

The House has members who are specialists in appropriations they serve on the house Committee on Appropriations.

According to the Rules on the House of Representatives the House Committee on Appropriations' function is the appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

The Appropriations Committee would not have forgotten to include Hill staff, which this bill will address. Hill employees include Capitol Police officers, custodial staff, and the staff of the Library of Congress.

This gesture is appreciated by these Federal government employees, but neither they nor the other federal employees promised back pay will see anything until this body passes a clean CR offered by the Senate.

The United States House of Representatives has Rules that govern how we as the people's representatives are to conduct the business of the Federal government.

The House of Representatives have been trying to put on a show for the American public by bringing bills to the floor—fast and varied though they may be they are half baked and ineffective means of funding the Federal government.

My colleagues on the other side aisle are only human—and they are going to forget something, but one of the things they should not forget is how their decisions are impacting the lives of people.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.J. Res. 89.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. 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.

□ 1815

DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3273

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. BICAMERAL WORKING GROUP ON DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a bicameral working group to be known as the “Bicameral Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth” (hereinafter referred to as the “working group”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The working group shall recommend to the House of Representatives and the Senate—

(1) overall levels of discretionary spending, including for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2014;

(2) changes in the statutory limit on the public debt; and

(3) reforms in direct spending programs.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) The working group shall be comprised of 20 members to be appointed as follows:

(A) The Speaker shall appoint 10 Members of the House of Representatives, of which one shall be designated as House co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(B) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 10 Senators, of which one shall be designated as Senate co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the working group shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation was made.

(3) Each appointment under this subsection shall be made not later than one calendar day after enactment of this Act.

(d) MEETINGS.—The members of the working group shall meet not later than one calendar day after their appointment pursuant to subsection (c) and shall meet on each calendar day thereafter unless both co-chairs jointly determine that there is good cause to dispense with such meeting.

(e) ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—The working group may not report any recommendation unless it receives the support of a majority of the members appointed by both the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) The working group shall report its recommendations, including any legislative language required to implement those recommendations, to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 3 calendar days after their adoption.

(2) The report shall be referred in the House of Representatives by the Speaker in accordance with clause 2 of rule XIV.

(3) The report shall include any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted to the co-chairs prior to its transmission pursuant to paragraph (1).

(g) TERMINATION.—The working group shall terminate immediately after transmission of the report under subsection (f).

(h) RULEMAKING.—The provisions of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supercede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3273.

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

There was no objection.

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

It has been 1 week since the Federal Government shut down. In that time, House Republicans have passed several appropriations bills designed to provide funding for numerous parts of the government's most important functions. Additionally, we've invited Senate Democrats to join us at the negotiating table to find a commonsense solution to our Nation's fiscal problems.

Unfortunately, no one over these 3 weeks has been able to reach a compromise, and Senate Democrats have simply returned our volley every time without a value-added proposition. So what we are here to do today is to stand up once again and say we believe we are trying to appropriately fund the Federal Government.

As a result, we are here today. House Republicans are going to offer to sit down at the negotiation table with Senate Democrats in an effort to reach the meaningful solutions our constituents expect from us.

H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013, would establish a bicameral, bipartisan working group consisting of six Members of the majority and four Members of the minority from both the House and the Senate. These 20 Members would be appointed no less than 1 day after enactment of the legislation and would meet each subsequent calendar day to provide recommendations to overall discretionary spending levels for fiscal year 2014, changes to the discretionary debt limit, and reforms to direct spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, being from Texas, I am used to a lot of people trying to work for the good—the common good—of its people. I will tell you that I fully expect that the reason I came to Washington was to work for the good and not for just the people of Texas, but to accept the responsibility. It was important that I come to work for all people in Texas and the American people to make their lives better. I believe that some of those ideas include sitting down, talking, negotiating, finding common ground, leading—not obstructing, not saying “no,” not being the

first one to walk out or not agreeing to meet, but, rather, to sit down and be constructive.

That is what we in the House of Representatives are trying to do once again today with a common set of principles. We believe constitutionally, as the House of Representatives, we have the authority and the responsibility to be leaders in the process that will allow the American people to effectively see who is here, who is working, and expect us to get our job done. Unfortunately, it's a rough world, and we're having a tough time, so a new idea today is to gather our colleagues together from each side and see if we can make progress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Texas, who yielded the time.

I rise today obviously in strong opposition to this measure. I would say to my friend, I just heard him just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, say that the people from Texas sent him here to do things. Well, the people from Florida sent me here to do things just like him. There are 435 Members in this institution, in addition to delegates from around our territories, and each one of them has an unequivocal and clear understanding about how to go about budgeting in this particular matter.

