, and that we have passed here on the floor.

In fact, as you know, Mr. Speaker, for far too long, the House has been the only institution in town that has been able to pass a budget. The Senate joined those ranks this year for the first time in a long time, and I am proud to have them here. But we have been getting that business done. What we haven't been able to do is to then take the budget that the House has passed and combine it with a budget that the Senate has passed in order to create a vision of the United States of America for the coming years.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, with what I have seen in this town, with what I read of the differing opinions that are on each side of the aisle and each side of the Capitol, America didn't have any reason to expect that we would be able to come to an agreement this year either. They didn't.

But we sent one of our best and our brightest, Chairman PAUL RYAN of the Budget Committee, into those negotiations, and he was joined by one of my colleagues from Georgia, Dr. TOM PRICE, also one of our best and brightest, to put that Georgia stamp of approval on where we were headed with that budget conference report, and they teamed up with our colleagues in the Senate.

Senator PATTY MURRAY led the Senate side, led the Democratic side, let the Senate side. And they worked, again, not for a day, not for a week. They worked tirelessly around the clock to try to find an agreement that we could come to together.

Now, I am a person who came here for big ideas, Mr. Speaker. I don't think you came here to do the little things. I think you came here to do the big things. I know my friend from New York came here to do the big things, those things that really make a big difference for America. We don't have that big budget deal on the floor. This rule doesn't make available debate on a big budget deal. We could not find the big budget deal. And for that, I am deeply sorry. I wish that we could have found that. But what we did find are those elements of agreement that were available to be found.

In recent weeks, Mr. Speaker, I have grown fond of a quote first shared with me by our deputy whip, PETER ROSKAM. It was from a Thomas Jefferson letter to Charles Clay in 1790, and he says this:

> The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches, and we must be contented to secure what we can get from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get. It takes time to persuade men to do even what is for their own good.

We are in the game of inches here today, Mr. Speaker, and I expect you will hear the same thing from my colleague from New York.

□ 1245

We are going to secure today what we can get from time to time, and we are going to eternally press forward for that that is yet to get.

My sense is my friend from New York is going to eternally press forward in this direction, and I am going to be eternally pressing forward in this direction, as is the process here, as she follows the wishes of her constituents and I follow the directions of mine.

But we have an opportunity today, for the first time in the 3 years that I have served in this body, to come together on a budget agreement to get that which we can get before we both wake up tomorrow morning and begin to eternally press forward on that which is yet to get.

I am grateful to those folks who have negotiated this budget deal. I am grateful to the folks of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee who have come together to begin to find that bicameral, bipartisan SGR solution. I am grateful to my friends on the Ag Committee on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol who have been working so long and so hard to find that agreement on the farm bill.

My great hope, Mr. Speaker, is that we are, with the beginning of the rule today, laying that framework and that foundation for bipartisan, bicameral agreement not just for this hour, not just for this day, but for this week and this month and the remainder of this Congress.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59 ESTABLISHING A CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Section 111. Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Resolution.

This section establishes a congressional budget for fiscal year 2014 for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The section requires that the chairs of the Committee of the Budget in the House and the Senate submit a statement to the Congressional Record, which includes a committee 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations consisting of the total discretionary limit set forth in the Act, committee 302(a) allocations for all other House committees, and aggregate spending and revenue levels required for enforcement of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

This section also maintains existing authority for the chair of the Committee on the Budget to make further adjustments to reduce the aggregates, allocations, and other budget levels in the statement referred to subsection (b) to reflect the budgetary effects of any legislation enacted during the 113th Congress that reduces the deficit.

Section 113. Rule of Construction in the House of Representatives.

This section provides that those provisions of H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) necessary for budget enforcement will remain in effect

to the extent that budgetary levels are not superseded by other provisions in this subtitle or other action of the House.

Section 115. Authority for Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Resolution in the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this section is to ensure that the Committee on the Budget has time to complete consideration of a Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2015 and to preserve the ability of the Committee on Appropriations to begin consideration of its 12 annual funding bills in a timely manner. The Committee on Rules expects that the Committee on the Budget will pursue a budget resolution through regular order in the second session of the 113th Congress. The authority to effectuate the levels and allocations described in this section is only provided after the date by which the Congress is otherwise required to conclude consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget as prescribed in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If a concurrent resolution on the budget is adopted by the House and the Senate, this section does not apply.

This section establishes a congressional budget for fiscal year 2015 for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Subsection (b) requires that the chair of the Committee of the Budget in the House of Representatives to submit a statement to the Congressional Record after April 15, 2014, but not later than May 15, 2014. The statement must include a committee 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations consisting of the total discretionary limit provided for in section 251(c)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, committee 302(a) allocations for all other House committees, and aggregate spending and revenue levels required for enforcement of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Subsection (c) also provides that the statement referred to in subsection (b) may include levels and limitations relating to advance appropriations, reserve funds, and overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. The Committee on Rules expects that the Committee on the Budget will base all levels and limitations established pursuant to this subsection on prior practices for determining such levels, including, in the case of advance appropriations and funding for overseas contingency operations/global war on terror, consistency with the President's request for such funding.

This section also maintains existing authority for the chair of the Committee on the Budget to make further adjustments to reduce the aggregates, allocations, and other budget levels in the statement referred to subsection (b) to reflect the budgetary effects of any legislation enacted during the 113th Congress that reduces the deficit.

Section 118. Exercise of Rulemaking Powers.

This section clarifies that the provisions of this Act are enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking powers of the House and Senate, that they are considered part of the rules of each House, and that each House has a constitutional right to change the rules in the same manner that each House may change any other rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the legislation before us today gives us a chance to begin to mitigate the worst effects of sequestration; but it is not enough, as my colleague has stated.

Our Nation can—and should—dare to once again dream big. We are a Nation that built one of the largest interstate highway systems in the world, which is presently crumbling; launched the Internet; pioneered the creation of GPS; and created the largest middle class on Earth through a fair and balanced Tax Code that asked everyone, including the wealthiest among us and the biggest corporations, to pay their fair share. We are home to public institutions like the National Institutes of Health, which have helped to find the cures for countless diseases and conditions and saved millions of lives.

Great achievements like these are only behind us if we so choose. I strongly believe that we can rebuild our crumbling runways, our roads and rails, restore our middle class, and invest in the breakthroughs that will once again make us the envy of the world. But in order to do so, we have to make responsible fiscal choices that are a reflection of our values. That means restoring smart and targeted funding to programs and agencies that drive our country forward, asking the most fortunate among us to pay their fair share—not more than that, but their fair share—and protecting the programs that serve hardworking Americans at times when they need help the most.

To that end, it is shameful that the legislation before us does not extend unemployment benefits for the 1.3 million Americans who are scheduled to lose them within a matter of weeks—3 days after Christmas, actually.

In the United States of America, we believe in providing a hand up, not a kick while you are down. Unemployment insurance is that hand up.

Studies have shown that unemployment insurance allows jobseekers to purchase necessities such as groceries and gas without accruing further debt. In so doing, it helps to increase economic activity while easing the financial burden of unemployed Americans and making it easier, not harder, for them—as we are—to find a new job.

