

committed a crime. This bill is right out of the 47 percent playbook that was defeated last year during the Presidential Election and this bill needs to be defeated as well.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the bill would reduce net SNAP spending by 39 billion over 10 years and that 2.8 million people on average would lose their benefits while 850,000 would see benefits cut.

SNAP benefits help the disabled, which include men and women who have served our nation during times of war. It is reported that nearly \$53 million in food stamps had been cashed in by people eligible to shop in base commissaries, including disabled veterans. The use of food stamps in commissaries increased 9 percent from 2012 to 2013. Military commissaries sold about \$31 million under the Women, Infants and Children program in 2012 and nearly \$15 million by June of this year.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this Nation must have to exist and to prosper.

Next year if this bill become law the nearly \$40 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs also known as SNAP that is proposed by this bill 4 million Americans would fall though our Nation's food safety net.

In 2011, according to Feeding America: 46.2 million people were in poverty, 9.5 million families were in poverty, 26.5 million of people ages 18–64 were in poverty, 16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty, 3.6 million (9.0 percent) seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas: 34% of children live in poverty in Texas, 21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas, 17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

In my city of Houston, Texas the U.S. census reports that over the last 12 months 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level.

In 2011: 50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children. Households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

MORE FACTS ON CHILD HUNGER

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), 16.7 million children under 18 in the United States live in households where they are unable to consistently access enough nutritious food for a healthy life.

FOOD INSECURITY

16.7 million children lived in food insecure households in 2011. 20% or more of the child population in 37 states and D.C. lived in food insecure households in 2011. In 2011, the top five states with the highest rate of food insecure children under 18 were New Mexico, the District of Columbia, Arizona, Oregon, and Georgia.

EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE

Nearly 14 million children are estimated to be served by Feeding America, over 3 million of which are ages 5 and under. 54 percent of client households with children under the age of 3 participated in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

POVERTY

In 2011, 16.1 million or approximately 22 percent of children in the U.S. lived in poverty.

PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

In fiscal year 2011, 47 percent of all SNAP households contained children. During the 2011 federal fiscal year, more than 31 million low-income children received free or reduced-price meals through the National School Lunch Program. Unfortunately, just 2.3 million children participated in the Summer Food Service Program that same year.

As elected representatives we should see our Nation's vital interest to be to feed hungry children and all hungry Americans.

At the core of our vital interest is a stable and thriving economy, a strong and healthy population that is able to contribute to the economic engine that fuels our economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and restore fully the food programs to the farm bill.

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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time from the calendar day of September 26, 2013, through the calendar day of September 29, 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.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend,

the gentlewoman from Rochester (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. COLE. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 2014.

The rule is a closed rule and provides for the consideration of a short-term continuing resolution, keeping the government funded until December 15, 2013. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee of Appropriations.

Additionally, the rule incorporates an amendment by Representative SCALISE, which fully defunds ObamaCare and also ensures that the government prioritizes interest and principal payments on our national debt and Social Security payments in the event that the debt limit is reached. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules from September 26 to September 29.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, Chairman ROGERS, for bringing a bill to avoid a government shutdown to the Rules Committee. Within the Republican Conference, we've had a very spirited debate on this issue; however, it's led us to a good product.

There are a number of things I like about this bill. First, it extends the funding for operations of all programs until December 15, allowing the Appropriations Committee the needed time to finish its work on the 12 full-year spending bills.

Second, this continuing resolution adheres to the post-sequester caps of the Budget Control Act, maintaining our commitment to reduce the deficit.

Third, this bill fully defunds ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the closer that we get to the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act, the more unpopular it becomes.

Already, the President has agreed with Congress to make major changes to this legislation on seven different occasions. Additionally, he's delayed major provisions like the employer mandate unilaterally another seven times.

If business is chafing under these mandates and in need of a delay, then surely the American people should be given the same relief. The continuing resolution provides them that relief.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides certainty to our creditors that they will get paid. Some of my friends on the other side have called this the “Pay China First Act”; however, nearly 70 percent of our debt is owed domestically. This legislation would provide for the prioritization of U.S. bondholders and people on Social Security at the front of the line to be paid if the government hits its borrowing limit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the responsible thing to do. Some have said that this is just brinksmanship and an attempt by Republicans to lead to a government shutdown. That could not be further from the truth. The Appropriations Committee has brought this bill to the floor explicitly to avoid the threat of a shutdown.

It’s a good bill, and I urge the support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, if the House of Representatives fails to act, the government will shut down on October 1.

□ 1415

A government shutdown would result in the furlough of hundreds of thousands of government employees, stop the flow of Social Security checks, and hold up Medicare benefits for our seniors. In short, there are very real and very significant consequences to what we do here today.

Given the stakes, one could reasonably expect the majority to avoid extremism and partisanship and allow this Chamber to keep the government open. But this bill doesn’t do that. Unfortunately, the opposite is happening here today.

Unable to pass 8 of 12 annual appropriations bill, the majority has been forced to resort to a continuing resolution—and this CR should have been clean, as the CR is in the Senate. But today’s proposal includes a self-executing amendment to defund the Affordable Care Act and put medical decisions back into the hands of the insurance companies. And that will not go through the Senate. So we will, once again, go to the very brink of disaster, hoping that we can pull out of it while letting most Americans hang by their thumbs, wondering what we’re going to do.

As the newspaper *The Hill* wrote this morning, today’s proposal makes “shutdowns more likely” because the Affordable Care Act will never be repealed as long as President Obama is in office and the Democrats control the Senate.

The fact of the matter is the Affordable Care Act is already delivering on its promise of lower health care costs and more secure health care. States are just 11 days away from opening online

health care exchanges, where individuals will be able to compare health plans and purchase an insurance plan that fits their needs. In many cases, these exchanges will allow individuals to purchase health insurance cheaper than ever before.

In my home State of New York, premiums for some insurance plans have already dropped by 50 percent. This week, Secretary Sebelius announced that many monthly premiums will be less than \$100.

Perhaps most importantly—not something I’m sure everybody knows—the Affordable Care Act flips the script and takes the power out of insurance companies’ hands. Instead of having lifetime and annual caps on what the insurance company will spend on your health care, the Affordable Care Act enforces limits on what you will have to pay out-of-pocket for your health care.

Does everybody know that? Because when your constituents find it out, they’re going to be bummed out at you for trying to kill it.