Forming a working group is forming another group up above that group. I don't need that, and I don't believe he needs that. I don't need it. Evidently, we haven't done very well when we've had it. From the newspapers today, I gathered that we had a Simpson-Bowles Commission, which people forget was the legacy of the 2010 debt ceiling increase. We had the Domenici-Rivlin commission. We had the Cantor-Biden talks. We had the Obama-Boehner debt ceiling negotiation, the Gang of Six talks, the supercommittee, and then the Obama-Boehner fiscal cliff talks. Not one of them worked, and this mess isn't going to work either.

It's sort of like, Mr. Speaker, moving the hostages, since they're taking them one by one here with this rifle-shot approach to legislating, when, in fact, all they have to do is put a clean CR on the floor and we could pass it, and they know that. But basically what they're doing is saying, Okay, we're going to take some hostages over here; then we're going to put them in another room with some more people so that they can talk to them.

I said in the Rules Committee, and I repeat: this is a gimmick wrapped in a con inside a scam, and nothing tells me anything different about my friends across the aisle who've offered gimmick after gimmick instead of doing what they know is right.

We can open the government, and that's easy to do. We can put Ameri-

cans back to work, and that's easy to do. We can keep our country from defaulting on its obligations. This measure will do none of those things, not one of them.

In all that talk about the President, the President made it very clear today that he's willing to negotiate. Evidently—and I picked up on this—my friends on the other side must have poll-tested conversation. Well, conversation allows, among other things, that you have an exploratory understanding with people in an informal setting.

What have we been talking about around here for 2 years? We've been talking about this mess. This didn't just come up last night or the day before yesterday. Democrats have already offered seven times to take up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. The House GOP has blocked a vote on the measure each and every time. For 6 months, we've been asking these people to conference.

To the House Republican leadership I say, Mr. Speaker, let us vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. Why prolong this shutdown when you know that the votes are here in the House of Representatives?

My friends across the aisle know they've made a mistake. The goalposts have not only moved; they have vanished completely from the field. First, they want to defund ObamaCare. Then they only want to delay ObamaCare. Then when that didn't work, they said, well, we don't want to shut the government down, so let's open it up piece by piece. Evidently, that isn't working either, so they're now down here, moaning and groaning about the fact that the Senate isn't going to take up something that's foolish because they've made it clear that they want this to be a measure that's not a part of any negotiations or conversation; and the President made it clear that he will converse with anybody about anything but not with a gun at his head and not with the kind of undertaking that you are going forward here.

So now it's a working group, another supercommittee. How did that work out for you the last time, I ask my friends, if you would, Mr. Speaker?

So tell me, where does it all end? In all seriousness, what do my friends across the aisle hope to achieve?

Speaker BOEHNER has said: "My goal here is to have a serious conversation"—he said it 27 times "conversation" on Sunday; I was looking at him when he said it—"about those things that are driving the deficit and driving the debt up, and the President's refusal to sit down and have a conversation about this is putting our Nation at risk of default."

At 11:38 today, the President's office issued a statement wherein they had a conversation today with JOHN BOEHNER, in essence, telling him virtually that we can do this with a clean CR.

What have we been talking about? Why are we even here? What are we

talking about now? Are we having a conversation, or are we just talking past each other here in the House of Representatives? Republicans have shut down the Federal Government and taken us to the brink of a global economic catastrophe because, evidently, they want to have a conversation that we are already in the middle of.

Guess what? The Senate CR is at the levels you wanted—\$986 billion. That's what they voted on. Sequestration is the law, as my friend from Georgia is fond of saying, "the law of the land." You've already gotten what you wanted. Let's just vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. This shutdown and looming debt ceiling breach are failures of the majority's leadership to stand up against the extremists within their own party, elected on a platform of obstructionism that borders on insurrection.

Leaders, you say on the other side, must be strong. Leaders must be courageous. This has become not a democracy that was intended by Jefferson and Madison and Adams and all of those that were our Founders, the Franklins and the Washingtons. They founded a democracy in spite of their divisions. They did not want to have mobocracy. That's what you've allowed to stand up in your part of this institution, a mob.

Mr. Speaker, let us end these games with a strong bipartisan message. We can show the rest of the world that the United States is ready to end its political brinksmanship.

When I was a child and I would speak out of turn, my dad and my grandmother would say: Sit down and shut up. We don't need a shutdown. We don't need people being shut out. What we need to do is shut up and let the American people cause us to listen to them and go about the business of bringing a clean CR down here. That's what I'm hearing from the American people, both Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, that they want us to sit down and shut up and open up this government with a clean CR.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party hears the gentleman. We are also listening to the American people. The American people are sick and worried about their future. They see a government that spends too much money and listens too little. They tax too much and leave too little for the American people. They are very aware that this Big Government ploy and play by not just this administration, but the prior administration that ran this House of Representatives, placed America in a detrimental position, in a position where we have health care that is a government-run health care plan, that is causing not just uncertainty, but unemployment. Republicans got into this whole mess of the debate with ObamaCare because it got closer and closer and closer to implementation.