That is why my Democratic colleagues, Representative LEVIN, Representative VAN HOLLEN, and Representative BARBARA LEE, introduced an amendment in the Rules Committee last night to extend the unemployment insurance for an additional 3 months.

This bill was paid for. I want to make that perfectly clear. It would not have cost an extra dime.

Inexcusably, the majority rejected my colleagues' amendment, despite inserting language to fix Medicare payments to doctors over the coming year, which is certainly important. Fixing the Medicare payments to doctors is a worthy and important goal, but it is certainly troubling—and should be to all of us—that we are unwilling at the same time to ignore the needs of the unemployed.

The majority's refusal to extend a helping hand to jobless Americans stands in stark contrast to the defense of tax loopholes for big corporations and powerful special interests. For far too long, our Nation has allowed wealthy individuals and powerful corporations to hide billions of dollars in offshore bank accounts and create tax loopholes instead of paying their fair share.

Indeed, some corporations in America pay no taxes at all. It is unfortunate that not a single one of the loopholes is addressed in the bill that is before us today to help us reduce the national debt.

Despite these shortcomings, today's legislation does take an important first step toward easing the painful budget cuts contained in sequestration. It has been an unmitigated disaster that has hurt our economy and our country, and there is an urgent need to avert the next round of budget cuts that are scheduled to take effect. And I am grateful for that.

In a study conducted earlier this year by the Association of American Universities, 81 percent of the respondents declared that sequestration cuts had immediate and detrimental effects on research activities. Seventy percent of the respondents cited delays in research projects, and 58 percent of respondents stated that sequestration led to reductions in staff, students, and fellows through attrition and layoffs.

A recent study showed that sequestration and other budget cuts have resulted in an actual Institutes of Health budget far too low to support our biomedical research community.

In addition to that point, Mr. Speaker, let me say that during the government shutdown, which cost the economy $24 billion and was useless, of the five Nobel laureates employed by the United States of America, only one was declared essential.

Four Nobel laureates were said to be nonessential. That blows the mind, doesn't it?

These types of drastic budget cuts have profound impacts on our country. Reduced funding means that new discoveries and breakthroughs are delayed—or never realized—and that our public health knowledge is stunted for years to come.

As a microbiologist, I can tell you that you cannot simply turn research off and on like a faucet, but that is exactly what we do when we arbitrarily slash the budgets with no regard for the consequences of our cuts.

That is why today's legislation is an important step forward for our country. We must end the self-inflicted wound that is sequestration and get back to investing in our own well-being and the future of America. By restoring funding across our government, we will help to jump-start our economy and get back to work on the cutting-edge research and on infrastructure that will benefit the Nation in years to come.

In closing, today's bill is an important step forward, but our work is not done until we add an extension of unemployment insurance to this legislative package. We will give you an opportunity to do that at the end of the

rule. In so doing, we can ensure a brighter, more prosperous future for every American this holiday season.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentlelady from New York. I appreciate her mentioning all of those things that we are working on together.

The gentlelady is absolutely right: we had an opportunity in the Rules Committee last night to add to these bills that we are considering today—these bills that are bicameral, bipartisan solutions to a budget; these bills that are bicameral, bipartisan solutions to a farm bill; these bills that are bipartisan, bicameral solutions to keep our seniors' access to Medicare. And to add to that an unemployment extension that we in the Rules Committee were seeing for the very first time, I don't know what the committees of jurisdiction were doing. I certainly was one of those ''no'' votes last night, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that is the appropriate place to do that.

But I will say to my colleagues again today, as I said to them last night, I am so pleased that this rule contains that same-day authority, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned earlier. Because if my colleagues, who I know have deeply heartfelt opinions about this issue, as do I, if that bipartisan, bicameral agreement can be found, this House has the opportunity, if we pass this rule today—and only if we pass this rule today—we will have the opportunity to bring such a package up.

I hope we can find that agreement. But at the moment, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can pass this rule so that if such an agreement is found, we will have the authority on the floor of the House to bring that agreement immediately to the floor for consideration.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, begin by congratulating Congressman RYAN, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, and Senator MURRAY for coming together and trying to work out a bipartisan budget deal. It is far from what I would deem as perfect, but it begins to chip away at this awful sequestration that my Republican friends seem to be so enamored of.

But I want to come here on the floor to echo what the ranking member said in terms of expressing outrage over the fact that my Republican friends want to leave town without addressing the issue of extending unemployment compensation for 1.3 million Americans.

They are going to leave town tomorrow; and on December 28, after they have opened up all their presents and wished everybody a merry Christmas and had a wonderful dinner, on December 28, 1.3 million of our fellow citizens will be cut off totally from their unemployment compensation.

I want to put this in perspective.

On November 1, the American Recovery Act funds ran out, in terms of supporting the SNAP program, which means that everybody on SNAP has received a cut. So the average family of three, Mr. Speaker, received a $30 reduction in their SNAP benefits. That is their food benefit. That is about 16 meals.

It may not sound like a big deal to some of my friends on the other side of the aisle; but for millions of family in this country who are struggling just to put food on the table, it is a big deal.

On top of that, they are going to say to these 1.3 million people and their families, We don't care. We don't care. We are leaving town.

And since when did my Republican friends have to wait for a bicameral, bipartisan deal on anything to bring this to the floor? They brought a repeal of the Affordable Care Act to the floor about four dozen times.

Since when do they wait to get a backroom deal with the Senate before we are allowed to vote on something on the House floor? That is an excuse, and it is a poor excuse.

We ought to be doing the people's business, and that means not turning our backs on millions of Americans who are struggling during this difficult economy. We ought not to be making excuses. We ought to do something, and this is an opportunity to do it.

Defeat the previous question, as the ranking member said, and we can have a vote on extending unemployment compensation for these 1.3 million people. And it is paid for.

If you don't want to do it, you can vote ''no.'' But for those of us in this Chamber who believe we have a moral obligation to those people, we want that vote. And let us vote for the extension and then send it over to the Senate.

Let's take some leadership on this issue. Let's not turn our backs on the most vulnerable in this country. It has become unfashionable in this country to worry about the poor. It has become unfashionable to stand up for these programs just to help people get by. This is the holiday season. Have a heart.

We ought to do something here. We ought to help these people and not just skip town. So there are no excuses.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the previous question. Let us vote on extending unemployment compensation, and let us do the right thing. Let's not make excuses.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that our bipartisan, bicameral spirit lasted for the first 5 minutes of the debate. It was going to be too much to ask that it lasted much longer. I regret that.

But I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know why problems are so hard to solve in this town, when the folks who have such a heartfelt commitment to solving the problems begin the presentation with ''and we could do this, except for those heartless Republicans,'' it is easy to see why disagreement prevails and agreement is hard to find.

I will say to my friend that I appreciate his recognition of the tireless effort we have put in on this side of the aisle to repeal the President's health care bill, which is denying not only the choice of plans to my constituents; it is restricting their choice of doctors as well.

But the issue that he brings up is an important issue, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we will have more success on his issue than we have had the 40 times trying to repeal the President's health care bill.

