

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

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 10:00 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution H.J. Res 59.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 368) relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

*Resolved*, That the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, (2) insists on its amendment, and (3) requests a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 368 directs the House of

Representatives to go to conference with the Senate to resolve differences between the two Chambers on how to appropriately fund the Federal Government. Like any other time the House goes to a conference, Mr. Speaker, the minority will have an opportunity to instruct conferees and have their ideas heard.

For nearly 3 weeks, this body, the United States House of Representatives, has made numerous legitimate efforts to find a compromise to avoid a government shutdown. Unfortunately, Senate Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats have been unwilling to negotiate and have stonewalled any attempt to find common ground.

No one wants a government shutdown, but Mr. REID's unwillingness to work with House Republicans to find a solution is what brings us to a point now this evening. I know that we want to get our work done tonight. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me be clear: the proposal before us is nothing but another way to run out the clock. I think while we're speaking here, in just a little while we will find in 20 minutes—21 minutes, because I think we will go 1 minute after midnight—that this government will shut down.

This amazing government that we are supposed to be overseeing—America, the United States—can't manage its business and shows that to the rest of the world over the fact of trying to stop the bill you hate that is the law of the land, that has already been verified by the Supreme Court as to its constitutionality and where our President won election handily when this was the main idea.

I don't believe anymore that this is the product of a few people with strange ideas. This is the Republican Party. I think people who watch the news, jaded—I do; every idle moment I have to be finding out what's going on in the world—were quite stunned to watch a Republican conference over, and the Members coming out absolutely gleeful, many of them expressing glee—one of them said that he was almost giddy with joy about closing down the House.

Earlier this evening, I saw after the 2010 elections some new Members who were saying on the news that their intention was to shut down the House. Well, they've done it.

At any time we could have taken up a clean bill for the Senate. All we had to do was vote for that Senate amendment resolution and pass that here, which could have been done easily with bipartisan votes. It would then have gone to the President of the United States. Government workers could sleep easier tonight if we had done that. They wouldn't have to worry

about paying the rent, or being able to buy groceries, or being able to pay the tuition for their child in college.

What we are doing to the psyche of America—not "we." I'm not going to say that again, the universal "we." What Republicans are doing to the psyche of America will be a long time in healing.

I think the absurdity knows no bounds. We want to say again that if anybody has any mistaken notions that the Democrats were involved in it, there are no Democrats' fingerprints on any of these bills. I'll say that again: Democrats had no input at all at any time on what any of these bills were going to say in the greatest matter before the House of Representatives to keep the government going, to meet our obligation to fund the government.

In fact, by cutting out the people's Representatives on my side of the House, almost half of the people in the United States' voices were stilled throughout this whole process. The only time we got to talk was when we were up here, and we were trying to run and catch up to see what was going on. We had no idea what this was about, that this was coming tonight. We were able to pick up bits and pieces maybe off the floor, and people passing around some things that maybe they heard. But the whole Democrat side has been shut out—not just on this measure, but on everything in the world that we have done in this term and last term as well. Now, I don't want anybody to forget that because everybody is going to yell if something goes wrong here, they're going to try to blame it on us. It's not on us. I have never seen anything like this.

In addition, for well over 6 months this Democratic side has begged, cajoled, done everything they could to try to get this House to appoint conferees and to go to conference with the Senate of the United States on bills that each Chamber had already passed. We couldn't do the farm bill—couldn't do much of anything. And I said earlier today one of the reasons is sequestration. So we had only gotten two appropriations bill. They've run out of money, and there was no way in God's Earth we could have ever done the 12 that we needed to do.

But even that hasn't caused any idea of changing what we're doing. And we want to be a part of that. We would like to take the 6 weeks—imagine, on one hand, we are appointing conferees for a 6-week measure when we wouldn't do it for the budget of the Federal Government.

Now we would like to be as much a part of it as we can while we're trying to deal with the debt limit and certainly to do away with sequestration that even my friend, Mr. ROGERS, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, said was far too draconian and that the government would be seriously underfunded.

□ 2345

But tonight, here we are, tragically here. Let me see now, it's 15 minutes

away from time where it will be useless; so I am not going to say anything more about we could take up another bill, we could pass it, it would go to the President, he would sign it, and we could avoid it. It's simply too late. How could you, with any common sense at all, think that, as we have moved to this point without changing from the left to the right with moving ahead, throwing up every kind of thing on a clean CR that would kill it when it arrived at the Senate.

We are hearing—and I hope it's not true—that when we get to the debt limit in about 2 weeks, that the Christmas list that they want to pass—everything that they wanted all their lives and couldn't get—again, holding the country hostage, is what we have ahead of us.

Now, given a clear choice between serving our country and serving ideology within these ranks, the majority has chosen to stand against the country and shut the government down. Make no mistake about it, there is going to be a lot of hurt.

At this point, all I can do is urge everyone on our side of the House to vote "no" for no other reason than because of the rules in the House being broken and regular order being so far from reality. The rules of the House say that any Member can call for a vote on the Senate bill, but this rule takes that away from everybody but the majority leader. Only the majority leader can call for that vote.