For example, in 2015, those covered under a group health insurance plan will not have to pay more than \$6,350 out of their pocket for medical procedures and medicine. That is such a gift. People will no longer have to go bankrupt to pay health bills. That is going to be covered from that point on. Once you’ve reached that limit, your insurer is going to pick the rest of it up. My constituents don’t want to lose that. It’s a landmark change and just one of many reasons why the majority’s attempt at repeal will never become law.

Today’s legislation falls short when it comes to ending the devastating cuts within what we call the sequester. The sequester has been one of the most devastating policies ever implemented in the history of the United States. Just today, the head of the FBI said that the idea of having to get rid of 300 employees and putting all of his employees on 10-day furlough makes it almost impossible for him to run the FBI.

Because of the sequester, tens of thousands of cancer screenings have been canceled at public health clinics right now, more than \$1.6 billion has been cut from the National Institutes of Health, and more than 70,000 children have been kicked out of Head Start. And over the next 12 months the CBO estimates that 1.6 million jobs will be lost because of the economic drag caused by the sequester.

Last night, the Budget Committee ranking member, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, came to the Rules Committee and requested to have a vote on the House floor in order to end the sequester. That was the eighth time that his request has been denied by the Rules Committee. Given the chance for bipartisan cooperation and to rid ourselves of this plague that is so worrying and causing such devastation, the majority simply walked away.

Finally, today’s legislation also includes a proposal to protect some bond-

holders, including China, from any economic fallout that would occur if the majority refuses to lift the Nation’s debt. This legislation has no place in a continuing resolution. Furthermore, it should never have been considered, for the faith and credit of the United States should never be in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to “promote the general welfare.” And that’s a far cry from what we’re doing here today, not only in this bill but in the one that preceded this, where we’re cutting \$40 billion out of food that will affect, as you heard before, veterans, the elderly, Meals on Wheels, and school nutrition. It’s not what we are and not what we do.

Everybody knows, though, that what is happening here today is what every mother knows. When a child has a tantrum—and a tantrum is being had here over health care—you slap a pacifier in the mouth. That’s exactly what trying to redo the health care bill is—it’s a temporary tantrum retarder so that we can get by today. There is no real plan. It’s just how will we get by today.

After the majority passes this bill, the Senate will take the legislation. With a pure majority, they can remove the partisan attacks within it and they will send us back a clean CR if they can get 60 votes, which we will have to pass or chaos will ensue. By the time we get around to all this—which we could be doing today—we’re on the edge of a cliff.

In the meantime, the majority’s refusal to work on a balanced plan to create jobs, grow the economy, and to invest in our future, which is such an important thing that’s been neglected, and stop the brain drain being caused by the sequester is hurting our economy and threatens a government shutdown.

With time running out, the decision to play politics has dire consequences. Think about it for just a moment. We’ve gotten reports about substandard bridges and roads and the neglect of the railway. We could put all those people to work that would be needed just to rebuild those, and spend some money on ourselves, instead of \$2 billion a week on the wars, as we did in Iraq for 10 years.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against today’s rule and the underlying legislation so we can consider bipartisan solutions instead of games. I can promise you that our side stands ready and willing. We have nothing to do with any of this today. No Democrats were involved. We want to be a part of it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As usual, my friend makes a skillful and thoughtful case in defense of the Affordable Care Act. The problem is that the jury is the American people. They’re still not convinced. They haven’t been convinced for 4 years.

Repeatedly, poll after poll after poll has shown this to be an extraordinarily unpopular piece of legislation. In fact, I'd suggest my friends probably lost their majority in their pursuit of this legislation. It was their continued defense of it that may well have cost them the opportunity to regain that majority when the President was re-elected.

If you look at the evidence, it's not only unpopular as we approach the implementation date, but more of the people that supported it are asking either for delay or for it to be overturned altogether. We had a lot of labor unions recently march down to the White House and request the President—these are people that helped pass the bill—to please fix it, change it, delay it, do something—it's going to hurt our members and their families.

The President himself acknowledged this bill isn't working very well. We're going to have to delay it for a year for all sorts of businesses.

We've been told repeatedly that this was some day going to become popular. But I would suggest the experience of not weeks, not months, but years has taught us that it's never going to be popular with the American people.

My good friend also talked a little bit about the sequester. I think that's worth visiting again because we probably have some common ground there. I would suggest that we ought to get rid of the sequester. But let's remember how it got here and what it was designed to do.

Sequester is in law because of the President of the United States. He's the one who proposed it. He's the one who advocated for it. He's the one who signed it into law. We all agree it's not a very artfully drawn piece of legislation, but the President insisted on it.

We twice in this House acted to provide opportunities to get rid of sequester. Neither time did our friends on the other side pick up those opportunities, either in this Chamber, the Senate, nor the President of the United States.

We are more than willing to renegotiate sequester. We are not willing to give up the savings. We would like to spread those cuts and savings over the entire budget. And we think we can work through the problems without surrendering the savings unilaterally or raising taxes, another thing which we don't think is the appropriate way to deal with this particular piece of legislation.

My friend talked about food stamps, which are not directly relevant for our debate, but it's worth thinking for a minute that, under President Bush, the amount of money we spent on food stamps doubled. And under President Obama it has doubled again. In other words, 100 percent and another 100 percent.

All our bill is suggesting is perhaps 5 percent of that massive increase. At a time when unemployment is coming down and the economy is supposedly on the mend, we could, through reforms, reclaim and save. That's all this is.

Finally, there was some discussion of the Senate and what it will and won't do. I learned a long time ago not to try to predict what the Senate of the United States is going to do. Some of my colleagues, frankly, on our side of the aisle have been asking for an opportunity to express their opinion on ObamaCare and have an opportunity to get in the fight. I think they ought to have that opportunity. Frankly, I suspect there are some Democratic senators who may be on the ballot for the first time since voting for ObamaCare that might want to reconsider their positions and if not defund, perhaps delay.

But in any event, our job here is to do what the American people sent us here to do. That's, number one, to fund the government, which this bill certainly does. And, number two, in the case of the majority, to repeal, reform, delay, or somehow postpone ObamaCare. That's what we're doing.

We'll send this over to the Senate. We'll see what our colleagues can do over there. They've got some remarkable tools that we don't have. They have things like cloture. It doesn't exist on our side of the aisle. They have things like the filibuster. It doesn't exist over here.

Again, the political situation suggests they may be able to find allies. Regardless, they certainly deserve the opportunity to have the fight and debate and discussion that they requested. I think this House is acting wisely and well in giving that chance.

