

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 70, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 72, VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 73, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-241) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 370, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 72, VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 73, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 370 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Providing for Consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 70) Making Continuing Appropriations for National Park Service Operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for Fiscal Year 2014, and for Other Purposes; Providing for Consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 71) Making Continuing Appropriations of Local Funds of the District of Columbia for Fiscal Year 2014; providing for Consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 72) Making Continuing Appropriations for Veterans Benefits for Fiscal Year 2014, and for Other Purposes; Providing for Consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 73) Making Continuing Appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for Fiscal Year 2014, and for Other Purposes; Providing for Consideration of the Bill (H.R. 3230) Making Continuing Appropriations During a Government Shutdown To Provide Pay and Allowances to Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces Who Perform Inactive-Duty Training During Such Period; and Providing for Consideration of Motions To Suspend the Rules

October 2, 2013.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. Woodall, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report [to accompany H. Res. 370.]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 370, by a record vote of 9 to 3, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution provides closed rules for H.J. Res. 70, H.J. Res. 71, H.J. Res. 72, H.J. Res. 73, and H.R. 3230. The resolution provides 30 minutes of debate on each measure equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of each measure and provides that each measure shall be considered as read. The resolution waives all points of order against provisions in each measure. The resolution

provides one motion to recommit each measure.

Section 4 of the resolution provides that it shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 6, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules and that 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.

EXPLANATION OF WAIVERS

The waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 70, H.J. Res. 71, H.J. Res. 72, H.J. Res. 73, and H.R. 3230 includes a waiver of clause 11 of rule XXI, prohibiting the consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which such measure has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

The waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 73 and H.R. 3230 also includes a waiver of Clause 9(a)(2) of rule XXI, which prohibits consideration of a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee, unless the chair of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration. However, it is important to note that the chair of the Committee on Appropriations submitted an earmark statement to the House on October 2, 2013 for printing in the Congressional Record. The statement affirms that the measures do not contain any earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits under the meaning of the rule.

Although the resolution waives all points of order against provisions in H.J. Res. 70, H.J. Res. 71, H.J. Res. 72, H.J. Res. 73, and H.R. 3230, the Committee is not aware of any points of order. The waiver is prophylactic in nature.

COMMITTEE VOTES

The results of each record vote on an amendment or motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and against, are printed below:

Rules Committee record vote No. 78

Motion by Ms. Slaughter to make in order the clean Senate Continuing Resolution so we can send it to the President for his signature today. Defeated: 3-9

	Vote
<b>Majority Members:</b>	
Ms. Foxx .....	Nay
Mr. Bishop of Utah .....	Nay
Mr. Cole .....	Nay
Mr. Woodall .....	Nay
Mr. Nugent .....	Nay
Mr. Webster .....	Nay
Ms. Ros-Lehtinen .....	Nay
Mr. Burgess .....	Nay
Mr. Sessions, Chairman .....	Nay
<b>Minority Members:</b>	
Ms. Slaughter .....	Yea
Mr. McGovern .....	Yea
Mr. Hastings of Florida .....	Yea
Mr. Polis .....	—

Rules Committee record vote No. 79

Motion by Ms. Foxx to report the rule. Adopted: 9-3

		Vote
<b>Majority Members:</b>		
Ms. Fox	.....	Yea
Mr. Bishop of Utah	.....	Yea
Mr. Cole	.....	Yea
Mr. Woodall	.....	Yea
Mr. Nugent	.....	Yea
Mr. Webster	.....	Yea
Ms. Ros-Lehtinen	.....	Yea
Mr. Burgess	.....	Yea
Mr. Sessions, Chairman	.....	Yea
<b>Minority Members:</b>		
Ms. Slaughter	.....	Nay
Mr. McGovern	.....	Nay
Mr. Hastings of Florida	.....	Nay
Mr. Polis	.....	—

H. RES. 370

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The joint resolutions referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(d) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 6, 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 Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1345

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we're here today because we don't have a "my way or the highway" system of government. We have a system of government that requires that the people's representatives come together and build consensus, find a common path forward. And that path has been illusive, Mr. Speaker.

Oftentimes, as the reading clerk is reading a bill, you'll see someone ask to waive the reading of the bill, ask unanimous consent that the bill not be read. I'm so pleased that today we had every single word of this resolution read, Mr. Speaker, because the words matter.

I open up a newspaper, it talks about all the division in Washington, D.C. It talks about all the things on which we cannot agree. And what we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a bill about things on which we agree.

I hear it from my constituents all the time. They say, Rob, why in the world can't you all get something done? I understand there are things that you legitimately disagree about, ideas about which different parts of the country have different paths forward. But what about those things on which you agree?

That's what we have here today, Mr. Speaker. There's not a Member in this body that is celebrating a government shutdown. What we can celebrate, though, is a path out of the government shutdown. This rule allows for that today.

I want to read those titles again, Mr. Speaker. H.J. Res. 70, to reopen our national parks and museums, common ground on which this body agrees.

H.J. Res. 71, to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. A lot of folks don't realize, but because the District of Columbia is a Federal district, the Federal Government provides a little money, but most of the money comes from the District of Columbia itself. But the District of Columbia is not allowed to spend its local funds without a Federal authorization. This does that.

And then, so important, Mr. Speaker, honoring our promise to America's veterans. I don't believe there's a man or woman in this Chamber that doesn't believe our veterans deserve the very best service that we can provide. I

don't think there's a man or a woman in this Chamber who wants to see our VA services halted or curtailed. We solve that today, Mr. Speaker.

Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 73, to continue funding at the NIH. NIH makes us all so proud. We do so many first-in-human trials at the Winship Cancer Institute down just outside of my district in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, lifesaving research, lifesaving opportunities caught up in this government shutdown, not one of those things on which we disagree; one of those things on which we agree. We have an opportunity to get that done today.

And, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3230, Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act.

Again, there's a lot to be frustrated about here today. And I know folks back home, Mr. Speaker, in your district and in mine, they have a lot to be frustrated about too. But one bright moment in this debate came late on Saturday night when we came together unanimously and said, whatever our disagreements here, our men and women in uniform should not get caught up in it. Pay our troops first. It brought us together.

Not just in this House, Mr. Speaker, we have the ability to come together, but also in the Senate, where, by unanimous consent, they passed that bill. It went to the President's desk.