Let's look at what this bill tactically does. It tactically puts rules and regulations on business. That means that business arbitrarily will make decisions literally to cut not only the amount of people that they have, but the work hours associated with that. Many unions across the United States are concerned about the loss of the 40-hour workweek because that's the threshold that Democrats have placed the American worker in.

So the Republican Party, in listening not just to business, but workers, made a determination that the closer we got to this implementation, we were going to continue discussing how bad this was for not just business, but for individuals.

Then the President came and unilaterally decided he would let businesses be deferred for a year, but kept the rules and regulations on individuals. That was done over Fourth of July, just in a tweet that went out. They weren't even brave enough to put the full announcement out.

So now the Republicans have focused since the Fourth of July on the unfairness about how individuals will be expected to apply all of these laws directly on them as individuals. See, what the American people understand is, it is almost impossible to fight as an individual against a big government, against the IRS, and it's the IRS who will be making sure that the American people follow this tax law.

□ 1830

That is what the Supreme Court said it is. It is a tax law.

That is where lots of groups around the country continue to speak, not only clearly, but with effectiveness, about how it is unfair for the President to give 1,200 waivers and a waiver to certain people who were included in the bill—business—and now he is going to waive that but put it off on individuals.

These are small business owners. They are men and women who are not just our neighbors. They are men and women who produce the goods and services, who put their name on their businesses, who have their children become teachers and firefighters and members of our military.

They see where this is harming their ability to have health care. It is harming their ability to have the opportunity for their small business to be successful because it is putting them at a disadvantage. Perhaps worst of all, there are lots of businesses who understand that this will cost an incredible amount of money, and that is why businesses will not offer the exact same health care plan that they had previously—UPS, all the way to Delta Air Lines, and lots of other companies.

That is why it is very timely—it is very timely—that Republicans have been doing this all year, but we focused on this directly at the implementation.

We are here for a good reason. We are trying to now change the dynamics with a working group. We are trying to

say we believe that some of our colleagues would have a better opportunity to negotiate with some good ideas. Trust me, there are good ideas that float back and forth between Republicans and Democrats all the time. We are trying to say that a successful "rain dance" has a lot to do with timing.

That success can be accepting this working group, getting our Members together on a bipartisan basis—House and Senate—immediately within a day or so, and then start working together. Do you know what? Even if they weren't the final answer, what a great opportunity to empower our Members to talk and work together and see if they can make headway.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both sides how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, my good friend and an appropriator supreme.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, a quick review of the facts makes clear that Republicans are revising history when they claim Democrats refuse to negotiate.

A headline yesterday from National Journal sums it up:

Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate With Republicans: The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last weekend.

House Republicans' failure to negotiate includes: their leadership walking out of negotiations last December; ignoring the President's \$4 trillion deficit reduction plan; refusing for months to negotiate on the budget with the Senate; and now denying the House a vote to end the shutdown after Democrats agreed to their spending levels.

Of course we will work with you, my friends, on honest efforts. President Obama signed a bipartisan \$2.5 trillion deficit reduction law, and the deficit today is half of what it was in 2009. We are willing partners who will compromise.

But to suggest that we need a special committee to tell us what we already know is just not sincere. This bill is an attempt to shift blame for this shutdown. Speaker BOEHNER should stop trying to find somebody else to do his job. He can end the shutdown today by allowing a vote on the Republican-written and Senate-passed CR, which would get a majority vote in the House and be signed by the President.

Reopen the government. Do not jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. Stop wasting time on political stunts like this bill while Americans suffer. Vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I would thankfully acknowledge the floor of the House of Representatives here for voting on several very, very important items that allow those employees that today might not be at work. We have asked that they come back to work, and it was passed here—those in food and drug security, those in Head Start, those in national emergency disaster recovery, those in the NIH, and those in national parks.

These are an example of the ideas that have come forth from votes on this floor. And soon to come—intelligence, border security, Native Americans, and Alaskan health care, national weather monitoring, nuclear weapons security, and nutrition assistance for women and children.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I put to you most sincerely: Do you not feel that by cherry-picking what it is that you want to do with these rifle shots, that it is causing a morale problem in the rest of the government?

Let's assume that you have 150 that you are going to do, and the group that would be going back to work the latest would be sometime the week after next or sometime 2 weeks from there.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman for asking. My dear friend, very respectfully, has asked a good question.

As a matter of fact, we would like to move forward with all 150 as quickly as possible. What we would like to do is move through these. We've got them now. They are lined up to go to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. But they don't want to do that.