Once they've made their decision—and we're not here to express the will of the Senate, and they're certainly not there to express the will of the House—they'll send something back. At that time I have no doubt that we'll pick it up and react to it and try to respond in an appropriate fashion.

But nothing is going to begin until we pass something out of this House. That's what we're trying to do today.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule.

Last night, the Rules Committee spent nearly 3 hours discussing the merits of health reform, food assistance in the farm bill, and U.S. debt held by foreign entities. Yet very little time was devoted to one of the primary jobs of the legislative branch which this bill addresses: appropriating funds.

This rule adds a provision to dictate to the President in what order to pay the Nation's bills in case of default and another provision to defund the Affordable Care Act. The President issued a veto threat this morning, based on these extraneous provisions.

We should be focused as sharply as a laser beam on the American economy

and jobs. This brinksmanship on the budget and the debt limit will force the stock market to plummet and businesses to freeze hiring. Continuing sequestration, as this bill does, will cost our economy up to 1.6 million jobs over the next year, according to CBO. That is why I join my Rules Committee colleague and urge the House to reject the previous question to get a vote on the Democratic amendment to stop the sequester job loss.

Voting to add politically motivated provisions to the CR is akin to voting to shut down the government. And shutting down the government means shutting down the Nation's economy. Nonetheless, Republicans place their ideological crusade against health care reform ahead of the American economy and jobs.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to assure my good friend we have no intention and no desire to shut down the government. Absolutely not. If that was our aim, we wouldn't be bringing a bill to the floor whose main purpose is to keep government funding open.

□ 1430

We want to take the 75-day window, roughly, and sit down and negotiate with our friends and make sure—particularly my friend and our chairman, Mr. ROGERS, have an opportunity to work through the appropriations process. So that is not our intention.

As for the President's concern about sequester, again I will just remark that this was his idea. This was his proposal. He signed it into law. He is not an innocent bystander in this process. So if he would like to sit down and redo it, we are more than happy to do that; but he's not going to dictate the outcome from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my fellow member of the Rules Committee, my classmate, the distinguished physician from the great State of Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, of course we are here today to discuss the rule that will allow the continuing resolution to come to the floor; and coupled with the continuing resolution is language that will forever affect the funding for what is known as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Let us pause for a moment to remember how the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was visited upon the United States of America.

This was not something that was a product of any House hearing. This was not something that was a product of the House in any way. This was a product of the Senate Finance Committee; developed between Thanksgiving and Christmas in 2009; put on the floor of the Senate on what I like to describe as the "darkest evening of the year" in a

cloture vote, December 21, 2009; followed by a vote by the Senate on Christmas Eve.

Many of you will remember that day. There was a snowstorm descending upon Washington, D.C. The Senators wanted to get home, they wanted to get out of town, so they simply voted one after the other until they got the 60 votes for the Affordable Care Act and then left town under the cover of darkness. They never thought that what they were voting on on Christmas Eve 2009 would ever become law.

But a funny thing happened. A dog ate my homework, and I turned in the rough draft and it accidentally got signed by the President 3 months later. That's where we are today. That's why this law has been so difficult to implement. That's why the American people have never embraced this. And now more recent polling in the past several days shows that the American people actually reject what is being visited upon them.

A headline in *The Wall Street Journal* yesterday, Walgreens has told their employees, well, guess what, we're not going to pay for coverage any longer; we will give you money. Good luck in the exchanges, and we'll see you on the other side. UPS dropping family coverage. The unions wrote the minority leader in the House of Representatives and the majority leader in the Senate and said: please help us. Please help us. We've helped you. We've manned your phone banks; we walked neighborhoods for you; we got you elected. The administration is not listening to us. You have broken the contract with the middle class by voiding the 40-hour work week. By redefining full-time employment as 30 hours, you have essentially broken the back of the middle class.

The American people, regardless of political persuasion, are crying out for our help. Fortunately, today and tomorrow, we are going to be able to provide them that help.

We are frequently hearing about 40 or 41 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I'll tell you what, as many as it takes. But seven of those efforts to restrict and repeal portions of the Affordable Care Act, seven of those have been passed by the Senate and signed by the President. So it's not entirely a fruitless effort.

But probably more telling is the President himself, who has, whenever it suited him, simply jettisoned a portion of the law—a law that he signed in March of 2010 that we all remember. Those of us who were in the House at that time, those of us who watched news shows during the summer of 2009 and on into 2010, the cry that went up: we've got to do something about people with preexisting conditions. There are just far too many people in the country who are frozen out of the insurance market because of an unfortunate medical diagnosis.

But the reality is the large group plans in this country have open enrollment periods. So the preexisting condi-

tion conundrum generally is a problem for people in the individual and small group market. How do I know this? How do I know that this number is much more manageable than the 8 to 12 million people that then-Speaker PELOSI and the President of the United States talked about? Because on the eve of the Supreme Court's ruling on the Affordable Care Act, when I thought it was going to be important for this House to respond to those people who had the Federal preexisting program taken away from them by a Supreme Court action, I did an investigation: how many people had been signed up in the so-called "Federal PCIP program." The number at that time was 65,000; by the end of the year, it was nearly 100,000.

Then, Mr. Speaker, something really strange happened. On February 1 of this year, less than 2 years after the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, people showing up at the teller's window over at the Department of Health and Human Services saying I would like to buy my insurance in the Federal preexisting pool were told, sorry, that window is closed. We will only take care of the people who are already enrolled. If you're coming in today wanting that kind of help, so sorry, program terminated. There were no headlines in that regard. There were no cries of anguish that the President had stopped providing coverage for people with preexisting conditions. You had people who were waiting the 6-month waiting period—they were required by law to wait and not have insurance—show up for this Federal preexisting pool. But what did they hear when they got to the window? Sorry, sister, window is closed. Go somewhere else. Eleven months from now you will have the full Elysian Fields of ObamaCare. And maybe if you can make it until then, you'll be fine.

Well, what else went by the wayside? Remember the discussion about: we're going to put a cap on out-of-pocket expenses so no longer will people have to pay excessive copays and deductibles. Oh, by the way, they postponed that for a year. That was supposed to start January 1, 2014. Now it's been put off until January 1, 2015.

The Small Business Health Exchange, supposed to open—we are going to get the power of competition in the small group market—was supposed to open January 1, 2014; delayed for a year, January 1, 2015.