But what that bill did not include, and what I believe we all believe it should have included, was funding for our National Guard and our Reserve. This bill gives us the opportunity to solve that today.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to bring up three of these five bills yesterday under a process they call suspension of the rules. It requires two-thirds of the House to support it. But because we unanimously supported our troops last week, we assumed that we would be able to unanimously support our veterans, unanimously support our folks here in the District of Columbia, using their local forums, unanimously support our parks and our monuments, and we were wrong.

I'll say to my friends, I don't know if they looked at the numbers—80 percent of my friends on the other side of the aisle said no. They said yes, this is something on which we agree, but no, we are not going to participate in solving that problem. We want that problem to persist until you solve all the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close with this. One of our great patriots during the American Revolution, Edmund Burke, said, No man does worse than he who does nothing because he can only do a little.

Mr. Speaker, I concede that some of the things we're working on today might seem like a little. But we have the opportunity to help people. We have an opportunity to make a difference, and shame on us if we do nothing because we can only do a little.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, good day to you. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think if Edmund Burke were alive today he would say that what we're really doing is so very little it's shameful, when we could do so much.

I want to say this, and I want to say it about every chance I get. We could stop this today.

We have just come from a 3-hour Rules meeting and hearing people on the floor and a lot of my colleagues, I have the sense that they don't have any idea what a government shutdown was. All of a sudden it's starting to hurt. Let's pick this piece over here, that one over there, and we can fix that.

800,000 people who work for the United States Government are being used as pawns. We are hurting all of the citizens of the United States who need the services that those 800,000 people provide.

We have one thing to do, Mr. Speaker, one thing: we can take from this desk and concur with the Senate CR. That's it. It doesn't have to go back to the Senate. It can go directly to the President of the United States, maybe even before the big meeting today. Sign it and it's over with. But no, we're not going to do that.

Now, don't believe that this bill was written today because there is a particularly sympathy for patients at NIH or the visitors to the national parks or the citizens of the District of Columbia. These proposals are cynical attempts to make these things pinch just a little bit less.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that 30 sick children, most with cancer, were turned away from NIH clinical trials because of the government shutdown. Should they be pawns in this political, cynical game to hurt the health care bill?

This morning, the majority proposes to reopen NIH, or part of it. Yesterday, the TV cameras were dispatched around the country to capture the footage of museums and monuments closed. This morning the majority proposes they're going to open those sites.

The majority's making itself clear: anytime they see a bad headline, they're going to bring a bill to the floor to make it go away. At this rate, it could be a year from now before we ever finally come to some conclusion thereon, because nobody has said anything about what the end game is here.

How long are you going to hold the government, the country hostage?

Surely it doesn't have anything to do with health care anymore, after yesterday.

Now, if the majority really cared, we'd reopen the entire government, all of NIH, national parks right here, right now on this floor in this action we're taking today.

If the majority held a simple vote on a clean version of the Senate CR, the government shutdown would be closed upon the President's signature.

This afternoon I will give every Member of this Chamber a chance to do just that, as I did just in the Rules Committee. I want you to know that the opportunity to vote for the CR, end the government shutdown, failed 9-4 on a party-line vote. That tells us something about why we're here today and what the purpose is for all of this.

Let me be clear. This amendment is the only chance that this Chamber may ever have to end the government shutdown. If this Chamber supports my amendment, we will pass a clean CR this afternoon.

Now, if the majority really cared about helping those cancer patients' access to health care or letting the World War II veterans visit the monuments and reopening the doors of the Nation's parks and museums, they will vote for my amendment.

The VA, by the way, has announced today that they are running out of money. Furthermore, passing a clean CR would actually do more to help the Nation's veterans than the majority's proposal to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Under the majority's proposal, the VA would receive \$6 billion less than if we simply passed the CR which, in other words, has \$6 billion more for the veterans than what you're proposing today.

So for all the cries of concern, the majority's desire to shortchange the veterans by \$6 billion tells you all that you need to know. And the veterans understand that. They know that they're being used as a pawn in this cynical, political game, and they resent it.

Far from honest policy, today's proposals are more cynical politics. For almost a week, the majority has found itself in a legislative box, or at least I thought so until a little while ago, and the Rules Committee vote, and when they voted 9-4 not to open up the government, I realized that that was the aim all along.

Now, because the Senate voted for cloture on a clean funding bill, a simple majority of Senators have been able to put an end to the repeated attempts to dismantle the Affordable Health Care Bill.

Now, under these circumstances, the majority knows they can't keep proposing ransom demands, so they've broken cloture and returned to a 60-vote threshold in the Senate. The need to break cloture is why they tried to go to conference 15 minutes before the government shutdown, and that's why they are continuing to avoid a clean vote on the Senate CR today.

Mr. Speaker, two paragraphs in The Washington Post this morning sum up what this fight always has been and continues to be about: defunding the Affordable Care Act and taking health care away from 300 million Americans who have no insurance.

Referring to yesterday's events, Ezra Klein of The Washington Post wrote:

The top story all day was that Republicans had shut down the Federal Government be-

cause President Obama would not defund or delay the Affordable Care Act. The other major story was that the government servers were crashing because so many people were trying to see if they could get the insurance through ObamaCare. On the one hand, Washington was shut down because Republicans don't want citizens to have ObamaCare. On the other hand, ObamaCare was shut down because so many Americans did want that insurance.

Yesterday was, indeed, a historic day for our Nation and for every American who's ever been denied access to health care. In my home State of New York, there were more than 2 million visits to our online exchange in less than 90 minutes.

And by later in the day, the last number that I have, just for yesterday, 10 million people had visited the Web site at the end of the day. That is about 12 percent of the entire population of the State of New York, yesterday.

Meanwhile, 4.7 million people visited healthcare.gov yesterday—that's the national database—while almost 100,000 more visited online exchanges in Illinois, in Colorado. Most importantly, in States from Kentucky to California, in red States and blue States, thousands of Americans went to sleep last night having purchased health insurance through the newly launched exchanges.

Now, while these Americans went to bed realizing their long-awaited dream, the majority woke up this morning realizing that their worst nightmare had come true. Despite their best efforts, the American people were finally given access to safe and affordable health care.

Now, the only question that remains is if the majority will finally acknowledge reality, or if they will keep the government closed while they continue their quest to take American's health care away.

I'm extremely grateful to the chairman of my committee this morning, when he said, when we called for a vote on funding the government today, he said, and I quote, "I would say on behalf of the majority, what we think we are doing here today is probably some straight-line Republican viewpoints."

