

□ 1349

Messrs. CAPUANO and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 168, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—248

Aderholt	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Flores	Lummis
Amodei	Forbes	Lynch
Bachmann	Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean
Bachus	Foster	Marchant
Barber	Fox	Marino
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Barrow (GA)	Garcia	McCarthy (CA)
Barton	Gardner	McCaul
Benish	Garrett	McClintock
Bentivolio	Gerlach	McHenry
Bera (CA)	Gibbs	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Gibson	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	McKinley
Black	Gohmert	McMorris
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Boustany	Gosar	Meadows
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	Meehan
Braley (IA)	Granger	Messer
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Mica
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Brown (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Buchanan	Grimm	Mullin
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Burgess	Hall	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Harper	Neugebauer
Camp	Harris	Noem
Campbell	Hartzler	Nugent
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Capito	Heck (NV)	Nunnelee
Carter	Hensarling	Olson
Cassidy	Holding	Palazzo
Chabot	Hudson	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Coble	Hultgren	Perry
Coffman	Hunter	Peters (CA)
Cole	Hurt	Peters (MI)
Collins (GA)	Issa	Peterson
Collins (NY)	Jenkins	Petri
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Cotton	Jones	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jordan	Pompeo
Crawford	Joyce	Posey
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Price (GA)
Culberson	King (IA)	Radel
Daines	King (NY)	Rahall
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Reed
DeBene	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
Denham	Kline	Renacci
Dent	Labrador	Ribble
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rigell
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Roby
Duffy	Lankford	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Ellmers	Latta	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Fincher	LoBiondo	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Loeb	Rooney
Fleischmann	Long	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Simpson	Wagner
Ross	Sinema	Walberg
Rothfus	Smith (MO)	Walden
Royce	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Runyan	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Southerland	Wenstrup
Salmon	Stewart	Westmoreland
Sanford	Stivers	Whitfield
Scalise	Stockman	Williams
Schneider	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Schock	Terry	Wittman
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Schweikert	Thornberry	Womack
Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Woodall
Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Yoder
Sessions	Turner	Yoho
Shimkus	Upton	Young (AK)
Shuster	Valadao	Young (IN)

NOES—168

Andrews	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Green, Al	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grijalva	Owens
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Payne
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Horsford	Pocan
Capps	Hoyer	Polis
Capuano	Huelskamp	Price (NC)
Cardenas	Huffman	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Linda
Chu	Keating	T.
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schiff
Cohen	Kind	Schwartz
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kuster	Scott, David
Cooper	Langevin	Serrano
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tierney
Deutch	(NM)	Titus
Dingell	Maffei	Tonko
Doggett	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doyle	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Matsui	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Enyart	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Esty	Michaud	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	

NOT VOTING—15

Clay	Honda	Rogers (AL)
Gallego	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Gutiérrez	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Higgins	Richmond	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1356

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 529—Motion to Table Ruling of the Chair; and 530—Passage of H.J. Res. 84, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1520

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-243) on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.J. Res. 89;

(2) conform the title of H.J. Res. 89 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 373 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013; H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act of 2013; and H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, today this body will consider three important pieces of legislation designed to address the current government shutdown and the looming debt limit. The first of these bills would appropriate the funds necessary to pay essential Federal employees who have been continuing to work during the shutdown. These men and women have earned their paychecks and deserve for us to act on their legislation to ensure that they are paid on time.

Secondly, we will consider legislation to fully fund the FAA in order to ensure that our Nation's commerce and air travel continues uninterrupted and safely. There are many, many workers of the FAA who need to come back to work to ensure the safety and to ensure that millions of American passengers in the air are not put at risk due to a continued government shutdown.

Finally, we will consider legislation to establish a bicameral, bipartisan Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth. This working group would consist of 10 Members of the House and 10 Members of the Senate, representing six from the majority and four from the minority of both Chambers. These Members would be appointed no less than one day after the enactment of this legislation, and would each meet on the subsequent calendar day until an agreement is reached on the overall discretionary levels for fiscal year 2014; changes to the discretionary debt limit; and reforms to direct spending programs.

For nearly a month now, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have asked Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to sit down and negotiate with House Republicans. Bill after bill from House Republicans and this body have gone to the United States Senate only to be batted down or to be revised and to come back without addressing the significant problems that our country faces today.

So what we are trying to do is to find another avenue, and that is to have the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and their appointees be able to meet together in a working group to resolve these issues. What do I envision? I envision a TV would be in the room. The American people could take part in these discussions and see how much progress can be made between Senate Republicans and

Senate Democrats and House Republicans and House Democrats on these important issues, and hold those Members accountable for exactly the same thing that we're trying to do, and that is to get this government back opened up with an agreement about how we are going to fund this government.

So, today, we ask once again if the Senate is willing to join us not only as we work towards ending this government shutdown but on how we are going to address our government's debt and put our Nation back to work on the pathway to prosperity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my good friend, for granting me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends are devolving into self-parody. The solution to this unnecessary and manufactured crisis is simple, and it hasn't changed for months:

Step one, pass a clean, short-term continuing resolution at Republican sequester levels to reopen the government;

Step two, pass a clean debt ceiling bill so that the United States will not default for the first time in history and so we don't send the economy into a tailspin;

Step three, finally agree to go to conference on the budget so we can sit down and talk about our priorities.

Let me go over that once more just in case there's any confusion on the other side of the aisle: reopen the government; raise the debt ceiling; and negotiate on the budget.

That has been what the White House and Democrats in Congress have been asking for over and over and over and over again. It's what we're asking for today, and it's what we will ask for tomorrow.

By contrast, the list of House Republican demands changes every 10 minutes: repeal ObamaCare, defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, stage a non-filibuster filibuster, ask for the entire Romney economic platform in order to raise the debt ceiling, yell at park rangers, fund this part of the government, fund that part of the government, pay furloughed employees, pay essential employees, hold a conference meeting, hold a press conference, rinse and repeat.

Enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough.

Here we are again with yet another convoluted, cockamamie legislative effort that is going absolutely nowhere. We have yet another "message bill" that is designed to win today's news cycle but that gets us no closer to resolving this crisis.

Today's effort is particularly pathetic, Mr. Speaker. Instead of actually

solving the problem and letting the American people get on with their lives, the bill before us today would create that most cherished and beloved Washington institution, a committee—not just any committee, no, but another supercommittee. It's Supercommittee 2: The Wrath of Cruz.

We have before us a bill that was dreamed up—Lord knows when—floated in the press at 10 o'clock this morning, distributed as legislative language at 11:30 this morning, in the Rules Committee at 12:30, and on the floor at 3:20. Forget the 3-day rule, Mr. Speaker. This contraption barely even followed the 3-hour rule.

And the Superdupercommittee Part 2—pardon me, the “bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth”—that is created by this bill doesn't come with any instructions. There is no time line. There is no deadline. It doesn't reopen the government. It doesn't prevent a default. It doesn't do much of anything.

It's unclear whether coffee and pastries will be provided at the Superdupercommittee Part 2 working group. Maybe we need another bill to do that.

This is just another press release. Mr. Speaker, we do not need another committee to do the job that we were elected to do. Let me remind my colleagues that we have this thing called the Budget Committee, and the Republicans made a big deal about the fact that we passed a budget in the House and the Senate didn't pass a budget in the Senate. Then the Senate did pass a budget. What you're supposed to do is then go to conference and work out your differences and come up with a final product. For 6 months we have been pleading with the Speaker of the House and the Republican leadership to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget agreement. That's the way it's supposed to work. The Senate does something, we do something, and we negotiate the differences. For 6 months the Republicans have refused to appoint conferees, and now they're saying we need this kind of vague committee that has no instructions, that has no time line. It doesn't do anything to stop the government shutdown. It doesn't do anything to stop the government default on our financial obligations.