Who can forget the Tuesday evening before the 4th of July holiday this year when on a blog post Valerie Jarrett put out that the employer mandate was in fact suspended for a year. Three days later they had to say that, oh, yeah, by the way, all of those reporting requirements that we were requiring under the employer mandate, well, we're not going to require those either. We're just going to trust people to tell us the truth when they come in to sign up for benefits, not that any Federal program administered by the Department of

Health and Human Services has ever had a problem with fraud or misrepresentation.

Probably one of the most telling things is the lack of anyone within the agency to be able to answer a simple yes or no question about: Will the exchanges be open for enrollment on October 1? The head of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight was in our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations just this morning. I asked that question; a simple yes or no, sir, is all that I require. I got a long answer that, yes, there will be Web sites; yes, you will be able to access Web sites. Yes or no, will people be able to go to register for insurance on October 1? They could not give me a yes or no answer.

Second question: What about will people be able to sign up for the insurance on January 1 as advertised, yes or no? Again, unable to give a yes or no answer to that question.

Will people be able to buy insurance cheaper as the President suggested when he was running for office? Unable to answer with a yes or no.

These are the problems we have, Mr. Speaker. We cannot get people from the agencies to come and give us a simple answer, a simple direct answer to a simple direct question. No wonder the American people are full of questions about this. No wonder they are full of fear about what is just around the corner.

This rule vote will allow the House to vote on a bill that keeps the government funded and open until December 15 of this year. But that vote, very importantly, allows people's voices to be heard that they do not trust what has been quoted in the Affordable Care Act. They feel that the investment has been a bad investment so far, and they are telling us: don't sink one more dime into this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HHS.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this cynical and reckless rule and the underlying funding bill. This is neither a serious nor a good faith effort to address the fundamental responsibilities in our budget. Instead, the majority is trying to hamstring the government. They want it to be broken, and they want to make it seem like it cannot address real problems. That is why now they are committed to pushing us headlong into a government shutdown whereby they would leave the American people on their own in what are difficult, difficult economic times.

This rule does not responsibly address our budget in any way. Instead, the majority is using the resolution to ensure that their dangerously low funding levels are the ceiling for future budget negotiations, and to try for over the 40th time to thwart the law of

the land and to derail the Affordable Care Act, which denies affordable health care to families.

We passed the Affordable Care bill in the House of Representatives. We passed it in the United States Senate. The President signed the bill. The Supreme Court upheld the bill. But now this crowd wants to stop it by not providing the money to fund it and they want to repeal it.

The American public says: don't repeal the Affordable Care Act. Don't do that. Let's implement it. And, yes, if there are fixes to be made, let's do that. Because right now children, their parents can no longer be told by an insurance company we won't provide insurance coverage for your child that might have asthma, or autism, or anything else because we have regarded that in the past as a preexisting condition. It is no longer a preexisting condition. Quite frankly, what they want to do is to turn your health care insurance coverage back to the insurance companies that can say no. I say to them: get over it. It's the law of the land. Let's implement it and make the changes.

And while this majority plays games, the deep and dangerous across-the-board cuts which they are trying to enshrine in this bill are threatening our economy, our health, our well-being, and the future of American families.

Both the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke argued that these across-the-board cuts will cost us as many as 750,000 jobs. That's not all.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, more than 57,000 children losing access to early learning through Head Start, you can't make that up. When you've lost that Head Start slot, that child can't go to school; that learning opportunity is done. That is about the future of that youngster.

They would cut off biomedical research that saves lives. I'm a cancer survivor. They would cut off the research that provides us with the opportunity to save people's lives in this Nation.

They cut money for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration. Instructional services are being sharply reduced. Education cuts. There are similar cuts in place to every other national priority we care about—court systems, food safety, transportation, you name it. Instead of fixing these cuts, the majority is trying to make it worse for American families.

This resolution is not a serious attempt at addressing the budget; it is an ideological charade. Its purpose is to shut down the government and leave the American people on their own. I urge my colleagues to take no part of this and reject it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my great

friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished Member from the great State of Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the young gentleman from Oklahoma for his service not only to the Rules Committee, but also the Appropriations Committee, that he very aptly serves this honorable body well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that we're seeing the hysteria that we are. The people who are screaming the loudest are the people that ensured, through no—trust me, no other reason, other than the things that they voted for, no unintended consequence but to have this country go from a \$9 trillion to a \$17 trillion deficit in just 5 short years.

□ 1445

They made sure that this country has become unemployed, that we no longer really have careers, that there is not only hundreds of waivers that have been given to the political friends of this President. Uncertainty is all across this great Nation about employment. People who want to sign paychecks want more employees. It is rampant across America of uncertainty and answers that cannot be given about this massive government-run health care plan that is getting ready to face this Nation in just a few short weeks.

That's why the Republican Party is on the floor of the House of Representatives today. That's why we are here to say we are going to make sure this government gets funded.

But the main culprit of uncertainty of hugely rising insurance and health care costs is ObamaCare. It is not an Affordable Care Act. By the way, I think it works about this same way in Moscow as it does in Havana. It is an out-of-control health care system that will diminish America's greatest health care system.

So why we are here today is to join House Republicans, Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to prevent ObamaCare from becoming reality. Since ObamaCare was proposed in the House in 2010, I and my Republican colleagues, not just from north Texas, as you heard here from Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, but people from Oklahoma and all across this country, stood firmly to say that we believe that our fight against a government health care-run system is exactly what the American people want.

My Republican colleagues and I in the House are doing everything we can to stop ObamaCare through voting to repeal it, defund it, and to dismantle it. I am proud of that effort. ObamaCare is bad for jobs. It's bad for jobs all across this country. That means it's bad for our economy and it's bad for our Nation's health care systems.

Doctors all across this country are united, as well as consumers, to say we must do something about it. Up to 60 percent of Americans today are worried about the quality of health care and

how they will pay for this expensive product that Democrats have brought to America.

ObamaCare will jeopardize 3.2 million jobs across this country in the franchise industry alone. These are people that before had an opportunity to put food on their table that now are having to struggle to pay for this ObamaCare.

Additionally, hardly a week goes by that we do not hear stories about companies having to force their employees off their employee and off their preferred employer provider insurance. President Obama stood right in front of where you are, Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, and said that famous, what has turned into a lie: If you have health insurance, you can keep your health insurance. That is not true.

Today, we are learning that this is not just the case with just a few people, but also just, effective yesterday, Walgreen's has announced that they will move 160,000 of their employees off their current coverage.