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the majority's latest gimmicks by voting "no" on the rule and the underlying legislation, and vote "no" on the PQ so that we can put our amendment on the floor.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to my friend that we have an opportunity to do something today. There's been a lot of talk on this floor. We have an opportunity to actually do something, and I don't think there's going to be a single Member on the other side of the aisle that challenges the notion that, if we pass these bills, we will make a difference for American veterans, we will make a difference for American families, and we will make a difference for American Guardsmen and Reservists.

And I do not believe that the heart of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that, because we can only do a little, we should do nothing.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a good friend and great leader in this institution,

□ 1400

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolutions.

The situation in which we find ourselves is as unfortunate as it is unnecessary. The House has voted three times to fund the government. It's been rejected three times by the Senate Democrats. With each successive vote, the House compromised on its position that ObamaCare should be defunded.

Our most recent offer would have delayed the individual mandate for 1 year and ended the congressional exemption from ObamaCare. Nine House Democrats supported this proposal, which would give American families the same relief from ObamaCare that President Obama unilaterally gave Big Businesses. But, again, HARRY REID said "no."

As we wait for Senate Democrats to come to the table, the House will continue its efforts to restart government operations.

Two areas we seek to fund today—national parks and veterans benefits—hit incredibly close to home. The district I represent in east Tennessee includes parts of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Smokies are more than a natural wonder. They are an important part of the economy in Sevier County, Tennessee.

Dale Ditmanson, the park's superintendent, told me that 1.1 million people typically visit the park in October; but as long as the gates to the park remain closed, hotels, restaurants, and other parts of the service industry in that county will suffer.

Even more important than reopening our national parks is meeting our commitment to America's veterans. I'm privileged to serve on the nonpartisan Veterans' Affairs Committee; and as a veteran myself, I hope we can come together on a bipartisan basis to provide funding for processing disability claims and for benefits like the GI Bill and VA home loans. How could anyone stand in opposition to those who have stood in the line of fire to keep this country free? The answer is President Obama, who has promised to veto such a bill. This is unconscionable.

These funding bills represent a series of commonsense steps to get more of the government back online and to meet our commitments to the American people. After all, I wasn't elected and sent here by my constituents to shut down the government. I was sent here to reform it, to make it smaller, and to make it more accountable.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying rule and the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it would be the best of common sense for us to end this charade today. But I understand now, because I've heard it twice, that the intent really is to wait and whittle down the government. As Grover Norquist, I believe, famously said, he would like to shrink it down to drown it in the bathtub.

I think we're in the process of doing that today by funding it a little piece here, a little piece there, and the devil take the hindmost.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. We are now in day two of a Republican-created shutdown.

While my Republican colleagues drag their feet on allowing an up-or-down vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution, vital research at the NIH has been halted, student loan processing has been delayed, and veterans can't apply for a VA home loan.

The same bills that this rule will bring to the floor have already been debated and voted on. My colleagues are not being reasonable, to say the least. Because Republicans didn't get their way yesterday, they now bring the same bills up again, only this time under regular order. They will get their 216 votes, but they know and I know that this action does nothing to advance the ball. It does nothing to get us closer to a solution.

I remind my colleagues that House Democrats are willing to accept a clean CR at the levels that House Republicans have demanded. It's not what we want, but we compromised in an effort to do the business of the people.

The votes are here, Mr. Speaker, for a clean CR. Every Democrat, I believe, will vote for a clean CR. And many Republicans will do the same.

We're asking you to compromise. Your refusal to compromise has shut down this government. And for what? Political theater.

I repeat, the votes are here. Prove me wrong.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, in my prior life, as many of you know, I was a trial judge. I presided over thousands of very difficult cases. So often, jurors could not agree, but they worked hard without a political agenda. They reasoned together and administered justice.

Let us reason together. Let's get the CR passed today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend that there's a little revisionist history in that recitation.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the House passed its package, and the Senate said, No, it's our way or the highway. So the House said, Well, let me give you a different package—one that is a little closer to that position. The Senate said, No, it's my way or the highway.

Then the House said, Let me give you a third position that's a little closer to you. And the Senate said a third time, No, it's my way or the highway. And then the House said, Well, come and sit down with me at the table so that we can find a way through our differences. And the Senate said, No, it's my way or the highway.

The American people know who's looking for common ground and consensus in this body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), a real supporter of finding that pathway forward, the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, just 3 days ago, this House unanimously passed the Pay Our Military Act. The Senate unanimously passed the same bill, and the President signed it into law.

That was 3 days ago. That legislation guaranteed that all members of our Armed Forces would receive their pay for their service during any government shutdown. And that law also applies to full-time Guard and Reserve members. Yet Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel has improperly furloughed countless Guardsmen and -women across the country, in violation of the intent of that law.

Mr. Speaker, today, a bipartisan group of myself and my colleagues will be sending a letter to Secretary Hagel demanding that he enforce this law properly and to send our Guardsmen and -women back to work.

Today, we will also consider legislation that will provide for funding to make certain that the Guardsmen on inactive status are paid as well and allowed to continue to train during a government shutdown. This readiness is absolutely essential to the protection of our great Nation. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel is needlessly furloughing Guardsmen who are essential to defending our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama sent a letter to Federal workers telling them they should not be used as punching bags, but that is exactly what his administration is doing to members of our National Guard.

In fact, this is the same thing this administration did when the sequester was enforced.

They immediately shut down the White House to tours.

They scared the public into believing that their travel plans would be interrupted at our airports.

They tried in every possible way to hurt and to scare the public as much as possible.

And they are once again playing true to form, this time harming our National Guard to make a political point.

Now, I know that our friends on the other side of the aisle say that they're going to oppose this legislation because they say that they need an entire government funding bill or nothing at all.

And yet they are calling Republicans the absolutists. That's what they're calling us? Seriously.

I would just say to my Democratic friends that we aren't asking you to repeal ObamaCare in order to make certain that our National Guard gets paid. We are just asking our Democratic friends to pay the National Guard, for goodness sake.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I heard some Members on the other side, our Democratic friends, say that what we are talking about here is just a fig leaf or a distraction. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider paying our National Guard a fig leaf or a distraction. I consider our National Guard to be warriors essential to the defense of this Nation.

I would urge this House to pass this legislation that will allow our men and women who serve so bravely in our National Guard to do their job and to protect our freedoms.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and also the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that the three bills that everybody is so proud of that they've put out to try to refund the Government have a dagger at the heart of the health care bill and would have destroyed it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are, on Day 2 of the Republican shutdown of the Nation's government, and the Republican majority has come up with yet another bit of meaningless political theater.