This is no way to run a railroad, let alone the United States House of Representatives. So I would urge the Republican leadership to start caring a little less about winning today's news cycle and a little more about the American people, who sent us here and who expect us to do our jobs.

Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling. Negotiate on the budget. It is really not that complicated.

In the meantime, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this closed rule, reject the underlying legislation, and reject the politics of manufactured crises.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, hot off the press this afternoon from Politico, which is not exactly a right-wing newspaper, it says:

Obama calls Boehner. Reiterates he won't negotiate.

So the President evidently today, as reported by Politico, called Mr. BOEHNER to repeat: I'm not going to negotiate on bills to reopen the government or to raise the debt ceiling. That's what's being reported.

Mr. Speaker, this is, I think, a bad precedent. Where I'm from in Dallas, Texas, leaders lead. Leaders lead by trying to do what's in the best interest of everybody, not running to crisis after crisis after crisis, not negotiating, not agreeing to meet with people, not agreeing to do things to help resolution. Leaders present ideas, opportunities, options. They're the ones that stay at the table, and they're the last ones to leave when everybody else gets frustrated.

I think what's important to note is this President is simply different than every other President we've ever had. What he is doing is giving up not only his legitimate moral authority to lead, but what he's doing is saying, I recognize what could happen if we're unsuccessful. I think, as Speaker BOEHNER said yesterday, the President's senior adviser said he would sooner see the government go into default than to meet with and negotiate with the Republicans. That is not what leaders should be doing, and I would suggest to you that this President stands on the shoulders of other Presidents for 230-plus years who have given their very best to the benefit of others. They have looked at Republicans, they have looked at Democrats, they've looked at House Members, they've looked at Senate Members, and realized they had to negotiate. That was one of the key things I remember as a young man about Ronald Reagan's negotiating with Tip O'Neill, inviting Tip O'Neill down to the White House, their being good with each other, talking about how they could make progress with each other.

We are evidently past that. This President even has the audacity to call the Speaker and say, I'm not going to negotiate with you. That is not good leadership, and the American people are seeing it.

The House of Representatives, we're not going to get our nose out of joint. We're going to stay at work. It is true that we bring this bill up, and we'll probably be here tomorrow and the next day with new ways to negotiate. Today, we're here on the floor just as we were yesterday, just as we were on Saturday, talking about constructive, creative, bipartisan issues to fund this government and to make sure we can get moving.

The NIH should have been open already. We should have had lots of government agencies as a result of what we are doing, including Head Start. We should have these activities, even if it's

one by one, to open up. Today, we're on the floor to say, We ought to pay those government employees who have been working when Tuesday rolls around. They should get paid. We should have people at the FAA come back to work and open that agency back up. That's what House Republicans are doing. We recognize this President will not negotiate, but we're going to offer ourselves up. I think the American people see what House Republicans are attempting to do.

I am very proud of not only what our Speaker is doing but of our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY. They are attempting to move forward ideas that sustain this body to where we can look people straight in the eye and where we can accomplish things on behalf of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are in this predicament because the Republicans shut the government down. It is that simple.

You own this shutdown whether you like it or not.

The gentleman quoted Politico. Let me read from Politico. It says:

President Barack Obama opened the door to a short-term debt ceiling increase in order to avoid going over the fiscal cliff and allowed negotiations between the White House and Congress on a long-term deal.

That doesn't sound like someone who doesn't want to negotiate. I'd prefer a long-term deal because I'm tired of this crisis by crisis by crisis, but this President has gone out of his way to negotiate over and over and over again.

I will just point out another thing for my colleagues. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Speaker BOEHNER negotiated a deal on this short-term continuing resolution to keep the government going. Speaker BOEHNER admitted that this week with George Stephanopoulos on Sunday, that they negotiated a short-term spending deal to keep the government open at the Republican sequester levels. The deal was that, in return for the Republican numbers, the Speaker wouldn't attach any extraneous materials to that short-term continuing resolution.

Obviously, that is a deal that the Speaker did not keep in large part because of a group in his conference who kind of represents, I guess, the TED CRUZ wing of the party who said that wasn't enough. They wanted to shut the government down, and they're willing to default on paying our bills for the first time in history. That is, in my opinion, unconscionable.

Let's not talk about who wants to negotiate here. Democrats have negotiated going to your level on the short-term continuing resolution. The President has been willing to negotiate time and time again. Every time he gets close to an agreement, the Speaker can't deliver. He's going to continue to try, but don't say he's not trying to negotiate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address all remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is really getting more and more difficult for us to get out here and act as though we're really having a serious debate about something, and I just want to start off by saying that I don't want anybody in the country to forget—as they're trying to do things with a Federal Government that's shut down as the VA service centers did, and their phones are now inoperative as we've all learned to our great dismay—the deceased soldiers and their families have not been able to be compensated in any way to make it possible for them to pay for funerals or even go to them. I'm sure that will be something we're going to come up and deal with as they're doing with this part-time “let's build ourselves a new government.”

Don't forget that this was about health care. That's all there is to it. Service people can't get the benefits that they need. Nobody can get anything from the government. Mortgages are on hold because Republicans didn't like health care.

If you would have asked them why in the world do you object to 30 million Americans who have not been able to afford health insurance having an opportunity to get it, they don't give you any answer. It's more obfuscation. If we talk about negotiations, let me tell you the negotiation that is really critical that is not taking place at all, and we're doing an example of that right now.

There is no negotiation in the committee process. The only committee that has been putting anything up to the floor of the House has been the Rules Committee. Somebody writes a bill in the afternoon, and either that evening or early the next day, the Rules Committee goes in, and it goes right to the floor. There is no amendment chance, there's no discussion chance, and we don't know what they're doing. The discussion and the amendments and the negotiation, yes, that's supposed to go on between the two parties in the committees, and it is nowhere to be seen and hasn't been for ages.

We've been down this road before, again with the supercommittee idea, which was such a glaring disaster and only ended up in sequestration, and the whole idea of sequestration was so, with all of that, none of us ever thought we'd get there, but now we're pretending that's what it is. Now it's, Let's have another supercommittee. I will tell you that was so awful, and it set us back so much in this country not only with scientific research and na-

tional security and public safety being compromised, but now they want to do it again.

I think it's just another delaying tactic because I'm persuaded today, as I stand here, that the Republican Party in this House does not want to open the government. The opportunities they've had over and over again have been absolutely quashed. There's a lot of talk in the media about, Oh, if only I had a chance to vote for a clean resolution, I would do it in just a moment. Well, let me tell you that it has been turned down twice before in the House of Representatives on the rule when we got to the part about the previous question. We always say just vote “no” and you will then have your opportunity to vote on the clean bill from the Senate, which already passed there, and would go directly to the President. We never got a single Republican vote. Draw your own conclusions about the 25 Republicans who stated if only they were given that opportunity.

□ 1545

Now the sequestration, as my colleague has pointed out, we accepted as part of a deal on our behalf between Speaker BOEHNER and Senator REID. As awful as it is—and most of us did not like that—nonetheless, for the short-term CR, we were willing to take it, but now the majority, again, refuses to let us vote on a CR which was agreed on.

