

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

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	Graves (GA)	Nolan
Andrews	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Bass	Green, Al	Pallone
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Benish	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Bentivolio	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Pittenger
Brady (PA)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Price (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Radel
Broun (GA)	Higgins	Rahall
Bucshon	Holding	Reed
Burgess	Holt	Renacci
Capuano	Honda	Richmond
Cardenas	Horsford	Rigell
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Roe (TN)
Cartwright	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Castor (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Chaffetz	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Chu	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Cioccilino	Jenkins	Salmon
Clarke	Johnson (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Sanchez, Loretta
Conaway	Keating	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kilmer	Schiff
Costa	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cotton	Kinzinger (IL)	Sewell (AL)
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Shuster
Crowley	Lance	Sires
Cummings	Langevin	Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	Larson (CT)	Smith (MO)
DeFazio	Latham	Stivers
Denham	Lee (CA)	Stockman
DeSantis	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lipinski	Terry
Dingell	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
Duckworth	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Duffy	Lowey	Thompson (PA)
Edwards	Lynch	Tierney
Ellison	Maloney,	Tipton
Engel	Carolyn	Turner
Enyart	Maloney, Sean	Valadao
Eshoo	Matheson	Vargas
Farr	Matsui	Veasey
Fincher	McDermott	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Visclosky
Fleming	McIntyre	Walberg
Flores	Meehan	Waters
Fox	Meeks	Welch
Fudge	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Garamendi	Miller, George	Woodall
Garcia	Moore	Yoder
Gardner	Mulvaney	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Neal	
Gibson	Negrete McLeod	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert	Owens
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Herrera Beutler	Roskam
Hinojosa	Rush
Lewis	Scalise

□ 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

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 71, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I bring before the House today a continuing resolution that's very limited in scope. It simply allows the District of Columbia to spend their locally raised revenues. That's all it does.

I brought this same resolution before the House yesterday, under the suspension of the rules. The vote was 265-163, a majority, but not the two-thirds majority required by the suspension of the rules. So the bill that is back before us today will require a majority for passage.

Quite frankly, I don't understand why so many of our friends on the other side of the aisle voted "no" yesterday, because all it does is allow the District of Columbia to spend their own money. But, be that as it may, that's what happened.

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who represents the District of Columbia, made a very eloquent, very impassioned plea as to why we should pass this continuing resolution. But apparently that didn't convince enough of her Democratic colleagues for it to reach the two-thirds majority. So here we are today.

I think most of the Members recognize that the District of Columbia is unique. It's a unique city among all the cities in our great country. It's called a Federal city. And because of that unique relationship, Congress must appropriate the locally raised funds before they can be spent.

We do that every year, on a routine basis, as part of the Financial Services appropriations bill. We've done that from time to time, and things always seem to work out. But this time, we're back with the same resolution that we had yesterday.

The way it works is simply this: the District of Columbia has passed the 2014 budget. The mayor makes his proposal, the city council receives the proposal, it considers the budget, and this year it has approved the budget. There's an independent chief financial officer that has certified the budget. It's balanced. And there we are.

So now we're faced with a situation, unless Congress appropriates the money, they're not able to spend the money.

I don't think that, after they passed their budget, that just because the United States Congress is arguing back and forth between the House and the Senate as to how we should fund the government, I don't think that should stop the District of Columbia, this unique city, from spending the money that they've raised locally.

For instance, you have people that work for the District of Columbia, like any other city. You have schoolteachers that go to work every day, and they teach kids. You've got policemen that get up every day, that work night shifts, day shifts, to make sure that the streets in the District of Columbia are safe.

You've got firemen that go to work every day. They're there on call in case there's an emergency. Other first responders, they're working every day.

People keep the streets clean. They pick up the garbage. People go to work as librarians, and they do the work to make sure that people have access to reading material.

Now, there's no reason in the world why these people should be furloughed or not paid simply because Congress can't get its act together as to how to fund the Federal Government. That doesn't make any sense.

And if you live in the District of Columbia, you shouldn't have your quality of life degraded because of what goes on in Congress. You ought to have the police and fire protection. You have all the services that other cities have. You ought to have those.

Despite the fact that we tried to get together, the House and the Senate, to figure out a way to keep our government running, to keep it open, we haven't been able to do that. And so we shouldn't penalize the people in the District of Columbia for that.