If what he wants is a symbolic vote on this issue, more power to him, but I don't believe that is what he wants. I think he cares deeply about challenges that folks have in this country and he cares deeply about solving those problems.

I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, as I have said to all of my colleagues, we can do these things together. This is not a case of first impression. The gentleman knows that. We have come together in a bipartisan way to extend unemployment benefits.

Just to be clear, because we spend a lot of time in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, creating fear out there, I think that is one of the most shameful things that we are a part of, Mr. Speaker: creating fear for families that needn't have that fear.

□ 1300

For families that are concerned, we are talking about the emergency extended unemployment benefits. Those basic unemployment benefits that your State has guaranteed to you, nothing is happening to those, and folks need to know that. Those weeks of unemployment that the Federal Government has always provided, nothing is happening to those, and folks need to know that. What we are talking about are those emergency benefits.

Now, what we have done in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is to have come together not once, not twice, not three times, not four times—but more—to do this together, and we can do this together; but I promise you, Mr. Speaker, that we are only going to do it in working together. If the answer is that someone has got a heart and the other folks don't have a heart, we are not going to be able to solve the issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I guess my question to the gentleman is that, on December

28—I think it is indisputable—1.3 million people will lose their benefits. They have also had their SNAP benefits cut. What do these people do on December 28? What do they do? Where do they go?

Mr. WOODALL. In reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend, who has incredible expertise on this issue, that, instead of being on this floor, impugning our committee's process or impugning my heart, the gentleman could be hard at work in creating a bipartisan, bicameral solution, because the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, that anything short of a bipartisan, bicameral solution is showboating for those folks who are hurting and is not doing a dadgum thing to help them. We don't need showboating in this institution, Mr. Speaker—we need results—which brings me back to the bipartisan, bicameral solutions that this rule has made in order.

It wasn't easy, Mr. Speaker, but we came together on a budget for the first time not in 1 year, not in 2 years, not in 3 years—but more. It is important because we have come together on a pathway to a farm bill not in 1 year, not in 2 years, not in 3 years—but in more—and we have come together on a process to solve an SGR that has plagued us not for 1 year, not for 2 years, not for 3 years—but for more.

This is not a day for acrimony, Mr. Speaker. There is not a person in this Chamber who is getting everything he wants today. I promise you I am not. I promise you my constituents are not. This is a day for doing what can be done, and what we are doing today makes a difference.

I ask my colleagues to look at not just what we are doing today but at how it is we came together to do it, because that is the framework, Mr. Speaker, by which we will accomplish the rest of these goals that I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle share.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, to discuss our previous question amendment, which will allow every one of us to vote ''yes'' or ''no'' on whether we are going to allow 1.3 million Americans to keep their unemployment benefits for 3 months, which is absolutely paid for and which does not add a nickel to the deficit.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are talking about unemployment insurance.

We are not showboating—we want to vote—and you misunderstand, if I might say so, the issue.

If we don't act on December 28, 1.3 million people will lose every cent of unemployment insurance. These are people who have exhausted their State benefits. They have exhausted them. These are people who have been laid off through no fault of their own, and they are looking for work. When Walmart came to D.C. and asked for applications, 23,000 people applied for 600 jobs. That is the shortage of jobs for people. So these 1.3 million people are people who have exhausted their State benefits and who are long-term unemployed.

Historically, we have never, never ended these emergency provisions when long-term unemployment has been as high as it is today—37 percent—and we have already reduced the average number of unemployment insurance weeks in this country to 54. I want to point out to the gentleman and to everybody else that, if we don't act, another 1.9 million unemployed people will lose every cent of their unemployment insurance in the next 6 months.

So, under this bill, SGR is now extended for 3 months. We asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment—paid for—to extend unemployment insurance for 3 months, and here is what we said: if we can prevent a 25 percent cut to doctors' pay, surely, we can prevent a 100 percent cut for 1.3 million uninsured.

So what has been the response?

The answer from House Republicans is this—an empty box.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am sorry, Mr. LEVIN. All time has been allocated.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. TOM COLE, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation, the bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

I had the privilege of sitting as one of the budget conferees, and it was an interesting process but a productive one. This is the first time in a long time we have had a genuine compromise in this body and, frankly, between this body and the administration and between this body and the other Chamber.

I particularly want to praise Chairman RYAN and Chairman MURRAY, who worked together in good faith and who worked together well, neither one of whom violated their core principles but both of whom came together and did some pretty extraordinary things in what is a modest bill.

First of all, they actually added to the deficit reduction over the window. Literally, we will have a somewhat smaller deficit and debt because of what they did than if we keep the current situation.

Secondly, they did something we all know needs to be done in that they dealt a little bit with mandatory spending, and they redistributed those savings over to the discretionary side of the budget. It was because they were able to do that that we are probably going to be able to protect our military from what would have been really devastating cuts under the sequester. That is a pretty amazing achievement.

The achievement, to me, that is the most impressive of all is that they managed to find a compromise that will restore regular order. We all know, if this legislation passes, the appropriators from the Senate and the appropriators from the House will be working over the holidays. They will probably come back and have an omnibus or some series of minibuses, but we will actually have had a somewhat normal appropriations process. Even more importantly, because they have set a top line number for fiscal year 2015, we can have regular order work in this Chamber all year next year, and we will be spared the prospect of a government shutdown in January or again in October.

Those are exceptional achievements. I wish there would have been more and would have been different. I know I would have written it differently. I know my friend would have, and I know my friends on the other side would have; but we ought to take a step back and thank Chairman RYAN and thank Chairman MURRAY for what they did to restore the institution as much as what they did to try and work on the budget. They did it the right way. They did it together, and it is an example we ought to follow.

So I urge the passage of this rule and the support and passage of the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and I congratulate him for his hard work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the budget agreement that was reached was a small but positive step forward, and I plan to talk about that a little later today; but what I want to talk about right now is the abuse of process that has taken place in the last 8 hours and the changing of the terms of that agreement.

During that agreement, the Democrats from the House and others put forward a proposal that said, as we deal with the budget issues, we should also deal with what we call the doc fix, making sure that doctors are fully reimbursed to help Medicare patients, but that we should also help folks who are about to lose their unemployment compensation. That is what we said, and we put it on paper and offered it. We said, if we do a doc fix for 3 months, we should do a UI extension for 3 months, and if we do a doc fix for a year, we should deal with the UI issue for a year; but that was not part of the budget negotiation even though we wanted it to be.

Chairman RYAN acknowledged that yesterday as did Senator MURRAY. They said we wouldn't deal with either of those two issues—the doc fix or the UI—as part of the budget agreement but that we would deal with them outside of that agreement. Yet the ink was barely dry, Mr. Speaker, on that agreement before the House Republicans and the Speaker of the House put forward a rule that injected the doc fix, which we support, into the budget agreement, so it is all going to be one whole thing.

They did that to take care of a real issue of the doc fix, but what did they leave out?

They left out an extension of unemployment insurance for 1.3 million Americans who are going to lose that important support 3 days after Christmas. They left that out of that last-minute procedure.