This irresponsible governance has continued in the days since the majority shut the government down; and over this last week—or last several weeks, actually—the majority has abandoned any semblance of regular order and just turned the Rules Committee, as I've said, into the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, where does all this come from? I think most Americans were surprised. Let me express my concern.

I recall that, just after Senator Obama was elected President in 2008, we all heard about the great dinner that took place on inaugural night, declaring, among Republican elected officials, that they would not allow Senator Obama—now President Obama—to get anything done. Well, we thought after 4 years, maybe that was over with, and we did get the health care bill passed.

Now we learned on Sunday morning that that is taking place again, which again says, you know, I'm not sure that this party could put the government back into business or not because they would have to get the permission, apparently, from the Heritage Foundation's Heritage Action for America, former Attorney General Edwin Meese, and David Koch, because they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and they engineered this whole thing. That appeared on Sunday. This is Tuesday. Not a single refutation has taken place.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. So it's time for this game to come to an end, but it won't because it's not part of the plan. I am really tired, on behalf of the American people, of watching them being fooled; and I think that we are more than disgusted and tired with the process by which this legislation comes to us. The four of us on the Rules Committee are calling for you to open up this process so that the other members of our party—as well as yours who, I am confident, know nothing more about these bills than we do—have an opportunity to really do our jobs as we were sent here to do.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the committee. Just before we came down to the floor, we had a very, very nice committee meeting where she was able to not only articulate that, but was joined by her other colleagues. I did offer words of assurance to them about not only how we need to move forward but also how the committee needed to get slightly better in our time frames, and we're going to attempt to do that.

The gentlewoman recognizes that what we are doing is bringing bills as quickly as we can, including the FAA, opening up the FAA again, and how important that is. So she recognized the importance of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. President, can we talk? The government is partially shut down. The Nation's debt ceiling is looming.

President Obama and HARRY REID have drawn a hard line. They have proclaimed over and over again, no negotiation. They insist the debt limit must be raised at current levels of spending. No negotiation. They're adamant that the status quo must be preserved. And why not?

Here is the status quo: 7.3 percent unemployment 4 years after the recession has ended; 15 percent unemployment for those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates unemployed or underemployed; household income down 10 percent in the last 5 years. It has fallen every year since the President has been in office, and it continues to decline. Continued economic stagnation 4 years after the recession has ended; continued record deficit spending; Social Security and Medicare on a path to insolvency.

Why would the Republicans want to discuss these fundamental problems? Why would we want to alter that course?

By any measure, the President's policies are failing miserably:

He is failing our seniors. Their safety nets, Social Security and Medicare, are headed for bankruptcy, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our middle class through higher taxes, higher energy costs, higher insurance bills on one hand, and on the other hand, a continued decline in household income. They're getting squeezed from both sides, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our youth, the millennial generation, by piling mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren, but he won't negotiate. He is failing our youth and millennial generation through his job-killing policies of more regulation, more taxes, and more government.

Mr. President, our youth wants to work, and they're counting on us, but the President won't negotiate. Remember, my friends, that the Democrats held the House, the Senate, and the Presidency for only 2 years; but out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, the two biggest expansions of government and killers of jobs to come out of Washington in 50 years.

I didn't want the government to shut down—nobody did—but we cannot continue to run head-on into failure. If we are to change course, the Republicans can't do it on their own. The President and HARRY REID in the Senate will have to participate.

Mr. REID, we are asking once again for a conference.

Mr. President, it's way past time to soften your hard-line stance on no negotiation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair and not to another in the second person.

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from South Carolina, who just spoke, I don't know what he is talking about.

We have been negotiating. This temporary spending measure that we're talking about, HARRY REID negotiated it with Speaker BOEHNER. It's at your levels, your sequester levels. Do you think I like that? I can't stand it, but I don't want to shut the government down.

The bottom line was the Speaker said that, in exchange for that, there would be no extraneous materials attached to that CR. He wasn't able to deliver on his promise because of some people in your conference. It's that simple.

The gentleman is on the Budget Committee. I would think that, in being on the Budget Committee, you would want to go to conference—you worked on a budget; the Senate worked on a budget—to work out those spending differences. We have tried 19 times to get you to go to conference, and you refused to negotiate with the Senate on each of those occasions.

Every time the President negotiates, unfortunately, your leadership can't deliver on the deals. So we have been negotiating, negotiating, negotiating. We still want to negotiate, but, please, the gentleman gave no reason why we should shut down this government,

why the Republicans should have shut down this government, and he has given no reason why we should default on our financial obligations. We ought to pass a short-term spending bill to reopen the government, and we ought to pass a clean debt ceiling bill so we don't default on our financial obligations and ruin our economy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person. Directing remarks through the Chair helps to reduce personal confrontation between Members and fosters an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to this matter.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership in trying to keep the government open.

Mr. Speaker, this is—what?—the eighth day of the Republican shutdown of government. Small businesses cannot get loans to expand; veterans face uncertainty about their benefits; tuition assistance and the rest. Millions of women and children will go without the nutrition programs that they desperately need.

The shutdown could be over in hours if Republicans would stop being the party of “no” and just take “yes” for an answer.

So in case you don't know, I have some very good news for you: Democrats have not only been willing to negotiate; Democrats have already stated that they are ready to cooperate.

For example, I have good news. Perhaps you missed the fact that 200 Democratic Members of the House have signed a letter saying that they're willing to accept the Republican number of \$986 billion even though, as the gentleman said, we don't like this number—we don't think it's adequate—but the fact is we don't like shutting down the government more.

So, in order to open up government, 200 Members have signed the letter, and five additional Members have made public statements of their willingness to support the Republican number. There's space in this letter for the signatures of maybe just 17 Republicans to sign, but they don't have to sign a letter. Many of them have made public statements, which we respect and honor as their public statements, that they would vote for the Republican number of \$986 billion.

The Speaker negotiated with Senator REID. Senator REID accepted the Republican House number. The President of the United States accepted the Republican House number. The Demo-

crats in the House accepted the Republican House number. The only people not accepting the Republican House number are the Republicans in the House.

So, when the leadership of the Republican Party—Speaker BOEHNER, in particular—go around saying it can't pass, that the votes are not there, does that mean he does not trust the word of his own Members who have said that they will vote for the \$986 billion? Let's find out. Let's bring the bill to the floor.

That is what we are saying: just bring it to the floor. It has passed the Senate. The President stands ready to sign a number we don't like, but prefer it over shutting down government. We don't like it. We want to open the doors of government, and we are willing to use the key of the Republican number to do so.

Last week, Democrats went a step further. In both public and private discussions, Speaker BOEHNER said that he doesn't want to go to conference on the budget even though he asked for regular order in March. In early March, Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER said they wanted regular order. That's a message to the President that Congress should work its will. That was good news to us. That means: you pass a bill in the House; you pass a bill in the Senate; you go to conference to reconcile your differences. Perhaps the Speaker didn't think that the Senate would pass a budget, but they did in a matter of days—practically hours—after the House passed its budget.

But what happened to regular order? It blew out the window. After saying, We want regular order, no longer did the Republicans want to take “yes” for an answer. And why? Well, some of this is explained under the Speaker's own statement. Speaker BOEHNER said, Under rules—listen to that word “rules.” Under rules, if you appoint conferees and after 20 legislative days there is no agreement, the minority has the right to offer motions to instruct, which become politically motivated bombs to throw up on the House floor.

So to be frank with you, we are following what I would describe as regular order. What I would describe as regular order is not “under rules.” “Under rules” are the rules of the House.