Yesterday's strategy from the gang that couldn't shoot straight was to bring up a small handful of bills to fund popular government programs and to try to pass them on suspension. That failed. Today's nonsense is to bring up those same bills under this rule and try to pass them with a majority vote.

Now, just for a moment, let's leave aside the fact that none of these bills are going anywhere. The Senate isn't going to go along with this, and neither is the President. So all of this is just a gigantic waste of time, which is one of the few things the majority is good at.

We say it all the time around here: budgets are about priorities. Budgets reflect things that you believe are most important to support.

And yesterday we learned all about the priorities of the Republican leadership. The first bill they brought up for debate—the one that they wanted to get over to the Senate most quickly—was a bill to fund the national parks and monuments. Now, I like the national parks. In fact, I love them. I support their full funding. I even believe they should get more funding than they would receive under the lousy Republican sequester numbers. But that's their number one priority?

What about the researchers at the Centers for Disease Control who pro-

tect us from epidemics? More than 8,700 people have already been furloughed from the CDC. I hope my Republican colleagues have gotten their flu shots, Mr. Speaker.

What about the low-income mother who has been cut off from WIC? What about the children who have been turned away from the Head Start programs?

No, they want to fund parks. And why? Let's be honest about this. Because right now every television network in America has a camera crew down at the National Mall interviewing disappointed tourists and taking pictures of the "Closed" signs on the Smithsonian museums. Because today, camera crews in California and Wyoming and Montana will be taking pictures of visitors turned away from Yosemite and Yellowstone and Glacier National Park.

Mr. Speaker, when my kids were little, we used to give them trail mix as a snack. There was granola and raisins and nuts and all kinds of healthy things. But my kids always wanted to pick out the M&Ms. That's what this Republican majority has been reduced to—trying to pick out the M&Ms from the trail mix. Eventually, my kids grew up. I hope the Republican majority will do the same.

We can do this right away. We can do this today. We can do this right now. We can pass the clean continuing resolution that has already passed the Senate. That's the way you keep the government functioning while the two Chambers work out their differences.

The notion that you're shutting the government down on a 5-week continuing resolution when we still have to negotiate a long-term spending bill is unconscionable. People all across this country, Democrats and Republicans, are outraged by the behavior of this Republican leadership. It is time to grow up. It is time to pass a clean continuing resolution.

Let's open up this government. Let's open it up today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it's clear we're going to hear more "it's my way or the highway" from the other side throughout today.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a freshman Member of this body who believes that there is a pathway forward and that we can make a difference.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule, which would allow the House to vote on the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act and the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act.

The Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component who are in inactive status.

Like most of us, my office has been flooded with phone calls and emails sharing real-life stories about how this government shutdown is negatively impacting the folks that we represent.

This government shutdown is such a disappointment. In the meantime, there's no logical reason for members of the military, Reserves, veterans, and their families to go one more day without the support they deserve.

According to an article in the *Indy Star*, about 600 full-time civilian employees and Air Force Reservists have been furloughed at Grissom Air Reserve Base located in Miami County. This could affect the ability for Grissom Air Reserve Base to maintain their operational readiness.

The *Peru Tribune*, Miami County's hometown paper, stated:

Reservists were told to go home.

One thousand Indiana National Guard employees were furloughed on Tuesday. Indiana has the fourth largest National Guard in the country.

□ 1415

We're proud that our brave men and women so strongly represent the Guard and a steadfast commitment to our country.

This is so unfair to our Hoosier heroes who fight every day. Indiana's Second District is home to more than 53,000 veterans. One of them called my office yesterday expressing concern about losing access to VA health services.

The Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act provides immediate funding to ensure the continuation of veterans' disability payments, the GI Bill, education training, and VA home loans. Passing these bills is the least we can do.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside. Be fair to the individuals and the families who have sacrificed everything for the continued defense of this Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, just 10 seconds to say let's not do the least we can do. This is the day we can open up the government and serve our people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

I had a prepared talk, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to give it. I'm going to respond to the distinguished manager who has used phrases like "revisionist history" and "my way or the highway." You know, those are words that are worthy of what surrounds this issue, but they are, of course, exactly the opposite of what the distinguished manager suggests.

It wasn't this side of the aisle that said: We'll fund the government on a condition, and that condition is you have to agree to what we could not achieve legislatively, what we could not achieve in the courts, what we could not achieve at the ballot box; we're going to hold you hostage. You're going to do it, or else.

You're right, it's my way or the highway, but it's you who are saying "my

way or the highway”—one might say you.

In terms of revisionist history, this idea that we're just trying to help veterans and the National Guard and that's the least we can do, well, what about all the other agencies of the Federal Government? What about the rest of the people that need to be served?

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, my family has participated in the National Guard. My nephew has been in the National Guard—still is. He has served two tours of duty in Iraq and one tour of duty in Afghanistan. He is now a Blackhawk helicopter pilot for the National Guard and ready to go again.

I and my family and my colleagues need no lecture about patriotism and about service to country. What we do want—and what my nephew wants and all like him—is that we stand up in this Congress and fund the government. That's the least we can do for National Guardsmen and for the clerk who processes applications for people to qualify for Social Security. We owe that to our constituents. We owe that to our country.

Can we put aside the issues of revision and “my way or the highway” and come together and have a clean continuing resolution—buy ourselves some time to continue the debate on ancillary issues, but stop the hostage-taking for the sake of my nephew, and perhaps yours?

It is time to put an end to this reckless Republican shutdown. We are now in day 2 of this manufactured crisis, in which House Republicans are holding hostage the American people and the essential government services on which they rely.

The cavalier nature in which Republicans have allowed this shutdown to occur—if not outright advocated for it—is shameful. Some have even suggested that the shutdown has gone largely unnoticed. That is outrageous! Do they not see the very real pain they are causing in their own communities? I suggest they visit with some of the 10,000 seniors a day who now have to wait for their Medicare enrollment to be processed . . . or the small businesses that cannot open their doors and hire new workers because SBA loans have been put on hold . . . or the dedicated men and women of our federal workforce—the majority of whom live outside the DC region in their communities—who protect our borders, safeguard our food supply, and respond to natural disasters and now have to worry about how to pay their mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans say it is unacceptable for Republicans to shut down the government to meet their narrow, partisan demands. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—along with the Prince William and Fairfax Chambers in my district—has urged Congress to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling without any extraneous provisions for fear of disrupting the economy.