So this simple resolution takes care of that. It authorizes, it appropriates the money, under the law, that needs to be spent on the local level by the locally raised funds. That's what it does.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

For the people watching at home, this debate may seem familiar, and it is, because we just considered this same bill yesterday. Unfortunately, nothing has changed in the past 24 hours, so I continue to oppose this bill.

Our Nation still finds itself in the midst of a completely unnecessary government shutdown caused by the Republican Party. And we all know the solution—passing the Senate version of the continuing resolution, which would reopen our Nation's government totally for everyone.

Doing anything less than a full CR is simply a political ploy. It is a false process designed, strangely enough, by a member of the other body to deflect attention from the harm that the shutdown is causing.

Now, for 23 years that I've been in Congress, I've been, at times, begging Members of the other side of the aisle to help the District of Columbia. I've spent years getting rid of riders that they imposed on the District of Columbia.

All the things that you just heard today from the chairman of the committee, who I have a lot of respect for—

and I know the public listens to this kind of debate and then says, but they say they respect each other. We do. We care for each other.

□ 1545

But a lot of this is just simply politics. All of the things that he just said are things that for 23 years his party refused to do for the District of Columbia. This is only to make it look good now so they can find yet another way to go after ObamaCare.

In fact, this bill continues that meddling by continuing a harmful and controversial rider that prevents the District of Columbia from spending its own funds on abortion services. No other State in the Nation has such a restriction.

Although I support D.C. being able to spend its own money, I do not understand why this bill is not being considered as part of the full Financial Services appropriations bill.

Many agencies under our jurisdiction have suffered, or will suffer, devastating problems as a result of the Republican Federal Government shutdown. Let me recap briefly some of the problems that I mentioned yesterday.

The Republican shutdown has required the Small Business Administration, our committee, to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. The agency has had to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas.

The Federal defenders currently have enough money to continue operations for just a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they will be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is going down from 540 employees to only 22, putting all of the American people at risk.

The IRS, a favorite target of the other side, has been forced to lay off most of their workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, to examine questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings. The IRS brings the vast majority of our Nation's revenue, and the Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

All of these agencies need and deserve a continuing resolution so they can perform the many functions of government that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses.

Let me close by saying that I have a lot of respect for the Members on the other side, but you've been caught up by a small group in your party and one person in the other body who is running this show and telling you that this shutdown has to go down for as long as it can—until the public tells you not to do it any longer. And they will do that soon.

And so rather than now open up the government totally by approving a proper resolution, you're going to start nitpicking little pieces—not necessarily because you have now developed this great love for the District of Columbia, but because you know that it can divide people on this side and on your side. And division is what is best for this situation right now for a lot of folks on your side.

I hope that we can see this for what it is—which is a sham, a trick, and more of the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just find it ironic that the other side always likes to complain that Republicans meddle too much in the affairs of the District of Columbia. And yet yesterday, so many of them voted not to even let the District of Columbia access their own local funds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Not allowing them to use their local funds is something that has been said on that side many, many, many times.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for the time.

One of my colleagues yesterday said, You've seen it worse, haven't you? Well, I've only been here 57 years, and I never have.

I've never seen such small-minded, miserable behavior in this House of Representatives and such a disregard of our responsibilities to the people. We're supposed to solve the problems of the people. We're supposed to deal with the concerns they have. We're supposed to see to it that the Nation prospers. None of that is being done. The American people could get better government out of the monkey island in the local zoo than we're giving them today.

I'm embarrassed and I'm humiliated. I certainly hope that my colleagues on both sides—especially on the Republican side—are embarrassed.

This is going to cost us huge amounts of money. It's going to waste money in an amount which will exceed that which we saw wasted during the last time the Republicans shut the House down. They shut it down in 1995 and 1996. In today's dollars, it cost \$2 billion, according to the Office of Management and Budget. This shutdown is no different. It's going to end up not only costing money, but hurting the economy, hurting jobs, and hurting the American recovery.

During the last shutdown, we lost huge amounts of revenue through the IRS, EPA, and other agencies. Passport applications were not processed, which meant even more revenue was lost. National parks, battlefields, and monuments were closed.

Now we're going to pass a budget with hit-and-miss legislation and the subjugate people are going to think that in some quaint way we're solving the Nation's problems.

We are called the Congress. That means coming together. I see no coming together here. I see a waste of time, a waste of money, and a behavior of a bunch of people who look small, petulant, and small-minded.

I'm embarrassed. I hope my colleagues are embarrassed. And the American people are not only embarrassed; they're being hurt by the shameless, miserable behavior that we're demonstrating today in this Chamber and on the television to the Nation.

Let's get down to business. Let's pass a continuing resolution. Let's do our responsibilities. Let's behave as a Congress of the United States, not an aggregation of petulant children.

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

I still don't understand why it's so hard for my friends on the other side to vote in favor of allowing the District of Columbia to spend their own locally raised funds.

Back in 1996, as they may recall, there was a shutdown of the government; and there was a standalone provision, pretty much just like this, and it was signed into law by the President of the United States. It was Bill Clinton, a Democrat.

I just don't understand why it's so hard for Democrats to accept that today.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, DARRELL ISSA, the distinguished chairman of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I'm the gentleman, the colleague, that walked up to Mr. DINGELL and asked him if he'd ever seen it this bad before. And I'm sorry to hear that he did. Because in his 57 years, he covered 57 of my 59 years of life. So I hope I'm not the petulant child when I say that, quite frankly, the disregard over the District of Columbia is on his side of the aisle.

It's not an appropriations bill. It's not really part of the CR.

The truth is the District of Columbia pulls quarters out of meters every day, and they're not going to be allowed to spend that. They receive revenues from building permits, but they're not going to be able to use that money to keep the people that look at those building permits employed.

They receive money from the various services they do, including, obviously, making sure that the property in the District of Columbia is protected. And that creates the property value on which we who own property in the District of Columbia—and I am among them—pay our taxes.

Now, the Democrats love to talk about taxation without representation.

Well, I'm here today to say, Where is ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON's representation? Give her her due.

They're being taxed locally. Those moneys will build up locally. And you're saying they can't spend it?

There's no question in your mind that the right thing to do is to pass a CR on everything cleanly. That's good. But until we pass a CR which would include some funds for the District of Columbia, allowing them to have what every single Member on both sides of the aisle has going on in every single city in their districts, it's just fairness.

Do not treat the District of Columbia greater than what it is—it is the Federal city—but for goodness sake, it's a city. It should have the right to spend its own money.

Yesterday, I was pleased to see some 34 Democrats cross former Speaker PELOSI's orders and edicts to vote "no" on everything and vote with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. I just hope today that people will search their souls and ask the question, Don't you really want to vote "yes"?

Isn't this a time in which you show your independence and do the right thing for the District of Columbia and let them spend their own money? Or will you go home to the city you live in tonight or this weekend, knowing that they're spending the money that they collect locally and you're denying the District of Columbia the ability to spend the money it collects locally?

Our committee passed unanimously a bill to make that permanent. It wasn't an appropriations bill. It was a statutory change to the Home Rule Act. I only ask that you realize that we were on a trajectory toward providing an enhancement in home rule that would cover this. I want that bill brought up as soon as possible, but this is the equivalent for this crisis period.

I saw my friend ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON almost in tears yesterday because she couldn't believe her own party wouldn't support her. Don't do that today.

Support the Delegate from the District of Columbia and support the people of the District of Columbia in their ability to spend their own money, or you will be damning them to taxation without representation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

Just two quick points. First of all, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the bill yesterday passed on a voice vote, and then he interrupted the Speaker and asked for a vote, which then led to a recorded vote.

Secondly, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague and ranking

member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown. We can't cherry-pick our way through funding the government. Of course we support funding for the District of Columbia; but we also support funding for 800,000 Americans who are being furloughed, restoring SBA loans to help small businesses grow, and restarting Head Start centers.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, it really pains me that Republicans have brought up this cynical bill yet again today. Funding one budget at a time is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities to keep the government running or growing our economy.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It isn't designed to solve problems. It is designed only to help Republicans shift blame for the most evident results of their shutdown. It would not be before us if Republicans had not been so irresponsible throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown.

This bill is wasting critical time that should be spent passing the Senate-passed compromise bill that we know the President would sign to end the shutdown for all of government. This bill is irresponsible.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes; the gentleman from New York has 5½ minutes.

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

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Ranking SERRANO, and ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution, so we can go to conference on a real budget.

Let's end this Republican government shutdown that is already harming economic recovery and has already slowed growth by a third of 1 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now consider the Senate-passed clean continuing resolution so that the Department of Homeland Se-

curity can pay the frontline personnel that put their lives on the line every day and secure our country's critical infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59 and stop this silly game-playing, multiple-choice government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution that will end the outrageous Republican shutdown which threatens the recovery of our housing sector, furloughs more than 3,000 aviation safety inspectors, and is reckless to our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize for proper unanimous consent requests, but not for debate.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is slowing the economic growth and threatening to derail our economy at a time when we can least afford it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, which is the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is delaying student loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

The gentleman from New York will be charged.

Mr. SERRANO. Charged with what?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time will be deleted.

Mr. SERRANO. Oh, just checking what I was being charged with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Understandable.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to end this reckless Republican-orchestrated shutdown. It is time for the House Republican leadership to stop with the gimmicks and step up with a legitimate effort to re-open the government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

The gentleman from New York's time will be charged.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The Chair would like to clarify.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is covered by the Speaker's guidelines for recognition. Embellishments constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who is yielded for that purpose.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the Members cannot state why we should end this charade?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members can state their unanimous consent request but cannot engage in debate thereon.

The gentlewoman can continue.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is taking away nutritious foods from young children and mothers in the WIC program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank my colleague from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and ask that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown that is hurting public safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from New York control at this point in time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for a unanimous consent request.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent statement.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for a unanimous consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, before I state my unanimous consent request, may I ask a point of information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. My inquiry is: Who is the Speaker of this House? Is it JOHN BOEHNER or is it TED CRUZ?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, to go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown that is adding to the veterans' disability backlog.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget that will end this Republican government shutdown that is delaying home loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this irresponsible shutdown of the United States Government and restore the people's government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining public health by preventing the CDC from working on its annual flu vaccine or detecting disease outbreaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, to help the hundreds of workers at West Point and the Stewart Air National Guard base, we bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and stop this reckless Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his support during his service in Congress for the District of Columbia.

Notwithstanding the way the D.C. budget is coming to the floor this year, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues for help. And I think each and every last one of you would be saying exactly what I'm saying if your own district was on the line.

I'm speaking for 618,000 innocent bystanders to this Federal food fight. They have raised \$8 billion—more than four States—but they are not able to spend a dime of it as I speak because this Congress hasn't done its work, and they have no authority to spend their own local funds. They are living off of contingency funds that are fast running out. You are holding their local funds as if it were your money. It's our money.

The strategy of each side seems to deepen the city's crisis. The Republicans cherry-pick, but the health care bill is still on the table. The Democrats see that the public is on its side, so they don't have any incentive to move. The goals of each side are known, but neither has an exit strategy, and it is the District of Columbia that is hurting.

If the game plan is to keep this going until the debt ceiling in the middle of the month, please don't. Each day without an agreement is punishing millions of Americans and every single D.C. resident. Freeing D.C. leaves every bit of the strategy of each side in place because all the Federal funds are there.

The sin was requiring the local budget to come here in the first place. Don't compound that sin by simply throwing

D.C. into the pile with Federal appropriations and pretending as if they were the same.

You have no right to pull a defenseless city into this Federal boxing match. You have no right to use the good name of the people of the District of Columbia alongside appropriations—no matter how wonderful they are. Those appropriations depend upon your funding. The \$8 billion is our funding.

You have no right to leave our local budget sticking up like a sore thumb among the Federal appropriations. It's our money, not yours. Do not drive the Nation's Capital into crisis. Pass this bill. Free D.C. Please free the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from New York how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. SERRANO. We have two.

Mr. CRENSHAW. We don't have any additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm new to Congress, and I knew when I was elected last year that I was coming to a place where I would be in the minority and where it was a highly partisan environment.

I was elected to replace a gentleman—my uncle—who served in this body for 36 years. He sat alongside Mr. DINGELL, whom we heard from earlier. I did not believe, though, that I was elected to a body where the majority would impose its will and use the rules to prevent a vote on the floor of the House for action that would open government—that the President supports, that the Senate has already adopted, and that Democrats and Republicans in this body have both acknowledged would pass if it were brought to a vote here on the floor of the House.

We know how we can get D.C. and the whole rest of the government open again. It's simply to do what the will of this body would have us do if we were only allowed a vote. And that is to bring the Senate CR to the floor of the House. We will pass it; we will get government open again; and then we can go to conference on the rest of the budget.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for a unanimous consent statement.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

In order to end these childish games and put our government back to work

for the American people, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wish that in the 23 years I've been fighting on behalf of the District of Columbia I had heard so much love from the other side for the District of Columbia.

□ 1615

This is a game, this is a ploy. It is such a ploy that even when they had an opportunity to get by under the screen yesterday, they didn't do it.

Let me just end briefly by repeating this. There was a vote call on the floor. No one from this side called for a vote. The Speaker said that the bill had passed. Someone—they are denying now who it was—from that side called for a vote.

We had a vote on this bill yesterday which resulted in what it resulted in because that side called for a vote. Why? Because they wanted to show a vote on the board. They wanted to make this a show, a trick, a ploy, and a sham. They didn't want that bill to really pass, and I am not sure they want the bill to pass today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There has been a lot of talk about political games. To watch people parade up and down and make speeches under the guise of a unanimous consent, I am not sure how serious that is. I am not sure how much that complies with the rules of the House. But be that as it may.

You have folks on the other side that say they really believe the District of Columbia ought to be able to spend its own money, but yet they vote "no" on the authorization to do that.

We are in the second day of a shutdown in the Federal Government. A lot of people are upset. I am upset, I am disappointed, because it doesn't have to be this way.

On three separate occasions, this House sent to the Senate a continuing resolution that would have kept the government open, kept the government running—three times. Yet three times the Democratic-controlled Senate said no—not once, not twice, but three times.

Then this House sent to the Senate a continuing resolution that also said: let's appoint a conference committee. That is a group of individuals from the House and a group of individuals from the Senate. They would sit down and they would try to resolve these differences to try to keep the government open. Because how are you going to solve a problem unless you sit down—that is what we call a conference committee—and then you try to move for-

ward? But the Senate once again said no.

Now, we all know that we have conference committees from time to time. The gentleman from New York and I—he is the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee of Appropriations. We have jurisdiction over lots of different agencies—the IRS, the Department of Treasury, the Federal Court system, the Supreme Court, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission.

We drafted a spending bill this year. I assumed the Senate was working on their own spending bill somewhere, somehow, some way. Usually, when it all ends up there is a conference committee and you try to work out your differences.

For instance, we oversee the IRS. Members might remember the scandal that took place. As we were appropriating money to the IRS, we found out that they had been singling out individuals and groups of individuals based on their political philosophy and they had intimidated them, they bullied them, and it held them up. We thought that was wrong. So when we drafted our appropriations bill we didn't give the IRS all the money they asked for.

But the Senate might have done something different. If that was the case, then we would come together and have a conference committee, and we would talk about that.

That is all we are saying here. Why don't we sit down and have a conference committee about how we are going to fund the Federal Government? That is the way to get started, that is the way to figure out a final way, that is a way to stop this shutdown.

Again, we don't have to be here. It is disappointing. I wish we could move ahead. But at least—at least—let's pass this continuing resolution. Let's say to the District of Columbia we have met our legal responsibility and we have appropriated their own local funds so they can move on with their lives. Let's don't punish the citizens of the District of Columbia, let's don't punish the people that work in the District of Columbia to try to keep the city open, keep it running, keep it safe, keep it clean. Let's pass this resolution and move ahead.

With that, I urge the adoption of this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 370, the previous question is ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO TAKE FROM THE SPEAKER'S TABLE H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 59 with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, to recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, that motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the standing rules of the House, particularly standing rule XXII, clause 4, which reads:

When the stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments, a motion to dispose of any amendment shall be privileged.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Haven't we now reached that state of disagreement as defined by rule XXII, clause 4?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, but under section 2 of House Resolution 368, the motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, you started by saying the gentleman is correct. Did you mean that I am correct in saying that the standing House rule XXII, clause 4 that says that the "stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments," that that would be applicable under the standing rule if the standing rule was in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct about the standing rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, what is it that changed the normal rules of the House with respect to the ability of any Member, including myself or any Member on the other side, to offer a resolution calling up the CR passed by the Senate and asked that it be sent to the White House immediately? Why is that standing rule of the House not in operation right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is operating under the terms of House Resolution 368, which provides that the motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.