Now, as Mr. LEVIN said, he and I went to the Rules Committee last night and said, All right. If we are going to fix the SGR issue, let's deal with the unemployment compensation issue, and we presented an amendment. I have it in my hand—3 months. We said we would pay for it, and we paid for it, Mr. WOODALL, in a way that has been agreed to on a bipartisan basis, which is in the ag bill negotiations, in the farm bill negotiations. We have already agreed on a bipartisan and on a bicameral basis to get rid of these excessive direct payments—subsidies—that go to agribusiness. We had agreed on that already. As of now, we have agreed on it. Let's use $6 billion of that savings to make sure that 1.3 million Americans aren't left out in the cold.

So I would say to my friend Mr. WOODALL: If you want to make this a bipartisan agreement, all you have to do is vote for it; and if you want to vote for it, you have got to give this House an opportunity to vote for it. Yet, while we are going to get a chance to vote on the doc fix and on the budget agreement, the Rules Committee and the Speaker of the House have told the American people you won't allow a vote to help 1.3 million Americans who are going to be left out in the cold. It is not just them and their struggling families, but the Congressional Budget Office that tells us that their surrounding communities are going to be hurt, too.

Why?

They won't be able to make the rent payments. They won't be able to go out to the local stores around Christmastime and the holiday season to buy gifts. That hurts local merchants, small businesses. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that we will have 200,000 fewer of those jobs—private sector jobs—as a result of not extending unemployment insurance.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unconscionable and shameful, after we have reached an agreement in which we had wanted to include a fixed SGR and UI in the agreement but it was decided not to, that we would have this last-minute thing parachuted on and would leave the 1.3 million Americans out in the cold. That is shameful. You should allow a vote, and if you vote against the previous question, we will have a chance to do our job and vote on that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I think the gentleman characterized much of that exactly right, and his characterization of all we have to do to make his idea a bipartisan idea is to agree to do it his way—that is all we have to do—and that is not the way we reach agreements in this institution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. WOODALL. In just one moment, I would be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

We have here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, a rule, again, to bring bipartisan, bicameral agreements on the budget, bipartisan, bicameral agreements on Medicare, bipartisan, bicameral agreements on the farm bill; and we have two of the finest minds in this institution with two of the biggest hearts in this institution, who want to do the right thing for the American people, who are using this as their opportunity to try to get that done. I can promise my friends, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to solve that problem here in the 1 hour of debate on this entirely separate measure.

□ 1315

What the gentleman characterized as the agreement within the Budget Committee is we weren't going to be able to find an answer to SGR within the budget conference and we didn't. We found it outside of the conference. We didn't find an answer to my issues with Medicare in the conference. We didn't find the answers to saving Social Security in the conference. So many things I wanted we didn't find in the conference.

The commitment that was made was to deal with UI outside of the conference. I don't sit on any of the relevant committees for UI, but I take folks at their word that that is something we can solve outside of conference. We are not going to solve it here. Knowing that folks need that help, it is a great frustration to me, Mr. Speaker, that some of the finest minds in this Congress are focusing their energy on this hour while we are trying to move things forward that we do agree on instead of focusing their energy trying to find that agreement on things we do not yet agree on but we could agree on if folks would focus their energies in that direction.

I will be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out—and I think the gentleman knows this—we have not seen a single proposal from our Republican colleagues to extend unemployment insurance because there is a philosophical difference and a majority of the Republican colleagues don't think we should extend unemployment compensation for 1.3 million Americans. We have not seen a proposal. We paid for this proposal in a way that has bipartisan support.

I will just say the question is whether we should be able to vote on it. My colleague and friends can vote against it, but I think the American people deserve a vote on this.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend that I wouldn't want anyone to be confused who is listening to this debate that we can't find agreement on this in a bipartisan way.

Why would folks come to that conclusion? Well, much has been said here on the floor; but the facts are that time and time and time again these provisions have been extended and they were not extended January 2013, February 2012. All the way back to the beginning they were not extended on party-line votes alone. They were extended in a bipartisan, bicameral way.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. In just one moment, I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Folks back home are so frustrated, Mr. Speaker. They know that we can argue with each other. They are absolutely convinced we can do that. We do that every single day.

Today, we have an opportunity on this rule to move forward those things that we have not found an easy agreement on, but things we have struggled to find agreement on for, again, not days, not weeks, in most cases months, in many cases years, and we have finally found that agreement.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, it advances any of our causes to turn what should be an hour on those things that we are doing well together into any kind of an hour on accusations that somebody is right and somebody is wrong and only if we do it one way can we find the answers.

I will be happy to yield 30 seconds to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. I appreciate your courtesy.

I always enjoy coming before the Rules Committee.

Just two points. First of all—maybe three quick ones—SGR was outside the budget agreement. It was decided to place it within it. All we are asking is for a vote on UI. And the third point, December 28 is a few days away. The ax falls on the livelihood of 1.3 million people.

So if you will say today that the Speaker will sit down with us on a bipartisan basis today and tomorrow and find an answer, fine. But just to say you are skipping town not addressing this and leaving an empty box, that is not a good answer.

Mr. WOODALL. Well, I would say to my friend suggesting anyone is skipping town is also not a good answer.

Mr. LEVIN. It is true, isn't it? We are leaving?

Mr. WOODALL. The gentleman knows, and it is so frustrating, Mr. Speaker, because, again, much, much to the surprise of the odds makers all across this country, we have got three provisions before us today on which Republicans and Democrats on the House side and the Senate side, with the support of the White House, have been able to come together on.

If we want to go down the road of moving things on which we don't have agreement, the gentleman knows those things don't move. If you want to make a difference for people, I say stop the recriminations and begin the conversations. That is the only way we have been able to find these, Mr. Speaker.

I say to my folks back home, Mr. Speaker, it is not the happiest day in the life of their Seventh District Congressman that we have these bills on the floor today. I would do something different in every single one of them—every single one. I would do a lot of things different in every single one.

While I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Speaker, perhaps one day if I am Speaker of the House I will have the power to do those things by myself. I think if you ask the Speaker, he will say he does not have the power to do things alone. It takes herding 434 other cats to make that happen.

But we have successes here today, hard-fought successes on behalf of the American people. Not frivolous things, but things that are going to make a difference in people's lives.

My colleague from New York mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, medical research. I am a huge believer in medical research, a huge believer in NIH. CDC is stationed in my great home State of Georgia. We have an opportunity with this budget agreement to restore some funding to those two agencies that do amazing work on behalf of all Americans, in fact, in the case of the CDC, on behalf of the world.

We should take advantage of these successes, Mr. Speaker, and then we should show up again—maybe it is not even tomorrow; maybe it is the very next hour—and build on these successes to do more. We have got that framework now. We know what it takes to come together and do things that matter to the American people, do things that make a difference for this land that we both love. We have that opportunity today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield for 30 seconds on that?

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to my friend that we are very lopsided on time. If the gentlelady runs out later in the hour, I will be happy to yield to my friend.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). This is very important.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. As I said at the outset of my comments, I support the bipartisan agreement. I think it is a small step forward. But the gentleman knows we will be debating that issue later this afternoon.