Very little is left on our side except to vote "no" and to express our great displeasure and hope to goodness that when this is over and all that pain is out there, that we can move as quickly as possible to try to right this dreadful wrong that is about to land on the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope we really find a way to avoid that by agreeing to a conference. I think a conference is important. The United States House of Representatives will be on a vote here in a few minutes where we are asking for that. I believe the American people see what we are doing is trying to legislatively resolve the differences that we have.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our first CR was a clean CR at sequester levels and simply defunding ObamaCare. Our second CR was a clean CR at sequester levels with a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. The third CR was a clean CR with a 1-year delay of the individual mandate and removal of certain benefits for Members and congressional staff.

I have, during these times, found that some of the wise counsel that I have received in the deliberations that I have had, in the duties and responsibilities as the chairman of the Rules Committee, leaned upon several people. One of them is here, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS.

HAL ROGERS has provided me—and I hope I have provided him—some bit of working knowledge of what we were trying to accomplish, a desire to accommodate House and Senate Members to complete more work on appropriations. That is still a part of the goal that we are going to tonight, to go to conference so that we can fund the government and get it done right.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS OF Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those kind words. It is likewise. I have relied upon the gentleman for advice all through this process as well, and I appreciate his leadership in this body, especially as chairman of the very important Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just rejected the House's third attempt to avoid a government shutdown. This body has voted time and time again to keep the lights on in our government and to stop the train wreck that is ObamaCare. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate have rejected these offers and have refused to come to the table to find a solution.

To be absolutely clear, the House has debated and approved three separate continuing resolutions. These bills do what they are named for—they continue government. We do not want a shutdown, and we have done what we can to avoid it. Given the situation at hand and the late hour, we will now vote to send the CR we just passed and a request for a conference to the Senate.

Our challenges are great, but they are not insurmountable. This conference will provide a venue to discuss the differences between the House and Senate, having productive negotiations, and come to a final agreement that most can support.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, this is a logical next step. When the House and the Senate are unable to resolve their differences on other pieces of critical legislation, the appropriate action is to appoint a conference. That is the time-honored way of this great body.

I understand that this is not the first or the second or the third choice of many Members here tonight. It is not my first choice either. But I believe this motion can help us move forward and provide at least a gleam of light at the end of this very long tunnel.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we watch this train wreck in slow motion, this Republican shutdown of government, I ask myself, in trying to understand what the Republican majority is doing: Why—why are they seeking to close down government? Is it because some of them are against government and

want to see it closed and—I think it's been quoted—this is exactly what they wanted?

That might be the case for a few of them, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think most Republicans want to abolish the United States of America Government. I think that's a position that very few Republicans hold.

So why are they closing the government? Now, I understand that many of them don't like the health care reform, the Affordable Care Act, a law that was passed by the House and Senate, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court; it's the law of the land. Some of them don't like that.

Do you know what? Some Americans are uncomfortable with that. They want to learn more about it: What does it mean to them? How does it help them afford health care? How does it help their families?

But the American people don't want to see our government close down over disagreeing with a particular law. That seems to be what my friends on the other side are arguing. They are arguing: Do you know what? We've been unable to repeal this law under the process set up by our Constitution. We've been unable to pass a bill in the House, pass a bill in the Senate, send it to the President, and have the President sign it. We've been unable to follow the Constitution to get what we want. So instead of doing that, we're just going to shut down government until we get what we want. By the way, we want a lot. We want to change a law that was passed by the House and the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court that helps middle class Americans afford health care. We want to change the way that benefits are conducted. We want to change different tax systems.

These are all policy discussions to be had through our process. In fact, some of these things have actually been passed by the House of Representatives and either have been rejected by the Senate or are awaiting action in the Senate.

But that is the genius of the Founding Fathers in setting up our constitutional system in the separation of powers. It was to provide for a way to pass laws that had broad buy-in from the American people and had the checks and balances that have kept our democracy strong for over two centuries. Yet here today we are short-circuiting that. The Republicans are seeking to say: We are going to close down the entire Federal Government.

This is the most powerful, strongest country that the Earth has, the freest democratic Nation. We are going to shut down the government. We are going to shut down because we can't pass our laws the way we want them.

Do you know what? The country has had an election. The country has elected a President. This was discussed in the Presidential election. This was discussed in Senate elections over and over again.

In 5 minutes, the government will shut down. This bill does nothing to

prevent that. Until the Republicans change their mind, we won't have an operating Federal Government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just entertained a piece of legislation that came from the Senate. There is a lot of business that needs to be done. We had the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was here, who spoke very favorably not only about his optimism of being able to work through this with his colleagues, not only the gentlewoman NITA LOWEY, his ranking member, but also the working relationship that the Appropriations Committee has with our Senate colleagues.

I think if there is one thing that is a takeaway from tonight, that is that HAL ROGERS, a man who has been in this body for a long period of time and who has great wisdom about not only the intricacies and the running of the government but also, I think, a good bit of esprit that comes with it, not just optimism, but his desire to make sure that good things happen, that is what HAL ROGERS was on this floor talking to us about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself—most Americans do understand the concept of fairness—when did fairness become a partisan issue? Certainly tonight it seems that is the case.

Now, look, no secret I have opposed the Affordable Care Act ever since I heard the first stirrings, the first musings about it in our Energy and Commerce Committee. I opposed it in committee, opposed it here on the floor of the House, opposed the Senate bill that came over to the House. I have opposed it at every opportunity.

Yes, there have been multiple attempts to repeal it since the Republicans took majority in January of 2011. Seven of those times actually got passed by the Senate, went to the President, and he signed them into law. So there have been some restrictions on the Affordable Care Act over the past 3 years.