The Speaker—as awesome as the power of the Speaker is, and I understand that—does not have the power to just decide what regular order is, and if you don't want to honor regular order, just say you're not going to honor it, but don't redefine it in order to keep government shut down.

So, in listening to the Speaker's not wanting to shut government down at first and then after it was shut down wanting to open it, the House Democrats took a step unprecedented by any minority party in the Congress of the United States. The House Democratic minority said, We will surrender. We will relinquish our right to motions to instruct—an insider term, actually—

placing conditions on how it would go to the conference table.

□ 1600

So we said to the Speaker, don't worry about that. If that's important to you, if you want to shut down government because you're afraid of a motion to instruct, we'll allay your fears. Fear no more, Mr. Speaker. We will not offer these motions.

As an example, we didn't offer the motion on the first night, which was our right to do, when this bill was introduced as all of you will agree.

So we have said, we have made that claim. This, as I said, is unprecedented, but is a necessary move to end the Tea Party stranglehold on our government and restore basic services on which millions of people rely.

They didn't take "yes" for an answer. Two hundred signatures.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit this letter for the RECORD—200 signatures. It's a beautiful sight, because I want to tell you something: it's about cooperation.

None of us likes this number. All of us want to open up government. That's why we signed it. I want to thank Congressman TIM BISHOP, Congressman PATRICK and Congressman KEITH ELLISON for producing this result.

So we've said, yes, we're giving you the votes on something we don't like. We've said we won't do motions to instruct. Please take "yes" for an answer.

If you insist on being the party of "no," then don't hide behind something and say who won't negotiate. We cooperated. We gave you what you wanted.

Now here we are today. Republicans are offering yet another motion to keep the government shut down. Some people call it, in the press, the "super-committee." Others call it the "Ted Cruz committee." Whatever you call it, I'd like to know who writes this stuff. This is so ridiculous a proposal. It's so ridiculous a proposal.

How about we go to the budget table and see how we can reduce the deficit? produce growth for our country?

But all we're going to do is cut our investments in education, investments in making the future better. We're going to make seniors suffer more while we do not touch revenue, and we will not allow any discussion of closing special interest loopholes. That's how they want us to go to the table.

You must be kidding.

As I said, who writes this stuff?

Sometimes there is an expression that people use. Flippantly, they'll say, "Who do you think you are?" when you say something. Remember that from your childhood when somebody said, "Who do you think you are?"

I think we have to take that sentence very seriously, with an emphasis on "think." That would be interesting.

Who do we think we are?

Do we think that we are a party that is responsible, all of us—a Congress that is responsible—that wants to do

the right thing for the American people, that knows that we have to come here to cooperate with each other to get something done in a bipartisan way?

To my fellow colleagues on the Republican side—I hope that's allowed, Mr. Speaker. They are Members of the body—do you think you have come here to make sure that people know that you can do this just because you're doing it?

It's just a waste, a total waste of time, and we don't have time to waste. In fact, we could be spending our time in such a more important way—working in a bipartisan way on entrepreneurship, on creating growth for our country, on investing in the education of our people, which, by the way, brings more money to the Treasury than any other initiative you can name.

Early childhood, K-12, higher education, lifetime learning. You want to reduce the deficit?

Invest in education.

You want to increase the deficit?

Cut education.

But let's sit down and talk about that. The path to get there is one that says, say yes to 986. We did, your number. It says accept our offer. We won't offer any instruction to the committee, but don't continue to be the Tea Party of "no."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Speaker—is that allowed, Mr. Speaker? I hope the Speaker will give us a vote so we can see where this Congress stands on the serious responsibility that we have and that the Republicans will even accept what they are asking us to accept.

This rule should be voted down. This commission is a joke whether you call it the Ted Cruz commission or the super—super in what way? Certainly not super in meeting the needs of the American people.

To recap, A, we are giving you 200 votes for your number. Take "yes" for an answer.

B, the Speaker doesn't want any conditions or discussion or anything else on the floor about the budget. We are willing to accept that.

Take "yes" for an answer.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Enough is enough.

Today marks the fifth day that the federal government has been shutdown. Please consider how deeply unfair this is to the citizens we represent.

The solution to this crisis is a simple piece of legislation that funds the government at levels that have already passed both chambers of Congress.

At this point, to attach defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act to legislation needed to reopen the government is to put our economy at risk in order to advance a political agenda.

We demand a vote on a clean continuing resolution immediately so that government functioning can resume and Americans can move on with their lives.

The games have to stop.

Best Regards,

Tim Bishop; Patrick E. Murphy; Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader; Steny H. Hoyer, Democratic Whip; James E. Clyburn, Assistant Democratic Leader, Xavier Becerra, Chair, Democratic Caucus; Joseph Crowley, Vice Chair, Democratic Caucus; Nita M. Lowey, Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations; Chris Van Hollen, Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget; Robert E. Andrews; Karen Bass; Joyce Beatty; Ami Bera, Jr.; Sanford Bishop, Jr.; Earl Blumenauer; Suzanne Bonamici; Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Robert A. Brady; Bruce L. Braley; Corrine Brown; Julia Brownley; Cheri Bustos; G.K. Butterfield; Lois Capps; Tony Cardenas; André Carson.

Joaquin Castro; Judy N. Chu; David N. Cicilline; Yvette D. Clarke; Wm. Lacy Clay; Emanuel Cleaver; Steve Cohen; Gerald E. Connolly; John Conyers, Jr.; Jim Costa; Joe Courtney; Henry Cuellar; Elijah E. Cummings; Susan A. Davis; Danny K. Davis; Peter A. DeFazio; Diana DeGette; John K. Delaney; Susan DelBene; Theodore E. Deutch; John Dingell; Lloyd Doggett; Keith Ellison; Eliot L. Engel.

William Enyart; Ana Eshoo; Elizabeth Esty; Sam Farr; Chaka Fattah; Bill Foster; Lois Frankel; Marcia L. Fudge; Tulsi Gabbard; Pete Gallego; John Garamendi; Joe Garcia; Alan Grayson; Gene Green; Al Green; Raúl Grijalva; Luis Gutiérrez; Janice Hahn; Colleen Hanabusa; Alcee Hastings; Denny Heck; Brian Higgins; James A. Himes; Rubén Hinojosa; Rush Holt; Mike Honda; Steve Horsford.

Jared Huffman; Steve Israel; Sheila Jackson Lee; Hakeem Jeffries; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson; Marcy Kaptur; Bill Keating; Robin Kelly; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; Dan Kildee; Derek Kilmer; Ann Kirkpatrick; Ann McLane Kuster; James Langevin; Rick Larsen; John Larson; Barbara Lee; Sander M. Levin; John Lewis; Daniel Lipinski; David Loebsack; Alan S. Lowenthal; Michelle Lujan Grisham; Stephen Lynch; Daniel Maffei; Carolyn B. Maloney; Sean Patrick Maloney.

Doris O. Matsui; Carolyn McCarthy; Betty McCollum; Jim McDermott; James P. McGovern; Jerry McNerney; Gregory Meeks; Grace Meng; Michael H. Michaud; George Miller; Gwen Moore; James P. Moran; Jerrold Nadler; Grace Napolitano; Richard Neal; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Richard Nolan; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Beto O'Rourke; William L. Owens; Frank Pallone; Bill Pascrell; Ed Pastor; Donald Payne; Ed Perlmutter; Gary Peters; Pedro R. Pierluisi.

Mark Pocan; Jared Polis; David Price; Mike Quigley; Nick J. Rahall; Charles Rangel; Cedric Richmond; C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger; Bobby L. Rush; Tim Ryan; Linda T. Sánchez; John P. Sarbanes; Janice Schakowsky; Adam Schiff; Brad Schneider; Allyson Y. Schwartz; Robert C. Scott; José Serrano; Terri Sewell; Carol Shea-Porter; Brad Sherman; Albio Sires; Louise Slaughter; Adam Smith; Jackie Speier; Eric Swalwell; Mark Takano.

Dina Titus; Paul Tonko; Niki Tsongas; Juan Vargas; Marc Veasey; Filemon Vela; Tim Walz; Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Maxine Waters; Mel Watt;

Henry Waxman; Peter Welch; Frederica Wilson; John Yarmuth; Pete Visclosky; Matthew Cartwright; David Scott; Zoe Lofgren; Nydia M. Velázquez; John Carney; Ben Ray Lujan; Michael F. Doyle; Donna F. Edwards; Eddie Bernice Johnson.

Scott H. Peters; Chellie Pingree; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Kurt Schrader; Rosa L. DeLauro; Bennie G. Thompson; Mike Thompson; John Tierney; Kyrsten Sinema; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Kathy Castor; Tammy Duckworth; Collin C. Peterson; Donna M. Christensen; Ron Barber; Michael E. Capuano; Raul Ruiz; Loretta Sanchez.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the minority leader for her comments today and thank her for coming to the floor.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado Springs, Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his work on the Rules Committee and for bringing H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, and I rise in support of this act.

Mr. Speaker, this will ensure that Federal employees who have been deemed essential will have no disruption in their pay. That's an excellent step in the right direction, and I wholeheartedly support that concept.

Just on Saturday, the House unanimously—every single Republican and every single Democrat—supported H.R. 3223, and that said that everyone who is a Federal employee will get paid eventually, at the end of this slowdown that we're in right now. So this is a step in the right direction.

But I want to urge that we take up a bill that I introduced yesterday, H.R. 3271, which goes a step further and says there is no distinction between the essential and non-essential Federal worker. All Federal workers are to be brought back immediately and given back pay and put on a regular pay schedule.

We are going to be reimbursing these people for back pay sooner or later anyway. That's what the bill Saturday accomplished that we all supported here in the House, but this would reassure everyone that they can go to work immediately.

There are people who are going to be having a tough time making house and car payments, and these are people with important jobs.

In my district, in Colorado Springs, there are a lot of defense civil workers, and they are supporting the warfighters. The Pentagon is supposed to be bringing all of them back, and many of them are coming back, but not every single one. So I want them to have the assurance that they will get paid immediately on being reinstated and that they will come back to work immediately.

So I think that it would be in the interest of our Federal workforce to take up the bill that I've introduced, H.R. 3271, and bring all civilian furloughed and Federal workers back immediately, with back pay.

But this is a great bill. I do support it, H.J. Res. 89. I thank the Rules Committee for bringing it out.

There has been, unfortunately, some gamesmanship we've seen with the National Park Service. I think that that's unfortunate. Shutting down the World War II Memorial when veterans are in their eighties and nineties, coming to Washington, maybe for the last visit that they can, and they're being told they can't enter the memorial.

So let's don't have any gamesmanship. Let's bring everyone back to work.

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

Mr. Speaker, if you want to end the games, I have a better idea. Just open up the government. End the Republican shutdown.

It's really simple. We could have an up-or-down vote to open up government today, and all the Federal workers would be taken care of, and all the monuments would be reopened. We wouldn't be having all this controversy. We can get serious about negotiating a long-term spending bill. It's a better way.

So join with us and support a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished 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. I thank my dear friend from Massachusetts.

As I begin, I express my great affection and respect for my colleague from Texas, who is my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are here to be ashamed of ourselves. We're wasting the taxpayers' time, the taxpayers' money, and we're wasting the business and the time of the House.

We are taking up a bill to require that Members of Congress sit down and talk about deficit reduction and raising the debt limit. The last time I checked, we didn't need a law to do that. It's already our job. We have a conference that we can call at any time between the House and the Senate, which would enable us then to get to the serious business in handling this matter under the regular order. We don't do it. I don't know why.

The President says he is not going to negotiate with a gun at his head. Frankly, I wouldn't either, and I don't think anybody else in this place would. Beyond that, he also is not going to negotiate the full faith and credit of the United States, which is one of the questions at issue.

So one of the problems we seem to have with our Republican friends is that their Tea Party fringe is so ideologically hell-bent in getting their way that they're finding that they're too extreme to get it.

Now, we Democrats have shown a willingness to cooperate and to compromise. In fact, as the minority leader

observed, we have asked Speaker BOEHNER to convene a budget conference all year, but to no avail.

Two hundred Democrats, including myself, sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER on Saturday, saying we'd support an extension of sequester-level spending through November 15. Democrats don't want the sequester to begin with, but the interest of compromise and keeping government open says that we're going to show good faith to my Republican colleagues.

And what is my Republican colleagues' response?

No. Resurrect the failed supercommittee. They have apparently read the Peter Principle, which says, when you can't think of anything else to do, appoint a committee, and they will obfuscate the matter further.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to put an end to these asinine antics and maneuverings. It's time to pass the Senate continuing resolution. It's time to show the Americans and the rest of the world that a great institution, created by an enormously wise group of men who made the United States Constitution, is an institution that is not beyond hope of redemption and that it can work together.

We offered to work together with my Republican friends and colleagues. We hope that they will do this.

I would simply observe that we are engaged here in another curious practice also. We're going to have it so that we're going to pay Federal workers for doing nothing. Imagine that.

My Republican colleagues, over the years, during my career here, have always been complaining about "welfare queens" who would ride to the welfare office to get their pension checks. Well, here we are going to convert a bunch of Federal employees to "welfare queens" by paying them while they do not work. The whole thing is silly, and the American people feel so.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Dean of the House has spoken. I gather, from his comments, that he would not like to be appointed on the committee, and I'm disappointed. I was rather hopeful that the minority leader would see that he would be exactly the kind of commonsense person that could represent the party, and so I'd hope that the gentleman would reconsider that.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

We've heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle they only need us to take up one bill. Well, what about all those bills we've sent over to the Senate, including four appropriations bills that the Senate won't take up to vote on?

It seems to me that they ought to be doing that if they want to show some good faith effort.

Today, as we have every day since October 1, the House of Representatives is taking yet another bipartisan step forward to resolve our differences with the United States Senate and reopen the Federal Government for the American people.

Even prior to October 1, House Republicans took numerous reasonable steps toward compromise. We voted four times on separate proposals to fund the entire government. With each vote, we sought to lay the groundwork for bipartisan compromise.

Our final two full-funding proposals simply addressed the fundamental unfairness in ObamaCare, the fact that American families won't get the same year to prepare for ObamaCare that the President decided to give to businesses and the fact that Members of Congress will get a subsidy to pay ObamaCare premiums that the rest of America will not.

Every vote from the House of Representatives has had at least some Democrat support. Not one Senate vote has been bipartisan.

While we've moved to the middle, Senate Democrats still refuse to budge. They won't even send any Senators to sit down and talk with House Republicans about a bipartisan solution to reopen government.