Right now we are debating the rule of the House. That rule parachuted in a doc-fix for 3 months, which we support, but our Republican colleagues denied this House and the American people an opportunity to vote to extend UI in that rule. That is what we are debating right now, Mr. WOODALL, and you know that.

The way that rule was structured was to deny the people of this country a vote to help 1.3 million Americans, and that is shameful.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), my colleague, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 16 days, 1.3 million Americans will lose their unemployment benefits they have relied on to buy groceries and keep a roof over their heads; and, no, we are not creating fear. This is the reality for 1.3 million Americans who every day get up and go out to the job market to find out that there are no jobs available. This is the reality of American children who are suffering. This is the reality of 1.3 million individuals in this country who will not know how they can pay for the next meal or how can they pay for their rent.

This is not the American way. We took care of the doctors; we took care of big farmers at a time when the economy is still struggling in the wake of the 2008 financial collapse. We should not be revoking needed economic assistance from jobseekers while millions of Americans are fighting to get back to work.

Last year, unemployment insurance kept 2.5 million Americans and .6 million children out of poverty. If long-term jobless benefits are allowed to expire, next year there will be nothing to protect these families from long spells of unemployment.

Unfortunately, this budget fails to extend the unemployment insurance millions of Americans rely on to make ends meet. Allowing jobless benefits to expire will not put people back to work. It will just make it harder for families to pay the bills and discourage people from seeking employment.

I urge my colleagues to continue fighting for struggling Americans, and I hope that Americans are paying close attention to what is happening in Congress today.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to remind my colleagues about the successes that we have had when we worked together and about the terrible, terrible failures that we have had when we decide fussing with each other is better than seeking long-term solutions.

One issue at a time we can absolutely make a difference, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have not come down to express all of their disappointments about everything that wasn't included. I hope that we will be able to use this time to celebrate our successes on those things that were included and again rise tomorrow to solve the rest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader, on this important issue.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, and thank her and our colleagues on that committee for trying so hard to have this rule contain an amendment that will allow us to vote on the extension of unemployment insurance for over 1.3 million Americans who will lose those benefits if we do not pass that extension. I would particularly salute Congressman SANDY LEVIN of Michigan, the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, for his relentless championing of this issue of fairness to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we come here to talk about a bill that is to end the sequester, and end the sequester it does. I commend the conferees. I am very proud of the work of Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member on the Budget Committee on the Democratic side; NITA LOWEY, the ranking member on Appropriations; and our assistant leader, Mr. CLYBURN, representing the leadership in those negotiations. I thank them for taking this to a place, fighting it to a draw, so that we come to the floor to fight some and end sequestration.

But the opportunity was so much greater. Apparently, the Republicans never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity when it comes to creating jobs. Mr. VAN HOLLEN had in his bill just a few points in terms of priorities. One was to create jobs and economic growth for our country in the short term and in the long term.

If we close a loophole, build the infrastructure of America; close a loophole, build a bridge; close a loophole, special interests, tax loopholes for special interests, invest in the human infrastructure of our country, early childhood education, long-term economic growth; close a loophole, pay for unemployment insurance. I don't think it has to be paid for because it is emergency spending; but, nonetheless, let's have an opportunity to vote to extend unemployment benefits.

When we do ignore those investments in the future, we are not reducing the deficit; we are increasing the deficit. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than creating jobs and the revenue that produces. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than the education of the American people starting with early childhood education.

As far as unemployment benefits are concerned, the economic impact is clear: every dollar spent on unemployment benefits grows the economy by $1.52, according to Moody's Analytics—a dollar and a half for every dollar we spent, and that is a conservative estimate.

Failing to extend unemployment benefits will cost us 200,000 jobs over the next year. We can't do that. A recent report shows that extending UI instead would produce 300,000 jobs.

So again, this money, if spent immediately, injects demand into the economy, creates jobs, grows the economy, as well as honoring our social compact that we have with the American people.

□ 1330

People work hard, play by the rules, and lose their job through no fault of their own; insurance is what they have. We should honor that insurance.

So it is disappointing, yes, because this package is so limited. But as I said, it was a fight to a draw, and I recommend that our colleagues vote to support it so we can take it off the table and make way for the discussion we should be having about comprehensive immigration reform. The votes are here. Give us a vote, Mr. Speaker.

Passing a farm bill, that is very important to the economy of our country.

Raise the minimum wage. Nearly two-thirds of the people making the minimum wage are women. Paycheck equity, have fairness in the workplace for women.

The list goes on and on. ENDA, ending discrimination against the LGBT community, people in the workplace. There are so many items on the agenda that have the support of the American people in large numbers.

Yesterday was the anniversary of Newtown. Pass the Brady background bill. All of these things are on an agenda we have neglected. Up until now we just haven't had time for it. I guess they haven't been priorities for this Congress, but they are priorities for the American people and for the Democrats in Congress.

So again, one reason to vote for this package, even though you may think it is meager and you may not like all of its priorities, as the gentleman said, is to at least have an agreement on the budget that enables us to move forward for bigger fights that will improve policy and improve the lives of the American people and honor our responsibilities to them.

I urge our colleagues to vote for the budget, but to vote against this rule because this rule says ''no.'' It says ''no'' to the Congress; we are not even going to allow you to speak or vote on unemployment insurance benefits extension. It says ''no'' to the American people that if you work hard and play by the rules and lose your job through no fault of your own, the safety net is not there. And that safety net is not there just for individuals; it is there for the system. Our beautiful free market system grows in cycles, and sometimes unemployment is higher than others and there are some outside forces at work that people lose their jobs because of. And so it is a safety net for our economic system as well as individuals.

Why would they not allow us to bring this up and extend the extension? Is it the money? If it is the money, we will find it. Is it the price? Do you think the price is to high to give people dignity, to allow them to keep their homes and meet the needs of their children? Two million children would be affected by this. Tens of thousands of veterans will be affected by this. We care about veterans here. We care about children here, but apparently not enough to extend unemployment benefits.

So why, my Republican colleagues, would you not allow us to have a vote on this? I know the support is there on the Republican side. I know that the Democrats would vote 100 percent for this. Do you not believe that these people are worthy of receiving unemployment insurance? I say ''insurance,'' that is something paid into, a benefit check. If so, let the American people know that.

But this debate will not end today. While you may not give us a vote on the floor to extend these benefits so we see where everybody is on the subject and why, this fight will continue because this is about the morality of our country, the respect that we have for people, the value that we place on work, the pride we take in the great work ethic of the American people. But sometimes it just seems the harder they work, the forces are in a deck stacked against them, and this Congress is saying this deck is not going to include you as we deal out the cards.

So I can't explain it to anybody except to say it is a values decision; and, apparently, there is not enough shared value on the subject of the respect we should have for our workers to even honor the subject with a vote on the floor of the House. It is an outrageous rule to come to the floor. I thank you, Madam Chair, for fighting it, and I urge a very strong ''no'' vote on the rule. Vote ''no'' on the previous question, which would allow us to bring the issue to the floor.

What are you afraid of? Are you afraid of the vote? Are you afraid of working people who are out of a job? What are you afraid of? Let us have a vote on the floor.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and a ''yes'' on the bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to go back to the place I was earlier, and that is how one of the worst things we do in this institution is create fears in the minds of the American people.