That is why Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives today. We are trying to pass this same message to our colleagues in the other body so that they are able to take the fight so that Americans understand that we not only hear them, but we are willing to do something about it.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me time and I end my speech today by saying this: that Republicans will continue to fight for jobs, better health care, and an opportunity for every single American to have a job to make this country even stronger.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that, while I did not make a Federal case out of it here, I deeply regret that my colleague has disparaged the President of the United States.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER)—I wish I could give him an hour and 40 minutes to counter what we have heard, but unfortunately I can only give him 3—the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I need that hour to correct so much misinformation. But I've got to say something to my friend from Texas, who has now left the floor, or is about to leave the floor, and just remind him: during the last 18 months of the Bush administration, we lost 4,491,000 jobs. Over the last 42 consecutive months, in the private sector, we have gained 7,452,000 jobs. That, my friend, is an 11.5 million turnaround to the benefit of workers. Have we done enough? We have not.

Now, let me speak to this perverse rule. Let me first say to my friend, Mr. COLE, who like so many of his Republican colleagues continues to say the President signed this cloture bill. He did. Why did he sign it? Because our Republican friends threatened, as they are doing today, to put the United States of America into default for the first time in history if he did not. That was the threat. It's the threat again today.

Mr. COLE, my friend, would not really support that policy, I am convinced. He does not have to have a colloquy with me, but he would not support that.

The sequester, however, he did support in the cut, cap, and balance bill that was totally voted on by Republicans, a few less than my hand of Democrats, who said that they wanted the sequester as the fallback position. They got it. They got it because that's the only deal they would make.

The President doesn't want sequester, I don't want sequester, and the chairman of his committee doesn't want sequester. Let me assert, without undermining his credibility, I don't think TOM COLE wants sequester. By the way, I have a quote here which indicates that ERIC CANTOR, the majority leader, doesn't think sequester is so hot either.

Here is what HAL ROGERS said, however—and I would like to debate this for some period of time, but I don't have the time: With this action, we pulled the transportation bill. The appropriations process is broken, irrelevant, dismissed.

By the way, when they marked up their first three bills that they passed in the House, they didn't use their sequester number. They used the number that the Senate is marking to because they knew their number doesn't work, their number that is included in the bill that would be the result of this rule.

Mr. COLE, you are my friend and I have great respect for you and I think you believe that, but here is what HAL ROGERS said: With this action, pulling the transportation bill, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just 3 months ago.

Mr. ROGERS—conservative, Kentucky, Republican, chairman of the Appropriations—said: I believe the House has made its choice.

Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. He then went on to say: The House, Senate, and White House must come together as soon as possible on a comprehensive compromise.

This bill represents zero compromise.

Come together on a comprehensive compromise that repeals sequestration, takes the Nation off this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, reduces our deficits and debt, and provides a realistic—realistic—top line discretionary spending level to fund the government in a responsible and attainable way.

I've been here for some period of time. I know about compromise. My side needs to compromise. There is no compromise yet on the other side of the aisle, ladies and gentlemen—none, zero. And I say lamentably, and I say this with great sadness, in my view,

there are only about 60 on your side of the aisle who want this hard-line approach, this unrealistic approach, this approach that the Senator from North Carolina who served in this House and on the Appropriations Committee said was unreasonable.

Now, let me tell you what the chief executive of The Heritage Foundation said: We are pushing back on these gimmicks.

Who are the gimmicks? Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. CANTOR, saying we'll pass it, we'll get a vote on health care. If they reject it, we will still fund government.

Your side wants to defund government. It may not want to shut the door on government. It wants to defund it badly and undermine our national security, our economy, and the operations of the government. Every member of the Appropriations Committee knows that to be the case. No member of the Appropriations Committee, in my view, Republican or Democrat, believes that the sequestration levels that are in this bill that this rule provides for are viable. They will not work. They will hurt Americans.

But what does Michael Needham say about these gimmicks and about pursuing this? He says: I think it's exciting. It's a game.

It's a game that will hurt America.

Reject this rule, reject this bill, let's have real compromise.

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

I know that Bob Woodward is a widely read author. I can look at the book sales that he racks up and know that there's a lot of people in this town that read what he has to say. But evidently my friends on the other side have never read what he had to say.

Let's be clear: sequester was the President's idea and proposal. Now, where I agree with the President is that I think we need to save money in the Federal budget. Sequester was supposed to be a trigger to force that negotiation.

Unfortunately, for whatever reason, I was not a member of the supercommittee; but I think all of them worked hard and in good faith, and I cast no aspiration, but they didn't get there. So sequester, the President's recommended method, happened.

We would still like to sit down with the President and our friends on the other side and renegotiate where those cuts occur. Sequester is about \$85 billion on an annual basis in a \$3.5 trillion budget that is roughly \$700 billion out of balance as it is. So the idea that we can't find 2.5 percent if we negotiated over the entire budget I think is probably, frankly, not a very sustainable proposition. We could do that without some of the distortions we are going through now. We would be more than happy to do that with my friends on the other side, and certainly with the President of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. No, I will hold my time, but I will yield in a moment.

But let's be clear whose idea this was and who has not put a solution on the table. I could go ad nauseam into cuts that did not have to occur in the Defense Department that have occurred because the administration insisted on them, but that's for another time and another debate.

I agree with my friend that this is a time to come to a deal. That's what we are trying to do, actually, in this rule and in the underlying legislation: set aside a 75-day window to sit down and let the appropriators and those above them come to an agreement, and let's get out of this cycle—I agree with my friend—of short-term fixes and deals and let's move back to what I know my friend wants to do, and that's to establish regular order.

But to do that, we have to start the process; we have to begin now. Let's pass this resolution. It reflects the will of the majority. Let's move it to the Senate and let's see what the Senate is prepared to do. They will send us something back. Then, hopefully, at the end of that process, a CR will be arrived at.

My friend alluded to the fact that people want to shut down the government. That's the last thing we want to do. I thank my friend for accurately putting my position out there on both government shutdown and on default. I've made it abundantly clear I think those are bad ideas. I thought they were bad ideas.

By the way, TOM COBURN quotes me in his book in 1995 telling him not to do it. I was his political consultant back then. So I have never thought this was an appropriate tactic in government. I don't think we need to do it now.

But let's do that, and at the same time let's give the Senate an opportunity to vote up or down, whatever they want to do, on ObamaCare. We've gotten to do it multiple times. They seem to be anxious to have the opportunity. I think they should. But they will send us back a product, and I'm sure we will respond.