But honestly, the changes that have occurred to the Affordable Care Act that have been the most dramatic and the most profound are those changes that are brought about by the President himself, by the administration itself. They are sort of like the delayer in chief for parts of the Affordable Care Act.

I've had constituents email me, text me, and say: What blog post do I need to follow if I'm going to keep up with the changes in the Affordable Care Act? I had an HR director say: What Twitter feed should I keep up with? I have had other constituents ask me: Is there an Instagram place I should look at to keep up with the changes that are

occurring with the Affordable Care Act? We are all familiar with them. We have discussed them the past several days.

The fact that the preexisting condition program—the Federal preexisting condition program—that the President and Speaker PELOSI talked about with such high regard, the sign-up window has been closed since February 1. No one can sign up for the Federal preexisting program.

There was supposed to be caps on out-of-pocket expenses starting in 2014. Well, guess what? Those got delayed by a whim.

We are all familiar with July 2, when on a blog post the employer mandate was just suddenly set aside, and then 3 days later, all of the reporting requirements were sort of laid aside.

So people are concerned that parts of this law seem expendable, but they just don't know which parts are.

The most egregious one was what happened in the early part of August, right before this body went back to their district work period, where the fundamental fairness, where a different set of rules were going to apply to Members of Congress. Constituents do not understand that.

So this week we have had an opportunity to repair that damage, repair that credibility with our constituents. That went over to the Senate tonight and, unfortunately, it failed. I wish that it hadn't. Perhaps we could be talking now about the funding of the government to December 15 and things could continue on as planned, but it didn't work out that way.

□ 0000

But this issue of fundamental fairness is not going to go away; it's going to be a recurrent theme. People are going to be asking us questions: Why couldn't we settle on the issue of fundamental fairness and do what's right for the American people and, in the process, keep the government open?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is midnight, and the great Government of the United States is now closed.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joke that we are having this debate at all at this particular time now that it's midnight and the government is officially shut down.

My Republican friends say they're coming here to try to keep the government open. They're here, and they're presiding over a Congress that has now shut the U.S. Government down. After 6 months of refusing to go to conference on the budget—18 times I've been told the Republicans objected to going to conference on the budget with the Senate—now they say they want a conference committee. It's too late. It's past midnight now. The government has been shut down. This is both

cynical and disgraceful. Republicans have shut down the Government of the United States of America.

I would say to my Republican friends that you own this. This is your shut-down. This represents an absolute failure of your leadership. Real people in this country—your constituents—are going to be hurt by your inability to do your job.

Now, the funding levels in the continuing resolution are unbelievably low. They are at your beloved sequester levels. You should be declaring victory that the Senate actually agreed to your low numbers, but that's not enough. You had to overreach. You had to add in the dismantling of the Affordable Care Act and 1,000 other things that were pet projects of the Tea Party right wing in your party.

The fact of the matter is you knew all along that the President would never sign a bill that dismantled the Affordable Care Act—nor should he—nor would the Senate go along with that, but you did it anyway. You are shutting down this government because you didn't get your way. You didn't get your way, so you're shutting down the government.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that elections in the United States of America still do matter. Your candidate for President lost badly, and this was his No. 1 issue—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Your Senate candidates lost badly. In fact, you lost seats in the House, and the Democrats got a million more votes than you did in House elections, but because of some very clever redistricting, you were able to hold on to the majority.

The American people rejected your call to overturn the Affordable Care Act, and the American people overwhelmingly do not want you to shut this government down, which you just did 2 minutes ago.

This is the people's House. We are supposed to be doing the people's business. We are not supposed to be doing the business of some right-wing Senator from Texas who somehow wants to run for President and wants to get the Tea Party all excited. You are supposed to represent your constituents. We all are. Our constituents—the people of this country—do not want the United States Government to shut down.

This is a failure of your leadership, and I would say there is one way for us to kind of make things better at this point, which is to let us bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—a clean bill, a clean CR. Even with those low levels that I have some problems with, I guarantee you that it will pass with Democratic votes and Republican votes. We can reverse this shutdown now by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Please do it. Please don't shut this government down.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New

York, Congressman REED, a second-term Member and one of the clearest thinkers in our party.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear as to what we did tonight.

We sent a request to the United States Senate to simply treat all Americans equally under ObamaCare. We sent a request to the Senate to keep the government open. Because the President has chosen to give a pass to Big Business for 1 year, we are asking to give that pass to American individuals for 1 year.

The law isn't ready. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it's not ready. Why can't we just treat American citizens—individuals—the same as our President, who, by his executive order, has said Big Business should get a pass?

Most egregiously, why wouldn't you agree with us that Members of Congress should not be treated any differently under the law? You know the truth, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker: Members of Congress are getting special treatment under this law because of what HARRY REID and the President did through the OPM. Our contributions for our health insurance premiums as we go into the exchanges are different and are not allowed to every other American citizen.

So what we stood up for tonight was a simple request: we will keep this government open, but let's just treat American citizens no differently—no special treatment for Members of Congress, American citizens no different than Big Business.

Why don't you join us. Why don't you join us in those commonsense reforms by which Americans across the country are saying, We don't want this law. It's not ready to go.

At a minimum, just treat us the same as Big Business America. Treat us the same, and don't give Members of Congress—yourselves—to my friends across the aisle, special treatment under the law.