The gentlelady from California has a powerful voice. She is listened to, admired, and respected across this great land; and it has to be said, I was just in a hearing, Mr. Speaker, in the Oversight Committee where we were hearing from doctors who were talking about all the fears their patients had that they were going to lose access to their doctor and lose access to their pharmaceuticals because of ObamaCare. Now, those fears have been realized. That is exactly what happened to those patients.

But these fears are not realized. I want to make clear to everybody back home because I talk to constituents every day who are losing their jobs in response to what their employers are doing to be able to afford the ObamaCare mandates. They are losing their jobs, Mr. Speaker, and absolutely every week of State unemployment that has always been available to them will continue to be available to them. Fear not from what you are hearing from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, for those folks who are losing their jobs in my district as their employers are trying to comply with those mandates, understand that every week that you paid your insurance premium for unemployment insurance, all of those Federal weeks that have been there not for a year, not for 5 years, but for a decade, those will still be there for you. Fear not, that is still there.

What we are talking about here today, Mr. Speaker, are benefits in the emergency unemployment category, benefits that folks have not paid the insurance premiums for, benefits that are absolutely being utilized by families across this country. I don't minimize the impact of those going away. I don't minimize the impact; but I reject, Mr. Speaker, the fear creation that coming to the floor of the House and saying unemployment benefits are going away tomorrow is going to create in my district. Folks are losing their jobs today. Why, because after we do job creation bill after job creation bill after job creation bill, I can't find a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on those. I'm going to keep looking, but I haven't found it yet.

My message, Mr. Speaker, is if you are losing your job today because of the heavy foot—and I won't yield because I am running low on time. I know my friend has much time remaining. If you are one of those folks in my district or others who are losing your job because the heavy hand of government is on your employer, those unemployment benefits on which you are counting to apply tomorrow will be there.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have to yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. WOODALL, if you believe anything at all that you have just said, I understand what is going on here.

First, blame everything in the world on ObamaCare.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will not.

To try to give people health insurance is somehow a crime in the House of Representatives, but the people we are talking about on unemployment have exhausted their unemployment. It will not be there, Mr. WOODALL. They can lose their housing. They can lose their food. They may even be dispossessed out into the street. There is a meanness that is going on that is absolutely astonishing to me.

Mr. WOODALL. I am sure that the gentlelady does not mean to suggest that there is meanness going on, I would ask the gentlelady.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I please have my time. I didn't get to speak because he took it.

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

The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, and I started out that way.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the Energy and Commerce Environment Subcommittee ranking member, who I hope can finish my thought.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. And absolutely, those benefits have been exhausted, and I think that needs to be very clear here.

Mr. Speaker, while this budget compromise is not perfect, I would like to highlight a provision that will reduce our deficit.

Since 2011, I have fought to change a little-known statutory formula for capping the maximum reimbursement for Federal contractor executives and employees. Due to a flaw in this formula, taxpayer-funded salaries have spiraled out of control in recent years.

Just this month, OMB announced that it was required to raise the cap to over $950,000 per year—$950,000—while we debate our ability to afford essential services for our most vulnerable citizens, for extending unemployment insurance. We are paying private sector executives nearly million-dollar salaries. This agreement sets the cap at $487,000. Personally, I would have preferred the cap to be set at $230,700—the Vice President's salary—as it is stated in my legislation, but this is an important step and sensible compromise to restoring sanity to taxpayer-funded salaries.

Just a sampling, GAO, within the Department of Defense, found just 7 percent of their contracts when reduced to this level would save hundreds of millions of dollars.

I again thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Committee on the Budget and author of the amendment we are trying to get here.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her tremendous leadership in her capacity as our ranking member on the Rules Committee. Thank you so much for standing in strong opposition to this rule.

As a member of the Budget Committee and Appropriations Committee, I want to commend all of my colleagues for putting forth a plan to replace some of the reckless sequester cuts that do continue to hurt families each and every day.

Yet this budget deal is really outrageous for what it doesn't do. It does nothing—nothing—to extend emergency unemployment benefits to the millions of jobless workers in every State.

As the Center on Budget and Priorities report today points out, the failure to include any extension of Federal emergency jobless benefits in the deal would likely negate any boost from sequester this deal would bring, and I will include this report for the RECORD.

Over 170 Democrats have joined my letter calling for an extension of this critical lifeline. It is really shameful that Republicans have refused to include an extension of unemployment benefits. The least we can do for the millions of the long-term unemployed who are struggling just to get by during this holiday season is to pass this 3-month extension. This budget does nothing for the millions of jobless people and asks nothing from the people who caused our economic crisis and continue to benefit from economic inequality.

Please remember, this is not about showboating or statistics. We are talking about people's lives. We are talking about people living on the edge. We are talking about 1.3 million people who will lose unemployment benefits during this holiday season. It is cruel. It is morally wrong, and it is economically stupid.

So I hope that we can vote ''no'' on this rule and defeat the previous question so we can vote for a 3-month extension of unemployment compensation.

Finally, let me just say, we must do better. We must protect and expand the safety net that are the pillars of our society.

[From offthechartsblog.org, Dec. 11, 2013]

FAILURE TO CONTINUE JOBLESS BENEFITS WOULD UNDO BUDGET DEAL'S ECONOMIC BOOST

(By Chad Stone)

The Murray-Ryan budget deal provides a stimulative boost to the economy—albeit a modest one. But here's the rub: the economic drag caused by lawmakers' failure to include an extension of federal emergency jobless benefits in the deal would likely negate that stimulus.

Economist Joel Prakken of Macroeconomic Advisers says that the deal would boost economic growth by ''maybe 1/4 percentage point'' compared to the sequestration cuts scheduled under current law. The deal follows the sound principle under current circumstances of raising deficits in the near term to boost the economic recovery but reducing them by an even larger amount later, when the economy is expected to be stronger.

The problem is, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) has a very similar impact—boosting the economy by up to 0.3 percent by the end of 2014 and adding up to 300,000 jobs. Not extending EUC would remove that potential boost from the economy.

The budget deal and extending EUC have similar economic effects because their budgetary effects are roughly the same size: CBO estimates that the budget deal's increases in discretionary spending would raise federal spending by $26 billion in fiscal year 2014 and $22 billion in fiscal year 2015, while its deficit-reduction provisions would cut spending by roughly $3 billion in each fiscal year. Netting these effects and assuming that about a quarter of spending for fiscal year 2015 (which starts October 1, 2014) occurs in calendar year 2014, the budget deal would produce a net increase in spending of about $28 billion by the end of calendar year 2014. CBO estimates that extending EUC would cost about $26 billion in calendar year 2014.

CBO and other analysts generally regard spending on unemployment insurance as providing more ''bang for the buck'' than most other stimulus measures. So, the economic drag in 2014 from a failure to extend EUC is likely to be at least as large as the economic boost from the budget deal.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. You know, it is very good that we have a deal. The American people are frustrated and tired. Our offices are being bombarded by calls from people from all political perspectives that they are glad for the deal; and to be honest with you, I am glad that we have made some progress. Many of us want to be part of the deal.