That is what Democrats have offered to do, but House Republicans refuse to compromise on their demand to defund or delay the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, it's like our Republican colleagues have been overcome by a mass psychosis to satiate the rabid demands of the Tea Party crowd.

We know there are some sensible members on the other side of the aisle who want to do the right thing. I implore them to prevail upon their leadership to work with us in bipartisan fashion to end this shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I would say to my friend from Virginia, before he leaves the floor, that I'm grateful to his nephew for his service. I, too, represent a part of the world where service is not an opportunity but an obligation.

I would say, as my friend knows very well, this body, this United States House, in June, passed our Veterans and Military Construction appropriations bill. This whole idea that you're supposed to fund the government in one giant bill is more of that revisionist history. That's exactly the wrong way to fund the government.

The way the government is supposed to be funded, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is that we're supposed to fund it one piece at a time—that's the way it always has been, the way it always should be—because you end up looking to see where those funding priorities are.

So this House, Mr. Speaker, in June, with only four dissenting votes, passed a bill affirming the financial commitment that this Nation should have to our veterans, and it has been sitting, gathering dust, in the United States Senate since June.

Funding for all veterans ran out on September 30. We all knew that. We knew it last September 30 that funding was going to run out this September 30, which is why this House has moved forward on appropriations bills. The Senate has moved forward on zero, Mr. Speaker. That's why it's my way or the highway.

There's a right way to get this done, and we've been trying to do it here. The Senate won't do it the right way. They want to do it their way—and a way that doesn't serve folks back home the way you and I, Mr. Speaker, know that they are entitled to be served.

You have not heard one voice on this floor today dispute that the bills we have before us would make a difference in the lives of American families. You've had folks say it doesn't do enough, but you haven't had folks say it doesn't do what it's intended to do. We have an opportunity to do some good. Let's do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to know is why the Republicans are so afraid of the Affordable Care Act. Is it because it makes health care affordable to millions?

The Republicans have spread fear about the ACA for so long, it's no wonder people are afraid. Well, maybe

they're afraid because the ACA is going to work. In fact, the ACA is already working—making health care accessible and lowering health care costs. It's increasing competition amongst insurance providers.

But here's what's happening: Republicans don't like the ACA, so they crash the government to get their way. That's no way to govern. You don't like the law, so you crash the government?

Republicans don't like environmental regulations and the EPA. Are they going to crash the government to eliminate them?

Are they going to crash the government to roll back the Dodd-Frank law?

This sets a horrible and reckless precedent, threatening 200 years of governance. There's a better way: Work together with people you disagree with to make this a better country.

Now the Republicans are using a cynical effort to peel Democrats to their side. The real way to honor veterans is to uphold the rule of law that they fought so hard and sacrificed for.

The ACA is the law. Let's fight to uphold the law. There will be glitches in the ACA, and some things should be improved. Let's work together to make it work for all Americans.

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

My colleague in the Rules Committee earlier said if we could just get a few of us together around the table we could sort this out. I believe that. I absolutely believe that. If we could just sit down around the table and talk to each other, get together on the facts, we could sort this out. But we're not even together on the facts, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague just talked about how we're taking away 250 years of American governance with this government shutdown. I don't celebrate this shutdown. I wish the Senate would have come to the table so we wouldn't have had a shutdown. But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, in the 16 years that Republicans have controlled this body, this is the third shutdown that has the great misfortune of occurring.

I came along in the Carter administration. I'm from the State of Georgia; President Carter is from the State of Georgia. You go back to the Carter administration, come 16 years forward, Democrats controlled this institution, shut the government down 15 times. In the Carter administration, Mr. Speaker, it was all Democrats—Democrats in the White House, Democrats running the U.S. House, Democrats running the U.S. Senate, shut down the government five times for more than 50 days. I don't celebrate that, but I do recognize that when people refuse to sit down and talk to each other that is sometimes the outcome. It didn't have to be the outcome this time, but here we are.

So we can either throw up our hands in disgust or we can start pointing the fingers of blame or we can do something about it. Again, Mr. Speaker, not one Member of this body has come to

the floor to attest that the passage of this rule and the passage of these underlying bills wouldn't make a difference for American families—and the reason they haven't is because they would.

I understand we're going to continue to disagree, but let's do those things on which we agree. These five bills contain the first of those ideas. And I commit to my colleagues, if we can begin this process today, we can be right back here tomorrow doing more of it.

Wonder of wonders, Mr. Speaker, if we start working together and doing those things that we know our constituents want us to do, we might just find a way out. We might just make constituents back home proud. We can and we should.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlelady from New York, and certainly my good friend on the Rules Committee. We see each other often in his work, and I know his passion and commitment. And as I walked on the floor today, I was listening to him recount history. But the history of shutdowns of years past will not help us be guided by our hearts and our minds today.

The American people are asking not for a recounting of historical perspective—years past that have been solved, Congresses who came together, patriots who stood in the line of fire and have lost their lives long since those particular shutdowns have occurred—we owe the American people today an answer.

I just came from the east steps of the United States Capitol. It's a very somber place. It's a place of joy, but it's a place of remembrance. If my good friend wants to remember anything, he needs to remember 9/11, when Members of Congress poured out of this place to show America that we were not going to be undermined by terrorists, that we were going to stand united together. That was a moment that America looked to with pride as we sang "God Bless America."

Today we stood on the steps, standing with Members of Congress who actually were wounded in Iraq and veterans who are now Members of Congress, and we asked for another moment of unity—unity to be able to address real issues in this House, to put 800,000 workers back to work who are not working for themselves in the Federal Government but are processing veterans' benefits and Social Security and Medicare. We asked for this Speaker and this Republican Conference and Tea Party-driven Members to put all of that aside.

Let us recount the history of the unity that was shown on those steps, so symbolic when we come together—that

that time on 9/11, we came together as Republicans and Democrats—and vote for a clean CR.

The idea that national parks are important, they're right, they are important. The idea that the National Guard is important, they're right, it is important. Right now, Ellington Field is shut down that the National Guard in Texas used, and they are there as front liners for our borders and needs in that area. It is shut down.

The National Institutes of Health is one of these bills, D.C. and the veterans. All of those are important. But I will tell you, just as important are the men and women in the FBI and the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms that are on the front lines of ensuring the safety and security of America. More funding for those in Homeland Security that are not presently being funded by fees are very, very important, and that is not on this list. So recounting the history doesn't do us any good.