□ 1615

One noteworthy area, though, where there seems to be great opportunity for us to move forward with our Democrat colleagues is on the matter of Federal employee pay. One of this rule's underlying bills will ensure timely pay for Federal employees who have continued to work through this shutdown. Those who are defending our borders, our food supply, and our Capitol, should be paid on time. It's my hope that both sides will come together and support this rule and the underlying Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, we don't expect to agree on everything with our Democrat colleagues. The House appointed a team on September 30 to meet with the Senate and find common ground to fund the government. When our team gathered on the morning of October 1, no one from the Senate showed up. Every day since, the Senate has refused to be part of any discussions with the House on how to move forward. That refusal is inexcusable.

That's why the House will be considering another bill today, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, to bring Senate Democrats to the table. Once the Senators have come to the table, we can start building on areas where we should have common ground and reach a solution that benefits all of the American people. But it starts with a talk.

Both the rule and the underlying bills have my support, and I urge the same from my colleagues.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues there's an easy way to solve all of this—reopen the government, raise the debt ceiling, and negotiate a new budget. Our minority leader has already said it on the floor. It's our willingness to cooperate.

It's not that complicated. You can save all this misery that Federal workers are now enduring by reopening the government right now. This is not that hard to do, and it's at your number. It's at Republican levels. That is a compromise on our part. We loathe those sequester numbers that Republicans insisted on enshrining—those are horrible for our economy—but to keep the government open, we're going to swallow that so we have time to work out a longer-term deal.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his time.

I am glad that the minority leader got on the floor of the House and spoke common sense and indicated two things. Right now, there are 200 Members who would be willing to vote for a clean CR that would open this House, right now. We believe a number of Republicans would make it a bipartisan vote, and we'd be able to open the government.

The Republicans are playing a game of Legos. They are taking that big red box and opening it up and throwing the Legos on the ground and are trying to construct a government. Well, that's a kids' game—and it's a good game—but we cannot play with the lives of the American people.

Just a few minutes ago, we talked about restoring Head Start. We know that that bill is going nowhere. We know that the sequester is continuing to undermine Head Start seats across America—57,000 of them. In fact, it's an empty chair across America, where little babies cannot go to a Head Start program. That's what the Republicans are trying to do. They're trying to tell Marlen Rosa that her 3-year-old son, Hector, couldn't go to Head Start.

And what is their answer? Another supercommittee—a committee that maybe will be playing Legos itself because the last supercommittee—of course, we respect all of our Members—was not the solution to our problem.

I tell you what the solution is, Mr. Speaker. It is to vote on the clean bill, open the government, let the FAA be in operation, let the Justice Department be in operation.

In the meeting that I just came from, I learned 90 courts are vacant. Issues dealing with rape and domestic violence are not being attended to. Public defenders are not being resourced and are being laid off. Hundreds of lawyers are not in the Department of Justice. The American Bar Association says there is no justice.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is not get a supercommittee, but get a supercommitment to America.

Vote for a clean bill, and vote for the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

I oppose this rule because it is not a serious effort to end the government shutdown engineered by House Republicans by cherry-picking some programs and now adding a smoke and mirrors effort to replace the negotiation of the Budget bills passed by both the House and the Senate.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing and now the American people are saying the same thing.

A piecemeal strategy now being pursued by House Republicans is not an honest or serious option to reopen the government and will not end the impacts of this shutdown that extend across our country.

A consequence of partial funding of the entire Federal government one piece at a time instead of through a clean CR is the denial of burial assistance to the families of four troops who were killed by an IED in southern Afghanistan.

The majority leadership of the House has America facing a government at war and a government shutdown at the same time.

The majority of the House has found a way to intentional inflicted wounds on the American public—not by accident, but as a political strategy to get what they cannot do through the regular legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Post Editorial Board said it best:

What have House Republicans managed to accomplish in a week of government shutdown? Damage the livelihood of millions of Americans? Check. Government secretaries, food-truck operators, cleaners who work in motels near national parks: They're all hurting. Waste billions of taxpayer dollars? Check. It costs a lot to shut agencies, Web sites and parks, and it will cost a lot to reopen them. Meanwhile, the House has voted to pay the salaries, eventually, of hundred of thousands of employees whom it has ordered not to work. That's an odd way to manage an enterprise. Interfere with key government operations? Check. Rattle the markets, slow an economy in recovery, interrupt potentially lifesaving research at the National Institutes of Health? Check, check and check. Derail the hated Obamacare? Ch—Oh, no, wait a minute. That was the GOP's ostensible purpose for this travesty of misgovernment, but the online insurance markets created by that law opened on schedule last week and continue to operate.

The House Republicans' continued refusal to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate over a week ago, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign is ignoring the easy solution to this impasse.

Now faced with strong public backlash—more than 70% of Americans disapproving of the government shutdown engineered by the House Republicans, the majority is trying to extricate themselves from this debacle by bringing to the floor and passing "mini-CRs."

The House majority should know that the American public knows and very well understands what is happening. This is legislative theater at its worst—noise and thunder signifying nothing.

Mr. Speaker, these ploys are a cynical waste of time giving false hope to innocent Americans who depend on the services provided by these programs. But House Republicans know they have no chance whatsoever

of becoming law. The Senate will not pass them and the President would veto these piece-meal measures if they made it to his desk.

All we are doing is wasting time when we should be helping people.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, to our elderly, to our children, parents and young people as well as the 800,000 Federal workers that our government is needed, compassionate, strong and effective.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund the services needed by those who rely upon our full faith and credit as well as our word that this nation will not forget its fallen heroes.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and urge my Republican colleagues to rescue the American people from this situation and end the disruption in the lives of 800,000 dedicated workers who take pride in the greatest jobs in the world: serving the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, we heard from one of the brightest voices of the Republican Party, a member of our Republican leadership, VIRGINIA FOXX.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a member of the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I saw my chairman get on his feet when the gentleman from Michigan began to speak. It's not often that the dean of the House comes down to speak. It's a treat for me, too. I've been here 2½ years, but I've been watching the process a lot longer than that. I do think there's a lot that we can learn from history and a lot that we can learn, as Chris Matthews put it on his show the other day, from when politics worked.

There is no shortage of shrill voices in Washington, D.C., and when I get back home to the folks in the suburbs of metro Atlanta, rarely do I hear somebody say, ROB, I wish there were more angry people in Washington. I wish there were more folks pounding their fists and yelling and screaming, because I really think that's how solutions can be brought about.

That's not how solutions are brought about anywhere. It's not how they're brought about in business. It's not how they're brought about in politics. It's not how they're brought about in kindergartens around the country.

I have a chart here, Mr. Speaker, that says that the Democrat Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, who presided over some of the most trying times in our Nation and some of the biggest deals in our Nation, was often in conflict with the President of a different party. While Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House, the government shut down 12 times.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, not to say that a government shutdown is okay. It's not. I didn't want it to happen. It doesn't need to happen. I'm glad we're bringing more bills to the floor to reopen the government—we are already more than 50 percent of the way there with the bills that have come to the floor. But it is happening, and it's not happening because Republican this and Republican that.

I commented earlier to some of my Democratic friends about what great party discipline they have displayed in never talking about a government shutdown but in always making sure it's a "Republican government shutdown." I suppose you get points for that in terms of party unity, but it's just not true; nor has it ever been true in the history of our Republic that when legitimate policy differences come about, driven by our constituents back home, that the best way forward to solve those is to make sure you demonize the other guy and make sure folks know who to blame for it.

In these 12 times that the Democratic Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, was leading this institution—the people's House—and the government shut down, it wasn't because Tip O'Neill was a bad man. It wasn't because he lost control of some liberal faction within his party. It was because the House of Representatives, the closest voice to the American people in our Republic, had legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States, and that's where we sit today.