But I know that it is equally important to raise the concern of faces like this, faces across America who equal the 1.3 million number of Americans who will lose their unemployment benefits; 3.5 million in 2014; 200,000 military veterans and 2 million children. And so we can't only be about ourselves in this holiday season, particularly as we recognize that the Pope, being named Man of the Year, has spoken to the world eloquently about this whole issue of the vulnerable.

And so I ask this, Mr. WOODALL and the Rules Committee: let's put the Van Hollen-Lee-Levin amendment to the floor tonight. Call us back, Mr. BOEHNER. Let us vote to provide for unemployment insurance for working men and women. Faces across America will not have the tears of desperation. The deal is good, but the people are suffering. We cannot allow this to happen in this season of joy and giving.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule and the underlying bill, H.J. Res. 59, the ''Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and Pathway for Sustainable Growth in Medicare Reform Act of 2013.''

The budget proposal before us is not perfect—far from it—but it is a modest and positive step toward preventing Republicans from shutting down the government again and manufacturing crises that only harm our economy, destroy jobs, and weaken our middle class. Thank goodness for small favors.

As with any compromise there are some things in the agreement that I support and some things that I strongly oppose.

On the positive side:

Republicans—and the bipartisan deal does not cut Medicare, Social Security, or Medicaid benefits by a penny even though our friends across the aisle went into the talks insisting on cuts to programs that sustain families and seniors.

Over the Republicans insistence, the agreement replaces almost two-thirds of the sequester's disastrous impending cuts to important domestic investments like education, medical research and law enforcement.

The agreement scales back the proposed cuts to federal employees sought by Republicans and exempts current federal employees.

On the negative side:

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous—it is scandalous—that the budget agreement does not include an extension of unemployment insurance for the 1.3 million jobless workers—68,900 in Texas—will have their benefits cut off on December 28, and nearly another 1.9 million—106,900 Texans—will lose their unemployment benefits over the first half of next year.

If Congress does not act immediately to extend these benefits, a devastating blow will be dealt not only to the millions of Americans who are already struggling, but to our economy.

That is why yesterday I joined with 165 of Democratic colleagues in calling upon Speaker Boehner not to adjourn this House for the year without extending the vital unemployment insurance desperately needed by millions of our fellow citizens.

To let their benefits expire in the middle of the holiday season is cruel and heartless and unworthy of a great and generous nation.

Cutting off unemployment benefits at the end of the year will only further hurt an economy already injured by sequestration and the Republican government shutdown.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that 750,000 fewer jobs will be created or retained in calendar year 2013 because of the budget cuts under sequestration.

The government shutdown cost our economy an additional 120,000 jobs in the first two weeks of October alone, according to the Council of Economic Advisors.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that cutting off extended unemployment benefits would cost our economy 310,000 jobs next year because of reduced consumer demand.

Other experts, like Michael Feroli, the chief economist at JPMorgan Chase, indicate that allowing the federal unemployment insurance (UI) program to expire could shave as much 0.4 percentage point off our economy's growth in the first quarter of 2014.

Letting unemployment benefits expire will deprive our economy of the positive impact unemployment insurance provides since financially stressed unemployed workers spend any benefits they receive quickly.

CBO also concluded in a 2012 report that assistance for the unemployed has one of the "largest effects on employment per dollar of budgetary cost."

I agree. Therefore, I urge all Members to join me in voting against this rule.

□ 1345

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time.

I rise in support of the bipartisan budget act, the underlying rule, and Chairman RYAN's hard work.

This isn't a perfect deal, but it is better than the alternative. This bill replaces some of the indiscriminate spending cuts called for by sequestration and replaces it with smarter ones; it makes modest reforms that will reduce the deficit without raising taxes; and it continues our Nation's trajectory toward a more fiscally responsible government.

I agree with those critics who say this bill doesn't solve all of our Nation's budget problems, but "no" can't always be the answer. Reality is that we have a Democratic President and a Democrat-led Senate. Given that reality, this is a solid deal. And virtually everyone agrees that we don't need another government shutdown. It is time to put politics aside and make genuine progress on ending wasteful Washington spending. This is a good first step in that direction.

Let's not be afraid to take that step and move forward toward common ground from which we can continue fighting for fiscal sanity for hard-working taxpayers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule, and I don't do so because it gives us limited opportunity to keep the government open for a few days, and I know that we are going to allow our physicians to practice medicine so that they can take care of Medicare patients for a few more days. What it does not do is it does not extend unemployment insurance for those 2 million or more people who will not have it. This is not going to be a good Christmas for many of the people in my district. It is going to be just the opposite.

I will vote against the rule so that we can, in fact, come back and provide unemployment compensation to those millions who need it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The budget deal that we are voting on today is a step in the right direction because it blunts some of the painful cuts caused by sequestration. But a critical piece is missing: extending unemployment benefits that are due to expire at the end of this year.

It is an absolute disgrace that this body would even consider leaving town without finishing our work and ensuring that we address the needs of the long-term unemployed. Just 3 days after Christmas, 1.3 million Americans struggling to find work will immediately be thrown out into the cold and lose their unemployment assistance, including 4,900 Rhode Islanders who will lose their benefits on December 28. Much of the economic gain achieved in this budget deal will be nearly wiped out by failing to extend unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker, how do you plan to explain to your constituents your 3-week vacation when you have constituents who won't be able to keep the heat on or put the next meal on their dinner table because Congress failed to do its job?

We should, every day, but especially during this time of year, be thinking of others and taking care of one another, not walking away from our responsibilities and ignoring the challenges facing our fellow citizens.

We have 15 days to figure this out. What is the rush to leave town? It won't take much time to resolve this problem because we already have the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House call up H.R. 3546 for immediate consideration. This will extend unemployment benefits for 1.3 million Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and to stand up and fight for the 1.3 million Americans who will lose their benefits on December 28.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding.

I don't see how my colleagues can go home for Christmas leaving their constituents who are unemployed with no Christmas at all. I understand this bill to be important for its elimination of some sequestration. That is a small favor considering that sequestration may be the only bill nobody wanted that nevertheless prevailed. But the callous treatment of the unemployed is unforgiveable, especially at this season. I am really outraged by the notion of some of my colleagues about the incentive to remain on unemployment

insurance, when the benefits per week have gone down one-third across the States.

We are exposing those who have worked and paid into unemployment insurance to more hard times, but we are also exposing our economy, itself, because the loss of unemployment insurance means another loss of 300,000 jobs.

This bill is counterproductive. It is counterintuitive. It spoils an otherwise acceptable bill. It makes a mockery of Christmas.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has further speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I am the final speaker on our side.

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

Today's proposal is a step in the right direction, but we must improve this bill before we vote on final passage.

What have we learned here today? We have learned first that during the budget negotiations that it was determined that the doc fix, as we call it—doctors' payments—and unemployment insurance would not be in the scope of what they were doing and we would do that separately. Then, unbeknownst to us on our side, after agreeing to that, only the doc fix, as we call it, was put back into this bill. It was supposed to be separate, it was a part of the rule, and it would be voted on automatically when we vote for this rule today.