With that, I yield to my friend if he had a point he wanted to make.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I might say not only have I read Bob Woodward's book; I invited Bob Woodward into my office and we discussed this assertion that you and others like to refer to ad nauseam, very frankly. Does the gentleman agree that before that was ever suggested by Jack Lew to HARRY REID as a possible way to getting us not to default on our debt that you and the overwhelming majority, all but eight of your colleagues, voted for your cut, cap, and balance bill which had within it in July of 2011 a sequester so that this was a proposal that you put in legislative action?

□ 1500

Mr. COLE. In reclaiming my time, it's certainly true that we've had multiple proposals to try and limit spending. We walked in with a \$1.4 trillion

deficit, so we thought maybe we ought to try and bring it down a little bit. Is it the exact form of this sequester? Absolutely not. No Republican ever came up with a sequester and had 50 percent of the cuts coming out of defense. So, in that sense, I don't think you can equate that.

Regardless, let's not argue over history here for a minute; although, again, just for the record, I, too, have had Bob Woodward in my office, and I actually had him sign 60 of those books, which I gave to my colleagues, because I thought it was such an interesting look, and the players and the process are still the same.

The bottom line: let's pass this legislation. It's going to move out of the House. Let's let the Senate act. Then let's see what they send back to us, and let's act in turn.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield just quickly to the gentleman from Maryland because I'm running low on time, and I do have other speakers.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman agree with me that the sequester is irrational?

Mr. COLE. I certainly wouldn't agree if it yields the cuts, but I think the structure of it is inappropriate, and it's flawed.

Mr. HOYER. And we ought not to continue with it?

Mr. COLE. We ought to repeal it and get savings across the entire budget. I think that's what we should do.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad the gentleman agrees.

Mr. COLE. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ROB ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have not had Bob Woodward in my office, but I have had in my office a guy who remodels kitchens for a living. He told me that, even though the economy has picked up a little bit, it's still not as good as it needs to be, and his concern is the one that I bring to the floor here today.

I believe that the majority is putting the country on the perilous path to a government shutdown with this vote, and the government shutdown is bad enough. It's bad enough that, on October 1, I think it's now likely that the people who inspect our food, that the people who now help pursue criminals at the FBI and that the people who run our National Guard Armories won't be showing up for work because of the government shutdown. That's bad enough. The problem here is not just a government shutdown—it's a shutdown of the economy. That's what this causes.

The way the American economy works is, when a person at the USDA

or the FBI gets a paycheck, he goes out and he has his kitchen remodeled. The kitchen remodeler is then more likely to buy a house, so the real estate broker is more likely to earn a commission. Then she is more likely to buy a car, so the car salesman is more likely to earn his commission, and he's more likely to go buy a refrigerator. The person running the appliance store is more likely to hire more people at the store, and more truck drivers have work in delivering the appliances. On it goes or on it doesn't go.

When the sequester was locked in, economists in this country predicted that a third of the projected economic growth wouldn't happen. They were right. When the latest growth figures came out, instead of growing at about 2.5 percent, the economy grew at 1.7. It's not a mystery as to why. The problem here is not simply the government shutdown—it's the shutdown of the economy that this represents. This bill will probably pass the House. It will not pass the Senate. It represents an obsession with the health care law rather than good faith negotiation.

We should begin those good faith negotiations right now. We should have on the floor right now a proposal that Mr. VAN HOLLEN has made for a very long time that says: let's get rid of the sequester for a period of time; let's not lay off the person at the National Guard Armory or the FBI or the USDA; and let's replace the spending cuts with a fair and honest set of proposals that would include things like taking tax breaks away from oil companies that are making billions of dollars a year.

We are not getting a chance to vote on that today or tomorrow, and I suspect I know the reason why—because it would pass. It would keep the government running. It would further reduce the deficit. It would put more Americans back to work—but it doesn't fit the political script of the majority.

Vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have, from time to time, wondered about where the business community is on this issue, so I would like to insert for the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which notes, as "the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than 3 million businesses . . ." it favors the passage of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for 2014, to ensure the uninterrupted funding of the Federal Government into the next fiscal year and to defund ObamaCare.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 2013.
TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES: THE U.S. CHAMBER OF

COMMERCE, THE WORLD'S LARGEST BUSINESS FEDERATION REPRESENTING THE INTERESTS OF MORE THAN THREE MILLION BUSINESSES AND ORGANIZATIONS OF ALL SIZES, SECTORS, AND REGIONS, AS WELL AS STATE AND LOCAL CHAMBERS AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS, AND DEDICATED TO PROMOTING, PROTECTING AND DEFENDING AMERICA'S FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM, URGES THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO PASS H.J. RES. 59, THE "CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014," TO ENSURE THE UNINTERRUPTED FUNDING OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTO THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR AT SPENDING LEVELS CONSISTENT WITH P.L. 112-25, THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce fully recognizes the importance of restraining federal spending, both discretionary spending and mandatory spending, to reduce federal budget deficits, contain the growth of federal debt, and thereby re-establish fiscal discipline in the near-term and for the long haul. However, as the Department of Labor's recent lackluster jobs report reminds us, the U.S. economy continues to underperform, reinforcing the need for the federal government to preserve its normal operations pending a successful outcome of broader budgetary reforms. It is not in the best interest of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.

Likewise, the U.S. Chamber respectfully urges the House of Representatives to raise the debt ceiling in a timely manner and thus eliminate any question of threat to the full faith and credit of the United States government. Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew has indicated the Treasury may exhaust its borrowing capacity and cash management tools as early as mid-October.

The nation faces many serious fiscal issues on which the Congress and the President have thus far yet to reach agreement. These issues include correcting the unaffordable path of entitlement spending to stabilize federal finances and the need for fundamental tax reform to strengthen the American economy. These issues also include the need to correct the many grave deficiencies in the Affordable Care Act. The Chamber believes each of these and related issues demand immediate attention. The Chamber also asks the Congress to work to clear the individual spending bills so that the improvements and changes reflected in this year's work may be signed into law.

It is readily apparent none of these important issues are ripe for resolution. We therefore urge the House to act promptly to pass a Continuing Resolution to fund the government and to raise the debt ceiling, and then to return to work on these other vital issues.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to finally let the House vote on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal to replace the sequester with a sort of balanced deficit reduction plan that bipartisan panels of experts have all recommended.