That simple agreement would have kept the government open, and I hope that you will heed that fundamental call for fairness. Yet you turned your ear to the American people. In the U.S. Senate, you turned a deaf ear to the American people and said we are going to continue the status quo and that somehow we in Washington, D.C., should be treated differently.

I reject that message. I reject that notion. I stand for equality for all Americans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say that, if the Members of Congress are going to be treated like everybody else in the country, we would be the only group that's forced not to take our employer's health insurance.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking mem-

ber of the Committee on the Budget, who has tried valiantly to do away with sequestration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, since the very moment the Affordable Care Act was passed, we have heard a massive campaign of misinformation and distortions from our Republican colleagues. From the beginning, we heard about death panels. Then we heard it was going to be the government takeover of health care. That earned them the independent PolitiFact lie of the year in 2010.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the floor, we just hear massive distortions, and what's shameful is that they want to use that now as the cover to shut down the United States Government. They want to use that so that, tomorrow, millions of Americans can't sign up for or access affordable care. Members of Congress—all of us—we have affordable care, but, tomorrow, you want to deny that affordable care to millions of Americans and take it away from the millions of Americans who already have protection as a result of the Affordable Care Act. That is shameful.

Now, this notion that they are going to go to conference on the continuing resolution is a fig leaf that's not going to get them any political cover. The only way to have kept the government open tonight, which is now closed, was to take up the Senate's continuing resolution and fund the government. Yes, then we should go to conference on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to go to conference on the budget to negotiate our differences since March, when this House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. In fact, back in April, I and my Democratic colleagues introduced a very simple resolution saying that the Speaker should obey the regular order and appoint budget negotiators here from the House to meet with the Senate. What did the Speaker do? Nothing. He blocked the ability to have those budget negotiations.

We actually voted on it three times in this House. My Republican colleagues voted against the opportunity to appoint budget negotiators. In the United States Senate, what happened? On 18 occasions, Senator LEE and other Republican Senators blocked the effort to go to budget negotiations.

Now, Senator MCCAIN said that was insane for Republicans in the Senate to do because he pointed out that our Republican colleagues claimed that they wanted to work on these budget negotiations all along. They said "no budget, no pay." What they forgot to tell the American people was that they didn't mean a Federal budget. They meant the House passes a budget and the Senate passes a budget, but then they were going to block the effort to negotiate the differences.

Now, why would you block that, Mr. Speaker? Because, when you go to a budget negotiation, you've got to com-

promise, and you've got to meet the other party halfway. You've got a Tea Party right wing in this House that refuses to compromise. So what did they say? We're not going to go to conference. We are going to vote three times against negotiations. In May, in June, and in July, no negotiations.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady.

So what do you do if you don't want to negotiate, if you don't want to compromise? You back the country up against the wall, and here we are with that strategy.

The idea is, since you don't want to compromise in the regular order, let's try and get what we want by threatening to shut down the United States Government. If that doesn't work, we are going to make sure the United States Government can't pay its bills on time so that we can enact our radical agenda that way because you're not willing to do it through the regular process of compromise.

So nobody should be fooled about this idea of trying to get fig leaf cover on going to conference on this. We should have voted on the bill and kept the government open. It is a shameful day for the United States Government and especially for this Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans came to the floor of the House several weeks ago—we've done it lots of times and have probably had 41 votes on ObamaCare. We've talked about how \$716 billion was cut from senior care, Medicare. We think that's a problem. We think that was wrong. We think pushing this off on seniors is the wrong thing to do. We know the cost to employers.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

I do appreciate the gentleman because I know what he is going to tell me. He's going to say, Well, we used that money in our budget. In fact, we did, because this was an action that was done 3 years ago, and we are trying to repeal the bill that took \$716 billion from seniors. We disagreed with it, but after 3 years, you have to use the money. We promised at that time that we would stay after it.

Look, the gentleman is the one who voted for it. Not one Republican voted to take the money. I know what their dialogue is, and I appreciate the gentleman. He is a very dear friend of mine. I know they're frustrated when we tell the truth about how bad this bill is.

With regard to the cost to employers, Delta Air Lines marched up to the White House in February and said, Hey, guys. Just so you know, you're

going to cost Delta Air Lines over \$100 million this year. In the first year, it's going to cost \$100 million.

Trust me. They were listening over there. That may be why they said, Whoops, we'll let business off the hook.

They should have done the same thing for everybody. Mr. Speaker, that's part of why we're here—we are here for fairness.

What do Members of Congress hear when they go back home? They hear a lot of things, but here is the one that we hear more than anything. What we hear about is that there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job in America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we were promised. We have talked a lot about what Republicans have said and not said and what's right and wrong. What is true is that the President of the United States stood right here and said: not one dime of taxpayer money, and you can keep the insurance that you've got if you want it. That's our promise to the American people.

□ 0015

Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare has passed, there have been for every seven part-time jobs that were created, only one full-time job. We're becoming a part-time job Nation. Mr. Speaker, you cannot be the greatest Nation in the world as an economic power, you cannot get kids, our young children, to want to go to college for a part-time job. It's just not working well.