The only thing left out was unemployment extension, and I think we know why. We heard from our colleague that he thinks there is plenty of money out there. They are not going to go without a thing. That is totally untrue. It would be a tragedy of gigantic proportions if this House turned down the extension of unemployment benefits because some Members believe it is not going to happen. It is going to happen, and it is not because we didn't try in the Rules Committee to try to explain it.

There is no justification in the world for turning down a 3-month extension in the dead of winter that is paid for, that adds not a penny to anything. And there was no bipartisanship in the Rules Committee on this last night. We did our very best, but we were outnumbered considerably, 9–4.

Nonetheless, we think it is important enough today to give every Member of this House a second chance, and we are going to ask everybody who wants to make sure the people in their districts who are unemployed, through no fault of their own—there has been sort of a prevailing thought that we have heard from time to time that if we don't extend unemployment insurance, we will teach them a lesson; we will teach them not to have a job. They will find out right away that is not the way to live, despite the fact, as was pointed out, 20,000 people applied for 600 jobs. That gives you some idea of what that is like. Some people have come before committees here with stacks of resumes that they have sent out as high as 2 feet with rejection notices that they have gotten. They are not there.

We are going to give another chance on the previous question. I want everybody on both sides of the aisle who believes they cannot go home—and we did have a resolution here not to go home until our work is finished—but that we will take care of our fellow Americans in need, which we hope is temporary, which again depends very much on what we do in the future. We will give you a chance if we vote ''no'' on the previous question to this rule. Then I will be allowed to bring up the amendment that was turned down last night to extend it for 3 months. Imagine, 3 months all paid for again.

So it is really appalling to me that we can fix anything here, but we can literally let children, veterans, people who are unable to work, the disabled, and the people who have lost their jobs, that we can say to them that it doesn't matter here in the House of Representatives if you are hungry, if you are cold, if you are going to lose the place that you live, if your sustenance is taken away from you. We don't care. Maybe some church somewhere, some temple, some synagogue will take care of you.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow the House to extend unemployment insurance for 1.3 million Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I am surprised we have spent most of the hour talking about what is not in this rule today because we have great cause of celebration for what is in this rule today.

It has not been months; it has been years we have been working to get a farm bill. There is an extension that this rule allows to be voted on that will bring us in the next 30 days that agreement we have been so long searching for.

Mr. Speaker, it has been since 1997 that the SGR has been a part of our lingo here. That is that provision that threatens access to health care for every senior in America. This bill today, this rule today allows us to have a vote on a bipartisan, bicameral solution to that. It is actually a 3-month extension that leads to the end of this discussion forever, putting at ease every senior's mind in America that around this time of year, every year, their access to care will be threatened.

Perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this rule allows for a vote on the bipartisan, bicameral budget agreement.

This is not a grand agreement. It is not the grand agreement that I have been fighting for on the Budget Committee for the last 3 years, but what it is is a small step in the right direction. The reason it is a small step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, is that we take those sequester cuts that no one would argue were done in a discriminate manner, we preserve those savings, but we apply them in a much more discriminate manner. For me, that is national security. The concern has always been national security.

Today, Air Force units have reduced their training activities by about 25 percent. With the sequester, only 2 of 43 active brigade combat teams are ready or available for deployment in the United States Army. We absolutely must rein in Federal spending—this budget agreement does that—but we must do so in a responsible way that preserves our national security.

The sequester reductions that were coming up in January, as many of my friends know, fell on no program in the land except for our Armed Forces, except for our national security. The Constitution does not ask much of us in this House, Mr. Speaker—far too often we are doing too much here as opposed to not enough—but it asks us to protect and preserve our national security. And with this bill today, while it does not achieve my Medicare goals, while it does not achieve my Social Security goals, while it does not achieve the budget reduction goals I would like to see, it does replace an indiscriminate sequester with discriminate reductions in mandatory spending programs, putting those dollars, instead, towards our national security.

I will end where I began, Mr. Speaker, with the letter from Thomas Jefferson to Charles Clay in 1790:

> The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches, and we must be contented to secure what we can from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get.

I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on this rule and a ''no'' vote on my colleague's motion so that we do those things that we are able to do today and then tomorrow eternally press forward.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 438 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

In section 1, strike ''to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question'' and insert ''and on any amendment thereto to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except an amendment specified in section 12 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Levin of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for

division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.''

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. The amendment referenced in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Levin of Michigan to the motion offered by Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin:

At the end of division B, add the following:

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL EXTENDERS

Subtitle A—Emergency Unemployment Compensation

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2013''.

SEC. 1302. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''April 1, 2014''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendment made by section 1302(a) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2013;''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 1303. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(b) EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(c) EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 1304. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''; and

(2) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Agricultural Programs

SEC. 1311. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided by each provision of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651) and each amendment made by that Act (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2013, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until the later of—

(1) September 30, 2014; and

(2) the date specified in the provision of such Act or amendment made by such Act.

(b) COMMODITY PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms and conditions applicable to a covered commodity or loan commodity (as those terms are defined in section 1001 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702)) or to peanuts, sugarcane, or sugar beets for the 2012 crop year pursuant to title I of such Act and each amendment made by that title shall be applicable to the 2014 crop year for that covered commodity, loan commodity, peanuts, sugarcane, or sugar beets.

(2) REDUCTION IN DIRECT PAYMENTS.—For purposes of applying sections 1103 and 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713, 8753) for the 2014 crop year of a covered commodity (as that term is defined in section 1001 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) or peanuts, the Secretary of Agriculture shall modify the terms ''base acres'' and ''payment acres'' as otherwise defined in sections 1001 and 1301 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8702, 8751) to realize savings of $6,400,000,000 from direct payments for the 10-year period of 2014 through 2023.

(3) COTTON.—The authority provided by the following provisions of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 shall continue through July 31, 2015:

(A) Section 1204(e)(2)(B) (7 U.S.C. 8734(e)(2)(B)) relating to adjustment authority regarding prevailing world market price.

(B) Section 1207(a) (7 U.S.C. 8737(a)) relating to import quota program.

(C) Section 1208 (7 U.S.C. 8738) relating to special competitive provisions for extra long staple cotton.

(4) SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITIES.—The provisions of law specified in subsections (a) through (c) of section 1602 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8782) shall be suspended—

(A) for the 2014 crop year of a covered commodity (as that term is defined in section 1001 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)), peanuts, and sugar, as appropriate; and

(B) in the case of milk, through December 31, 2014.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, 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 438, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
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
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)
Gohmert
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)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
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)
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 (IN)

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
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
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (GA)
Castro (TX)
Culberson
Doyle
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Radel
Rush
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1424

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 637 a vote on ordering the previous question, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held December 10, 2013, the Honorable Katherine M. Clark was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, MA, December 11, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special State Election held on Tuesday, December 10, 2013, for the office of Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, show that Katherine M. Clark received 40,172 votes out of 60,937 total votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Katherine M. Clark was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by those municipalities located within the Fifth Congressional District, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

□ 1430

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE KATHERINE M. CLARK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable KATHERINE M. CLARK, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect CLARK and the members of the Massachusetts delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation