

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. 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. 104. 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. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of the Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.J. Res. 75, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of H.J. Res. 75, which would continue funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or commonly known as the WIC program.

The fiscal year 2013 Agriculture appropriations bill provided sufficient funding, even after sequestration, totaling \$6.5 billion, to ensure that all participants receive both nutritious food and the nutrition services that are necessary for their health and their well-being.

Before the United States Department of Agriculture completely shut down its Web site, information could be found on their Web site stating that short-term funding was available for WIC through the contingency reserve fund, carryover funds, and other available resources.

While some States have indicated they have sufficient funds to at least work several more weeks, other States are not so fortunate. Many of us have seen headlines, perhaps received phone calls into our offices from constituents who have reported that their appointment at their local WIC clinic has been canceled or that clinics are being closed. Numerous times we have heard our colleagues across the aisle mention that WIC cannot continue without an appropriation for fiscal year 2014, and this will leave millions of women, infants, and children without proper nutrition.

Now is a chance, Madam Speaker, for my colleagues to join us in keeping this important program fully functioning and operational. By passing the resolution that we have on the floor this afternoon, we will help 8.7 million low-income women, infants, and children who are nutritionally at risk to continue to receive the nutrition they need. This resolution will keep WIC clinics across the Nation open. No more appointments will have to be canceled.

I believe that every Member of this House of Representatives believes that WIC participants need and should get the participation they need, and I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution, that we supply ade-

quate nutrition for women, infants, and children as we move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this piecemeal approach of funding our government. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

The bill dealing with all of those issues is on the House floor. We did our job, as the chairman so eloquently spoke about. The committee fulfilled its commitment to review the whole budget. We passed H.R. 2410 out of committee and even adopted a rule to bring it to the floor in June, but we didn't move the bill because the timing with the now-expired farm bill wanted to hold everything off.

I'm just wondering, Madam Speaker, when is the House going to announce its conferees on the farm bill? The Senate has done it not once, but twice. If we had a conference, we could be bringing up the full bill and not just this piecemeal—let's take a little bit of this that we like and that that we like and do what I call this menu of choice, which, if you're not on that menu, everything is out.

Nobody can challenge my support on WIC. I mean, I am a returning Peace Corps volunteer. If there's anybody that got training on the need for feeding women, infants, and children in this Congress, it's my experience in living in a poor barrio in South America.

But this does nothing for the 48 million people who currently need food stamps, what we call the SNAP program. This does nothing for the rest of the kids and the family who may be hungry, going to school and can't get access to school lunch. This does nothing to open the door for Federal workers who help people in rural agriculture to produce the food. This bill does nothing to provide a remedy for rural areas like Colorado and California, who were just ravaged by floods and fires, to do the post-op cleanup and restoration to prevent floods from coming this winter. This does nothing for the farm service agency loan borrowers to help those that are needing loans to put their livestock or their grain or other commodities into the program that is going to be feeding the women, infants, and children. So just one little piece that they carve out and suggest that: Oh, Congress, do this.

I want you all to listen to this. Since I've been here since 1993, we've passed 111 CRs. Not one of them had this battle, had this conditionality, had this shutdown of government—none of them. Why now? What's different? You want to take away the President's health care bill. That was enacted 3½ years ago. You passed a CR the year it was adopted. You passed a CR after it was adopted. You passed a CR after that. What is it?

Let's stop being so mean and so broken about the ability to keep our government open.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, Chairman ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of H.J. Res. 75. This bill ensures that the nearly 8.7 million women, infants, and children who rely on the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children will continue to receive critical nutrition assistance without interruption.

□ 1645

This bill provides funding for WIC at the fiscal year 2013 post-sequester rate of \$6.5 billion until December 15, or until we can enact full-year appropriations legislation. That is the ultimate goal of this bill, Madam Speaker, to move us closer to ending this government shutdown by providing regular appropriations for all government programs. To achieve that, we've got to have an adult conversation about what this might entail and how we can get there.

And I've got a great suggestion, Madam Speaker. Monday night, the House passed an amendment to the CR over to the Senate and asked for a conference with the Senate. Then the Speaker named House conferees.

Now the normal traditions of this body, as all of us know, is that when the House and the Senate pass differing versions of the same bill, how do we resolve the difference? Well, we appoint conferees. We have some House Members and some Senate Members that are selected by their respective leaders. And they go up, and they argue and debate and amend. And they come up with an agreement that they then bring back to each body for approval, and that becomes the law.

That procedure is in play right now. I mean, the House has appointed conferees. We've got a table arranged downstairs for the Senators to join us in resolving the shutdown. And what does the Senate do? What do we hear from the Senate? A big loud snore, that they're not willing to come to the table and talk. Just talk. We may not be able to agree. But we can talk and try to work it out for the American people.

And as we work this out, we've got to be sure that our most vulnerable citizens don't fall victim to politics. This bill will take care of those who count on WIC to meet their nutritional needs—our women, our infants, our children. Because this language was essentially included in my original initial clean continuing resolution, I endorse it today. This House, I think, should support it today.

But our colleagues in the Senate should also support it. This would be the seventh bill we've sent them to help reopen the Federal Government in the last 3 days. The seventh bill. We've heard nothing from them. Altogether,

these bills provide nearly a third of the discretionary funding that's needed to operate the entire Federal Government. So in the last 3 days, we've passed bills to fund a third of the government.

The Senate keeps demanding from us, and yet they won't vote on these bills that would be a part of that clean CR. The math just doesn't add up, Madam Speaker.

Though this piecemeal funding approach is not my preferred mechanism to move forward, it does move us incrementally forward. I would rather we fund the government with regular appropriations bills, so-called regular order.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the chairman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. This House passed four of those regular bills this year. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol passed none. For all of their talk on the other side of the Capitol about returning to regular order, it seems the Senate has made very little action to achieve that goal. We're in this mess today in part because of that. But passing this bill will help us get out of it.

So I urge my colleagues to support an end to this shutdown with this WIC program, support this bill, and pass it today.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

WIC services are vital to new mothers and their children, and Democrats have long been strong supporters. In fact, it is puzzling to me that Republicans today claim to be so supportive of WIC when, just 4 months ago, they proposed to deprive over 200,000 women and infants WIC benefits.

Funding one budget item at a time, even one as important as the WIC program, does nothing to help children get immunizations or help working families find child care. Republicans are just disconnected from reality.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. Madam Speaker, as my friends know very well, we could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill, which includes the funding levels that Republicans wrote, the funding levels of the Republicans. That was the negotiation. That was the discussion. The Democrats agreed to the Republican funding levels. And that would be signed by the President.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman from New York an additional 20 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. If you really care about the mothers and infants who

benefit from this program, you should vote "no" on this bill and demand that the Republican leadership allow the House to vote on the Senate bill to immediately end this reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), one of the members of our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 75, the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

This bill would continue funding until December for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, commonly referred to as WIC. Across the country, over 8.9 million moms and kids under the age of 5 are living near or below the poverty line and depend on supplemental vouchers by the WIC program to purchase healthy food.

The WIC program is especially important to my constituents in the Central Valley of California. My district suffers from 14 percent unemployment. That's almost double the national average. Some regions of my district are suffering from more than 30 percent unemployment, making it nearly impossible for many mothers to find work, despite their best efforts, so that they may provide for their families.

Congress must put aside partisan politics and come together, working across party lines to pass this critical legislation so that mothers in California's Central Valley and across the entire country can continue to feed their children.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the congressman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), ranking member of the Education & the Workforce Committee.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, Congress should reopen the Federal Government in its entirety and not continue to hold the Federal Government and the American people hostage. The fact is, by closing the Federal Government, Republicans in the House are jeopardizing critical services for mothers and their children. They should have realized this when they shut down the entire Federal Government.

It is not enough just to restore one set of services for women, infants, and children, like the WIC program, but not to fund food stamps or income assistance or housing vouchers, for example, which the same mothers and children rely on to hold their families together. This is literally taking food out of the mouths of children.

Republicans are taking a lot of heat for closing down the government, so they want to open up one part or another to relieve the pressure under

them. But this doesn't help these families. This doesn't help these families because they're cutting other resources and services to these families.

Republicans should allow the House to vote on a bill to open up the whole Federal Government, and then we can sit down and talk about what the budget will look like for the rest of the year.

They should stop trying to kill the new health care law that will help some of these very same families that depend upon WIC. And they should stop picking winners and losers based upon the political realities out there that the American public is getting angrier and angrier at how they're treating the recipients of Federal assistance in this country today.

I urge people to vote against this legislation.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very, very strong support of the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

You know, much of the controversy that's been surrounding this government shutdown has really been focused on ObamaCare. We keep talking about ObamaCare, et cetera. But this bill that we are considering right now has absolutely nothing to do with ObamaCare. Nothing. The only thing at issue in this bill is will we help provide supplemental nutrition programs for American mothers, their babies, and their children, period. That is the issue before us today.

Now I know that many of my friends on the other side, Madam Speaker, are going to say that they oppose this legislation because they need to have an entire government funding bill or nothing at all. And I would just note, when they say that each and every time, they then accuse us of being absolutists. But they will not accept anything, except an entire government funding bill. I also know that many on the other side of the aisle will look to their hearts and will support this bill. And we will pass this bill with very strong bipartisan support.

I certainly hope that the leaders in the Senate will look as well at the very broad bipartisan support that we will have for this bill and that they will take it to heart as well and take it up.

Madam Speaker, more than half the babies that are born in my great State of Michigan are enrolled in the WIC program, and currently, the State of Michigan is only able to sustain this program for the next few weeks.

I would ask my colleagues, again, to look to your heart, look to your heart. We're not talking about defunding ObamaCare or anything like that. We are talking about women and their

children and their babies. I would hope that we can join together today across the aisle, pass this bill, and see to it that mothers and infants and children in Michigan and all across America get the support that they need.

Mr. FARR. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the former ranking member of the Ag Appropriations Committee and now the ranking member of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this cruel political game the majority is playing this afternoon. Since they took office, this Republican majority has repeatedly tried to slash the women, infants, and children feeding program—2011, 2012, 2013.

I sit on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. This past summer, on a party-line vote, the Republican members on the committee who have just gotten up to speak to you voted to slash the WIC program and take nutritious food from over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants. I introduced an amendment to restore this critical funding, and the Republican majority shut it down.

When it mattered, when we all voted, the Republican majority cut this funding. And now they're trying to use low-income families for a political message. This is disingenuous, this is duplicitous, and it is shameful.

Last month, on a party-line vote, they took food stamps from over 4 million low-income families, seniors, veterans, and children.

□ 1700

Are we meant to believe that today they have come to Jesus?

Or is it just politics?

I have strongly supported the Women, Infants and Children feeding program my entire career; and when I served as chair of the Ag Appropriations Subcommittee, the Democrats funded WIC at record levels, expanded it as the need arose during a recession.

We are talking about people's lives. This majority chose to shut the government down, and families all across this country are being affected. Furloughed workers, small businesses, and families cannot get loans. Biomedical and scientific research has stopped.

Food safety, food banks, flu tracking, Federal economic reports, immunizations—they have been stopped because of what the Republican majority is doing here.

The gamesmanship is heartless; it's offensive. The government has been shut down now for 4 days.

Do not use hungry families as political pawns. It's time to stop these bills, fund the government, reopen it. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

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. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I've got to tell you, this is remarkable. I hear a passionate speech from the gentlelady from Connecticut, and I hear my friends across the aisle applauding?

We're here to provide funding for 9 million women and children because we're here to provide funding for people who are in need of help and aid. And when we're here to do the work of the people, that you applaud and say, no, I don't want that money to go to them? That's wrong.

We may not agree on a lot of things, but there are things that we agree on, and this is one of them. And to applaud and say that we don't want to provide this funding for women and children?

I have six kids of my own. There are people in need in my community. And for my friends to say no to that and applaud a speech saying do not vote to help our women and children in America, that's wrong.

Listen, we have a shutdown right now. Why?

Everyone in this Chamber is in ObamaCare. In America, we are in ObamaCare. All we've asked for is that Barack Obama and the administration join America and this institution in ObamaCare. That's what we've asked for.

We know that Big Business and the lobbyists came to Washington, D.C., and they said, give us a 1-year exemption from the tax. Give us an exemption. And Mr. President, he said, okay, Big Business, I'll give it to you.

All we've said is, Mr. President, treat the individuals in America the same way you're treating Big Business—equality, fairness. If it's good for the American people, if it's good for this institution, it is good for Mr. CARNEY and President Barack Obama and their administration.

Let's all join this together. Let's hold hands. Let's all join ObamaCare, but let's not treat one group of people differently than the rest of us.

Join us, Mr. President.

Let's open up this government. Let's bring the President in, and let's treat the individuals the same as the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, we've passed 111 CRs without any of this rancor. There are no excuses. They have all been clean.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to yet another disingenuous legislative charade by my Republican colleagues to appear

as if they are doing something about their unnecessary government shutdown.

The fact is, Republicans can open the government today by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Instead, Republicans are targeting the WIC program to try and fool the American people into believing they are concerned about the painful effects of their government shutdown.

The National WIC Association sees through this charade and is urging Members of Congress to oppose the bill, calling it “a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers, and young children as political pawns for political ends.”

The NWA also stated it has sufficient operating funds through October and “will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policymakers.”

I could not agree more. I urge my colleagues to heed their words and vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for the time.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, I introduced legislation that would ensure the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program remains funded during a government shutdown. Today, I’m very grateful to my colleagues for swift action to fund this important program.

In Arkansas, WIC benefits 42,000 kids, 24,000 infants, and 2,000 moms. Fortunately, the Arkansas Department of Health reached an agreement earlier this week with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to fund the WIC program, though only on a week-to-week basis.

Moms and kids shouldn’t suffer because Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their special perks and political allies, because that is what has happened here, Madam Speaker.

The House of Representatives, earlier this week, passed a continuing resolution that would fund the government, to include funding, in part, for ObamaCare; and we asked that the Senate Democrats only accept two simple principles: that the White House and Congress follow the same ObamaCare rules as the rest of America and that if Barack Obama is going to give big businesses a 1-year break from ObamaCare, then families and workers should get the same 1-year break.

But Senate Democrats refused to fund the government with those simple terms, the terms that Congress should follow the laws they impose on the American people, and that workers and family should get the same breaks as businesses.

Now, I know there’s many important pieces of legislation in front of the Senate today. For instance, they ear-

lier passed a resolution calling next week National Chess Week. Now, that’s obviously an urgent matter for this country. But women and kids in need shouldn’t be political pawns in the Senate’s game.

So I say to the Senate, let’s put aside partisanship and pass this legislation for the kids, just as we did earlier this week for the troops.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Berkeley, California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first I rise in strong opposition to this bill, but I just have to say what nerve the Republicans have to bring this bill to the floor.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have witnessed Republicans vote over and over again to cut funding for the Women, Infants and Children’s program. In the past year alone, they have cut \$500 million, which cuts, in my district alone, 21,000 participants. But let me tell you, they have refused in committee to listen, and they have insisted on these massive cuts.

Now, today, they are pretending, pretending that they care about the WIC program with this cynical ploy. It is simply outrageous to play politics with pregnant women and their children. What nerve.

Republicans are now trying to pretend that they want to reopen government that they shut down, using our most vulnerable as pawns. It is hard to believe what I’m hearing today from Republicans about their support for nutrition assistance for women and children, when, in the Appropriations Committee, they say and they vote just the opposite.

How hypocritical can they get? Americans are not fooled. They want the government, the entire government, open.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. They want us to shut down the shutdown that the Tea Party extremists shamefully created. We can reopen the government today, right now, on a bipartisan basis, if Republicans would allow a vote on the bill that would reopen the government.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this shameful bill and insist on a vote to open the entire government up. The American people deserve that.

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a great Rules Committee member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, there are nearly 50 million people who are hungry in this country. Seventeen million of them are children, and because we are still emerging from this difficult economy, hunger is not getting better in America. The only rea-

son why people aren’t starving is because of the essential safety net programs that we have put in place.

For months and months and months and months, we have seen the Republicans in this House try to gut the SNAP program, try to slash funding for WIC, and for school lunches and for Meals on Wheels. And now, today, we’re supposed to believe that they are champions for hungry kids? Today they want us to believe that they care about poor people?

Please. This charade is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It is a cynical ploy that won’t feed a single pregnant mother or won’t provide formula to a single needy infant. It’s going nowhere. It is a stunt. It’s legislating by press release, and it’s shameful.

We should pass a clean CR and reject this woefully inadequate bill and try to end hunger in America. Do not treat poor women and children as political pawns. It is not right, and you know it is not right.

We have an obligation to our most vulnerable neighbors. This fails that test, and it fails that test badly.

Pass a clean CR. Do your job. This is cynical.

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished doctor from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Republican Caucus is standing out here naked, and they keep bringing fig leaves out to cover themselves. This is another fig leaf. It is not intended to do anything.

At the end of the Second World War, it was determined that 43 percent of the people who were drafted were unfit for military service because of nutritional deficiencies. We have, as a public policy, from that point onward, fed people at every level. School lunches, Head Start, WIC program, SNAP—they have all been designed for making this a healthy country.

One of my colleagues says, well, this has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has everything to do with ObamaCare. If you don’t feed kids the proper things, they get sick. Everybody knows that, apparently, except the Republican caucus, Madam Speaker.

The fact is that what we need to do is bring out a clean resolution and reopen the government and feed all the people. This business about picking one group that’s entitled to a little something and leaving some others out is absolutely cynical beyond belief, and it should not happen in this place.

We have the ability to have the most healthy people in the world. We produce food, we ship it everywhere, and yet you hear from my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, how many people are

hungry in this country because they don't have it.

Now, somehow you think a mother's going to sit there, she's got her stuff from the WIC program, right? She's got a kid that's 1 year old and one that's 3 and one that's 7, and she's going to say to the 3 and the 7-year-old, you don't get anything; but I've got a little something for your brother Johnny?

What kind of situation is this? Do you understand what it's like to be deprived in this country?

We can do better than this. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves for this cynical fig leaf.

I urge you to vote "no."

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), another member of our Subcommittee on Agriculture for Appropriations.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his leadership.

To what lengths will the Democrats go in order to protect ObamaCare? They've already denied pay to National Guardsmen and -women and Reservists, ceased lifesaving medical research. They've stopped VA benefits. Yet these measures have passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support.

Now, will they deny food to women, infants and children?

□ 1715

The Democratic colleagues in the House that support this measure, maybe they can talk to their friends and get them to support it as well.

This morning, a key White House official gloated and said, "We're winning." Madam Speaker, this is not a game. Those men and women in the Guard and the Reserves that have been furloughed don't think this is a game. Those awaiting lifesaving medical research and treatment don't think anyone is winning. Those veterans who are waiting in line because they cannot apply for the benefits that they have earned don't think this is a game. And the women, infants, and children that are awaiting food under this bill know this is not a game.

It's time to end this charade. Let's pass this bill and then invite our colleagues in the Senate to come to the table and talk.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, for 111 times we've voted for CRs to feed everybody, not just a few.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin, GWEN MOORE.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, today's consideration of H.J. Res. 75 is a sham, a masquerade, a charade, and it features this relentless drumbeat and parade of pretentious concern for suckling babes and lactating women.

Who do you think you're fooling? You're not fooling the National WIC Association. After all, they have watched the Appropriations Committee of this majority vote out up to half a billion dollars in cuts in the WIC program for these 8.6 million suckling babes.

And what of these lactating women? I breastfed my kids; and I tell you that when you cut \$40 billion out of food stamps, women cannot produce milk because they won't have fresh fruits and vegetables and lean meats.

And what about the siblings of these children—school-age children who are the 210,000 who rely on free lunch that this bill does not address?

Madam Speaker, I would hope that we would not deny 859,000 children, elderly, and disabled. Enough of this carnival. Let's get off this merry-go-round and reject this chicanery.

Mr. ADERHOLT. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the word "hypocrisy" has been thrown around a lot tonight.

I got to Congress about 3 years ago, and my understanding was if you were Republican, you hated women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors.

This week, we have tried to address the problems of women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors. For some reason, our colleagues can't understand that because they say, You are using these people as political pawns.

And the hypocrisy of it is they no longer can stand up when they say that they defend these folks because they have turned their backs on them this week; and instead of helping them, they have turned a cold shoulder.

When I was a child growing up, I used to make a list every night when it came close to Christmas of everything that I wanted, and I'd wake up Christmas morning and I never got everything I wanted, but boy, was I glad for everything I got.

If you're telling me tonight that you are turning your back on the same people that you say only your party defends, that is the height of hypocrisy. It's totally uncalled for on this floor.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished Congresswoman from Florida, KATHY CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of 1,500 of my neighbors in Tampa who have been furloughed at MacDill Air Force Base due to the GOP government shutdown. They were laid off on Tuesday, and they will not be paid.

I'm very proud of my community. The banks, credit unions, and the

Tampa Bay Partnership are coming together to ensure they have bridge loans so the families stay afloat. But it should have not come to this. It is so irresponsible for the GOP to shut down the government because they disagree with a duly enacted law.

I also rise on behalf of small businesses in my community. They are stymied from their expansion plans because the GOP has shut down the Small Business Administration. They want to buy equipment or get working capital, but the Republicans have shut them down.

I rise on behalf of the veterans in my community that were waiting for disability benefits; but due to the shutdown, they're going to have to wait longer.

And I rise on behalf of mothers, infants, and families all across this country in opposition to the Republicans' continued slashing of the basic sustenance that they need to keep going. This is not consistent with our American values.

This dysfunction is irresponsible, and it's causing real pain. I urge my colleagues to set aside the political gimmicks, allow a vote on the bill that will get people back to work, and end this GOP shutdown before it causes greater pain.

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

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

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, enough is enough. We must end this reckless government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59.

We must end this blame game. We must come together and put the American people first. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) a distinguished Member with a great deal of seniority and probably the most knowledgeable Member in the Congress about all the health care issues in this country.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the people that we're talking about here tonight in this debate are people who work very hard and have a couple of children, usually, and need some help with their nutrition when they're pregnant, when their children are very young. Those folks have another problem, too. It's lack of health insurance.

A lot of them have worked their whole lives. They have worked for a

small business. They made just a little bit too much money for Medicaid, but not nearly enough to pay \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year for a health insurance policy.

On Tuesday, for the first time in their lives, for many of them, there's a chance to do something about that. A great number could enroll in Medicaid—their whole families. Others were able to buy health insurance for \$10 or \$15 a week to cover themselves and their families.

This whole government shutdown is about shutting down that opportunity for them to buy health care. So all these crocodile tears tonight about these families, the reality is we wouldn't be having this debate if there wasn't a compulsion on the majority side of the aisle to kill the Affordable Care Act.

You are not going to be able to.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I'm the last speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Many of us that have spoken here are appropriators. Our job is to bring 12 bills to this floor, 12 conference reports. We've done none. We've totally failed. We're not the first Congress to do that. We've had to pass 111 CRs in the 20 years that I've been here in Congress. None of them had these prerequisites that we've got to meet with the President, we've got to repeal something, we've got to defund something, we don't like this, we don't like that. In fact, as appropriators we know that the rules of this House don't allow us to legislate on appropriations bills.

So even these requests that everybody is making of what we ought to do have to take a waiver by the Rules Committee—waiver to our own House rules—to bring all this stuff up. And in the meantime, we've done nothing, and so the government shuts down because we haven't been responsible for that oath of office that we took here.

It didn't say just fund a part of government. Today, we have a choice out of 10 parts of government. It's your popular parts, your menu, your special. Well, I didn't come here for any Tea Party special. I came here for the whole government—the hundreds of thousands of parts that put together this incredible, wonderful government that we have the privilege of serving.

But I can't go and tell my colleagues to go vote for this, vote for that on conditionality of this and that. All those things violate our procedural rules, violate our history.

This institution is 113 sessions old. As I said, since I've been here, 111 times we've come to the point where we need to pass a CR. We've never done it like this.

Reject this piecemeal legislation, and let's get on with the business. Let's open up government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to address a couple of issues that have come up during our discussion here this afternoon.

I've heard some of my colleagues across the aisle say they believe WIC has been underfunded. I do want to point out that all eligible participants are being served; and to my knowledge, no one has been turned away from the program.

The FY 13 Ag approps conference agreement provided more than \$7 billion for the WIC program. After sequestration and rescissions, the total equaled \$6.5 billion. At the end of FY 13, WIC had carryover funds, or remaining funds, totaling nearly \$300 million. Even with sequestration, WIC has been able to serve all eligible participants and still have funding left over for the end of the fiscal year by \$300 million. Clearly, the program has received sufficient funding, and we have certainly made sure that to be the case.

In closing today, I would hope that my colleagues would join me in support of this resolution. There's nothing cynical about what we're doing here. You can read the resolution. I have it right here. It simply continues to provide funding for the WIC program, and it provides certainty. It ensures that WIC clinics will be open, appointments will be kept, and food benefits will be provided.

There's nothing, again, cynical about this. The only thing that's cynical about this is if you decide to politicize this bill.

It's interesting that those who claim to be the defenders and supporters of this program are the very ones actually coming here this afternoon that are opposing the bill. My colleagues will have a chance to be cynical and vote "no," but I hope they will not turn their backs on providing certainty for low-income women and children. All we want to do is to keep the program fully operational and fully funded.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.J. Res. 75, a piece-meal mini-CR," which woefully underfunds Women-Infant-Children Program, or WIC as it is known through the end of the year.

Notwithstanding the issue of the majority refusing to allow a vote on a clean continuous resolution, and dealing with the deficit and the majority's refusal to accept Obamacare—which must be addressed—we cannot stop investing in children because they are the future of our country.

WIC is a federal assistance program for health care and nutrition of low-income pregnant women, breast-feeding women, and infants and children under the age of 5.

In my congressional district, 67 percent of children under the age of 4, or 41,300, are eli-

gible for WIC. This is the ninth highest district in the country.

Indeed, in a story in Houston Chronicle, a young Houston mother posed a very relevant question. She asked, "How am I going to feed my children?" Has it come to this Mr. Speaker? A mother in the United States of America has to worry about her children going hungry. This is an outrage.

In fact, in my state of Texas there are 971,000 WIC eligible children, the 7th highest in the nation.

Madam Speaker, you might be interested to know that the top 10 states in terms of WIC eligible women and children are:

Rank	State	% WIC Eligible	Number
1.	Mississippi	54	115,600
2.	Arkansas	53	103,800
3.	New Mexico	52	74,900
4.	Oklahoma	51	132,100
5.	West Virginia	50	52,000
6.	Louisiana	50	148,600
7.	Texas	49	971,000
8.	Tennessee	48	196,700
9.	Kentucky	47	132,000
10.	South Carolina	47	138,800

The Agriculture Department, which funds WIC, released \$100 million in contingency funds, out of the \$125 million on hand when the budget impasse began, and is working with states to distribute about \$280 million in unexpended funds left over from the 2013 fiscal year.

According to USDA, with these funds states should be able to continue to supply new and existing WIC participants only through the end of October.

Madam Speaker, you will be as disappointed as I was to learn that When I attempted to access more up-to-date statistics on the WIC Program, SNAP, and hunger, I was greeted by a message that said: "Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available."

The National WIC Association does not support this dishonest attempt by House Republicans to extricate themselves from the mess they created when they recklessly voted to shut down the government and harm our economy and wreak havoc on the lives of millions of Americans who provide and depend upon services and benefits critical to our nation.

According to the National WIC Association opposes this bill because it is "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends" and urges Congress:

to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation. We will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers.

Madam Speaker, if Congress fails to pass a "clean" continuing resolution before month's end, many WIC Programs across the nation will run out of operating funds and clinics will be forced to close their doors, turn participants away, and end benefits.

This would be unconscionable.

Normally I would be pleased to be here today to talk about the funding for this program, but this is different. What the majority is doing is playing games with the lives of real

people—real mothers and their children—struggling to get by in the real world.

WIC is the nation's premiere preventive public health nutrition program targeted at low-income mothers and young children who have or are at risk for developing nutrition-related diseases and disorders. Serving nearly 9 million mothers and young children, including 53 percent of all infants in the country, WIC provides nutrition education, breastfeeding education and support, referrals to medical and social services and a small nutritious food package.

Numerous studies show that WIC has been effective in improving health outcomes for its target populations.

For example, every dollar spent on a pregnant woman in WIC saves up to \$4.21 in Medicaid costs for her and her newborn because WIC reduces the risk for preterm birth and low birth-weight babies by 25 percent and 44 percent, respectively.

The average first year medical cost for a premature or low birth-weight baby is \$49,033 compared to \$4,551 for a baby born without complications.

Children on WIC are also more likely to consume key nutrients, receive immunizations on time, and have high cognitive development scores than their peers not participating in WIC. Recent studies in Los Angeles County and New York State have documented a reduction in obesity rates in the WIC child population over the past several years.

In light of these successes, it is no wonder that recent surveys indicate that WIC retains broad support across political, ideological, ethnic, and socio-economic lines in America. A bipartisan national survey of 1,000 likely November 2012 voters indicated nearly 3 in 4 Americans want WIC funding to remain the same or increase.

Because of increase emphasis by Congress and the WIC program, between 1998 and 2010 the breastfeeding rate in WIC has risen from 41.3 percent to 63.1 percent. According to one estimate, if 90 percent of U.S. mothers exclusively breastfed their infants to 6 months, the U.S. would save \$13 billion per year in medical expenses and prevent over 900 deaths annually.

Inadequate funding will have short-term and long-term consequences. In the short-term, mothers and young children cut from the program may go without healthy food or enough food.

In the long-term, healthy childhood growth and development may be hampered resulting in health and development problems that will have life-long physical, mental, and financial costs.

A full funding level for the WIC program would ensure that no eligible applicants are turned away; maintain current and anticipated WIC participation levels; assure adequate nutrition services and administration funding; respond adequately to economic forecasts of rising food cost inflation; and provide funds for nutrition services to maintain clinic staffing and competitive salaries.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and the women and children who depend upon the WIC program.

USDA

Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available.

After funding has been restored, please allow some time for this website to become available again.

For information about available government services, visit usa.gov

To view U.S. Department of Agriculture Agency Contingency plans, visit: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/contingency-plans>

Message from the President to U.S. Government Employees

[From the Huffington Post, Oct. 4, 2013]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN JEOPARDIZES WIC PROGRAM

(By Michael Rubinkam)

ALLENTOWN, PA. (AP)—Jacob Quick is a fat and happy 4-month-old with a big and expensive appetite. Like millions of other poor women, Jacob's mother relies on the federal Women, Infants and Children program to pay for infant formula—aid that is now jeopardized by the government shutdown.

Pennsylvania and other states say they can operate WIC at least through the end of October, easing fears among officials that it would run out of money within days. But advocates and others worry what will happen if the shutdown drags on beyond that.

"What's going to happen to my baby?" asked Jacob's mother, Cierra Schoeneberger, as she fed him a bottle of formula bought with her WIC voucher. "Am I going to have to feed him regular milk, or am I going to have to scrounge up the little bit of change I do have for formula or even baby food?"

WIC serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children, providing what advocates say is vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Schoeneberger, for example, said her son goes through about \$40 worth of formula a week. "It's like a car payment," said the unemployed mother of three.

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children—better known as WIC—supplies low-income women with checks or debit cards that can be used for infant formula and cereal, fruits and vegetables, dairy items and other healthy food. WIC also provides breast-feeding support and nutrition classes. Poor women with children under 5 are eligible.

Just before the shutdown, the U.S. Department of Agriculture had warned that states would run out of WIC cash after a "week or so." Now the agency says WIC should be able to provide benefits through late October, with states using \$100 million in federal contingency money released Wednesday and \$280 million in unspent funds from the last budget year.

If the aid dries up, desperate moms will probably dilute their babies' formula with water to make it last longer, or simply give them water or milk, said the Rev. Douglas A. Greenaway, head of the National WIC Association, an advocacy group. Pediatricians say children under 1 shouldn't drink cow's milk because they can develop iron deficiency anemia.

"These mothers have trust and confidence in this program, and that trust and confidence has been shaken by Congress," Greenaway said. "This is just unconscionable."

Danyelle Brents, 22, a single mother of three, receives about \$200 a month in vouchers for food and formula for her two children and baby. She is being hit doubly hard by the shutdown: She is a contract worker for the Federal Aviation Administration who catalogs records for aircraft certification, and is furloughed. Now, with her baby going through 10 cans of formula a month, she might lose key help with her grocery bill.

"That's a lot of money, \$15 a can," she said. "Now that I'm out of work, WIC is how

I support my family . . . I'm scared at this point to go buy anything extra."

Groups that fight hunger say they are also concerned about the confusion that needy mothers may be feeling. Though most WIC offices are open, many mothers mistakenly assumed that benefits were cut off.

Advocates are also worried that there will be a cumulative effect as other, smaller government feeding programs run out of money.

Adding to the uncertainty While USDA has said that food stamps are guaranteed to continue through October, it is unclear what will happen after that.

In Pennsylvania, whose \$208 million WIC program supports 250,000 women and children, all local WIC offices remain open and benefits are being dispensed as usual. The state Health Department said it has \$25.5 million on hand to continue operating the program through October. Ohio said it has enough money to last through the second week of November.

"Ohio WIC is open for business!" proclaimed the headline on a state website.

Utah's WIC program, though, immediately closed its doors Tuesday in the wake of the government shutdown, meaning that families who hadn't already received their October vouchers were out of luck and new applications couldn't be processed. The state got \$2.5 million in USDA funding on Thursday, and WIC offices throughout the state planned to reopen by noon Friday.

Charitable groups were already filling the void. A Facebook group called "The People's WIC—Utah" was launched hours after WIC offices closed, matching up families in need with those able to donate formula and other food.

In Layton, about 25 miles north of Salt Lake City, a donation drive was planned for Saturday, with organizers asking for fresh fruits and vegetables, unopened baby formula and other necessities.

Food banks, meanwhile, are bracing for a surge in requests for help if WIC runs out of money.

Linda Zimmerman, executive director of Neighbors In Need, which runs 11 food banks in Massachusetts, said her organization already provides a lot of baby formula to its clients, most of whom get WIC aid as well.

"I think they're truly nervous," Zimmerman said. "We're going to have to be doing a lot of work to make sure we can keep up with need for infant formula."

In some places, grocery stores refused to honor WIC vouchers, assuming they wouldn't get paid. Terry Bryce, director of Oklahoma's WIC program, said WIC officials called and emailed grocers to assure them the program is still funded.

In New Jersey, Patricia Jones said she is worried about losing her WIC assistance.

"You're affecting families that haven't done anything to you," said Jones, a 34-year-old mother of five. Because of the shutdown, she was turned away from the Social Security Administration office in Newark when she tried to get printouts of her children's Social Security numbers to renew her welfare and WIC benefits.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, let's be clear about what's happening here. We are in day-four of the shutdown of the federal government for one reason, and one reason alone: The desire of a radical wing of the Republican Party to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

To that end, House Republicans have rejected the clean government funding bill passed by the Senate, and shut down the government. The shutdown could end today if Speaker BOEHNER would bring up the Senate-passed funding bill. There are more than enough votes to pass it and send the bill to

the President, who would sign it. The only reason we aren't voting on the Senate bill is because Speaker BOEHNER has not stood up to a radical group of Tea Party lawmakers who are demanding repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Instead of re-opening the entire government, the Republican Leadership is playing more games as they continue to bring up piecemeal bills to fund the most visible casualties of the shutdown they caused. Earlier this week, we had a vote to reopen the Smithsonian and the National Parks. Then we had a vote to reopen the National Institutes of Health. Then the Republicans began to feel the heat from veterans, so they brought up a bill to reopen the VA. These Band aid bills are an attempt by Republicans to give themselves political cover for causing this shutdown in the first place.

Today we have another Band aid bill before us. This bill would restart funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children through December 15. Nearly 9 million moms and kids under five living near or below the poverty line rely on WIC for healthy food, breastfeeding support, infant formula and other necessities. It's as if Republicans have just figured out that closing down the federal government has health consequences when mothers cannot provide food and nutrition for their kids.

Let me read a statement from the National WIC Association, which urges the House to reject the bill before the House. They call this Republican bill "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends. Funding the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) in this piecemeal, short-term, stop-gap manner is not an acceptable solution. . . . NWA urges Congress to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation. NWA will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers."

It's time to stop playing politics, and have a vote on the Senate's clean funding bill. It's time to end the shutdown.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1730

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 75 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like for the motion to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is not surprising that the WIC program is the latest subject of the majority's ploy to use low-income mothers and children as political pawns.

WIC enjoys bipartisan support. A bipartisan poll in 2012 found the program enjoyed 67 percent approval among the American people, including 53 percent of conservatives. By providing things like fresh fruits and vegetables, low-fat dairy and salmon, tuna for breastfeeding mothers, every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC produces \$1.92 to \$4.21 in Medicaid savings for newborns and their mothers. That just makes common sense. On Wednesday, the USDA estimated that WIC would continue operations for a week or two, thanks to a small contingency fund.

In Arizona, 29 percent of children are food insecure, and over 36 percent of Arizonans live in WIC-eligible households. In my district, the Arizona Department of Health Services in Apache and Navajo Counties says 70 percent of families were WIC-eligible in 2010.

We need this program. But the bill before us is not meant to relieve needy families. It is only a tool meant for partisan gain.

The Republican budget proposal would cut WIC 22 percent. The National WIC Association estimates that the sequester has resulted in nearly 12,000 deserting families in Arizona dropped from the rolls, yet now the majority reverses itself to fund this program.

Beyond the cynicism of this tactic, WIC cannot stand alone. It is a gate-

way to health care and social services for families, services that will remain unsustainable due to the shutdown—services like low energy assistance through the Department of Energy, immunizations through Health and Human Services, and early childhood education programs like Head Start. Where is the funding for these programs? The majority proposes a fragmented program that would be crippled.

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government for funding so that we're no longer picking and choosing the needs that we are going to meet.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice?

Stop these political games. Let's get serious about helping the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires an amendment to be germane to the bill that is currently under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2 and October 3 of 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

So, Madam Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized on the point of order.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so all of our needs can be met.

If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for school safety? If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for supplemental nutritional assistance? Why aren't we protecting food safety for every single American? Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice? Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government and denying taxpayers the benefits they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to the hardworking, everyday people trying to make a living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on the point of order, it would be my view that you could clarify the legislative process by ruling against the point of order.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would be an up-or-down vote on keeping the entire government open. A sustaining of the point of order would mean that if we do what we've done in the last few bills, there would be a challenge to your ruling. If that challenge were to be sustained, then we could get that up-or-down vote because overruling the Chair would mean that we could get an up-or-down vote.

So you should rule against the point of order to clarify all this. We can get a clear, up-or-down vote on keeping the government open, but on the other hand, Madam Speaker, the vote on keeping the government open will be on the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, may I be further heard for just 15 seconds?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may conclude.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, if you rule against the point of order, we can have an up-or-down vote. Otherwise, the up-or-down vote will essentially be on the motion to table. We should vote against the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Alabama makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding related to the special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled earlier today, as well as on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Similarly, the instructions here propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 185, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Amash	Gosar	Paulsen
Amodei	Gowdy	Pearce
Bachmann	Granger	Perry
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Petri
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Benishek	Grimm	Posey
Bentivolio	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hall	Radel
Bishop (UT)	Hanna	Reed
Black	Harper	Reichert
Blackburn	Harris	Renacci
Boustany	Hartzler	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hunter	Rokita
Camp	Hurt	Rooney
Campbell	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Jenkins	Roskam
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cassidy	Jordan	Royce
Chabot	Joyce	Runyan
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (NY)	Sanford
Cole	Kingston	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Collins (NY)	Kline	Schweikert
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cotton	Lance	Sessions
Cramer	Lankford	Shimkus
Crawford	Latham	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Daines	Long	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marchant	Southerland
DeSantis	Marino	Stewart
DesJarlais	Massie	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
Duffy	McCaul	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Terry
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McKeon	Thornberry
Farenthold	McKinley	Tiberi
Fincher	McMorris	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Upton
Fleischmann	Meadows	Valadao
Fleming	Meehan	Wagner
Flores	Messer	Walberg
Forbes	Mica	Walden
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fox	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Garrett	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Gerlach	Noem	Williams
Gibbs	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Nunes	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Gohmert	Olson	

Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—185

Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Barber	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Beatty	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Becerra	Hahn	Owens
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Payne
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Holt	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Bralley (IA)	Horsford	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Israel	Polis
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Kind	T.
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Langevin	Schiff
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lewis	Scott, David
Courtney	Lipinski	Serrano
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowe y	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sires
DeFazio	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Slaughter
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Speier
DelBene	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maloney, Carolyn	Takano
Dingell	Doggett	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Rokita	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Rooney	Tierney
Doyle	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Duckworth	Roskam	Tonko
Edwards	Ross	Tsongas
Ellison	Rothfus	Van Hollen
Engel	Royce	Veasey
Enyart	Runyan	Vela
Eshoo	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez
Esty	Salmon	Walz
Farr	Sanford	Wasserman
Fattah	Scalise	Schultz
Foster	Schock	Moore
Frankel (FL)	Schweikert	Moran
Fudge	Scott, Austin	Murphy (FL)
Gabbard	Sensenbrenner	Nadler
Gallego	Sessions	Napolitano
Garamendi	Shimkus	
Garcia	Shuster	
	Simpson	
	Smith (MO)	
	Smith (NE)	
	Smith (NJ)	
	Smith (TX)	
	Southerland	
	Stewart	
	Stivers	
	Stockman	
	Stutzman	
	Terry	
	Thompson (PA)	
	Thornberry	
	Tiberi	
	Turner	
	Upton	
	Valadao	
	Wagner	
	Walberg	
	Walden	
	Walorski	
	Weber (TX)	
	Webster (FL)	
	Wenstrup	
	Westmoreland	
	Whitfield	
	Williams	
	Wilson (SC)	
	Wittman	
	Wolf	

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Lummis	Tipton
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Grayson	Miller, Gary	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Jones	Rush	

□ 1801

Messrs. VELA and LEWIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 164, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—244

Aderholt	Gohmert	Pearce
Amash	Goodlatte	Perry
Amodel	Gosar	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Gowdy	Peters (MI)
Bachus	Granger	Petri
Barber	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Barton	Grimm	Price (GA)
Benishek	Guthrie	Radel
Bentivolio	Hall	Reed
Bera (CA)	Hanna	Reichert
Billrakis	Harper	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Ribble
Black	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bralley (IA)	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rokita
Buchanan	Hunter	Rooney
Bucshon	Hurt	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Issa	Roskam
Bustos	Jenkins	Ross
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Camp	Jordan	Royce
Campbell	Joyce	Ruiz
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (NY)	Salmon
Cassidy	Kingston	Sanford
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schneider
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Latham	Sessions
Conaway	Latta	Shimkus
Cook	Lipinski	Shuster
Cotton	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cramer	Loeb	Sinema
Crawford	Long	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lynch	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Southerland
DelBene	Marchant	Stewart
Denham	Marino	Stivers
Dent	Massie	Stockman
DeSantis	Matheson	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Turner
Ellmers	McKeon	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walden
Fleming	Meehan	Walorski
Flores	Messer	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Mica	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Foster	Miller (MI)	Westrup
Fox	Mullin	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Gallego	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Garamendi	Neugebauer	Wittman
Garcia	Noem	Wolf
Gardner	Nugent	Womack
Garrett	Nunes	Woodall
Gerlach	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gibbs	Olson	Yoho
Gibson	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—164

Andrews	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Beatty	Bonamici	Capps
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)	Carney
Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)	Carson (IN)

Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Chu	Jeffries	Pingree (ME)
Ciциlline	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Keating	Quigley
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rahall
Cohen	Kennedy	Rangel
Connolly	Kildee	Richmond
Conyers	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda T.
Crowley	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schwartz
DeFazio	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Serrano
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Doyle	(NM)	Sires
Duckworth	Maffei	Slaughter
Edwards	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Carolyn	Speier
Engel	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Enyart	McCollum	Takano
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Esty	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McNerney	Tierney
Fattah	Meeke	Titus
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Tonko
Fudge	Michaud	Tsongas
Gabbard	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Moore	Veasey
Green, Gene	Moran	Vela
Grijalva	Nadler	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Walz
Hahn	Neal	Wasserman
Hanabusa	Negrete McLeod	Schultz
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Waters
Himes	O'Rourke	Watt
Hinojosa	Owens	Welch
Holt	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Honda	Pascrell	
Horsford	Pastor (AZ)	
Hoyer		

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardenas	Labrador	Tipton
DeGette	Lummis	Vargas
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Rush	

□ 1808

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1804

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be permitted to file a supplemental report on H.R. 1804.

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

There was no objection.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, my office has continued to be flooded by

calls from folks in North Carolina who are experiencing the negative effects of ObamaCare. Not an hour goes by in which I don't learn of another hard-working family who just received notice that, starting next year, they will face higher premiums.

Not only are everyday Americans going to have to pay more for health care, but their options for providers are being curtailed at every turn. This does not even mention, Madam Speaker, the technical glitches that, all too predictably, have emerged in the rollout of the online exchanges. They are a harbinger of the trouble ahead with this misguided law.

We are almost \$17 trillion in debt; our government has a massive spending problem; and ObamaCare will only contribute to our Nation's fiscal woes.

Madam Speaker, now is the time to stop this disastrous law in its tracks. Congress has the opportunity to provide all Americans with an exemption from ObamaCare—the same exemption the President has provided to all of his friends.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, we are now in the fourth day of a manufactured government shutdown; and despite repeated calls to end this manufactured crisis, House Republicans have yet to allow a simple majority vote on a Senate-passed bill that would pass this House on a bipartisan basis and that the President could sign today to bring operations back on line. Instead, Republican leaders have begun cherry-picking services to fund during the shutdown to mitigate the political fallout from the untenable position in which they have put our country.

Don't you think the American people see through that?

It's nice to see my Republican colleagues finally acknowledge that the government does, in fact, provide many critical services worthy of our support. These piecemeal bills are not serious attempts to reopen our government. They would not help the 800,000 dedicated public servants who have been involuntarily furloughed; they would not help my constituents applying for Social Security disability benefits; they will do nothing for small business owners who are cut off from SBA-backed loans; and they certainly don't address the women depending on rape crisis or domestic violence centers, which will lose their funding after today.

What these bills would do is merely prolong a disastrous, manufactured situation. I urge my colleagues to bring up a straightforward funding measure to get our constituents, our economy, and this Congress back to work.