What's surprising is not that we have legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to fund Head Start, and that becomes complicated. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to make sure that our men and women are getting paid, and that creates the controversy. What's surprising is we bring a bill to the floor to fund nuclear security across the country, and that's what brings controversy.

There is so much that we agree on, and I am certain we're going to find the pathway forward; but I am equally certain that that pathway forward is not going to be found more quickly in depending on how much we can embarrass and marginalize our political opponents. It's going to be found when we agree that there is more that unites us than divides us, and it's okay that we have some serious policy differences.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman is actually the one who appointed me as the rules designee to the Budget Committee, and I'm grateful to him for that because it really gives me an opportunity to express what, for my constituents, is commonsense budget re-

form, Mr. Speaker. They know you just can't keep spending and spending and spending and never have to pay the bills. The bills have to get paid.

But I would say that the funding level that the United States Senate has agreed on is absolutely in no way a compromise. It's the law of the land. The law of the land, if this Congress were to dissolve itself tomorrow, is that for fiscal year 2014 we're only going to be able to spend \$967 billion. The Senate wants to spend \$986 billion. The law of the land is not going to let them spend that much. That's just the law of the land.

Now, we don't have to like it. We can try to change that, but to characterize that as somehow moving to the middle is to misrepresent, Mr. Speaker, what the facts of our budget are.

As my colleague from North Carolina said so well, the House has adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved to the middle and adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved further to the middle, adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. Then we said, Let's just sit down and talk about it to find that pathway forward.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, are talking a lot about a budget conference. I suspect we'll continue to hear that. I even read about it in the National Journal—apparently, that message is being sold well—but as my friends on both sides of the aisle know, a budget conference has absolutely no force of law whatsoever. Zero. We can conference a budget until we're blue in the face, Mr. Speaker, and we will never change one penny of Federal spending.

Now that's different from the conference that this House moved to go to with the Senate. The conference that this House moved to have with the Senate—where we could actually change the law, where we could fund the government, where we could deal with the debt ceiling, where we could focus on priorities that each one of us has for our families back home—the conference this House moved to create, Mr. Speaker, can change the law.

Let's do something that matters. Let's do it today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I served as an aide here on Capitol Hill when Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House. I think he is one of the greatest Speakers that ever served in the United States House of Representatives. He was a friend of mine as well.

I will tell you that Speaker O'Neill would never go on national TV and threaten to default on the debt to this Nation. He would never, ever act in a way that might bring this economy to ruin. He put country before political party.

I would also say that Speaker O'Neill understood the importance of working in a bipartisan way. He would be disgusted with the way this House is being

run today. The bottom line is he'd be scratching his head right now, wondering why we just don't resolve this in a very simple way.

There were 200 Democrats who have signed a letter saying, We will cooperate with the Republicans to pass a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels, and we know that there are 20 Republicans in the House who publicly said they would support such a move. That's the majority. We could open up the government in a matter of minutes. In the Senate, over a dozen Republican Senators voted for cloture on a clean continuing resolution. That is bipartisanship. Accept it. This is the way this House should be run.

So I would just point that out to my colleagues that we're going through all this rigamarole for I don't know what when we could end this Republican shutdown right now by bringing a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels to the House floor. It would pass in a bipartisan way, and I predict that there will even be more than 20 Republicans that would support it. They want a way out of this.

Let's open the government. Let us not use the debt ceiling in the threatening manner in which it's being used by the Republican leadership here. We should never—I don't care what your political ideology is—default on our financial obligations. That is economic ruin for this country, and I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that. We should never use that in such a political way.

Let's work together and appoint budget conferees and go to negotiate a budget conference so we can have some parameters in terms of numbers we can work with.

I listened to some of my colleagues talking on the other side—even those who serve on the Budget Committee—and you wonder why we should have a Budget Committee if the Budget Committee doesn't mean anything. I have a lot more respect for the people that serve on that committee.

As this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1630

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Also, let me just associate myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments with regard to Speaker O'Neill. I, too, was a staffer during that period when the great Speaker, Mr. O'Neill, was Speaker, and there is no way that he would have allowed this hostage-taking to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Again, I just have to say, we've seen this 8 days, unfortunately, and it is a Tea Party Republican government shutdown. We've seen \$2.4 billion in lost economic activity; and so, yes, this hostage-taking, it continues.

Hostage-taking really is a deplorable tactic. The Tea Party Republicans con-

tinue to want to deny millions of Americans health care—and, yes, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, which the Supreme Court has upheld. That's why the shutdown continues, and the public knows it.

Yet, instead of bringing up a budget bill to open up the government or pass a debt limit increase to pay our bills, the House has taken up two more last-minute bills to distract from their Tea Party Republican shutdown. This most recent bill establishes a supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes.

I want to remind my colleagues, this is the same proposal—or very similar—that got us into this devastating sequester in the first place. We've been there; we've done that. Thanks, but no thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Now, as a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, I can tell you that both the House and Senate have passed budget resolutions. Democrats have been trying to work out our budget differences for 6 months, but Republicans continue to block these efforts. The American people deserve a functioning government.

The public understands that we can open up the government. And I have to say, the Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but we are compromising to get this government open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. It's also important to recognize, again, as an appropriator and as a member of the Budget Committee, I hear and see each and every day, whenever we're in committee, the tactics and the discussion with regard to cuts to Head Start and the women and children nutrition assistance program—all of those programs that just very recently the Republican Tea Party Members have started to say that they support. So let's see what happens. I hope that they do support this when we get to these budget negotiations.

It's time that we shut down this shutdown. We need to reject this rule. Let's have an up-or-down vote to open up this government and let the chips fall where they may.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that there is a lot of dialogue on the floor today about opening up the government. Yet this body has passed bill after bill after bill—whether it's the intelligence community, whether it's Head Start, whether it's NIH—making sure that we are going through a deliberative process. Repeatedly, you are seeing where our friends on the other side vote “no,” and when it gets to the other body, even though it's a passed piece of legislation, the Senate, our friends over there, ignore the bills. I kind of wonder what we're really try-

ing to aim at, whether we're really just trying to score political points or whether we can begin working together. That's what House Republicans are here to do: to set aside our differences, to try and fund these issues, to try and deal with the President.

Earlier in the week, our great young Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, went to the White House. He was asked to come to the White House, and really all he was there to be told by the President was: I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. Then, as Mr. BOEHNER tells the story, he got that message, so he came back to work. Here we are, trying to send ideas out about working together.

The working group intentionally was an open-ended opportunity for Members of Congress—10 on the House side, 10 on the Senate side—to work together with an opportunity, as a working group, to try and overcome this by-pass. That's what we're trying to do. I think we're going to be faithful to it. I think we're going to pass this here today, and then we're going to see what the Senate will do again—I'm sure, once again, just another piece of log over in their fireplace for the Senate majority leader to burn down. I am hopeful here today that we have common sense, and I think we will pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would advise the gentleman, at this time, I do not have any further speakers. I thank the gentleman for asking.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the clean Senate continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as we bring this debate to a close, I have the dueling emotions of being angry and being very sad—angry that we are putting the American people through this trauma. This is totally unnecessary. This is a manufactured crisis.

When my colleagues talk about the fact that Democrats aren't willing to negotiate, let me just refer to some of

the recent headlines: “Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate with Republicans”; that’s according to the *National Journal*. “Republicans Spent Year Blocking Budget Conference”; that was in the *Huffington Post*. “Boehner Tells GOP He is Through Negotiating with Obama”; that was in *The Hill* newspaper. I mean, those are the headlines about my friends’ actions during these recent weeks.