To discuss this bill, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the House Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply reckless for our Republican colleagues to say they

will shut down the United States Government unless we shut down the Affordable Care Act, a law which is already providing protections to millions of children in this country who have preexisting conditions—like asthma, like pediatric cancer, like diabetes—and to millions of seniors on Medicare who have high drug costs; but what's also irresponsible and undemocratic is that the Republican majority has refused to allow us even a vote on a plan to replace the sequester.

Now, what's the sequester?

The sequester is Washington speak for a job-killing mechanism. It's meat-ax, immediate, across-the-board cuts that are doing damage to our economy. You don't have to take my word for it. The independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which is the referee around here, says that, at this time next year, we could have up to 1.6 million fewer jobs in this country as a result of that sequester. By this time next year, we could see economic growth cut in half as a result of the sequester.

Look, the good news is the economy is growing, and the bad news is that it's growing very slowly. The last thing the American people need is a self-inflicted wound by this Congress that slows down the economy and puts fewer people back to work, but that's what the sequester does.

We should do something about it, which is why the Democrats have a proposal to replace it, to replace it with targeted cuts over a period of time and, as Mr. ANDREWS said, targeted cuts to big tax breaks, like oil subsidies. If you do that, you will eliminate the bad parts of the sequester, but you actually get the deficit reduction part. In fact, our plan would give you even more deficit reduction during the period of this plan.

We've tried eight times now to get a vote on that—just a vote. In this House, the so-called "people's House," we haven't been able to get a vote. I hear our Republican colleagues say they don't like the sequester—I hear them say that to their constituents—but what they don't tell them is they've denied us the chance to have a vote on a plan to replace the sequester seven times.

Mr. Speaker, guess what else they don't tell them?

How many times during this Congress have our Republican colleagues put a plan on this floor to replace the sequester? Zero. Zero times.

Now, Mr. COLE, I have to correct you because we have now a concrete plan to replace the sequester for 2014. It's right here.

We'd like a vote on that plan, Mr. Speaker. We'd like a vote. We think Members should be held accountable when they go back home and tell their constituents they want to get rid of the sequester and then come here to the United States Congress and deny us an opportunity to have that vote, deny the people of this country the right of

accountability for their Members of Congress.

So let's take action today. Let's vote "no" on the previous question, and then this House can have a chance to vote on our plan to replace the sequester and get rid of the drag on the economy, which, according to the CBO, is going to cost us up to 1.6 million jobs. That's democracy. That's just letting this House work its will. What I'm afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that our colleagues are afraid to have that vote in the light of day. There is no other explanation for why they would be denying the American people that opportunity.

So what I ask is: either say to your constituents you really do like the sequester, and you support the sequester, and you don't mind the jobs that are being lost as a result of the sequester, or vote for our sequester replacement, or at least come to the floor of this House with one of your own because, right now, we've tried eight times for a vote, and our Republican colleagues have tried zero times in this Congress to replace that sequester.

So we ask that you vote against the previous question and give the American people the chance to hold us accountable for what we say at home. Hold us accountable right here in the Halls of this Chamber.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more speakers. If not, I am ready to close.

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close whenever my colleague would like to do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Mr. COLE.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as my Democrat colleagues and I have stated, instead of proposing a clean and non-controversial continuing resolution, today the majority wishes to bring a proposal to the floor that would defund ObamaCare—their favorite—and prioritize bond payments to China in the event of financial default.

This type of legislative maneuver unnecessarily injects partisanship and politics where it does not belong. With time running out on the fiscal year, we have to put politics aside and come together to keep the government open and serving the American people.

To that end, I want to state to all of my colleagues in their offices—or wherever they may be—who are preparing to come over and vote: this vote on this previous question may be one of the most important votes that you have ever taken.

All of us, while we were at home during our district work period, heard over and over and over again from businesspeople, from hospitals, from schools—from everybody—that the sequester was ruining them. We have visited this plague upon them, and we can take it away. We can do it now.

I will remind you that this CR continues the sequester. Let's take this

opportunity we have now with this previous question, and everybody vote "no" on it on both sides, please. The simple thing that will happen here is we can vote on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal, which he just explained. It not only replaces the money that the sequester would cut, but we get more deficit reduction from Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal than we get from the sequester.

Every one of us who fails to vote "no" so that we can do that, which is the least of our responsibilities here, ought to have to explain it every single day to our constituents as to why we did not want to remove that awful burden which we inflicted. I am sure that every one of us—I'm certainly guilty of it myself—told our constituents back home that the House would never do that, that it was too dumb to be believed. But no. Now that we've done it, we like it—but you don't see the consequences.

Dr. Francis Collins, who is the head of the NIH, says that we are losing our scientists and that we are losing our research edge as we know we are falling further and further behind in education, in jobs, in the future of this country. We've failed to invest anything in our future. We are living with crumbling roads, crumbling infrastructure—everything around us—but the uncertainty overrides it all: What next? What does this mean for me? Will I get to keep my job? Am I going to have to lay off all of those employees? How can I run the FBI when people are out on furlough?

Why in the world would we put our people through this disgraceful charade here simply because we made a mistake?

We have an opportunity now by voting "no" on the previous question, which would simply allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN to get a vote on his measure. For heaven's sakes, please do that.

Mr. Speaker, 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 gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, with all of my heart, I urge everybody to vote "no."

I want you to vote "no," too, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule. The underlying bill is not as important to me as getting this sequester out of the way. Vote "no" on this at least, whatever you do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to put you under any pressure, but we're counting on you.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentlelady. It's always great to have the opportunity to come down here and

exchange views with her. I want to make a couple of points in closing.

First, remember, we did bring down legislation—and passed it out of this House—to deal with sequester twice. The Democrats in the Senate didn't pick it up, and the President didn't pick it up.

To my friend Mr. VAN HOLLEN, frankly, your legislation hasn't made it out of committee. You've got to get it out of committee before it comes to the floor, and so far, as persuasive as you are, you've not been that persuasive. Frankly, I don't think it would work on the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. If I finish my remarks, I certainly will yield to the gentleman.

□ 1515

My friends on the other side have repeatedly said we want to shut down the government. That's the last thing we want to do. This bill actually keeps the government open. It's not about shutting down the government; it's about keeping it open so we can negotiate and arrive at a larger deal.