That's why the Republican Party is here. That's why we have Members here tonight. That's why we've sent three CRs. That's why we have meeting after meeting after meeting trying to determine how do we best get after this. We didn't stay after the same way. We sent one offer, a second offer, a third offer. We're now asking something very simple: a chance to appoint conferees, get together face to face, talk about the issues and ideas, find room for compromise, and do something better. That's what we're asking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, although what we're doing here is an exercise in futility, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who has been doing a wonderful job.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, now Republicans want to negotiate. After the shutdown clock has struck the witching hour, after weeks of making threats of insisting on your way or the highway, of arrogantly demanding repeal or delay of affordable health care, now the Republicans say, Please negotiate.

This is not a motion to go to conference or a motion to negotiate. There's no time left for that. This is a motion to shut down our government. There's been plenty of time for negotiation, and Republicans said "no" at

every turn. Forgive me if I remain skeptical that Republicans actually want to negotiate now.

Republicans can stop this shutdown right now if they bring to the floor the Senate-passed continuing resolution that removes divisive provisions that House Republicans insist upon.

This stunt tonight doesn't do one thing to end the government shutdown. We should call it what it really is: a pathetic, last-ditch attempt to not be blamed for a government shutdown. This is too little too late. We should greet this motion with the same cynicism with which it was offered.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, Congressman JOE BARTON, the dean of the Texas Republican delegation.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee as I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is past midnight. Officially, the government is shut down. That is not a good thing, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. We have been arguing politically the last several weeks various proposals to fund the government short term in a continuing resolution. We've been having some debates on the debt ceiling. If you're like me, most of your constituents, regardless of whether they're Republicans or Democrats, they're saying, Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and work things out. I think the Republican leadership in the House has been trying to do that. I know there's some disagreement on the other side about that.

In any event, we've come up with the novel idea of going to conference. I know a lot of the junior Members on both sides of the aisle don't know what a conference is. It's where the Speaker of the House and the House minority leader each appoint a certain number of Members, normally senior Members of the committee of jurisdiction, and the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate minority leader appoint Members of their respective parties. If they actually do it, according to regular order, lo and behold, the Members meet and they discuss things.

House Republicans would put a proposal on the table, House Democrats would; Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans. They would argue over it and debate it, maybe amend it. Then you take a vote. The House Members vote. If they agree, that's the House position, if the majority agrees. The Senate votes, and if they agree, that's the Senate position. If they don't agree, they have a stalemate. At least we'd be talking, and it would be Members, not leadership, rank-and-file Members. And it's just possible, if they open the conference, C-SPAN could cover it and the American people could see what's going on. There's no preordained outcome, Mr. Speaker, but it would be good for democracy.

I can see no reason why my friends on the minority side don't want to go

to conference with the Senate. I would assume that the distinguished ranking member, NITA LOWEY, would head the Democrat conferees and that HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would head us. That's up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint that, but I assume that. I trust them. We can disagree on what the solution is, but for Heaven's sake, I can't see why we can't agree that actually doing what the rules say we should do is somehow partisan and somehow is a negative thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I rise in strong support of the resolution that we should go to conference with the other body and hopefully make it an expeditious conference and work this out.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

I've seen this act before, but most Americans don't recall the shutdown under the Clinton administration. What they recall is the 25 million jobs moving our economy forward, having peace and prosperity. And I would bet 20 years from now, this fleeting moment is not going to be recalled by many people in our country. They're going to think about the 42 months of straight employment gains, the return of the housing market, the auto industry, and bringing our young people home from Iraq.

This majority has managed this brilliantly. Now the ObamaCare affordable health care exchanges are open all across the land, but they've managed to shut the national parks and to do a lot of other damage to our reputation even by this meaningless shutdown. Senator MIKULSKI has said she'd be glad to go to conference once we pass a CR so that the government stays open.

What the majority comes to the floor with is, Well, we don't want the government to stay open; we want to go to conference. This is not going to work. The Obama record, from eliminating Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to Wall Street reform, to the stimulus, and, most importantly, for opening the door to health care for tens of millions of Americans who have never had the access to be able to go to a marketplace—those marketplaces are open. They're going to stay open no matter what this majority does. Never again is health care going to be denied to people who are American citizens here in the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Members come from diverse districts all over this country. Men and women get together, we meet, we talk, we have clear voices. We listen to each other about what people are hearing from back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr.

HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He is one of the clearest voices in the discussion that we've had. He represents a largely rural district—people who get up and go to work every day, people who have a lot at risk, people who care about this country, men and women who provide for their children, and their children are part of the military. They believe in this country, and they know that America's greatest days need to be in our future. It requires vigilance, and every day you have to stay after it.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing us to this point with his leadership in trying to get America back to work to take us off the road to bankruptcy and to ensure that there is fairness for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this debate—I'm sure the Americans perhaps on a little bit more Western time zone hopefully are still following this. If they are, I understand how they could get confused. But, Mr. Speaker, we're down to only debating two different matters here.

Should the bosses in America get a better deal than their employees in ObamaCare? That's what we're debating here. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are debating should Members of Congress get a better deal than every other American in ObamaCare? House Republicans say, No, that's not fair. That's not equal protection under the law. Yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle are now saying, No, no, no. They're going to protect this sweetheart deal.

It's not in the law, ladies and gentlemen, yet they want to protect this sweetheart deal. And people wonder why there's cynicism about Congress, about why Washington elites get to have a better deal than everybody else because they know more. Now Members of Congress, thanks to the Obama administration, are going to be the only people in America to get subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Clearly, the other side of the aisle wants to preserve this special deal for Members of Congress granted by the President of the United States. Where is the fairness in that, Mr. Speaker? Again, where is the fairness in letting employers—no, no, we're going to give you a year delay, but no fairness for the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon to make America great. That's what this debate is about.