The National Institutes of Health, all of us who have had conditions such as what I've had and surviving breast cancer realize the importance of it. But we will not, Mr. Speaker, piecemeal. What we want is what we want for America—unity.

Mr. Speaker, we want a clean CR. Put it on the floor now. We will vote now. We will vote now.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my concern with this rule is it allows us to debate and vote on four bills. Each of these bills picks and chooses what government program should be open, what is most important.

I guess of all these four bills, the one I find the most cynical is the one that didn't pass last night under suspension, H.J. Res. 72, the partisan resolution that will cut \$6 billion from our Nation's veterans from what passed the House this last June.

□ 1430

There are many issues that divide our parties. One of the issues that has always received bipartisan support is supporting our Nation's heroes and their families.

Unfortunately, due to the extreme views of some in the majority, this Chamber is now considering a resolution that will cut \$6.2 billion from the VA and excludes funding for several VA programs which are vital to the thousands of veterans in my district, including national veterans cemeteries, VA construction, and grants for State veterans homes and State cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's veterans deserve better. I call on this Chamber to demand a vote on the full VA for the entire year. Every day that goes by without full appropriations for the VA

is another day that our veterans are being harmed and denied the support and services they paid for with blood, sweat, and sacrifice.

Let me explain it again. This House on a very bipartisan vote in June voted for a VA appropriations bill that was \$6.6 billion more than what we are considering today. So this would be a cut in what we need. In fact, even the one in June is not enough. But this makes it even worse. That is why this is the most cynical of all these bills.

What we need to do is come here on the floor and pass a clean CR and get the government back to work. Don't pick and choose here, don't waste the time of the American people. Let's have a clean CR today and vote and get the government back to work today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to ask my friend from Texas whose words had an impact on me.

My friend from Texas who was talking about the bill we passed in June, I happen to share his commitment to that legislation. It is my understanding that that legislation is sitting today, as it has been since June, in the Senate, and they could take it up and pass it and not fund veterans just for a week or 10 days, but fund those programs at those levels for the entire year.

I would ask my friend if he would join with me in calling on the Senate to do exactly that.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I support our veterans. I voted for the one in June, like a majority of both our conferences and caucuses. You and I can't control the Senate, but we can control what is on the floor today. This bill cuts \$6 billion, which you and I supported in June. That is the issue we have on the floor today.

I want a clean CR and I would like to have regular order for our appropriations. We will deal with the Senate, but we need to get our act together here in the House.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I say to my friend that the clean CR that he is advocating so passionately for cuts the exact same \$6 billion that he said is a problem. I agree with him that that's a problem. I hope we won't do that. I hope the Senate will take up that bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL), a new Member of this body, but one who brings commonsense idea after commonsense idea, bipartisan idea after bipartisan idea to the Rules Committee.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for this time.

We are here today trying to do some pretty simple things—trying to support our veterans, keep open Veterans Affairs, open up our parks around this

great Nation, and even keep open schools right here in D.C. Heck, I take the Metro every single day. I am here supporting this. Do you know what? Even last night we saw House Democrats that are supporting the same causes.

The problem today really lies with Senate Democrats. They simply are refusing to come to the negotiating table just to even talk with us.

I have been in Washington working through the weekend—many of us have been here until 3 in the morning every night working—to simply keep the government open. But no offer has been good enough for the Senate, not one. They have rejected every single compromise that we have sent them.

Compromise is essential, especially when we have a time of divided government, because we are here to pass laws—sometimes repeal them—but most of all to govern, to give certainty and stability to this great Nation.

We have sent four different bills to the Senate to keep government open. All of them have been rejected. We even sent legislation to simply offer a small group of Members to come to the negotiating table to compromise, again, with the Senate to keep government open. The Senate rejected us time and time again.

It is a sad day when we can't even get Democrat Senators to come to just have a conversation with us to keep government open. In fact, this is ridiculous. It is a disservice to the American people. I knew Washington was broken before coming here, but the Senate's pure refusal to even work with the House is an all-time low.

As a result of the Senate's actions, we now have a government officially shut down. Parents all across the country are now worrying where their next paycheck is going to come from, how they are going to pay their mortgage, how they are going to pay their rent, how they are going to put food on their kid's table all because Democrats won't have a conversation.

I don't think it is unreasonable for us in all of these compromises that House Republicans—and some House Democrats—I don't think it is unreasonable to ask for a simple 1-year delay of the individual mandate. After all, the President himself has already delayed ObamaCare for big business. Think about that. Big business, big corporations, are exempt from this law, but you are not.

He has delayed this, he has delayed the launch of online enrollment for small business, even delayed the Spanish language version of the Web site: If you all speak Spanish, good luck—*ustedes hablan español, buena suerte.*

The President has been willing to exempt everyone from this signature piece of legislation, except for you. Yesterday, when you went to [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) to sign up, most people saw glitches and errors. The administration has had 3 years—3 years—to build a Web site which a 14 year old can do in his parents' basement today.

Again, ObamaCare is just not ready for prime time. All we are asking is just for this small piece to be delayed. It is a compromise that I think all of us can live with.

I stand here ready to work with the Senate to get the government open and do the right thing for you and this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, give us back our government.

I am on the Appropriations Committee. We shouldn't be talking about CRs; we should be talking about passing appropriations bills. But those were stopped, and we are now down to the emergency tool that we have had to use over and over again to continue government operations.

I have been here 20 years. We have done CRs many times. We have never, ever had a pre-condition to a CR.

People are not entitled to make up facts here. The facts are that the Senate is negotiating and the House Democrats are negotiating. We came up with your numbers. We hate those numbers, but we swallowed them.

There is only one thing to do—reject this proposition. Vote “no” on the rule and vote “no” on the ability to bring the rule up. We have a bill here. It is in the House right now. It is the Senate version. It is clean. Send it to the President and before tonight it is all over and people can come back to work tomorrow—tomorrow.

So stop this game playing, this selfishness, this poor loser and this whining and just get on with doing the business you were elected to do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to agree with my friend that folks are not entitled to their own facts. The fact is that the law of the land is the budget number that the Senate is proposing. There is no set of circumstances you can spend a penny more than that. In fact, as all of my colleagues know, beginning on January 1 that number is going to drop another \$19 billion.