Why would I move forward if they don't want to do that? Why would we move forward if they do not actually really want to open up the government except under their terms?

We believe that they have not addressed the underlying problems:

Number one, what is happening with this thing called ObamaCare, and secondly, with the debt? We are adding debt as we speak. We have gone from \$9- to \$17 trillion in just a few short years.

We have been working with the President. We have been doing things in the 3 years that Republicans have been back in the majority. We are trying to correct the errors of the past. That is why we are here today.

The gentleman asked a good question: Wouldn't it be a good thing to get through our list of 150? I would say to the gentleman, we have already done some and we will keep doing them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In the vernacular, they just say "bring it." Put all 150 of them down here and we would have a clean CR.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of the most distinguished Members that has served in the House of Representatives, my good friend, the minority whip of my party, who may very well answer that question that I asked about morale.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out, the morale is low for approximately 315 million people who call America home; low because they see a dysfunctional board of directors of their country; low because they are anguished about the inability to come to grips with reality.

I want to tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, we said "yes." You sent us a bill to the United States Senate, which we control, and you said, Let us open government, and we will open it on the condition that we cap spending at \$986 billion.

Now, you also put another piece on that bill which said we ought to defund ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act, as we call it. I venture to say that close to 90, maybe even 100 percent, on your side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman—I say to him, Mr. Speaker—didn't think that was going to happen. They said it because they feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, about that. I understand that. I have strong feelings myself.

Now, the gentleman, my colleague from Maryland, I hope is going to use the analogy about "vetoing" the debt limit because it is a good one. But I will tell my friend the Senate said "yes" and sent it back here.

We could open the government this evening if only you would accept what you suggested, if only you would say, "Yes, you agreed with our number."

There was no negotiation, there was no compromise on our side. There was a saying to you: We want to keep the government open, so yes. Our Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate said, Mr. Speaker, we will take your number. America needs to know that we have said "yes" to the number that you suggested.

I don't like your number. I think it is not good for America, Mr. Speaker. I think it is not good for our national security, for our economy, or for the morale of the American people long term.

Having said that, I want government open, so we have said "yes" to your number. We didn't negotiate. We said, "We will take what you propose."

Mr. Speaker, I hope every American understands that when one side says, "We'll take your number," that there ought to be an agreement.

Now, I rise in opposition to this bill that has been put on the floor, which is another way to distract from the business at hand—opening up our government. Eight days from now our government will be in a position for the first time in history where we won't be able to pay our bills. The wealthiest Nation

on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, will be in a position not that we don't have the resources, not that we don't have the credit to borrow to make sure that we continue to be able to pay our bills—that won't be the case. It will be the case that we don't have the authority to do so because this Congress has not acted.

I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, who chairs the Rules Committee and whose father served with such distinction as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. The present head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Comey, says that this sequester and budget number will deeply hurt law enforcement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to my colleagues, let's defeat this bill, and let's move to the business that is real, that will make a difference, not make a political point. Let us move to doing the business of America and put the people's government back to work, not pretend that we are going to do it by some supercommittee. We tried that. It didn't work very well. I am sorry about that. I urged them to stay in business and do their job.

I ask my colleagues, defeat this, move to the business of America, put the people's government back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this House has a responsibility to reopen government.

We can vote on a bill within the hour that would reopen the entire government—and we know the votes are there to pass it.

Two hundred Democrats are on record that we will vote to reopen the government, and there are media reports that twenty-five Republicans will do so as well.

So let's find out: put a bill on the floor to reopen government, and let the House work its will.

Democrats are also ready to work with Republicans to prevent a default.

Once we end the shutdown and remove the threat of default, Democrats want to sit down and talk in a bipartisan way—as we have asked to do for months—and work out a long-term solution to our nation's fiscal challenges.

But the plan on the floor today won't do that.

It is a pretense, not a substantive action. It does not reopen government, nor does it ensure America pays its bills.

And it is not a real mechanism to reach a broader agreement on fiscal issues.

It does not have a deadline for action—nor does it require a vote on any recommendations the committee would produce.

And, it is not a balanced approach, as it precludes the consideration of any new revenue whatsoever.

This is just more of the same from the Tea Party-driven Republican conference that isn't serious about reducing the deficit in a balanced and sustainable way.

Instead of wasting more time on these reckless and irresponsible gimmicks, we ought to be taking responsible steps to end the shut-

down, prevent a default, and then work together to achieve real, long-term fiscal solutions.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

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

As the gentleman knows, there are few people in this House who I have a better relationship than I do with the gentleman from Maryland. With great respect, I listened to him and his words.

I would say back to him there is a little bit more that really comes to us from people who speak about their lives also. I am concerned about people who are not only working for our great government and people who receive services, but we are also trying—without to make a point—we are trying to make changes in the Affordable Care Act, which is also known as ObamaCare.

□ 1845

There are several things about the Affordable Care Act that render that title difficult to understand, because the Affordable Care Act, within a year the Congressional Budget Office said they believed it would be at least twice as expensive as it was originally thought it would be.

Secondly, some 70 percent more people will be in the system because they provided a figure that did not match what they expect now for people to be in it from people who moved off of their worker plans, their insurance plans.

Third, the President stood right here one State of the Union and said there won't be a dime of taxpayer money.

And lastly, the President of the United States said:

And if you like your insurance, I guarantee you, you can keep it.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since then is this administration was incapable of providing information about how this would work. And even to today, after the announcement was made, people are going onto the Web site and learning more about these exchanges.

The largest cardiology group in America, cardiologists—heart doctors—were not even included or asked to be in the exchange. Not even given a chance to say no, thank you, the largest cardiology group in America.

So now the American people are looking at it and saying, my doctor's not even included, so who is included because my doctor is not, and now I am looking at this plan that is very expensive. Granted, New York City, the State of New York was less because they had a very expensive plan, and it's true in some places it is less. But the best doctors or the doctors that people went to are not even included in those plans now. As an example, as I said, the largest cardiology group, the most experienced cardiologists, the ones you want to go to for Medicare, for Medicaid, and for your health insurance, are not even going to be included in the government plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is just one example about the disappointment that the American people have because they were told one thing, and they're going to get something else. Because you're fighting the government, we have to do it in such a public way. If we simply followed the law, and the contract or the express contract did not equal what came out the other end, you could go to court and sue for it. But you can't sue the government over this. So we are litigating this actually, Mr. Speaker, right before your eyes in a very public way, saying that we believe this health care, known as ObamaCare, should not be entered into lightly.

We better understand what we're doing, and we're asking for a lot of changes. Those changes are: we think we ought to delay it; we think we ought to defer it; we think we ought to wait on it. We have, in essence, backed up every single time from our demand, and now we've gotten to a point where we, as Republicans in our discussion through legislation with the Senate, have now gotten to the point where we've said, We are where we're going to be. Now we're going to try and open up the government and we're going to try and make it work. That's the facts of the case, and that's just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here about the working group, but it does come out in the wash: we really are here about ObamaCare.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida. As the gentleman said, we discovered right now that the government is still shut down because our Republican colleagues want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, when in fact we could open the government right now by passing the bill that's in our possession.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about negotiation because the President and the Democrats in Congress have been trying to have a budget negotiation with our Republican colleagues all year long. In fact, in March, the House passed its budget, and in March, the Senate passed its budget. And just like the textbook says, you're then supposed to have a negotiation between the House and the Senate to negotiate your differences to reach a compromise. What happened? The Speaker of the House refused to appoint negotiators from the House. We tried three times to get a vote; each time the Speaker said "no."

In the United States Senate, on 18 occasions, in fact 19 now, the Democratic leader and Senator MURRAY tried to get consent to have a budget negotiation between the House and Senate. On 18 occasions, Senate Republicans said "no." They didn't want to talk. They didn't want to negotiate. So the clock

ticked until we got down to government shutdown. And then what happened?

The Speaker of the House and the Senate Democratic leader had a negotiation. On Sunday on national television, the Speaker of the House told the country that he had a negotiation with Senator REID. They had gotten a deal. But guess what? The Speaker reneged on the agreement. Why? He told us that, too. He couldn't sell it to a reckless faction of his own party. He wanted to allow that faction of the party to run the country and shut down the government.

Now what are our Republican colleagues saying? That they're not going to let us pay our bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues—and I think this is an important question for the country—if the President of the United States said that he would veto a debt ceiling bill, that he would veto legislation to pay the country's bills on time unless Republicans adopted the President's budget and the President's agenda, our Republican colleagues would say he'd lost his mind. Our Republican colleagues would probably start impeachment proceedings. And yet, that's exactly what they're doing. They're saying that they won't take responsibility in joining us to pay our country's bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda unless we say let's get rid of the Affordable Care Act, unless we do everything their way.

Again, if the President was to take that position, you would say he was off his rocker. So now, our Republican colleagues are coming up with a fake committee where it actually sets the rules.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman.

So after all this refusal to negotiate, you now want to set up a fake committee on deficit reduction where you refuse to even include the idea of reducing the deficit in part by shutting down tax breaks for big oil companies because you don't want to use one penny of revenue, even from closing tax loopholes, to reduce the debt and deficit. I hear from my colleagues how important it is to reduce the debt—and it absolutely is—but apparently it's not important enough to shut down one tax loophole for special interests.

End this sham. Vote on the Senate bill. Open the government.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is some truth to this. I and the Speaker and the majority leader and the whip and our conference do not want to have anything that would empower somebody to raise taxes. But we did want to empower that we would allow maybe Mr. DINGELL, the Dean of the House,

maybe Mr. VAN HOLLEN, maybe Mr. HASTINGS, to be part of a committee, a working group that would sit down with their colleagues and speak honestly—and maybe Mrs. LOWEY—speak honestly about how we get out of this mess that we all have.

And as a working group, as a working group with no dictates but how you've got to do what you're going to do, no timeframe except you have to go meet, and you've got to be successful, and it's going to be about these items. In other words, make "the big deal" the big deal. And the big deal right now is spending, debt, and how we do something to get this government back to work. That's what I think the legislation does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, for a week now, the Republicans said no to a CR funding the entire government unless there was defunding of health care reform. That was the bludgeon. It did not work.

So the Republicans shut down the government. It turns out that tactic was in the works for a year, as described in The New York Times yesterday:

One morning in a location the Members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed "blueprint to defund ObamaCare" signed by leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups. It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that had long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire government.

So now we have a shift. Keep the government shut down, let government not pay its bills. Why? Because the Speaker said it would be "unconditional surrender." That isn't what's needed. We don't need another supercommittee. What we need is to be allowed to vote.

This poster shows 195 Democrats willing to reopen the government; 22 Republicans on record. That's a majority of the House. Mr. Speaker, let democracy prevail. Let us vote.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this debate is a bizarre experience for those of us who have been urging negotiation on the budget for a year. "Take the President up on his

overture of last December,” we’ve said to our Republican friends. “Let’s go to a conference with the Senate and work out a budget.” But the Republicans have steadfastly refused. They have run out the clock. And why did they do that? So that in a crisis atmosphere, they could demand a ransom for doing our basic duty—keeping the government open and paying our bills.

Well, that’s extortion, and it’s way over the line. We can’t do that. In fact, we need to open the government. We could do it tonight. The votes are here if the Speaker would simply permit a vote. We could reopen the government immediately.

I promise you once we do our basic duty, we will be happy immediately to do what we should have been doing all along, and that is to negotiate a budget plan, a budget plan that puts everything on the table: revenues, entitlement, all categories of spending, a budget plan that secures this country’s economic future and ends this charade that the Republicans have put us through here as the new fiscal year begins.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, we’re here because Republicans want us to move forward with a process that is very important. We’ve had a number of times that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY, we’ve had the great young chairman from Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS, chairman of Appropriations, come up to the committee and talk very clearly about their ideas about moving forward to get things done.

□ 1900

I don’t know that they would be the representatives of this body, but I bet they would be and I bet you that they could make real progress, along with, perhaps, Mr. VAN HOLLEN and others who are awesome Members on their side, Members who are committed to getting the work done.

But this is a fight, and it’s a fight that goes all the way to our friends in the Senate and all the way to the President. As best I can tell you, just as I started, I will end today. I will say that today’s stalemate is the making of the President. This is his making. He places his own political power, I believe, above the Constitution, wanting to dictate policies instead of negotiating them with a duly elected branch of government, and that’s the House of Representatives.

I hope that the American people take note of what’s happening. The President is different from his predecessors not in terms of greatness, but rather to the degree to which he’s willing to sacrifice this Nation’s greatness. He’s willing to take us to the brink, rather than offering his negotiating skill-set and getting people together. That is what we should be about.

The Speaker of the House has literally instructed us to get a working group together, gather it on a bipartisan basis, and see if we can make progress not with the President, not with the Speaker, not with the Senate Majority Leader, but among Members of this body who we know and who we respect. Let’s gather us together, and let’s get together, and let’s make a difference. That’s what we’re trying to suggest today. I will tell you that my colleagues that have been here on the floor, including the great minority whip, I believe have the ability to make this success happen if we will work together. That’s what I’m for.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3273, the so-called “Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013,” which establishes another supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes in the statutory limit on the public debt, the latest gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

The bill before us is a bad idea brought up at the worst possible time. The bill seeks to recreate the ‘super-committee’ Frankenstein monster that failed its assigned task and ended up giving us the Frankenstein monster called sequestration.

We have been there and done that. We are not going down that road again.

Additionally, this bill is not a genuine effort to reach an agreement on budget and fiscal priorities. If that were the case, House Republicans would not have rejected the numerous requests of House and Senate Democrats over the past six months to go to conference to reach an agreement.

Let us review the record leading up to the Republican shutdown and the cost of the recklessness course of action:

150—\$10 million a day—The price-tag for closing down the government In 1995, the record three-week closing cost \$1.9 billion in today’s dollars.

100,000—plus—Federal employees expected to be furloughed as a result of the GOP’s irresponsible shutdown.

192—The number of days House Republicans have refused to negotiate on a federal budget, setting the stage for a GOP government shutdown.

128—The number of points the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped on Monday in reaction to the GOP shutdown.

72—Percent of American voters opposed to Congress shutting down the federal government to block implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

68—Percent of Americans who say shutting down the federal government even for a few days is a bad thing for the country.

49—Republicans who say shutting down the government over Obamacare is a big MIS-TAKE.

45—The number of times GOP have unsuccessfully tried to repeal or undermine Affordable Care Act.

18—The number of times Senate Republicans have blocked Senate Democrats’ efforts

to go to conference and negotiate on the budget to avoid a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

And there is an easy and verifiable way for them to demonstrate their good faith, and that is by bringing to the floor for an immediate vote on the clean CR already passed by the Senate.

The President has stated repeatedly that he will sign a clean CR. Our constituents are waiting. It is time to end the madness.

Mr. Speaker, let the House vote on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate today.

That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION;

Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association (NEA) and the students they serve, we urge you to VOTE NO on The Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013 (H.R. 3273), a misguided strategy to ending this political stalemate, and instead pass a clean Continuing Resolution (CR) immediately. Votes associated with this issue may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 113th Congress.

The shutdown of the federal government has already affected countless children, working families, and seniors across the country; the longer this crisis drags on the more pain will be inflicted upon those who least deserve it. Meanwhile, H.R. 3273 seeks to create a “working group” of Senators and Representatives to discuss FY 2014 funding by attempting to achieve deficit reduction without accompanying revenue increases. Students in America’s schools are bearing the brunt of this shutdown every day and require solutions now.

Instead of seeking deficit reduction on the backs of those students and working families, Congress should take a responsible, balanced approach that reflects the values that make our nation strong: investing in people, jobs, and education as the path to prosperity. By eliminating wasteful corporate tax breaks and loopholes and ensuring the wealthy are paying their fair share we can appropriately reduce our deficit. As just one example, as many as two out of three U.S. corporations paid zero in federal income taxes over much of the previous decade, according to the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The share of federal revenues coming from corporate taxes has shrunk by two-thirds in the last 50 years. This is undermining our ability to make the necessary investments in education that are sorely needed in order to return our nation to prosperity. It is time to put politics aside, do what is right for our nation, and take the balanced approach to deficit reduction widely supported by voters by calling on corporations and the very wealthy to pay their fair share.

Meanwhile, the current approach to deficit reduction without revenue increases has left us with the indiscriminate, across the board cuts of the sequester. It is long past time for Congress to reverse course from the austerity approach that included slashing education across-the-board by 5 percent this year—the equivalent of cutting nearly all education programs and Head Start by roughly \$3 billion. The level of cuts imposed

by sequestration have already taken federal funding back to pre-2004 levels while our nation's schools are serving nearly 6 million more students since that time.

There are millions of children being affected every day this shutdown continues. That is why we urge you to think of every single individual when making these funding decisions to ensure continued debates on Capitol Hill are not hurting everyday Americans and their families. We urge you to immediately pass a clean CR to ensure that the most vulnerable among us are no longer the victims of the government shutdown and we can focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,

Director, Government Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Work Group Act of 2013, I note that Sec 2 (b) implicitly calls for reductions in direct spending programs, but does not authorize the working group to consider additional revenue.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed.

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

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

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3273 to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment

to H.R. 3273. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary, and it is also supported by the majority of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown.

The majority claims that the bill before us right now will force the House and Senate to negotiate; but as written, this bill will do nothing of the sort. It will simply prolong the government shutdown. It will prolong the pain being done to our veterans, to the National Guard and Reserves, and to women, infants, and children; and, most importantly, this bill will prolong the pain being inflicted on our economy.

Let's be clear, this bill is a bill to nowhere. In my view, there is no one in this room right now who thinks this bill will reopen the government.

Since April, the Senate has tried 19 times to request a conference with the House; but each time, the request was blocked by Senate Republicans.

After months of stalling and preventing a budget conference, I am amazed that my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to believe that they are ready to negotiate a budget. We have had months to produce a budget that the House and Senate could agree on.

If my colleagues truly want to negotiate a budget that will move our country forward, they must vote "yes" on my amendment.

Once we have reopened the government, we can then sit down and work out a budget for the long term. We can do this in a bipartisan manner, without our economy sinking, without our constituents being hurt, and we can do it in a manner that is becoming to this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Congress must get its fiscal house in order, and I believe both sides must come together to find solutions that better reflect the values of the American people; but instead of ending the shutdown, we continue to consider bills that play games.

We cannot open the entire Federal Government one bill at a time. If we continue down this path, the government will remain closed for the next 3 months.

How much damage would that do to the economy?

How many veterans would go without their benefits?

How many kids would lose Head Start funding?

How many families would go without nutritional assistance?

We cannot continue to play these games for 3 more months. The American people and the residents of my great county, Ventura County, deserve better.

We can end this insanity right now. Reopen the government. Spare the

American people the effects of this shutdown, and then come together to resolve our differences.

To put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of our Nation's critical needs, when they do not, is shameful.

I came to Congress to move our country forward, to help the families, the veterans, the small and large employers in Ventura County, to create jobs, and to invest in our future. We need to end this shutdown today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment contained in the motion violates clause 7 of rule XVI, commonly referred to as the germaneness rule.

The objective of the bill under consideration is to establish a working group on deficit reduction. The amendment proposes to consider a Senate amendment to a House bill; therefore, the amendment fails the fundamental purpose test of germaneness described on page 547 of House Practice:

If the purpose or objective of an amendment is unrelated to that of the bill to which it is offered, the amendment may be held not germane.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed in the motion is not germane to the bill, and I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard on the point of order.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us set up a commission to examine deficit reduction?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that our taxpayers can receive the benefits they have already paid for. The recommit deals with government expenditures, and right now we are running a deficit. So isn't the amount the government is spending a relevant topic to deficit reduction?

Can the Chair explain why it's not germane to open up the entire Federal Government while we discuss deficit reduction?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

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

As recorded in section 932 of the House Rules and Manual, a general

principle of germaneness is that an amendment must relate to the subject matter under consideration.

The instant bill proposes to establish a working group composed of Members and Senators. As such, it proposes a bicameral order in the form of a joint rule.

In contrast, the instructions in the motion to recommit provide for the disposition of an extant legislative measure. As such, it proposes a special order of business of the House.

By addressing a different exercise in rulemaking than the pending bill, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

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

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

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

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommendation; passage of House Joint Resolution 89; and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—227

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

Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Jones	Nugent	Sessions
Jordan	Nunes	Shimkus
Joyce	Nunnelee	Shuster
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Simpson
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Kingston	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Smith (TX)
Kline	Petri	Southerland
Labrador	Pittenger	Stewart
LaMalfa	Pitts	Stivers
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stockman
Lance	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lankford	Posey	Terry
Latham	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Radel	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Reed	Tiberi
Long	Reichert	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Turner
Lummis	Ribble	Upton
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Marino	Rigell	Wagner
Massie	Roby	Walberg
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Walden
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
McKeon	Rokita	Wenstrup
McKinley	Rooney	Westmoreland
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Rodgers	Roskam	Williams
Meadows	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Rothfus	Wittman
Messer	Royce	Wolf
Mica	Runyan	Womack
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Salmon	Yoder
Miller, Gary	Sanford	Yoho
Mullin	Scalise	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Schock	Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Lynch
Bass	Farr	Maffei
Beatty	Fattah	Maloney,
Becerra	Foster	Carolyn
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Matheson
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Matsui
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McCollum
Bonamici	Garcia	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Grayson	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Brown (FL)	Green, Gene	McNerney
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Meeks
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Meng
Butterfield	Hahn	Michaud
Capps	Hanabusa	Miller, George
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Moran
Carney	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Carson (IN)	Holt	Nadler
Cartwright	Honda	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Neal
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Chu	Huffman	Nolan
Cicilline	Israel	O'Rourke
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Owens
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pallone
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Connolly	Kaptur	Payne
Conyers	Keating	Pelosi
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Costa	Kennedy	Peters (CA)
Courtney	Kildee	Peters (MI)
Crowley	Kilmer	Peterson
Cuellar	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Polis
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Rahall
Delaney	Lee (CT)	Rangel
DeLauro	Levin	Richmond
DeBene	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Lipinski	Ruiz
Dingell	Loebsack	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Loftgren	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda
Duckworth	Lowe	T.
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	(NM)	Sarbanes
Engel		Schakowsky

Schiff	Smith (WA)	Vela
Schneider	Speier	Velázquez
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Schwartz	Takano	Walz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Serrano	Tierney	Waters
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Watt
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Waxman
Sherman	Tsongas	Welch
Sinema	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Sires	Vargas	Yarmuth
Slaughter	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—10

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Galleo	Lucas	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1933

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. KEATING, CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. COHEN and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—224

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

Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Waters
Watt
Clay
Gallego
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Waxman
Welch
Hinojosa
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
Rogers (AL)

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Rush
Young (FL)

Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Posey
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (FL)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1940

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]
YEAS—420

NAYS—197
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

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

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barietta
Barr
Chadwick
Bartow
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Fudge
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culbertson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribbon
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Posey
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (FL)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)