The bottom line is that what we’re doing today really is sad because I think it diminishes this institution. We ought to be solving problems. We ought to be finding ways to lift people up. We ought to be trying to debate ways to create more jobs and opportunity in this country. We ought to get the government running. We ought to deal with the debt ceiling, not politicize it, and we ought to work on a long-term negotiation so we have a long-term spending bill that makes sense for this country, and we’re not doing that.

We’re coming up with a committee today that does nothing. You pass this bill, the government still shuts down. You pass this bill, we’re still headed for a default on our obligations on October 17. This does nothing. It does nothing. It is sad because it is beneath this great House of Representatives. So many incredible things have happened on this floor, and yet this is so trivial. It is so meaningless at a time of such a great crisis.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is a crisis that my friends have brought on themselves. There is nothing that says that we should be in shutdown today other than the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to shut the government down.

Now they’re saying they care about the monuments and they care about our senior citizens and our veterans, but they’re the ones who shut the government down. They say they don’t want to default on our financial obligations, yet we heard on “This Week” with George Stephanopoulos that the Speaker of the House is prepared to basically see this country default on our debt. That’s what he said.

I mean, I am shocked by that kind of talk. I don’t care what party you’re in, where you come from ideologically. We all should at least agree that we ought to pay our bills, that if we don’t, it will do great damage to our economy, and it will hurt your constituents just as much as mine. We could do so much better. We could do so much better than this.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say they want a vote on a clean continuing resolution to vote with us on some of these procedural motions. Start giving us some votes on these procedural motions, because it appears that your leadership will not give you the right to an up-or-down vote. Notwithstanding all of the talk about a transparent process, an open process, you’re not going to get that vote unless you force it.

Here is the other sad thing. My friends on the other side of the aisle began this Congress by talking about regular order and a transparent, open process. Of all the stuff we’ve been voting on these last few days, nobody has seen it. Even the committee chairman who oversees these bills doesn’t even come to the Rules Committee to testify. We don’t know what we’re voting on here.

We can do better. Reject this rule. Vote “no” on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate my dear friend, my colleague, from Worcester, Massachusetts. I will describe it to him real fast.

Mr. Speaker, what we’re trying to do is open up all the employees that are home at the FAA. That’s it. We’re going to bring them back to work; pay them; get it done, all the employees at the FAA.

Secondly, we’re trying to form a working group. We’re trying to work around the process that has gotten bogged up today, with an idea from our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, and our Majority Leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and a couple of people who are in the Republican leadership who are saying let’s find another way around the logjam that we’ve got. So we came up with a good idea and said let’s go to a working group. Let’s actually get 10 Members of the Senate and 10 Members of the House. Let’s meet. Let’s meet very quickly. As a matter of fact, the resolution says that, within 1 day, they’ve got to be selected; within 1 day after that, they have to meet. Let’s put them to work. Let’s put the Members to work on this on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. That is what this is about. It is really pretty simple.

Mr. Speaker, this is not really rocket science right now. We’re engaged in how we put one foot in front of the other, and Republicans have been doing this for 3 weeks. We’re meeting at the Rules Committee. We’re taking testimony. We are listening to the people who come to the committee.

We have very vigorous, detailed debates where Members, Republicans and Democrats, come to the Rules Committee from the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, we’ve seen some star witnesses in this House—stars, good people, great ideas—trying to push that we’re going to work together. We’re going to do this together. We can do this together. Not all the bills were agreed to, but a bunch of them have been on a bipartisan basis.

So you never know when you throw up a good idea whether somebody is going to take you up on it or not. We have had a couple where that has worked; and we, as Republicans, are going to stay after it. We’re the ones willing to negotiate.

Now, there was a discussion about us showing up at the World War II Memo-

rial. Yup, sure did. I did that myself, too. The reason we went down there is that there are men and women who served in the military during World War II who, at the last years of their lives, are coming up in what are called Honor Flights, where they come up here and meet together as people who were comrades in arms for the United States of America, who fought the Axis of Evil, the Germans, the Japanese, and others. They wanted to come just about 2 miles from here down to the World War II Memorial, and it was locked. It was bolted up and locked. So a couple of colleagues, my fellow Texans, went down there last week and found out—the park ranger was there. Well, who’s allowed to get in? First Amendment protesters. First Amendment protesters are the only ones allowed in—well, and Members of Congress. So these two colleagues of mine took bolt cutters, opened it up, and it has been open ever since.

That’s what Republicans are trying to do. We are trying to do that not just for the World War II Memorial; we are trying to do that for this government. We are trying to work on commonsense ideas. We are asking for this House of Representatives to be with us today.

I support this rule. I support the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 373 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker’s table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 5 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

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

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the

House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the BBC News, on October 1, 2013 in England, published the following: “For most of the world, a government shutdown is very bad news—the result of revolution, invasion or disaster. Even in the middle of its ongoing civil war, the Syrian government has continued to pay its bills and workers’ wages. That leaders of one of the most powerful nations on earth willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services and decreases economic growth is astonishing to many.”;

Whereas the state-run Xinhua news service, on October 2, 2013 in China, published the following: “With no political unity to redress its policy mistake, a dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.”;

Whereas The News of Mexico, on September 25, 2013 in Mexico, published the following: “They squabble over the inconsequential accomplishment of a 10-week funding extension. It isn’t serious, but it certainly isn’t funny.”;

Whereas the Australian, on October 1, 2013 in Australia, published the following: “The irresponsible way in which Congress . . . played the politics of partisan petulance and obstruction . . . does them little credit. Neither does it say much for the budgetary processes in the world’s largest economy.”;

Whereas the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: “The main actors in this dispute, which brings together many factors, both ideological and political, took a huge risk and, unhindered, proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core . . . The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.”;

Whereas the Süddeutsche Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: “What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world’s oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn’t being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists or sinister major party donors. America’s democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it . . . the politicians . . . At the moment, Washington is fighting over the budget and nobody knows if the country will still be solvent in three weeks . . . What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.”;

Whereas the Washington Post, on September 30, 2013, quoted Justice Malala, a political commentator in South Africa as saying the following: “They tell us, ‘You guys are not being fiscally responsible’ . . . And now we see that they are running their country a little like a banana republic . . . there is a lot of sniggering going on.”;

Whereas the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on October 1, 2013, read: “House of Turds”, and the bylines stated: “D.C. cesspools shut down government” and “They get paid while nation suffers”;

Whereas these reports call into question the dignity of the House; and

Whereas the resulting reduction in the public’s perception of the House’s dignity has culminated in a 7% Congressional approval rating in the most recent Economist/YouGov poll: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—

that a government shutdown is a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a “clean” continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged under rule IX to take precedence over other questions?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the dignity of the House has been called into question. You have heard the text of the resolution, but I think that some points bear highlighting.

The BBC News has reported that “leaders of one of the most powerful nations on Earth”—by the way, that is still us—“willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services.”

A leading Chinese news service stated:

A dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.

A German newspaper stated:

The main actors in this dispute took a huge risk and proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core. The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.

Another German newspaper said:

What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world’s oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn’t being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists, or sinister major party donors. America’s democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it—the politicians. What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.

The headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has heard the reading of the resolution.

Does the gentleman have an argument to present as to why it qualifies as a matter of privilege under rule IX?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do, and I was about to get to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you.

As I just indicated, the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way: “House of Turds.”