To suggest that the Senate is compromising by agreeing to follow the law of the land says a lot about where we are in this town, but it says absolutely nothing about genuine compromise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, if the bills that are on the floor today pass unanimously—which they won't—here is what happens next. They go to the Senate, the Senate maybe takes them

up, maybe doesn't take them up, passes them, maybe doesn't pass them, and this whole charade continues.

If you want to get the veterans programs funded today, if you want to get the programs for the parks funded today, if you want to get the NIH funded today, there is a way to do it. It is to take up the bill that the Senate has passed, that the President says he will sign, that at least 14 Members of the majority have said publicly they will vote for—I think it is many, many more than that—put it on the floor and take a vote. That is the way to do this. That bill would go directly to the desk of the President of the United States. Before the day is over the government would be funded.

If that is what you really want to do, you would put that bill on the floor, and we would take a vote on it. I would just ask any Member of the majority to tell us why we can't do that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a new Member of this body, but a growing leader in this body.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, just hours after the President and Senate Democrats refused to compromise, causing our government to shut down, ObamaCare exchanges opened for business. Folks across the aisle said yesterday was a day to celebrate, but it is clear that is simply not the case.

The President likened the ObamaCare rollout to a new Apple product. But the difference is that the American people are not forced to buy iPods, and this is not just about buying a new technological gadget, but something extremely important and personal—your health care.

As soon as the ObamaCare exchanges became available online, there were immediate problems and glitches. The administration had to know millions of Americans would be trying to get on the site yesterday, and yet they still didn't account for the traffic.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the administration forced an individual mandate on the American people—they haven't even adequately prepared for it. The arrogance of this law is becoming more and more apparent. The administration is more concerned about getting ObamaCare off the ground than whether or not it actually works.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last night, the GOP followed through with their threat to shut down the government if they didn't get what they lacked the votes to obtain—the destruction of health care reform. It was staggeringly irresponsible, but the leadership was not willing to buck their Tea Party membership and meet even the most basic obligation of governance—to keep the lights on.

I can only hope that this shutdown is short-lived and we pass a basic funding bill soon. A small group of Members cannot be allowed to burn the House down when they don't get their way. We simply cannot continue to engage in these "my way or the highway" exercises every couple of months.

The Affordable Care Act was passed by Congress, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court. Democrats are willing to entertain improvements to this landmark law, but we are not seeking to undermine or destroy it.

The worst thing about this latest manmade crisis: our economy might have fully recovered long before now if Congress would just get out of the way. Let us take up the Senate bill—a clean bill—to keep the government running and end this latest manmade disaster.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. All we need is less than 20 Republicans and we can open up the government today. You will have the Democrats voting to open up the government. Just give us 20 Republican votes and we can open it today.

Instead, because of the Ted Cruz Tea Party faction within your caucus that somehow has managed to intimidate the Republican leadership, you are willing to bring this country to its knees—to furlough 800,000 Federal employees, to cause suffering around the country, and to cause billions of dollars in economic damage to our economy.

How can you do this? This is so wrong.

Today, open it, give us 20 Republican votes. Get our country functioning again. Let us do our job. This is an outrageous abdication of responsibility.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say to my friend I know he has a lot of Federal employees in his district, as do I—certainly not as many as he does. I know he speaks from the heart in terms of the struggles that those families are going through.

But I would say to my friend that while that might be his goal, we could have taken a step towards it yesterday and all of your VA employees would have been back and all of your park service employees would have been back and all of your folks who are in the D.C. Government would have been protected.

□ 1445

We could have done it yesterday, and the Democrats defeated it. Now we are bringing it back today, but we could have made a difference yesterday, and we didn't.

I would just say to the gentleman that I know his concern for everyone is

heartfelt, but I wish that he would join me in helping at least someone today. We might get all the way there. I believe that we can, but we have got to get started. These bills today get us started in that direction. Again, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend from Georgia.

The problem is that we are creating, really, a politics of divisiveness here because we are exempting some agencies at the expense of others. Even in the Department of the Interior, we still have 84 percent of Interior Department employees who will be furloughed even when we open up the national parks. The vast majority of Federal employees are without jobs. They may not be as visible to the public, but it doesn't mean they aren't performing essential services. That's the problem—picking and choosing. Tomorrow, we will be back with another agency. That's what we are trying to avoid. We are trying to do it appropriately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds to say that it encourages me that what I hear from my friend is that he doesn't like our proposal because he thinks it's a policy of divisiveness, and he would like to move toward those things that unite us. I happen to feel the same way about these proposals before us.

I think where the Senate is pushing us is a place that divides us, but that these ideas are common-ground ideas that unite us. While we may disagree on that, it does give me great encouragement, as I know it does my constituents back home, that the goal is to find those things that unite us, to focus on those and to move America forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1 minute to a leader from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. RICE), a good friend of mine and a new Member of this body.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker for the minority was complaining of these small continuing resolutions because they pick and choose which groups will get funded. That is our exact problem with putting this Affordable Care Act into place—the President's picking and choosing. We hear it's the law of the land; but, actually, the President is deciding what parts of the law of the land he wants to put in place. He says he is

for the working man, and he says he is for the middle class; but, in fact, he has exempted Big Business, and he has exempted many of his friends in the unions and so forth.

So if this law is so wonderful and if we are going to put it in place and if, as you're saying, we want a whole CR that funds the whole government, let's put the whole thing in place that funds every aspect the law was designed to apply to. Let's put the whole law in effect. If it's the law of the land, let's treat it like the law of the land with no exemptions and no waivers. Let's put it into effect exactly like it's written.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Georgia has any more speakers. If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank my friend. I do not have any speakers remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to vote on the clean Senate continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today. I don't want that to be lost on anybody. This will probably be the only chance in this House that you will get to vote on what everyone has been asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into 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, we found out already this morning in the Rules Committee, admittedly by the chair, that they don't intend to open the government back up. I brought this very same motion today to the Rules Committee. It was defeated 9-4 on a party-line vote.

My hope today lies in all of the people from the other side, my good friends, who have said that, if they had an opportunity, they'd open up the government again. They would put people back to work and stop the terrible pain that we are simply laying on our Federal workers. What we have done is simply punish them. What we have done to medical science cannot be turned off and on like a faucet, as well as what we have done to our security and what we are doing to our intelligence—all of it, Mr. Speaker. We cannot do this multiple choice of what we will save today, and maybe we will do something else next week if we get a bad headline.

This is terribly important, this opportunity. I want to give notice to all of my friends on the other side to stand up for what you said. Today, please put your voting cards where your mouths have been. Vote because you know it is the right thing to do—to get this government back to work.

I will remind everybody that the Senate has not been holding us up here. The Senate sent a clean CR over early. We have simply ignored it, and everything that we have sent back to them has had nothing to do with the running of the government, but has had everything to do with trying to kill health care.

Today, let's get ourselves back on track and get this magnificent government working again. This country of which we are so proud is looking pretty bedraggled right now because we don't know, with this lurch from crisis to crisis, what is going to happen from one day to the next. This is the day, Mr. Speaker. This is the time. This is the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. At that point, we will have our opportunity to vote on the clean CR that does nothing but continues the spending and allows the government to reopen.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from New York for joining me on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is sad for the House that we have come to define a CR as any sort of success whatsoever. Every Member of this body knows that, when we talk about CRs, we are just talking about varying degrees of failure, because there was a better way that the House was obligated to do that we didn't do.

I want to say to my friends again that no one has said this bill won't help. Absolutely, everyone knows this bill will help, but I want to reach out my hand once again, Mr. Speaker, and say what my friend from South Carolina said moments ago: take your pick. I will meet you on your terms. Either let's take these things that we agree on in government, and let's fund them—let's pick and choose those things we agree on, and let's fund them—or let's fund it all, and let's stop the picking and choosing in ObamaCare of what we like. If it's all good, let's fund all of the government, and let's obey all of ObamaCare, giving those waivers to individuals that Big Business got. If it's not good, then let's focus on these things that we unanimously agree are good.

There is a path forward, Mr. Speaker. We can find it together. I believe the rule and the bill we have before us today begin to take us down that path.

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

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 370 OFFERED BY  
Ms. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all and insert the following:

*Resolved*, that immediately upon adoption of this resolution 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, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question

shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in the first section this resolution."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

ber leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. WOODALL. With that, 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 370, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]  
YEAS—227

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kingston
Amash	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Bachus	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Barletta	Fleming	Lance
Barr	Flores	Lankford
Barton	Forbes	Latham
Benishek	Fortenberry	Latta
Bentivolio	Fox	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Black	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Garrett	Lummis
Boustany	Gerlach	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Marino
Bridenstine	Gibson	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	McCauley
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Buchanan	Gosar	McHenry
Bucshon	Gowdy	McKeon
Burgess	Granger	McKinley
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Camp	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	Meadows
Cantor	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Capito	Grimm	Messer
Carter	Guthrie	Mica
Cassidy	Hall	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harper	Miller, Gary
Coble	Harris	Mullin
Coffman	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Noem
Conaway	Holding	Nugent
Cook	Hudson	Nunes
Cotton	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Crawford	Hultgren	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Hunter	Paulsen
Culberson	Hurt	Pearce
Daines	Issa	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins	Petri
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
DeSantis	Jones	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Posey
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Radel
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	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  
Stockman  
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—197

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  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson

## NOT VOTING—7

Herrera Beutler  
Labrador  
Lewis

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  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
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  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Cantor  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

□ 1518

Messrs. BARROW of Georgia and GARCIA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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 yeas 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 228, nays 198, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—228

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Grimm  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs

Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland

Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NAYS—198

Andrews  
Barber  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
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  
Clarke  
King (NY)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod

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

## NOT VOTING—5

Graves (GA)  
Herrera Beutler

Lewis  
McCarthy (NY)  
Rush

□ 1527

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

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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 173, answered "present" 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]  
YEAS—246

Aderholt	Gibbs	Nadler
Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gosar	Noem
Barber	Gowdy	Nunes
Barletta	Granger	Nunnelee
Barr	Grayson	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Olson
Barton	Grimm	Palazzo
Becerra	Guthrie	Pascarell
Bilirakis	Hall	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Perlmutter
Black	Hartzler	Conaway
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Connolly
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Hensarling	Peters (MI)
Boustany	Himes	Petri
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Bridenstine	Huffman	Pitts
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hunter	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hurt	Pompeo
Buchanan	Issa	Posey
Bustos	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Quigley
Calvert	Jones	Rangel
Camp	Jordan	Reichert
Campbell	Kaptur	Ribble
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Roby
Capps	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Carney	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Carter	King (NY)	Rokita
Cassidy	Kingston	Rooney
Chabot	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kuster	Ross
Cleaver	Labrador	Rothfus
Clyburn	LaMalfa	Royce
Coble	Lamborn	Ruiz
Coffman	Lankford	Runyan
Cole	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (NY)	Latta	Sanford
Cook	Loeb sack	Schneider
Cooper	Long	Schock
Courtney	Lowenthal	Schrader
Cramer	Lucas	Schwartz
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Cuellar	Lujan Grisham	Schweikert
Culberson	(NM)	Scott, David
Daines	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sensenbrenner
Davis (CA)	(NM)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lummis	Sessions
DeGette	Maffei	Shea-Porter
Delaney	Marchant	Sherman
DeLauro	Marino	Shimkus
DelBene	Massie	Simpson
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Sinema
DesJarlais	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Doyle	McHenry	Smith (WA)
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Speier
Ellmers	McMorris	Stewart
Esty	Rodgers	Stutzman
Farenthold	McNerney	Takano
Fattah	Meadows	Thornberry
Fleischmann	Meng	Tiberi
Forbes	Messer	Titus
Fortenberry	Mica	Tonko
Foster	Michaud	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Miller (MI)	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
Frelinghuysen	Moran	Wagner
Gabbard	Mullin	Walden
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Walorski
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Walz

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup

Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf

Womack  
Yarmuth  
Yoho  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—173

Amash  
Andrews  
Bass  
Beatty  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Cohen  
Collins (GA)  
Conaway  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Dingell  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Flores  
Foxy  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibson

Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Harris  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (NV)  
Higgins  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huizenga (MI)  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
Meehan  
Meeke  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mulvaney  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod

Nolan  
Nugent  
Pallone  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Rahall  
Reed  
Renacci  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Sewell (AL)  
Shuster  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Turner  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walters  
Welch  
Wittman  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert

Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Grijalva  
Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Lewis

McCarthy (NY)  
Vela  
Roskam  
Rush  
Scalise  
Webster (FL)

□ 1535

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 370, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 71

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SEC. 1. This joint resolution may be cited as the "District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

SEC. 2. (a) The District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading "District of Columbia Funds" for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under "District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses" as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) are provided under the authority and conditions as provided under the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 5. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 6. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 7. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Provide Local Funding for the District of Columbia Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members