Here we have one party who, because they won't treat employees as well as their employers because they're preserving a congressional sweetheart deal, are prepared to shut down the government. That's what we're debating. We've got two matters.

Mr. Speaker, we've come time after time after time in the spirit of negotiation, but, no, the President will negotiate with Iranians, he'll negotiate

with Syrians, he'll negotiate with Russians, but he will not negotiate with Americans if they happen to be Republicans. No negotiation.

Again, is it any surprise that America gets cynical? Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Is it arrogance? Is it hubris? Is it pride? We know that this law apparently is not perfect already. The President has signed several changes into ObamaCare. Now we've had delay after delay after delay. Income verification, delayed; high-risk pools, delayed; out-of-pocket cost limitations, delayed; small business health options—just 3 or 4 days ago, as the President was extolling the virtues of the great rollout of ObamaCare, 20 minutes later his own administration announced yet another delay; small business health option.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has perhaps realized that his signature law is not perfect.

All House Republicans are saying in a spending bill—and ladies and gentlemen, this does spend money. This isn't some little sideshow. This is what we do in the Constitution. The Congress has the power of the purse. It's not the power of the rubber stamp. It is the power of the purse. ObamaCare is about the purse.

We're saying two things, Mr. President. In a law that you have already delayed time after time after time, if you're going to delay it for the employers, delay it for the employees. And, Mr. President, how can you decide that Members of Congress, to placate them, are going to get a sweetheart deal? This has to end, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are sitting here defending it, refusing to support a conference.

We need fairness for the American people. We need to go to conference. End the sweetheart deals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago, the House and Senate approved and the President signed the Affordable Care Act. Our friends on the other side said it was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court said they were wrong.

They nominated a candidate for President of the United States who said that if he was elected, the first thing he would do would be to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The voters said that was wrong.

And tonight their obsession continues, and they have shut down the United States Government because of that obsession. The American people rise up and join us in saying, you were wrong twice before, and you are wrong again this time. This is the wrong thing to do for the American public.

There's a way out of this debacle. It's to put on the House floor a bill that passed the United States Senate, that the President said he would sign, that most of us believe a majority of this House would vote for right now.

So I want to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if he would agree with me that the right and decent thing to do would be to put on this floor right now the Senate bill so that we can have an up-or-down vote.

Will the chairman agree to do that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. The House has attempted three times to send something over, and it's come back rejected every time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the chairman agree that the fair thing to do would be to put the Senate bill on the floor so that each Member could cast an up-or-down vote?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, the question I have is, Did the Senate pass the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running at your numbers that you wanted in budget.

We are asking, give every Member of this House a fair up-or-down vote on that bill. Will you do that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you put back in the language that we asked for, we will be very pleased to agree to it.

And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people in politics don't want to say "yes" or "no," they just keep talking.

We could do a lot more tonight than just keep talking. We could cast a vote that would say to the American taxpayers, the services you are still paying for you're going to get tomorrow morning. The absence of that vote from the majority should tell you all you need to know. They are afraid to put that vote on the floor because they would lose.

Well, the American people are losing because of their bankrupt and invalid choice.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, our great government, on October 1, was going to be open for health care. Mr. Speaker, all anybody has to do is to go online right now and try to sign up for this after years of our friends in the Obama administration

getting ready. And the site says, I'm sorry, your account cannot be done. The system is unavailable.

So here we are at the great day of October 1, at 12:30. Mandatory funding by the government can't get in the way of that. Right here, system unavailable for the American public. Why am I not surprised?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, let me disabuse my friends of any myth. Right now, the Republicans have shut the government down.

SOS message from Texas: we are a diverse State with different opinions. One that says, with so many people that need health insurance, we like ObamaCare.

But another SOS message: Ellington Field right now is shut down. The towers in Ellington Field in Texas are shut down. Why? Because the Republicans are on the floor of the House with a phony procedural vote that is not going anywhere, and the government is shut down.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, shut down. The SBA with no loans, shut down. Projects to improve our transportation, shut down. Federal economic reports and businesses, shut down. Workers in region 6 offices in the State of Texas, shut down. They will not be able to go to work tomorrow.

I only hope that we will have a moment of reconciliation and common sense to speak on behalf of the American people. Please know that Texas recognizes that the American people are important. I don't want a government shutdown. I want a vote on a clean continuing resolution now. Texas believes in the best for America, not special interests.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I've heard a number of the Members on the other side make reference to the notion that we ought to have a conference, and I have heard some eloquent commentary referencing the point that we ought to talk to one another.

Well, I know it's been said before, but I'm a new Member; and I heard a bit of a lecture, that maybe some of the new Members don't know what a conference committee is. Well, we know. We understand. We know how this works, so much so that many of us joined the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), on our side, on April 23 of this year asking that a conference committee be appointed to reconcile the differences in the budgets passed by the House and by the Senate. I didn't hear

any of those speeches then about the value of talking to one another. Not until 15 minutes before the government of the United States was to be shut down did suddenly something that a freshman has known for a long time, did it occur to folks on the other side that it might be time to have a conversation. It's too little. It's too late. Bring the Senate-passed CR here, and we will adopt it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, this is the latest gimmick in the latest game by people who simply cannot govern, and the casualty will be American families and the risk that they are inflicting on our economy.