We intend to send this to the Senate with the defunding of ObamaCare, something the majority of this House feels strongly about, and then we're going to wait and see what the Senate sends back to us. My guess is at the end of the day—as you never know what's going to happen over there, maybe I won't make a guess. We'll just wait and see what comes back. But I certainly want to give some of my friends over there the opportunity to carry on this fight.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows in a new Congress, all the legislation that was considered in the previous Congress goes away. The fact is that in this Congress, we've not had one concrete proposal from our Republican colleagues to replace the sequester.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, after you turned us down twice, we just think you guys are an awfully hard sell. The Senate is also a difficult sell on this. So let's move and do this CR and sit down in the next 75 days. I think we have an opportunity, frankly, to come to a very large deal where we can deal with sequester, we can deal with the long-term deficit that we know is a huge problem for us, and we can move forward, I hope, in a bipartisan manner. This is our opportunity to do it. Let's pass this rule, pass this bill, and get to work.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 352 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike page 1, line 1 through page 2, line 11 and insert the following:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) an amendment received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and caused to be printed by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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 amend-

ment 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. COLE. 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 352, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 351.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Alexander	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Crawford	Grimm
Amodel	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bachmann	Culberson	Hall
Bachus	Daines	Hanna
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barr	Denham	Harris
Barton	Dent	Hartzler
Benishek	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Bentivolio	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Holding
Black	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Boustany	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Fincher	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Issa
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Jenkins
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jones
Calvert	Fox	Jordan
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Cantor	Gardner	King (IA)
Capito	Garrett	King (NY)
Carter	Gerlach	Kingston
Cassidy	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Chabot	Gibson	Kline
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Coble	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Coffman	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Cole	Gosar	Lance
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Lankford
Collins (NY)	Granger	Latham
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Latta
Cook	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo

Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
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
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
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
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui

McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Engel
Polis
Herrera Beutler
Rush
McCarthy (NY)
Stockman

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1541

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

Messrs. MCINTYRE and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

YEAS—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
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
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)

Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford

Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

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

NAYS—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
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
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

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

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Beatty
Davis, Rodney
Engel

Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Polis

Rush
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1547

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.

Stated for:

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 473 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea"

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Alexander	Black	Camp
Amash	Blackburn	Campbell
Amodei	Boustany	Cantor
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Capito
Bachus	Bridenstine	Carter
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Barton	Broun (GA)	Chaffetz
Benishkek	Buchanan	Coble
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Coffman
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cole

Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roby	Kind	Moran	Schneider
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Kirkpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz
Conaway	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Kuster	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Langevin	Napolitano	Scott, David
Cotton	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Serrano
Cramer	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)
Crawford	Kingston	Rokita	Lee (CA)	Nolan	Shea-Porter
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney	Levin	O'Rourke	Sherman
Culberson	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen	Lewis	Owens	Sinema
Daines	Labrador	Roskam	Lipinski	Pallone	Sires
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross	Loeb sack	Pascarell	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lamborn	Rothfus	Lofgren	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Denham	Lance	Royce	Lowenthal	Payne	Speier
Dent	Lankford	Runyan	Lowe	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
DeSantis	Latham	Ryan (WI)	Lujan Grisham	Perlmutter	Takano
DesJarlais	Latta	Salmon	(NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sanford	Lujan, Ben Ray	Peters (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Duffy	Long	Scalise	(NM)	Peterson	Tierney
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Schock	Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Schrader	Maffei	Pocan	Tonko
Ellmers	Lummis	Schweikert	Maloney,	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Farenthold	Marchant	Scott, Austin	Carolyn	Quigley	Van Hollen
Fincher	Marino	Sensenbrenner	Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Sessions	Matheson	Rangel	Veasey
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus	Matsui	Richmond	Vela
Fleming	McCaul	Shuster	McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Flores	McClintock	Simpson	McDermott	Ruiz	Visclosky
Forbes	McHenry	Smith (MO)	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Walz
Fortenberry	McKeon	Smith (NE)	McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Fox	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Meeks	T.	Watt
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Southerland	Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Gardner	Meadows	Stewart	Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Garrett	Meehan	Stivers	Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Gerlach	Messer	Stockman	Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth
Gibbs	Mica	Stutzman			
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Terry			
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)			
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Thornberry			
Gosar	Mullin	Tiberi			
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Tipton			
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Turner			
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Upton			
Graves (MO)	Noem	Valadao			
Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Wagner			
Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Walberg			
Grimm	Nunnelee	Walden			
Guthrie	Olson	Walorski			
Hall	Palazzo	Weber (TX)			
Hanna	Paulsen	Webster (FL)			
Harper	Pearce	Wenstrup			
Harris	Perry	Westmoreland			
Hartzler	Petri	Whitfield			
Hastings (WA)	Pittenger	Williams			
Heck (NV)	Pitts	Wilson (SC)			
Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Wittman			
Holding	Pompeo	Wolf			
Hudson	Price (GA)	Womack			
Huelskamp	Radel	Woodall			
Huizenga (MI)	Reed	Yoder			
Hultgren	Reichert	Yoho			
Hunter	Renacci	Young (AK)			
Hurt	Ribble	Young (FL)			
Issa	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)			
Jenkins	Rigell				
Johnson (OH)					

NAYS—193

Andrews	Connolly	Garamendi
Barber	Conyers	Garcia
Barrow (GA)	Cooper	Grayson
Bass	Costa	Green, Al
Beatty	Courtney	Green, Gene
Becerra	Crowley	Grijalva
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Braley (IA)	Delaney	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Himes
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hinojosa
Bustos	Deutch	Holt
Butterfield	Dingell	Honda
Capps	Doggett	Horsford
Capuano	Doyle	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Huffman
Carney	Edwards	Israel
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Enyart	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Farr	Jones
Cicilline	Fattah	Kaptur
Clarke	Poster	Keating
Clay	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Fudge	Kennedy
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kildee
Cohen	Gallego	Kilmer

Kind	Moran	Schneider
Kirkpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz
Kuster	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Langevin	Napolitano	Scott, David
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Serrano
Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)
Lee (CA)	Nolan	Shea-Porter
Levin	O'Rourke	Sherman
Lewis	Owens	Sinema
Lipinski	Pallone	Sires
Loeb sack	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lofgren	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Payne	Speier
Lowe	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan Grisham	Perlmutter	Takano
(NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Peters (MI)	Thompson (MS)
(NM)	Peterson	Tierney
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Maffei	Pocan	Tonko
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Carolyn	Quigley	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Vargas
Matheson	Rangel	Veasey
Matsui	Richmond	Vela
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
McDermott	Ruiz	Visclosky
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Walz
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Meeks	T.	Watt
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Gohmert	Polis	

□ 1554

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 351, I call up the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3102

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is the following:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.