Tomorrow in my home State and the ranking member's home State, the Statue of Liberty will be closed. The last time the Statue of Liberty was closed, Mr. Speaker, was when a hurricane struck it. And may I add that the majority refused to pass a bill to provide relief assistance when the Statue of Liberty was closed as a result of the hurricane. This time, the Statue of Liberty is going to be closed by their recklessness and their irresponsibility in order to advance a selfish political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect two things from us. They expect the government to stay open and operate efficiently, and they expect their Congress to communicate. Our position is that we should keep the government open and operating efficiently while we communicate and go to conference. Their position is, shut it down, close the Statue of Liberty, and talk later.

The American people want us to talk now, and they want this government to remain open. We have heard over the past several days and over the past 2 weeks our friends on the other side saying, listen to the American people. Our friends on the other side should listen to themselves. They have asked us for a budget today. They said, We want a budget. Take it or leave it. We gave them their figure. They said, Take it or leave it. We said, We'll take it; and they left it.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of chronic chaos continues every day, every night; and the American people deserve better.

Open the Statue of Liberty tomorrow. Keep Small Business Administration loans going to small businesses. Keep college loans going to kids who need the college loans. Keep middle class families afloat. And communicate while the government remains open.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me advise my colleague, Mr. Speaker, that I have one

further request for time, and then I am prepared to close.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before us this evening, and that question has been proffered by so many on the other side of the aisle. That question, as articulated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), is to do what's fair, to do what's fair for the American people—not Democrats, not Republicans, not Green Party, not Tea Party, but the American people.

The American people in the greatest land, the greatest country in the world deserve to have their government open; and they deserve to know where their Members stand.

Do you stand with your country? Do you stand for your country? Or do you want to take it down this evening?

Stand up for your country. Stand up for America. Stand with us this evening, and keep this government going in the name of fairness.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, I feel such a combination of both sadness and anger that it makes it really difficult for me to express it. On the one hand, the chaos and the lurching from crisis to crisis that this Congress has continually gone through leaves me not just perplexed but absolutely bewildered.

At the same time, I think what overrides everything for me tonight is a sense of terrible sadness that all of us here who have sworn to protect and defend the United States of America have completely given up on that idea. Because the majority has moved so assiduously towards this moment, this is on them. This government shutdown belongs to them for the rest of their lives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the great country of the United States, the beacon of light for almost everybody in the world, the defender of all the people in the world is out of a government now. The most important institution of government anywhere ever devised is now closed.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a night that we will remember. The things that will be remembered about this night are that our party has attempted to work with, reach out, and deal with our colleagues in the United States Senate.

We have sent a CR, a clean CR at sequester levels and defunding ObamaCare. It was shipped back to us. A second CR, a clean CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. A third CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay, and removal

of certain benefits that we believe is fairness.

But the overriding suggestion that we have made tonight goes back to a little bit over an hour ago with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1245

He is asking for the opportunity for us to go to conference to resolve our differences, people working together, people looking at each other. As was suggested by the gentleman, Mr. BARTON, yeah, probably a TV would be in the room and the American people would get a chance to weigh and balance both sides also. We think that's important. That's what we're asking for. That's why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and this is what we stand for.

We're after fairness. We're after an opportunity to get these ideas and the issues resolved for the American people. So I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican majority has decided that appeasing radical Tea Party extremists is more important to them than providing necessary funding for the continued operation of the federal government, even on a temporary basis. Passing a common sense continuing resolution would ensure vital government services for millions of American families and business. These are the basic services provided everyday by federal agencies that keep our communities and country strong.

It is now the early morning hour of October 1st and Fiscal Year 2014 has commenced, but the government is shutdown. Here we are and the Republican majority in the House has failed to pass a simple, common sense extension to fund the government that the U.S. Senate passed three times.

The Tea Party GOP success in shutting down the government tonight means that over 800,000 federal employees will immediately be furloughed and vital federal services will be suspended indefinitely. Government services and functions we all take for granted for things like food inspections, government permitting, and essential scientific research will all immediately stop. They don't need to stop, but Republican House members have made this choice as part of a cynical, dangerous and harmful political strategy intended to appease conservatives, anarchists and those who disregard the value of government.

Why? Why would Congress want the government to shutdown? Because Tea Party Republicans are determined to repeal, defund, or delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), denying healthcare to tens of millions of uninsured Americans, in exchange for allowing the federal government to keep operating. This political stunt is beyond irresponsible, it is irrational when considering the damage it will cause to the economy, job creation, and families all across America.

Despite the fact that ObamaCare is the law, upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional, and was the basis of President

Obama's re-election in 2012, House Tea Party Republicans still feel they can "negotiate" the dismantling of ObamaCare by holding the entire federal government hostage.

Ironically, the Affordable Care Act's exchanges will open today and this government shutdown will do nothing to deter, delay or derail this critical health program from being implemented. ObamaCare is going forward and millions of Americans will have access to affordable healthcare. House Republicans have voted as many as 45 times, including tonight, to repeal, replace or defund ObamaCare. They are obsessed with this law and it has become a mania that has now resulted in a shutdown of the U.S. government—it is outrageous and it angers me greatly. It is a disgrace.

When will House Republicans end the dangerous game they are playing and put the needs of our Nation above their narrow, backwards, and irresponsible ideological demands? I was optimistic that Democrats and Republicans could find common ground on a clean continuing resolution that passed the U.S. Senate to fund the government for the next six weeks.

It is clear to the American people that the Republican strategy has been to create a crisis and use a government shutdown as a bargaining chip to advance an extreme agenda regardless whether there are millions of Americans who get hurt.

Yesterday in Politico my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho, Rep. MIKE SIMPSON, was quoted as saying, "We bitched and moaned about the Senate not doing a budget. Then they did, and we didn't go to conference. You need a big plan, Democrats and Republicans in the same room. We should have gone to conference."

He is right. House Republicans refused to negotiate on the federal budget. The ignored calls from Democrats to appoint conferees.

Tonight the New York Times reported, "The House's most ardent conservatives appeared ready to see their war over the health care law through to its inevitable conclusion, a shutdown that would test voters' patience. But cracks in the Republican caucus opened into fissures of frustration."

The Times article then goes to quote one of our colleagues: "You have this group that keeps saying somehow if you're not with them, you're for ObamaCare," said Representative DEVIN NUNES, Republican of California. "If you're not with exactly their plan, exactly what they want to do, then you're somehow for ObamaCare, and it's just getting a little old. It's moronic to shut down the government over this."

That's right "moronic." And I could not agree with my Republican colleague more.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the passage of a continuing resolution is about funding the government—not re-writing law to repeal, defund, or derail health reform. Democrats would like to see a Farm Bill, immigration reform, and responsible gun safety legislation passed into law, but we are not holding the federal government and the American people hostage to advance our legislative priorities. It is not responsible. Congress needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, re-open the government, and govern responsibly.

The situation the American people find themselves in at this moment is appalling, it is

maddening. This Republican Congress has abdicated its responsibility and duty to the citizens of this country. This federal government shutdown is a manufactured crisis for political gain propagated by the extremists who disdain government itself.

My job as a member of Congress is to govern. I am committed to work With my Republican colleagues, my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and the Obama Administration to pass a clean continuing resolution that funds the government without legislating radical riders or hostage taking.

This great nation is being tested by the irresponsibility of a House Republican majority that refused to govern. I sincerely hope the American people voice their displeasure, disdain, and disgust at the political game playing.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Amash	Ellmers	King (IA)
Amodei	Farenthold	Kingston
Bachmann	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barber	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Barletta	Fleischmann	Labrador
Barr	Fleming	LaMalfa
Barrow (GA)	Flores	Lamborn
Barton	Forbes	Lance
Benishek	Fortenberry	Lankford
Bilirakis	Fox	Latham
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Black	Frelinghuysen	Long
Blackburn	Gardner	Lucas
Boustany	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Lummis
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Maffei
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Brooks (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Buchanan	Gohmert	Marino
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Matheson
Burgess	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Gowdy	McCaul
Camp	Granger	McClintock
Campbell	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Cantor	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Carter	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Cassidy	Guthrie	McMorris
Chabot	Hall	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Hanna	Meadows
Coble	Harper	Meehan
Coffman	Harris	Messer
Cole	Hartzler	Mica
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Cotton	Holding	Mulvaney
Cramer	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Culberson	Hultgren	Nugent
Daines	Hunter	Nunes
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Nunnelee
Denham	Issa	Olson
DeSantis	Jenkins	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
Duffy	Jordan	Perry
Duncan (SC)	Joyce	Peterson



Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus

Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry

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

NOT VOTING—4  
Bachus  
McCarthy (NY)

Rush  
Velázquez

□ 0110

Mrs. CAPPs and Mr. RUIZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER Pro Tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1566. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 368, the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 0115

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on House Joint Resolution 59:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

Additional conferees may be appointed on the recommendation of the minority leader.

REPUBLICAN-LED HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHUTS DOWN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a real sad day in the House of Representatives.

You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can’t fool all of the people all of the time. What happened tonight is the Republican-controlled extremists—bullies or hostage-takers—took the American Government and our economy hostage to their demands. This is a shameful day. This Congress makes the Gingrich Congress look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the United States Government because they don’t want the American people to have affordable health care. Shame on the Republican Party. Shame on you.

Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. The American people know that there is a small minority who are controlling the Republican Party in the House, and they are acting like bullies . . . or rather hostage takers. Taking the American government and our economy hostage to demands that will not be met.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republicans. Here we go again: I have been in office for over 20 years and this is the worst, the most extreme Congress I have ever worked with. Today’s Republican Party make the Gingrich era members in the mid 1990’s look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the government because they don’t like the idea of providing health insurance to ALL Americans. And remember: The Affordable Care Act passed both chambers of the United States Congress, was signed into law by the President of the United States, was upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and received a stamp of approval by the American public when they voted to re-elect President Obama. It is now time for House Republicans to accept the ACA and assist their constituents to receive the many health care benefits that Obamacare offers.

On this day, the President helped move the country forward with open enrollment for the Affordable Care Act, and the GOP moved the country backwards by shutting down the government.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try and act like grown-ups so we can all work together to pass a Continuing Resolution to keep our government open to provide the services that our citizens pay for and deserve.

NO SPECIAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, all we did is we asked the Senate to negotiate with the House.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, the Majority Leader in the Senate

NAYS—199  
Andrews  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dent  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia

Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O’Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth