United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2013 No. 136

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 4, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

STOP DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FURLOUGHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, ''of the Department's 800,000 civilian workers, about half will be furloughed.'' That means President Obama, our Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, publicly declared that roughly 400,000 DOD civilian employees are not ''essential'' to America's national security.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's furloughing 400,000 civilian Defense workers violates the law while putting national security at greater risk.

Let me explain. If any one of three circumstances exist, then America's Defense workers should not be furloughed.

The first circumstance is if Congress passes a Defense appropriations bill, then the military is funded and the President has no legal basis for using the shutdown as an excuse for furloughing Defense workers.

Unfortunately, this first circumstance does not exist. While the House of Representatives, 4 months ago, passed the National Defense Authorization Act on a 315–108 bipartisan vote that included 103 Democrats, and while the House, almost 3 months ago, passed the Defense appropriations bill on a 315–109 bipartisan vote that included 95 Democrats, President Obama, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and their allies refused to allow the Senate to vote on either bill that would both fully restore Defense funding lost because of sequestration and fully fund America's national security.

The second circumstance exists if President Obama declares workers ''essential.'' While I disagree and question why any Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, would slight 400,000 Defense workers by declaring them superfluous to America's national security, President Obama did just that. Hence, the second circumstance does not prevent furloughs of civilian Defense workers during this shutdown.

This brings us to the third circumstance, the Pay Our Military Act. This act not only forces the President to pay our men and women in uniform; it does more, much more. It also bars the President from furloughing civilian Defense workers even if there is a government shutdown, even if they are not declared ''essential,'' and even if Congress has not passed its Defense appropriations bill.

For those who wish to read it, google the Pay Our Military Act to confirm that what I say is true. The Pay Our Military Act states, in part:

> There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

Let me repeat that for emphasis. It states:

> There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

There is no requirement that civilian Defense workers be essential. The only requirement is that they provide support to members of the Armed Forces. For emphasis, there is also no requirement that the support be for Armed Forces who are in combat.

Mr. Speaker, every single civilian Defense worker supports the Armed Forces. By definition, that is their entire job. Hence, as a matter of law, there should be no furloughs of any civilian Defense workers.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on October 1, I joined 67 other Congressmen in a letter to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security reminding them of the Pay Our Military Act and emphasizing that we are:

> Disheartened that the administration chose to needlessly furlough workers against the intent of Congress and that since all DOD civilian employees serve to support the uniformed services, all of these civilians should be returned to work without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President, our Commander in Chief, is actively violating the Pay Our Military Act. The Obama administration must immediately return all 400,000 furloughed DOD workers to work. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's the law.

Printed on recycled paper.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JANINE BENNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day on Capitol Hill for Janine Benner, my deputy chief of staff. Janine and her husband, Greg Dotson, a key member of the Commerce Committee, are a true Capitol Hill power couple—not the type that you see in the society pages of the Post or holding forth on the Sunday morning talk shows. When you see them on television, they are sitting next to a Member of Congress, helping them on a bill or an amendment to look smarter and do their job better.

Ms. Benner joined our offices as a legislative assistant in 2001, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, and leaves having seen Congress at its best and worst—the near meltdown of the economy, wars, and the shutdown. She has seen landmark legislation and made important contributions to many. She knows that we often make it harder than it should be, but that didn't stop her or discourage her.

History will judge what Congress has accomplished in her 12 years, but there's no doubt that Ms. Benner made it better with her countless daily actions behind the scenes and helping in meeting with thousands of people, listening, learning and helping them understand the mysterious ways of their government and how to be more effective.

Janine Benner was a colleague and mentor to hundreds of professionals and interns, not just in our office. She worked with them helping them learn and encouraging them to weave the tapestry of legislative activity. She brought her Ivy League education, passion, and commitment—especially to the environment—to help fine-tune opportunities on Capitol Hill to coax more value for the American people.

She led our staff efforts dealing with climate change and global warming. Janine helped manage and guide livability initiatives to make the Federal Government a better partner. She was a part of our initial work in 2002 in Johannesburg that led to our efforts with the Water for the Poor legislation and, more recently, with Water for the World, to help bring sanitation and safe drinking water for people around the world. She returned from the United Nations Climate Conference in Copenhagen in 2009, being a part of that hopeful and frustrating process with a renewed commitment to deal with energy and climate change and found ways to make a difference.

She organized and participated in my bipartisan 3-day backpacking trip around Oregon's magnificent Mount Hood with my colleague, GREG WALDEN, and his family and staff, working together to learn and build trust that led to the Mount Hood Legacy Stewardship Act that protected that Oregon treasure.

No Hill staffer knows more about the challenges, dangers, and opportunities dealing with natural disaster. She dove in behind the scenes working in the detailed minutia that brought about the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. No Member or staff did more to make that happen and with ongoing efforts.

She continues to nudge the Federal Government to be more productive. She spent years to refine and modernize procedures for the Corps of Engineers.

Whether it's in Copenhagen or Johannesburg, flying over the Klamath Basin or hiking around Mount Hood or being in a Capitol Hill lockdown yesterday, she brought experience, good humor, and intellect not to just some bills enacted or amendments passed; she helped improve Federal agencies like the Corps and FEMA that need more attention. She took time off and did amazing volunteer work in key Oregon campaigns with spectacular results.

Besides being a good citizen, she is a proud mother to her darling daughter, Dahlia. She and Greg could live anywhere in America. They could make more money and not have questions about whether they're going to be paid or whether their employer was going to take away their health insurance, but they've chosen to serve the public, help Congress, and make the world a better place. It was an honor to be able to work with her. There is no one who better exemplifies the dedication, confidence, and commitment that holds this place together.

Thanks, Janine.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS CHOOSING CALLIGRAPHY OVER OUR MONUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I came down to this well yesterday to talk about how for 20 years I have run back and forth to the Lincoln Memorial and how the day before yesterday I was shocked to run down there and see the place in chains. I had planned on making a run last night, and then tragically this shooting occurred here yesterday.

But it turns out there's some things that I didn't know about the Lincoln Memorial. In this shot, I had become so agitated, I had asked a tourist to take a picture. And it is an amazing picture of, again, the Lincoln Memorial without people, because what I have come to learn is that it has always been a place with people.

I didn't realize that in the last government shutdown, President Clinton elected not to close down the Lincoln Memorial. I didn't realize there had been 17 shutdowns in this country since 1976, and not one President elected to close down the Lincoln Memorial. That means President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton each, when given the discretion in how they would handle a shutdown, chose not to hold Americans hostage in somehow gaining political favor by a shutdown that would hurt them on their tour to Washington, D.C. In fact, what I came to learn is that in the history of the American Republic, the Lincoln Memorial has never been shut down.

So, my simple question would be: Why?

I think it's interesting that Dr. Martin Luther King came to its steps, and he talked about how the American Dream for many pieces of America and many people in America was in chains. And yet this President, for some reason, chooses to chain the Lincoln Memorial in a way that has never been done in the history of our Republic.

I don't know why he would do so, but what I can say is that it turns out he has a history of holding people hostage in a political equation that I think is very, very harmful, because in the sequester, he chose to end public tours to the White House. That means an eighth grader who may be making their one trip to Washington, D.C., over the course of their life is no longer afforded the chance to visit the White House as school groups have done, literally, since the time of Jefferson. Always that has been the people's house—not a palace, but the people's house.

What I came to learn here that I didn't know over the last 24 hours is that the White House, as it turns out, spends $277,000 on a calligrapher. Now, you can either keep the White House open for tours for eighth graders across this country or you can spend $277,000 on calligraphers. Now, what's a calligrapher? A calligrapher is a person who writes in very fancy prose on a very fancy invitation to rich folk to come to the White House. That's what a calligrapher is. And he would elect to do that? Or to take an extra trip on Air Force One? Or not to raise private money to open up the White House for tours?

It turns out, I've come to learn, in many cases, it's costing more to chain these public, open-air monuments, whether the World War II monument, whether the Lincoln Memorial, whether the Jefferson, in many cases costing more to rent barricade equipment than it is to take people out of furlough to have them there in ways that have never been okay.

So it is okay to agree that we disagree. It's okay to say you want to spend more, the House wants to spend less. HARRY REID wants to spend more, we want to spend less. I think the Congressional Budget Office numbers are on our side. What they show is that in just 12 years, we're going to be at a point in this civilization where there will only be enough money to pay for interest and entitlements and nothing else. And in that regard, what we see is simply a prelude to much greater problems in this country if we don't get our financial house in order.

So it's okay to disagree on those things, but it is not okay to try and inflict political pain to the American citizen as a way of somehow scoring a political point, particularly when this House has sent four different bites at the apple in terms of trying to keep government open, and particularly when this House has sent a bill over that would keep the national parks open, that would keep groups like NIH open, Guard and Reservists, go down the list.

So, I would come back and ask of you, Mr. Speaker, that we look for some way of, again, unchaining monuments that have never been chained in the history of this Republic, because I think they represent very silly political games by this President.

STOP PLAYING THE BLAME GAME, NAME CALLING, AND FINGER POINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 4 of a government shutdown, day No. 4 of not doing our job.

To the folks in the gallery, if you sit here all day, you're going to hear people throwing the blame game and playing that blame game—Democrats blaming Republicans, Republicans blaming Democrats, the House blaming the Senate, the Senate blaming the House, and the House blaming the President. Let's stop this madness, and let's stop the blame game. Let's stop pointing fingers at one another, and let's just do our job.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we did our job. You're the Speaker of this House. This is the House that has both Democrats and Republicans. It's time that you were Speaker of this House.

Yesterday, one of our colleagues said that we're being disrespected by the other party and we won't be disrespected by the other party. This can't be about Democrats looking for respect from Republicans and Republicans looking for respect from Democrats. That's the problem. We've lost the respect of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this body, Congress, has lost the respect of the American people, and that's who we should be looking for respect from. Eighty-seven percent of America feels like Washington, D.C., is going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, let's spend time working to earn the respect and the trust of the American people. This has to be bigger than political parties. It has to be about America.

Here is who deserves our respect: the United States Capitol Police. Did you see how great they were yesterday? They performed admirably. They did everything that they had to do, and they did so without getting paid. They're not getting paid. They show up, though. They do their duty, and they do their work. They deserve our respect, and they have the respect of everyone in this body and the United States because they're doing their job. Mr. Speaker, if we want to get their respect back, we'd better do our job.

Here's some other people who deserve our respect. When I visited our troops in Afghanistan earlier this year, those are some of the most professional young men and women that I've ever met. When they're called and asked to serve, they just show up for duty. They do what they have to do—one tour, two tours, three tours. They are doing their jobs. They deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, if we want the respect of the American people, we need to do our job as Democrats and Republicans. You're Speaker of the House. Bring us together. The leadership needs to start coming together and doing their job. That's how we get the respect back.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women behind us, they show up every day. They're doing their job, but they're not getting paid. The way we can show our respect for them is let's open the government up, and let's make sure that the men and women in America get paid. Let's start rebuilding jobs. That's how we can earn their respect. Let's do our job.

Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of Americans show up, young college students show up in Washington, D.C., to serve their country. They show up as unpaid interns. They show up as low-paid staff members. In my office, we have a young college graduate, Kelvin Lum. He shows up for work every day. He helps me deal and talk and manage the constituent requests that are coming in. He's not getting paid. Let's show our respect to those folks that care deeply about our country, about the United States of America. Let's open government up again.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that we work to get the respect of the American public. Let's do our job.

My father taught me a little bit about respect. He said: Son, the way you get respect is you don't ask for it. The way you get respect is you go out and do your job. You work hard. You do it with integrity. You don't blame others when things fail; you just work harder.

Mr. Speaker, let's get the trust and the respect of America back again by doing our job, which is opening up government, which is starting to put together a real budget that relieves our children and grandchildren of crushing debt that's coming at them. Let's do our job as Democrats and Republicans, listening to each other, taking the best ideas out of both parties and doing our job.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to get the respect of America back, we will do our job. The Democrats and Republicans in this body are ready to open government. We have the votes. It's up to you now just to bring legislation to the floor to let us open government again, to make sure our Capitol Police are paid, to make sure the men and women serving this country are paid, and to make sure that tourists that are coming to the United States Capital to visit and show their respect for America are able to visit the monuments.

Mr. Speaker, it's in your hands. Let's do our job, and let's get that respect back.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that the rules prohibit references to occupants of the gallery.

FISA COURTS: THE 21ST CENTURY STAR CHAMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, government secrecy is anathema to all people, and darkness by rulers can be trumped by the sunshine of a public and an independent judicial system. But, Mr. Speaker, secrecy by a judicial system is a threat to liberty of all free peoples.

in our country we have the Constitution; and, specifically, the amendments to the Constitution protect us as a free people against government—government intrusion and government violation of our privacy—because government really has no right; it has power. It has what we give it when we give up our liberty and our rights.

The amendments promote openness of government and protect individuals from government. There is the Sixth Amendment that talks about a public, speedy trial, where witnesses come forward and people are put on notice of the crime. Citizens are given a jury trial. But the most important part of that amendment is the right to a public trial.

The Seventh Amendment deals with jury trials in civil cases.

Of course, the Fifth Amendment talks about the fact that, in a trial, a person accused doesn't have to testify or produce any evidence against themselves.

And then the Fourth Amendment talks about how government is limited on how it can intrude into our homes and our papers. It limits government surveillance. And it's an inherent right that the government search be reasonable and based on probable cause, and that there must be a warrant drafted under oath describing the place to be searched, the persons and objects to be seized.

Now, this just didn't come out of our ancestors' minds because they thought it was a good idea. There are historical reasons for this. Maybe in our government public school system we ought to teach more about the history of liberty and why we do things the way we do under this Constitution. It goes all the way back to the 1500s in England when England invented this concept of the Star Chamber.

The idea was, well, we're going to be able to prosecute and go after nobles, certain people who are being able to get away with violations of the law. But the courts were made specifically to be secret courts where there were no witnesses, there was no indictment, and a person was forced to testify against themselves. So, obviously, it was abused. It was abused by the Kings of England, primarily Henry VIII, when he went after and fought his opponents by prosecuting them in those secret courts.

The United States doesn't have the Star Chamber, but we have the NSA—the National Spy Agency, as I call it—and the FISA courts, the 21st century descendants of the Star Chamber. The NSA and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act allows those courts under FISA to authorize searches of anyone. Those searches are not based on probable cause, and those areas are not specifically described to be searched. It is a general warrant concept that they used in England to search people in England that were political opponents of the government and of the King.

The spy courts in the United States started under the theory that we need to be safe from terrorists. But the NSA and the spy courts violate the Constitution in the name of security. Warrants under FISA are general warrants where NSA can seize phone records, NSA can seize credit card bills and utility bills. And we are learning now that they seize not only phone data but that NSA seizes bank records.

Also, the judges are far from being independent. They meet in secret—just like the Star Chamber did. They can't even keep the records of the proceeding. Those are turned back over to the government. There are no witnesses present—just like in the Star Chamber. There's no lawyers present for anybody—just like in the Star Chamber.

These FISA courts should be protecting American citizens and should be following the Constitution. They are supposed to act as the independent power between government and the people. But they're not doing that.

I call them the ''Spy, Search and Seizure Courts'' because they are operating in the darkness of tyranny. We don't know what they're doing. They allow the NSA to seize and violate the privacy of Americans in violation of the Constitution by seizing people's records under general warrants.

A general warrant is the idea that government knows there's a bad guy in the area, so the government wants to search the whole area of town for the bad guy. You can't do that. I used to be a judge. Government has to have probable cause. It has to give the address of the house, the specific area, state the probable cause. The warrant has got to be sworn to and be specific about the location and what government wants to search and what government wants to seize or it's a violation of the Constitution.

The spy courts—the NSA courts and the Star Chamber courts—need to be revisited. It's time to shine sunshine on the FISA courts and the spying of the NSA. The NSA and the FISA courts—the Star Chamber courts—have shut down the Constitution. Now it's time to shut down the unlawful surveillance and intelligence gathering by these courts on American citizens.

And that's just the way it is.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the government has now been shut down for 3 days, the people's government that is formed to serve it and promote the general welfare and the national defense. That government has been shut down. Entirely? No, not entirely. There are some sporadic incidents where, for the public safety, we have people working.

I read the papers every morning, clips, as so many Americans do, so many Members do. I start discussion of where we are today because surely the public must be confused.

The Republicans say that they don't want to shut down the government. They say that President Obama wants to shut down government and that we Democrats want to shut down government for political advantage.

Having said that, 99 percent of us are prepared to vote for a resolution at 12:01 this day to open the government, because that is the rational, common sense, and right thing to do. I tell Speaker BOEHNER, Mr. Speaker, that we're prepared to vote on that today, as soon as this House opens.

Now, the Governor of Virginia is a Republican. The Governor of Virginia wrote an article today that said:

> Budgets are documents born of many compromises. A government shutdown represents the antithesis of that approach.

We agree.

He went on to say:

> In a shutdown, planning and forethought go out the window. Instead of rational governing, we get speeches and inaction. That's not how government should work.

So we stand ready on this side of the aisle, I will say as one of the leaders of my party, to vote now to open government and, yes, to do what, in a democracy, we ought to do—sit down and discuss compromises.

Now, the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to know where we are and how we got here.

The process is that the House adopts a budget for the spending which keeps government open, and the Senate passes a budget that funds the government and keeps it open and serving the American people.

□ 1030

Now, often there are differences between the House and the Senate, as there are now. And so what our process is is to go to conference, as the Speaker has talked about so often, to sit down at a table and discuss, as reasonable people, as Governor McDonnell says government ought to work, resolving our differences.

But for 6 months my Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as you know, have refused to go to conference and sit down at the table. They have refused to try to bridge the gap. They have refused to do what Governor McDonnell says is necessary to do, compromise. And we are far apart.

Now, interestingly enough, we have only passed three appropriations bills out of the 12. All three of the appropriations bills that we passed through this House are at the Senate number—not the House-adopted number—at the Senate number. And so they have to slash the other nine bills very deeply. As a result, they have not brought them to the floor.

I have no power. I used to be the majority leader. I could bring a bill to the floor, as my colleagues know. I can't bring a bill to the floor now. One of those bills was brought to the floor and it was defeated. Actually, it was pulled from the floor because they couldn't pass it. So we are at a place where we are now, have shut down government.

The reasonable, rational, responsible thing to do is simply say we have enough votes to open government at the number that the Republican Party sent to the Senate. Not a compromise. We are telling them we will take your number. I don't like their number. But I like even less having government shut down, because it costs the economy money, it puts at risk our national security, and it undermines the confidence of the American people, not to mention the international community.

But we will take your number, I say to the Republicans, Mr. Speaker. We will take your number. The Senate has said we will take your number. But unfortunately, they haven't yet taken ''yes'' for an answer.

Now, earlier this week—and I don't know him—but Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN, who is a Republican from Indiana, said this: ''We're not going to be disrespected.'' Now, by that I presume he means that the President and the Democratic Senate is not going to agree to undermining or repealing the Affordable Care Act that millions of Americans already are trying to access to get coverage and get health security in their families. He says, ''We're not going to be disrespected.'' Then he goes on to say this, ladies and gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker: ''We have to get something out of this. And I don't know what that even is.''

Let me repeat that. He says, We have got to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is. How are you going to negotiate in that context? I see Mr. MCDERMOTT here chuckling. I'm chuckling. We need to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is.

Now, after being asked about the GOP leadership putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, Representative TOM COLE, one of the leaders, close to Speaker BOEHNER, former chairman of their campaign committee, said this. When asked about putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, he said this: ''Why in the world would we do that?'' Now, they've said they don't want to shut down government—that's why they'd do it. Why does he ask such a question, ''Why would we do that?'' To open government so it can serve the people. That's why you would do it. How confusing can that be?

He went on to say this, however. ''You know, that doesn't encourage anything. That's basically at this point a surrender to the Democratic position.'' Now, remember, ladies and gentlemen, I just told you that we took their number, their number that they passed through here. I don't like that number.

HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, doesn't like that number. The subcommittee chairmen don't like that number. But we're saying, okay, yes, we'll take your number, let's keep government working for our people.

Now, the House majority leader, I used to be majority leader, or as I refer to it, the good old days, he said this: ''We're trying to get the government open as quickly as possible.'' That's 12:05 p.m. today, ladies and gentlemen of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it's 12:05 p.m., 5 minutes after noontime, right now, you can get it open as quickly as possible. If that's what the majority leader wants to do, Mr. CANTOR, bring that bill to the floor and our side will overwhelmingly help you pass it and get government open for the people.

Now, the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee said this. He echoed CANTOR in an interview with the National Journal Daily, and he said this: ''I don't think anyone wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks.'' But what we'll see today is little tiny slices of bills. It will take weeks and perhaps months to open at the rate they're going. ''I don't think anyone,'' LANKFORD says, ''wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks.'' Now, this is the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. Here's what he said: ''I'd like to resolve this this afternoon.'' We're ready. The American people are ready. It's the responsible thing to do. Get the government working for its people.

If Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. CANTOR want to get this done as soon as possible, I tell them as a leader on my side of the aisle, I will help get them the votes to pass it this afternoon, early this afternoon, by 1 o'clock this afternoon. Let's get this government open.

Mr. LANKFORD goes on to say, ''I don't believe there's any argument for stretching this out for 2 weeks.'' This is their policy committee chair. ''I don't believe there's any argument for stretching it out.'' Why are we stretching it out if there's no argument to do so?

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I also read the American people are angry. Let me tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, I share their anger. I am angry too. As Governor McDonnell said, this makes no sense, this is no way to run a government. We've taken the Republican number. Mr. CANTOR says he wants to act quickly. Mr. LANKFORD says he wants to act quickly. We will support acting quickly. Let's do it. Let's just do it.

Open the people's government today, not slice by slice by slice by slice over the coming weeks and months, but today for the people, of the people, by the people. Open the government today.

FIND A BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, our House Republicans remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government for the American people. And we continue to act in good faith to find an agreement with Senate Democrats to do just that. But to build a bipartisan compromise, the Senate needs to come to the table so we can work through our policy differences.

My colleague from Maryland gave a quote from one of our colleagues. But he neglected to mention that Senator HARRY REID said, ''Why would we pass bills to keep the NIH operating and help children with cancer?'' We've offered such a bill. And guess what? One hundred seventy-one Democrats voted against pediatric cancer research. One hundred seventy-two Democrats voted against funding the national parks. One hundred sixty-four Democrats voted against funding veterans benefits.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like people who want to get the government back open. HARRY REID said, ''Why would we want to do a piecemeal approach?'' Well, we all know, and the American people know, that the way we pass appropriations bills here, and the way we have the government running, is by passing individual bills. We have 12 different bills that we normally pass. The House has passed five and sent them to the Senate, and the Senate has acted on none of them. So now we are doing it the way it's supposed to be done, under regular order. We are bringing the bills to the floor and passing them. And yet the Senate will not act on them.

What about the barriers at the memorials, Mr. Chairman? Isn't it a shame that barriers have been put up at our outdoor memorials that have never had barriers put up before? They are always open 24–7, 365 days a year. Why deny World War II veterans the opportunity to get into their own memorial? How petty is that, Mr. Chairman?

Make no mistake, House Republicans want to reopen government and stop shutdown policies before they cause any more pain. But if the Senate will not meet with us to build a bipartisan solution to end the government shutdown, we'll continue to take the lead to fix problems for the American people.

We want a fair government. And on those two things, an open government and a fair government, Democrats and Republicans should agree. But there are a few hang-ups. Shouldn't principles of fairness apply to ObamaCare? My colleagues in the House and I say yes. Big Business and other well-connected groups are getting a 1-year delay from ObamaCare, courtesy of the President, to prepare for its drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountains of regulation.

American families and small businesses who apparently don't have the same pull with the White House aren't going to get the same treatment. And further, many are losing the health care they like and would prefer to keep, or are having to find insurance through ObamaCare exchanges without any help from their employers. That isn't right. At the very minimum, these Americans deserve to have the same delay big businesses have to prepare for ObamaCare's drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountain of regulations.

Mr. Chairman, we remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government. And that's where we need to go. But rather than building off of common ground and fixing those problems for the American people, the President and the Senate are reflexively saying no. Preserving problems as leverage is wrong.

Help us do the right thing for the American people. Help us end the shutdown and ensure fairness under ObamaCare. It's time for the Senate to join us at the negotiating table and achieve fairness for all.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened by what has taken place the past few days with the closure of the government. We are participating in a downward spiral that has no end in sight. And we've lost the ability to relate to ordinary Americans. It's important to talk about how our actions, our inactions here in Washington affect the very people that we represent.

I want to talk to you today about two people who have been impacted tremendously by the actions of this House to close down government. Let me begin with one of my constituents,

who is an FAA safety inspector who has been furloughed. He has been furloughed, as I mentioned, from his job as a Federal Aviation Administration aviation inspector because we have not been able to keep the government open.

He reached out to me, and I have here his letter. He reached out to me and asked that I share his concerns with all Members of Congress and with the public at large. He made it clear to me that he was not here to talk about or to ask me to minimize the hardship that is going on in his family. Instead, he wrote that he wanted to express his concerns that the aviation inspectors will not be on the job to ensure the safety of U.S. travelers.

My constituent, a retired Army officer, veteran, wanted me to specifically talk about four safety functions that are now not being performed by FAA inspectors under this government shutdown. First, surveillance of aircraft, pilots, both domestic and foreign repair stations have been halted, leaving aircraft maintenance and aviation operations unchecked.

Second, in-flight cockpit inspections have been suspended, meaning that safety inspectors are not in the air overseeing aircraft, pilots, flight crewmembers, and in-flight operations and procedures.

Third, ramp inspections are not being conducted at airport gate facilities. This is not just here in Washington, but nationwide. This increases the probability of risks not being identified between destination points.

And fourth, even more frightening is that aviation safety inspectors are not on duty to respond in the event of an aircraft accident. How tragic this is.

But the second one even touched me more. Maybe not more, but certainly equally as much. This is about a young lieutenant at a local Los Angeles County police department who has worked for the past 2 years to be accepted into the prestigious FBI National Academy. This 11-week program, which is paid completely without Federal funds, was a once in a lifetime opportunity for him to pursue his dreams and contribute to the safety of our country.

The government shutdown Tuesday, however, crushed his dreams because this 11-week program began on Monday. All he wants do is to go to his classes, but he can't, because there are no instructors. They have been furloughed. This program has 212 of the brightest and most dedicated law enforcement officers from 24 countries and 48 States. If the government does not quickly reopen, they must go home, every single one of them.

Mr. Speaker, do not send these people home. We are witnessing political brinksmanship in its purest form. The American people have no time for these games. And I did not come here to participate in unnecessary political brinksmanship. I came to provide solutions and resolve problems. Instead of pitting Americans against Americans using this piecemeal approach that my colleagues across the aisle have decided to do to keep the government open, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to declare victory, use their own budget numbers, and vote for a clean CR that will last until mid-November. Don't hold our government hostage any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PERSPECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, just a quick minute to reflect on the previous speaker.

First of all, as a former chairman of Transportation, chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, if the FAA Administrator is not ensuring that safety positions, including inspectors that are key to safety, that those positions are filled and manned during this shutdown, he should turn in his resignation immediately. I can tell you he has the discretion to make certain that safety and our Essential Air Service inspections are conducted. So this is a game that's being played by the other side.

Secondly, the gentleman spoke to a non-Federal program. There is no reason that any program that's supported with private money can't continue. We've seen this game played this week, poking veterans in the eye, poking even minorities in the eye.

If you have been to Washington and seen the World War II Memorial, it's an open space. And to put up barriers, and to put Park Service personnel out there to put fences up to prohibit the public and our veterans from walking into that open memorial, is an offense. To do the same thing to the Martin Luther King memorial is an offense to our minorities and all Americans.

So this is a game that's being played. I have seen it played, you know, just a short time ago. And it's good to have some institutional memory on FAA. The other side controlled this body. Now, they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House in huge majorities, they could not pass an FAA reauthorization. They did 20 extensions. During those 20 extensions, you know what happened? They left all of our safety policy, they left our advancements in technology, our Next Generation air traffic control programs, all in the lurch. And here they are talking about a 4-day disruption. And they did the same thing to me.

I sent over to Mr. REID, after the 20-some extensions, I sent to him a clean extension with one caveat: you couldn't have Essential Air Service, a Federal program in which you gave more than a thousand dollars per ticket subsidy. That was offensive to him because he was giving $3,720 per airline ticket subsidy. And he held up the legislation for 2 weeks. We had a partial shutdown of FAA for 2 weeks.

They called me every name in the book. I was a one-man Tea Party terrorist cell. The President, I heard him talking about holding a gun to the head of the Senate. That's what they used against me. They've used this before, they are using it again. They had an opportunity to do some of these things, they didn't.

They couldn't even pass a budget. The only reason they passed a budget this year was we put No Pay, No Budget. All of their 4 years. So let's look at the record. How did we get ourselves into this situation? They spent that 4 years passing a health care bill that they told us we would know what was in it after we passed it, and we found out.

The President 17 times has changed provisions in it that were in law. He gave an exemption to business people. He gave exemptions to his friends. He changed the law. Many of us wanted to do away with the law. We know that has gone into effect. We have asked for a reasonable approach to negotiate and change some things that need to be changed.

Let Members of Congress and the White House staff and others be subject to ObamaCare. Let's have some relief for individuals for some time. But you can't do that if you won't negotiate. If you are golfing on Saturday, as the President was doing, if you don't show up for work on Sunday, like the Senate didn't do, if you come to work on Monday at 2 o'clock, you don't get the job done. And then if you go to the White House and you don't sit down and talk or negotiate, you won't get it done.

We're here, we're going to be here 24–7, our leadership is committed to stay over the weekend, next week until we get it done, until we open the government, until we get the finances of this country as it careens down the path to possible default. Seventeen trillion, asking for another trillion of indebtedness. From $9 trillion to 17 going to 18, double it in what—5, 6 years of this administration? Spending out of control, large government programs that do need our attention. We need to be responsible. We need to be accountable. We need to take any law, whether it's ObamaCare or others, and make certain that our people do have health care and do the best job possible working together and compromising.

SHUTDOWN DAMAGES THE POLITICAL PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I say good morning to our colleagues, and hope that as we focus on the very real pain and burden that so many Americans are feeling that we can act this afternoon to alleviate that pain, whether someone is looking for health care services from the National Institutes of Health, or whether they are troubled by the problems at the FAA that Mr. LOWENTHAL just talked about,

or whether they are veterans or a person in our police departments or military, that we can alleviate the suffering they are feeling and we can again have taxpayers receive the services for which they are paying by passing the Senate short-term budget this afternoon.

It's pretty clear to me that a significant majority of House Members would vote in favor of that budget. It should be put on the floor. If I am wrong, it will fail. But we will have a vote. I think I'm right. I think the bill will pass, the government will reopen, and the shutdown will end. That's the way we ought to proceed. If a majority of this House believes that that's the right thing to do, the majority should be given the chance to vote on that particular piece of legislation.

I hope we can also focus on the long-lasting damage that's being done to the way we govern our country by what has happened here. I want to say from the outset that I feel strongly that the Affordable Care Act is a good thing for our country. I really do believe that that's going to do many good things for our country. But I completely respect and admire those who have a completely different opinion.

I know that there are many Members of this Chamber, and many people in our country who believe that the Affordable Care Act is very bad for our country. They would like to see it repealed. They believe it will do harm to the country. I respect and admire their zeal and their passion. This is the essence of the democratic process. We are fortunate to live in a country where when we disagree over something we resolve our disagreements with voting, with elections, with peaceful and civil processes.

But when that peaceful and civil process protects the rights of those who have lost an argument, as frankly those over the Affordable Health Care Act have, when it respects your right to continue to come back and pursue your views over that argument, you also have to respect that process in return. And grave damage is being done to that process because of this practice of threatening a shutdown of the entire government, in fact causing a shutdown of the entire government, and now threatening a default on the country's obligation to pay its bills by tying the health care debate to the extension of the Federal debt ceiling.

And I want you to think about what is happening here. The health care legislation came to this floor and passed. It went to the Senate floor and it passed. The President signed it. It was challenged in the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court said it complied with the Constitution. We had an election a little less than a year ago, where one candidate promised that the very first thing he would do would be to repeal the law, and the other candidate promised he would implement the law. The candidate who wanted to repeal the law lost, lost in the Electoral College by a substantial margin, lost the popular vote by about 51 to 47 percent.

That does not mean that those who agree with Governor Romney have to abandon their efforts and try not to repeal the law. The democratic process says they have at their means every legitimate mechanism to try to win the next time around. That's part of the beauty of American politics, there is always a next time around. But it is not a legitimate means to shut down the entire government of the United States because you lost the last time around.

Let me draw some analogies here. Virtually everyone on our side believes passionately that the Senate immigration bill, which would provide legal status to 12 million people, the vast majority of whom are decent, taxpaying, hardworking people who are benefiting the United States, we believe passionately that that bill should become law. Sixty-eight Senators voted for that law. It has never been put to a vote on the House floor. We feel passionate that should become law, but we did not threaten to shut the government down if we didn't get a vote on that. It looks like we may lose that argument. If it doesn't come to a vote, we are not going to shut the government down because we can't get our way.

A huge majority of people on our side, a huge majority of the American people, if you believe the polls, believes that there should be a background check before someone can buy a gun. Before a wife beater or a terrorist can buy a gun, there ought to be a background check that says whether they can buy one or not. Again, we are damaging the political process by this, and we shouldn't do it.

□ 1100

INTELLECTUAL CONSISTENCY FROM THE LEFT NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those moments where you come to the floor—I am unscripted—and I want to sort of share something from the heart that actually has really, really disturbed me watching this debate over the last few days.

I am from Arizona and I like to say I am a friend of Gabby Giffords, and I have known her for a very long time. Do we all remember 3 years ago when this House came together, when my media in Arizona and the media across this country said, whoa, maybe it is time to actually take a step backwards and reflect on our use of language, reflect on our tone, reflect on our civility.

Yet look what you have heard over the last two or three days, over this last week. I have a President that got behind the microphones and was literally talking down the stock market, asking why hasn't it gone down. I have one of the heads of the intelligence services fearful that the intelligence service officers are bribable now because some are on furlough. I have had Members come to the microphone right off to the side of me here and use language like ''terrorist.'' The White House has stood behind the use of the language of ''gun to the head.'' You want to talk about something that is offensive? And this is to all my brothers and sisters here in Congress and for the blogs and the reporters and the political operatives around this country, you are better, we are better than this.

A good example is you just heard the Representative from New Jersey come to the microphone. I can only say nice things about his tone. He made his argument in a rational, constructive way. We have different views of the world. There was none of the flailing of the hands and the screaming into the microphone. And you have to start to take a step backwards and wonder, why the theater, why the viscousness and the theater coming from the left.

I hope we don't look back a month from now and find out that some of this was about money, fund-raising, the politics of cash; because the reality is this argument is actually pretty darn simple. Those of us on the conservative side believe we have and we have reached out over and over. And if you really want a solution, and this is to Senator REID, send over some Members to that conference committee. Put them in a room and let them start talking.

I am from that view of the world that a big deal is healthiest for the country; but then I will hear language like, well, we are heading toward the debt ceiling and you are going to default. Anyone that says that is looking you in the eyes and lying to you, either that or they don't own a calculator. You have got to understand the math. This country takes in 18 percent of GDP in taxes, and we pay out 2 percent in debt coverage. And in 2014 we have, what, $1.6 trillion in refinancing.

The fact of the matter is any way you ladder the model, we are never, ever, ever—and I am also quoting Bill Gross from a couple of days ago—we are never never, ever, ever, it is implausible that we won't make our interest payments. You have $3.1 trillion we are going to take in in tax revenues. We are going to spend about $3.7 trillion. So using language like, well, we are going to default, has the left decided that they are hungry to scare the markets, hungry to scare the world debt markets, and is this how you leverage politics?

Look, I understand we have different views. I actually believe the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is part-timing America, is destroying so many people's opportunities. But I also do believe we do have to come up with solutions and continued solutions for preexisting conditions for someone with

severe asthma. But we have our vision, we want to get to the same goal.

So to my friends on the Democrat side, particularly over in the Senate, 2 years ago you lit up my phones in my office demanding that we talk and negotiate on other issues. So that rhetoric was acceptable in the summer of 2011, but today it is not? How about just a little bit of intellectual consistency from the left?

SETTING ASIDE POLITICS AND PUTTING NEEDS OF CONSTITUENTS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it is day four and I am just amazed that this government shutdown has been allowed to continue even though we have the votes to end it right now. A bipartisan majority of this House supports the Senate-passed so-called ''clean continuing resolution,'' but for some reason Speaker BOEHNER won't allow a vote. People back home in Oregon and across the United States don't understand this. The majority of the House, a majority of the Senate, and the President agree on a deal that would reopen the government, but it is not going to happen because the Speaker won't allow a vote.

This is hurting our constituents. One of mine wrote about her family's effort to save enough money for a house, but she is on indefinite furlough, unpaid time that she didn't ask for, didn't deserve and can't afford. Another had planned a trip to visit the Grand Canyon; but after making reservations and buying tickets, the park won't be open and her family's trip will be ruined. Someone else wrote about her pregnant daughter who relies on WIC and won't receive the nutrition assistance she needs.

Yesterday, a volunteer at the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge said that years of conservation and restoration work could be set back because there will be no staff on duty to manage the water levels. Researchers at our State's universities, like Oregon State University, had to put projects on hold. They have been unable to collaborate with Federal agencies, important deadlines are being missed, new grant applications aren't being processed.

These are just a few of the stories I am hearing. The shutdown hasn't just affected one agency or one constituency. It has affected everyone who relies on a functioning Federal Government. And, Mr. Speaker, it is chipping away at what is left of the respect for this institution. We can't afford to use any more precious time on piecemeal bills that we know won't go anywhere. It is time to set aside the politics and put the needs of our constituents first.

Mr. Speaker, I understand, as does America, that you and some of your Members do not support the Affordable Care Act. We understand that. We got that message. But it passed both Chambers, was signed into law, and was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. They are harming my district and this country, and I will continue to fight them. Yet I am ready now to vote for the clean continuing resolution that contains those cuts. Why? Because it is critical to get the government open now. And every indication is that a majority of this Chamber will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, let us reopen the Federal Government. We can do it today. Mr. Speaker, please let us vote.

MAKING WASHINGTON, D.C., LESS IMPORTANT AND LESS POWERFUL IN THE LIVES OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this is a frustrating time in Washington. For the first time in 17 years, our government has been shut down. I believe the political gridlock is at a discouraging high mark. I empathize with those who are feeling its devastating effects, especially those hardworking people who have been affected by furloughs, including some members of my own family.

So I rise today in defense of the American people and I ask one simple question: Why won't the President and HARRY REID sit down and talk to us? The American people are hurting. They want to see progress. They want to see us work and fix this in a bipartisan way. So why won't the President and the Senate leader sit down and engage us in a simple conversation? What are they afraid of?

The President of the United States is the President of all of the people. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States. He is the President of everyone. He owes it to the American people to listen to their voices. So let me ask again, what is he afraid of? Why won't he sit down and talk with us?

I represent more than 700,000 people in my home State of Utah. They want the government to stay open, but they do not want ObamaCare. They know what a horrible piece of legislation it is. They know and they already see that it is destroying jobs. They know it is hurting working families. They know that it is driving up costs. They want the President to know this. They want HARRY REID to listen to their concerns, but both of them refuse to talk to us.

So let me ask again, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid that they might be actually convinced that we are right? Are they afraid that they might have to compromise just a little? I am the father of six children. I know what it is like to have teenagers in the house. I know what happens when they get angry because they don't get their way. They run to their bedroom, they slam the door, and they refuse to come out and talk.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for our President to take out his ear buds, to open the door, to come out and talk to us. He has canceled his trip to Asia. But I ask why, for what purpose, if he still refuses to come out and talk to us.

My goal throughout the last several weeks has been to find a way to fund the government operations, other than ObamaCare, and to avoid a government shutdown. But once again, unfortunately, President Obama and Senator REID have expressed no willingness, no willingness at all to compromise.

We have to understand that we are engaged in a generational fight over our debt and spending as it goes far beyond ObamaCare. Our current national debt is approaching $17 trillion, and it is growing every moment. During this administration, we will more than double our national debt; but it doesn't just end there. This is about the reach of government into our lives, with ObamaCare just being one example of how our government has grown too large and too powerful. In addition, this law will come with something like a $1.3 trillion price tag. That is something that we simply can't afford.

It is critical that we work together now to reduce the size and the power of government in our lives. House Republicans have repeatedly come to the table to negotiate over the past several weeks. So once again I ask, what are they afraid of? Why won't they sit down and talk to us? As a former President, one of my heroes, John F. Kennedy said, let us never fear to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do everything in my power along with my other colleagues to find a solution to reopen the government while fighting to make Washington, D.C., less important and less powerful in the lives of American citizens.

PUTTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in day four of the Republican shutdown, an irresponsible and manufactured crisis designed to promote ideology at the expense of the American people.

Let's be clear about why House Republicans have so knowingly, carelessly, and recklessly shut down our government. We have heard it on this floor today, Mr. Speaker. It is because they continue to be obsessed with eliminating the Affordable Care Act, the law of the land that is being implemented right now. It has become apparent that they are willing to sacrifice the basic functions of the U.S.

Government just to prove that point. Again, ideology and politics over people.

Right now there are nearly 1 million men and women who work for the Federal Government, good people, my neighbors and family, who signed up to do a job in the service of their Nation, and today they are not at work. They have had to either take a furlough, now missing four days of work, some of whom were already furloughed earlier this summer with the sequester. That means they are laid off, and they are not working because their work isn't essential. They are not getting paid.

Now, for those of us who are old enough to remember it, it kind of reminds me of the cartoon character in Popeye: I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Now, the Capitol Police and many other Federal employees that are deemed essential are in fact working. We heard that yesterday with their courage and their valiant service to this Capitol. But they are not being paid. Many have worked what would equal overtime this week due to the various protest rallies and yesterday's car chase, but they are not being paid.

Now, this shutdown is not just about faceless bureaucrats. It is about real people, about public servants who are directly affected by the shutdown, and I want to tell you about a few of them who live in my congressional district.

Pat from Gambrills, he and his wife are both Federal employees so in that household it is about 8 days of furlough. They, like many of their fellow colleagues, will experience extreme difficulties if the government defaults in just another couple of weeks. Pat contacted my office and he urged the President, my fellow Democrats, and me not to bargain with Republicans in regard to increasing the debt limit and getting government operating. It is our job, he said. Though they are experiencing difficulty, Pat stated, I believe it is more important not to negotiate or bend to blackmail. Republicans must learn that they must follow the same rules as the rest of us or there will be consequences. Those are Pat's words.

But I also want to tell you about some others who contacted my office like Tracy out in Laurel. She works at the Department of Health and Human Services. She helps her mother pay bills every month; and when she called my office, she was crying, she was in tears, because she wants this to stop so that she can pay her bills.

Then there was Dini who lives in Oxon Hill—and I live in Oxon Hill—who is a single parent who was already furloughed earlier this summer, and now she isn't sure how she is going to pay the bills or take care of her child. In fact, some of these workers still have to pay childcare to keep the spot in daycare, even though they are not being paid and they are not working.

Then there was Christopher. He and his wife are both employed at the Department of Homeland Security in support of the security of this Nation. They were both furloughed earlier this summer, and they are furloughed now.

So those are just some of the stories, and I could go on. I have sheets and sheets of calls from workers who live in my congressional district; and, you know, those Federal workers have already paid a great price. They are the folks out at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, which is located in the county I live in, in Prince George's County, a premier research institution; and 3,397 employees who would normally be at work aren't there. Only 104 of them are, and only 60 are working full time while the other 44 are working part-time. That means that also 250 of them are on call, and so 90 percent are actually furloughed out at Goddard Space Flight Center.

But it doesn't just affect Goddard. It affects all those small businesses, restaurants, shops, gas stations where civilian employees normally go to do their business, but they are not going there now. So the impact isn't just for the Federal workforce.

This is a really terrible situation, Mr. Speaker, and I really implore the leadership of Speaker BOEHNER. I know that he is a good man, and I want him to have the courage to put a clean Senate-passed CR on the floor of this House so that the majority of the House can work its will. Now, I know 40 or 50 won't, but the majority of the House should be allowed to work its will.

RETURNING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVE EDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the 800,000 Federal employees who have been furloughed for 3 days in the government shutdown. We can argue back and forth about who caused the shutdown, but the fact is that 800,000 people have been furloughed, and it could stretch into a week or two.

While we need to work hard to get these people back to work as soon as possible, we must remember that according to the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is costing us 800,000 jobs permanently. We are not talking about working people being furloughed for a few days. We are talking about the permanent loss of 800,000 American jobs because of this job-killing health care law. Where is the outrage over that?

You see, the fact is the President and my friends across the aisle like to say that they are for the working man. They are for American jobs. But if you pay attention just a little bit, their actions belie their rhetoric. The truth is they are not the party of the working man; they are not the party of jobs. My friends across the aisle are the party of Big Government and more regulation. They believe the American people cannot be trusted to make their own decisions, like how to invest their money or whether to buy health insurance. They know better than the American citizen. They want to make your decisions for you, to take care of you. ObamaCare is just the latest job-killing iteration of their Big Government expansion.

You see, it is only common sense. You don't have to be a genius to understand it. Big Government and Big Regulation do not grow the economy; they stifle the economy. They don't create jobs; they kill jobs. We have 7.3 percent unemployment right now, anemic growth four years after the recession ended; 15 percent unemployment among those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates are either unemployed or underemployed. I have got three sons who are recent college graduates. They have lived it. We are failing our young people.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Democrats held the Presidency, the Senate, and the House for 2 years and out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, two of the biggest government-expanding job-killing laws to be enacted in decades. It is no accident that the economy remains weak. It is no accident that unemployment rates are so high. And now when the Republican House asks simply for a conference, they won't even sit down to discuss it. They refuse to accept anything but the status quo. What is the status quo? Record deficits, high unemployment, and anemic economic growth. I guess with a record like that I wouldn't want to sit down and discuss it either.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody here wanted the government to shut down, but perhaps it is good that we have come to this point. Maybe the government shutdown will be a catalyst that brings us together to make some hard decisions. We have got to stop thinking on six-month time horizons and create long-term certainty if we want our economy to thrive.

Tax reform, deficit reduction, entitlement reform—these are issues that everyone knows must be faced to push our economy forward and to return America's competitive edge. If we could resolve just a couple of these issues, we would lift a cloud of uncertainty, our economy would grow again, and all Americans would benefit.

Nobody wanted this shutdown, but let's take lemons and make lemonade. Let's use this crisis to come together for once and resolve some of these fundamental issues. These are the issues we were sent here to face. I plead with the Senate and the President to rethink your hard-line no-negotiation stance. America is counting on us.

KEEPING TOUGH IRANIAN SANCTIONS IN PLACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have checked with the Parliamentarian and he has informed me that it is in order to give a bipartisan speech, even today. So I have a speech that I think most Members, on both sides of the aisle, can agree with. Mostly.

I have been here 17 years. I have been working every day for the toughest Iranian sanctions. This House has passed bill after bill. The Senate passed about half of them. And for over a decade, several administrations have basically refused to enforce the Iran sanctions that passed both Houses of Congress.

Then about three years ago, this Administration started enforcing our sanctions laws. They unleashed the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence, (TFI) and its Office of Foreign Asset control, (OFAC). TFI and OFAC are doing a great job. Yes, something the Federal Government is doing is working.

Iran's supreme leader was forced to allow one of his own insiders to run on a reform platform. And the Iranian people voted for the most reform they were allowed to vote for. It is clear that Iran wants out of these sanctions and is willing to surrender critical parts of its nuclear weapons program, but only if we are very tough in sanctions negotiations.

Let us remember why there is nothing more essential than preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Iran's supreme leader, on his Web site today, says the Holocaust is a myth and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. Iranian troops are in Syria backing Assad. Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, imagine terrorism with impunity. There is nothing more essential than stopping Iran's nuclear program. In order to do that, we need more sanctions. Why? Because every day Iran develops ways to get around the existing sanctions program. That is why we need to do a bit more as they are undoing what we already have in place.

But what is actually happening? TFI and OFAC are basically shut down, 90 percent furloughed. Seventy percent of our Intel Community's civilian employees are on furlough.

So what needs to happen? First, restaff TFI and OFAC. These are essential government functions. Second, pass a clean CR because all aspects of our foreign policy, our national security operations, our intel operations are critical to keeping Americans safe from terrorism and stopping the Iranian nuclear program. And just as critical is our credibility worldwide. So it is time to drop demands that everyone knows the Senate and the White House will never accept, and pass a clean CR.

Third, it is time for the executive branch to use the statutory authority we have already given them. For example, they have designated about two dozen Iranian banks, cutting them off from the international system. It is time for them to designate all Iranian banks.

Fourth, the Senate needs to pass a bill that passed on this floor with 400 votes last July, The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

Staff the agencies, pass a clean CR, designate all the Iranian banks, pass and implement The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act; and we may just see a world safe from the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

STOP THE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot we disagree on around here. By now virtually every American knows that we disagree on ObamaCare. We ought not allow what divides us to stop us from coming together on issues where we all agree. There is nothing political about passing bills to help sick kids or pay our troops or open our national parks, or bills to help low-income women and children.

In recent days, the House has passed bipartisan bills to fund the areas of government like those I just discussed where we all agree. Each of these bills passed the House with dozens of votes from my Democratic colleagues. Each of these bills were unilaterally rejected by Senate Leader HARRY REID. The President has publicly declared that he will veto any of these bills if they reach his desk.

Let me repeat: the House in recent days has passed bills to help sick children, pay our troops, open our national parks and help low-income women and children. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for those bills. And the President and HARRY REID refuse to have them even considered. Why? It is awfully cynical to oppose helping people who are being hurt by the government shutdown, a shutdown, by the way, caused by the President's refusal to participate in the democratic process and negotiate.

□ 1130

Clearly, President Obama and Senator REID are putting political leverage before the American people, and that is wrong. This shouldn't be about politics. It shouldn't be about the inside baseball games of Washington and who's going to win and who's going to lose in this debate; it should be about the American people. We have very big areas in which we disagree.

This is a time where that debate is coming to a head. Many of us believe the Federal Government is far too big. Many of us are concerned about a Federal Government that is $17 trillion in debt and robbing the next generation of their opportunity to live the American Dream. Many of us are concerned about ObamaCare and what it will mean to live in an America where government is in charge of 17 percent of our economy. Some on the other side of the aisle, disagree on each of those issues, but we do have areas where we agree. Common sense dictates that we would act on them.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue supporting these commonsense proposals, and I urge Senator REID and the President to do the right thing and allow those bills to become law. The American people don't want a government shutdown, but they also don't want the President's health care law. It's time for both parties to listen to the people, work out our differences, and find a common way forward.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, good morning, and good morning to my colleagues. I think that a greeting always sets the tone for conciliatory and direct and honest interest in bringing people together.

There are many of us that come from different segments of this Nation and therefore have to respond to our constituency, and I respect it and if I might use a term that we use sometimes, I get that. But I rise today to call upon our higher angels and the recognition that this is America's country, and to disabuse my colleagues and my friends on the other side of the aisle on some of the misinterpretation that they have represented in the dialogue and debate on this floor.

Numbers are showing that 60 percent of Americans don't want to have a government shutdown just to defund ObamaCare. I don't know how often that polling number has to be repeated and how often that number has to be noted as reflecting the sentiment of this country. But even more importantly than that, we're always told as we pledge allegiance to the flag that it is to this great Nation and it is because we are in fact united under one sense of commitment to our country.

And so yes, the President is acting like a leader of the Nation. Maybe he's even acting like a parent. I'd ask the question, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you had two children or five children, whether or not you would say to two of them: You're my favorites, you're going to get everything, you're going to eat every day, and the rest of you, you can fend for yourself.

That is the very nature of the piecemeal debacle that the Republicans are putting on the floor. I would have asked them, they could have done this in regular order 6–8 months ago in this House. They are in charge. They did not do that. They have not finished all of the appropriations process. But we have in fact compromised, Democrats, the President, by putting a continuing resolution on the floor of the House that is the exact number that the Republicans in the House and the Senate

wanted. And so in 31 minutes on this floor, they would have the opportunity to introduce that legislation, have it pass by a majority of this House and have the President of the United States sign it.

But instead of that, they want headlines like in the Houston Chronicle that has a mother, Talisha, asking: How am I going to feed my children? Because they're going to be cut off in the month of November for the funding for food stamps, even though it has suffered a horrible blow by this House of Representatives with a cut of $40 billion, but with the House not ceding to the will of America, a government shutdown, they won't be able to get that minimum support, so a mother says: How am I going to feed my children? And then, of course, someone else indicates what is going to happen to mothers with newborn babies and others. That is the problem that we face today.

Let me talk about the NIH. I am a cancer survivor, and I am very concerned about those who are dependent upon research. Just a few weeks ago, I was engaged with a number of children who are impacted by the disease. I represent the Texas Medical Center and MD Anderson and the Texas Children's Hospital. Why would I want to vote against the NIH? But this own body has already cut $1.55 billion because we have already been under sequester which is a devastatingly odious process, and it already accounts for the loss of 1 million jobs and already some $2 trillion-plus being cut from this budget. Already, the economic pundits say that's the absolute wrong way to go because it does not create jobs, it takes away jobs. But I will tell you that Mary Woolley, president of Research!America, says:

> On a micro level, this particular approach of allegedly funding parts of the NIH does not work. We are concerned that an incremental approach to the shutdown disrupts lifesaving research by other Federal agencies.

Benjamin Carr, the director of public affairs for the American Society of Biochemistry, also disagrees with this piecemeal funding, and Chris Hanson as well.

Now the leader in the other body has been charged by doctors, people showing up in a doctor's uniform at a press conference, saying he said something negative about children with pediatric cancer. He did not. What he said is he responded to Senator SCHUMER's comment that we shouldn't do a piecemeal type of approach, and he agreed with that. ''Why should we do that?''

And so we should not be going against each other, we should be going toward each other. NASA is concerned about monitoring of the space station, and the Affordable Care Act is working. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer an olive branch as well. That olive branch is let's stop calling each other names, and let's start working on behalf of the American people and vote on a clean CR.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and talk about the things we're doing here in this House to continue to fund government and keep the government open. If you look at what has been going on the last couple weeks, Mr. Speaker, you have seen more than four bills passed by the House of Representatives to fund all of government. You've seen us send bills over to the Senate to keep government open. But what you've also seen, Mr. Speaker, is the President of the United States and the leader of the Senate refusing to take up the bills because they're not getting everything they want. The Senate President, HARRY REID, said he's not going to budge an inch—not an inch—from his position. He'd rather shut the government down than to move one inch. President Obama said he won't negotiate. He refuses to negotiate with Republicans unless they give him everything he wants. He won't budge an inch. So what we've done in the House, Mr. Speaker, during that time is say: You know what? We're going to put a lot of options on the table because we do believe we ought to fund government properly. We ought to address the problems facing our country and get our economy moving again, and address all the problems that the President's health care law is facing.

But we also know that we live in a democracy, and when you've got divided government, Mr. Speaker, that means both sides ultimately have to come together. That's what our laws actually demand. And yet you've got a President saying it's my way or the highway; if I don't get everything I want, I won't budge. And then you've got Republicans saying: Let's pass bills to keep things going; let's actually negotiate and work out our differences.

I think the American people are realizing that, Mr. Speaker. They're seeing the unreasonable approach of President Obama. If you look at what has happened in the House the last few days, you're actually seeing a groundswell not just of Republican ideas to keep government funded. We passed a bill to fund veterans. Shouldn't we all, while we've got all of these other disagreements on government—there are actually areas where Democrats and Republicans agree. You don't hear a lot about it, Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of those.

So we've started putting those ideas on the table and saying we have some real disagreements over health care policy, but shouldn't we at least fund our veterans? Shouldn't we at least fund cancer treatment for those patients that are struggling through cancer that aren't looking at this from a Republican or Democrat issue; they just want their treatment? And so we passed a bill, and it got bipartisan votes in the House. It was not a partisan vote. A lot of Democrats joined with Republicans to say let's at least fund cancer treatment while we're negotiating these other differences. And the Senate majority leader's answer was: Why would we want to do that? How shameful, Mr. Speaker, that you would have the Senate majority leader saying he would rather hold them hostage unless he gets everything he wants. Nobody gets everything they want in a democracy. And so we continue to pass bills to address these problems.

We passed bills to fund our National Guard troops. Again, large bipartisan votes—a growing number, by the way, of Democrat votes that have been joining with Republicans—to take a reasonable approach to this, because again, ''my way or the highway'' is not how you govern in a democracy. You send those bills over to fund our veterans and to fund our National Guard and to fund cancer patients. And you literally, on a party-line vote, have the Senate leader saying he's going to kill those bills until he gets everything he wants, and is forcing every Democrat in the Senate to vote with him, to play some kind of partisan game. That's not how our democracy works, Mr. Speaker.

And where's the President's leadership on this? You should see the President standing up and saying stop these games; stop punishing people; stop taking hostages. And yet he's so afraid to stare down the Senate majority leader that he sits on the sidelines and continues just to throw rocks at people instead of getting in the fray and saying, as all adults in a room, let's get together and work out our differences. The President continues to say he won't budge an inch.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue moving forward in the House. As a tropical storm enters the Gulf of Mexico, we're going to take up a bill that says we ought to fund our emergency response in FEMA. Shouldn't again we at least be able to put partisan differences on the side on other issues that are unrelated and say at least we ought to take care and respond to disasters. That bill will be on the floor. And I'll predict, Mr. Speaker, that you'll see broad bipartisan support to vote that bill out of the House and pass it over to the Senate. Maybe, just maybe, let's all hold out encouragement that the Senate majority leader will finally put his partisan differences on the side and say let's at least agree to do that. Don't hold hostages.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what the President has been doing with these monuments, punishing the American people. The World War II Memorial is a great example of the greatness of America, the Greatest Generation, a tribute to those men and women who risked everything. You had heroes in their 20s that stormed the beaches of Normandy. They stared down the enemy. They didn't blink. Of course,

they came earlier this week to the World War II Memorial to see the memorial that was built in their honor, and they're faced with Obamacades blocking off that memorial. I'm glad they stared it down, they didn't blink, and they took that memorial.

Mr. President, tear down those Obamacades. Let our veterans into the World War II Memorial.

FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to speak from the heart of a true story that's happening really right now in my district. It's a story of an innkeeper, Bruce O'Connell, who's operated the Pisgah Inn since 1979. It's an inn on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and that inn has been operated really at no cost to the Federal Government for years and years and years. In fact, as he operates it, he sends money to the Federal Government. So this government shutdown shouldn't have anything to do with the Pisgah Inn. The Blue Ridge Parkway is open for business. It continues to allow cars to go both ways on the parkway. But yet what we see is under the direction of this administration, the edict has come out to close the inn down.

Yesterday, they had to close it down at 6 clock. So I got a call this morning from Bruce, and he says Congressman MEADOWS, I just want to let you know that I'm going to open my inn back up.

Now I expected to hear all kinds of just heartfelt hurt and concern from Bruce. But what he said is that you're fighting for the right thing. You're fighting for our future. You're fighting for our children. You're fighting for our grandchildren. And I'm going to open back up knowing that the cost of this particular thing may cost me a business that I've had for many, many years. But you know, Congressman MEADOWS, it is the right thing to do, that we must stand together and fight. We must make sure that what we do is, our voice is heard. So I want to say thank you to a patriot who is willing, at great cost to himself, stand and fight for what he knows is right.

And I'm going to close with this because this fight is not a new story. On the back of the Delaware quarter is a horse and rider. Many people think it's Paul Revere, but indeed it is not. It is an unknown or little-known patriot by the name of Caesar Rodney. His statue is in this very building. It's on the back of a quarter commemorating what he did because, actually, he got on a horse when the founding of our Nation was there, he got on a horse and rode through the night, through driving storms, to arrive in Philadelphia to cast the deciding vote that created this great country.

Now why do I share this story? Because across his face was a green scarf that covered a cancer that could be best operated on back in England. So he knew that by signing that document, he potentially was signing his death warrant.

It is that kind of patriotism, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing day in and day out. It is exemplified by the men and women across this country—World War II veterans who have come in and crossed a barricade. They fought, and many patriots died, for the cause of freedom. And I just want to say thank you to the patriots across this great land that are standing up to fight on behalf of this great country.

FUNDING NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for 4½ minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we have this debate over opening the government, I want to talk about an agency that people are not thinking about.

The National Institutes of Health started in 1887 in one room, the Public Health Service Hospital in Staten Island, New York. It was modeled on something that the Germans had been doing for a number of years that was called the Laboratory of Hygiene.

In 1891, it came to D.C.

In 1901, they built the first building. The appropriation was $35,000. It was for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases.

In 1912 in St. Louis, 12 kids died when they got a diphtheria vaccine that was contaminated with tetanus. At that point, they decided they would pass the Biological Control Act, and that was given to the Institutes of Health. Joseph Goldberger, a doctor, discovered the cause of the pellagra, which was a scourge of the South in this country, a dietary deficiency because of bad diet. That came from the Institutes of Health.

In 1930, a Senator from Louisiana by the name of Ramsdell started the National Institute, one, the National Institute of Health. It was to give fellowships to physicians to study problems in the health care system. That situation went on from that day to this day.

Now they tried to do it in the private sector. After the First World War and all of the problems of chemical warfare, the Congress said let the private sector figure out how to do it, and they couldn't do it. They couldn't find anybody to finance it, and so they came and established the National Institute of Health in the government.

In 1937, they added the National Institute of Cancer. And in 1938, they built the first building up in Bethesda, Building 6.

Now until the Second World War, they discovered and worked on various things, and then the war came, and they spent an enormous amount of effort trying to figure out the health problems of this country. People don't realize, 43 percent of the people who were inducted or brought forward to be inducted into the Army were rejected because they were unfit physically. The National Institutes of Health went to work on that. There were a whole variety of issues—diet, teeth, syphilis, all kinds of things that were not being done in this society, and they did the initial research on that.

In 1946 after the war, they decided we've got to expand this thing and they began creating new Institutes of Health. One was arthritis and metabolic diseases. That's where we started working on diabetes. Then they did allergy and infectious disease, which is what went on to deal with AIDS.

In 1970, there were 15 Institutes of Health. Today, there are 27. All over this country in every university and everywhere you look, there are scientists and physicians who are submitting grants to the Institutes of Health on issues that affect all of us. It has been the practice until very recently that one out of five of them is accepted. One is good, four are not so good. We're going to pick the one that's good and put our effort there. We are down at the point where we are now doing 6 out of 100; 6 out of 100. This country that boasts about our health care system is killing it by this kind of bill, by squeezing the National Institutes of Health to death.

Mr. Speaker, bring out a clean bill and let's start up the National Institutes of Health.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, today, give our lawmakers the wisdom to do what is right, led by You instead of political expediency.

Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes.

Lord, illuminate their minds so that they will find a solution to the current impasse, embracing Your purposes and doing Your will.

Continue to sustain our law enforcement agents and first responders, inspiring us to emulate their patriotism

and self-sacrifice, going beyond applause to ensuring they receive fair and timely compensation.

Bless this land we love so much and save us from our self-inflicted wounds.

We pray in Your powerful name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DOD CIVILIAN FURLOUGHS

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as you and I have discussed, Tuesday morning, 8,700 employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base were unnecessarily furloughed. I have voted every single time to fully fund the government, and I have opposed this shutdown. This shutdown is just as harmful to our military readiness as sequestration is, which I also opposed because it undermines our national security.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Pay Our Military Act was passed by this Congress and signed by the President to ensure our Nation's uniformed servicemembers and the civilian employees that support them would be paid in the event of a shutdown. The administration has chosen to ignore this law and force our civilian employees to sit at home and go without pay.

I have written to Secretary Hagel and President Obama demanding clarification as to why they have chosen not to follow the law and have furloughed these hardworking people. The Armed Services Committee is holding a hearing to get to the bottom of this clear defiance of the law by the administration.

It is past time that we get all men and women back to work and those who work to support our military.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tens of thousands of men and women who work in one of the fastest growing manufacturing regions in America, Houston and Harris County, Texas.

Today is National Manufacturing Day. In our district, which covers the Port of Houston and the Houston Ship Channel, there are over 125 chemical manufacturers, refiners and supporting facilities, employing over 33,000 people.

The chemical, oil, and gas industries are the new face of manufacturing in America. Houston is the energy capital of the world and has benefited from this energy renaissance taking place in Texas and the gulf coast. Houston has been the national leader in job creation in recent years and was named America's number one exporting region by the Department of Commerce in July of this year, sending over $110 billion in manufactured exports overseas.

I proudly stand with America's manufacturing sector, which is the backbone of our Nation's economy and our middle class. I look forward to this Chamber taking up legislation this Congress to provide the support and statutory clarity our manufacturers need to continue being the international leader in innovation and exports.

REMEMBERING NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the essential contributions manufacturers make to our country. Manufacturing accounts for 47 percent of national exports and 93 percent of exports from my home State of Illinois. In fact, on its own, American manufacturing would be the 10th largest economy in the world.

There are approximately 17,000 manufacturing companies creating jobs in Illinois, and nearly 25,000 of their employees work in the 14th District. These men and women produce items we use every day, like plastics, furniture and food products. Other companies rely on them for commercial printing and creating industries vital to industry.

Colleges in my district have recognized the promise of advanced manufacturing and have started programs to train the next generation.

While our economy struggles to jump-start on this National Manufacturing Day, let's recommit to protect this crucial sector of our economy.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the worst-kept secret in Washington, DC, is there is a majority in this House to pass a clean CR. In fact, this morning, a list of 21 House Republican Members who said they would vote for a clean CR was published. It would end this idiotic shutdown that is keeping 800,000 Federal employees from doing their job.

Unfortunately, a few minutes ago, the official Speaker announced that he is not going to listen to the will of this House. Instead, we're going to do these salami-sliced spending bills. And, incredibly, we're going on recess on tomorrow through Monday night.

Well, Monday morning in Stratford, Connecticut, thousands of defense workers at Sikorsky Aircraft are not going to be able to go to work because the contract compliance officers from the Department of Defense who haven't been on the job for the last week can't certify the helicopter parts and engines that allow them to do their work.

Those layoffs are on this Speaker's head. Those layoffs are on the majority party's head.

Allow the majority of this House to have a vote. There are 21 of your colleagues that are prepared to do it today, and the President would sign it tonight. Those workers could go to work on Monday and protect the warfighters of this country.

AMERICA NEEDS TO BE AMERICA AGAIN

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, even though the President continues to bully the House by threatening to veto every bill we pass, the House of Representatives continues to act on behalf of all Americans.

Yesterday, we passed the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act to fund critical veterans programs of the VA and to ensure proper funding for National Guard and Reservists. Defying common sense, most of my Democratic colleagues chose to turn

their back on our veterans, National Guard, and Reservists.

Today, we will act again to provide immediate funding for a critical program that takes care of low-income women and children—the WIC program. HARRY REID's Senate has already refused to step forward and provide funding for sick children, and it would be inexcusable for them to not take up this legislation.

HARRY REID's government shutdown continues to last, and there is still no sign of willingness to sit down with House Republicans to negotiate. President Obama has even canceled his trip to Asia; but, Mr. Speaker, I have my doubts he will actually use his time to continue the important conversations that must happen to end this government shutdown.

I urge my Democratic colleagues in the House and HARRY REID's Senate to do what's right for the American people and pass these important funding bills immediately. America needs to be America again.

END THE SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of the morning on Tuesday morning, I, along with a number of my colleagues, left our offices to walk over to the House floor to vote after the government had already been shut down. We passed on our way a cleaning crew who was down to half staff—half of her team not here to clean our offices.

We are not the ones that make this Chamber function. Yet we are clearly sending home those that do. They're not a line item in a budget. They've got rent and mortgages to pay, mouths to feed, and children to clothe. But because some of my colleagues have decided that it's better to shut down this government than to provide millions of Americans access to safe and affordable health care, here we are.

As you all know, the Affordable Care Act was modeled upon the health care reform we have already conducted in Massachusetts. So it's worth taking a quick look at where that Massachusetts health reform stands.

We have 100 percent of all kids covered. We've got 98 percent of all adults covered. We've made certain that no person is now one bad accident or one bad gene away from medical bankruptcy. Regarding cost containment, our rates have increased for individuals, and premiums are at a 1.8 percent increase this year.

We need to get this bill done, and I ask for your help.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what the American people want from their elected representatives is very much the opposite of what this body has been delivering. Americans didn't want this shutdown, but here we are. They didn't want to lose the health care plans they have, but a very large number will in the future. They wanted lower health care costs, but insurance rates continue to escalate.

In Pennsylvania, the Children's Health Insurance Program provides good-quality, low-cost, market-based health care coverage. My constituents don't want their children forced out of this program and into Medical assistance, but that's now happening.

If the legislative process worked, we would have amended the so-called Affordable Care Act's fatal flaws. If it worked, the repeal of the medical device tax, which has bipartisan support in the House and Senate, would have been sent to the President's desk long ago. It hasn't. It remains chained up in the Senate leader's office.

My constituents know that I don't run all three branches of government. They know it's not my party in the White House or in control of the Senate. Mr. Speaker, what they do expect is for me to be their voice in Washington, to solve problems, fix government, and put forward solutions.

REOPEN GOVERNMENT TODAY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, every day that our Federal Government is closed, our economy gets weaker and necessary services that the American people depend upon are not available to them.

But what do we get? Rather than taking up the Senate-passed continuing resolution, we get a series of bills for PR value that are purportedly intended to reopen government, but nobody is fooled. We know that there's no real intent on the part of the other side to reopen government because you don't want to give up your leverage to try to defeat or repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act.

You lost in the House of Representatives. You lost in the Senate. You lost the campaign for the White House on this question. You lost in the Supreme Court. If this were baseball, you hit for the cycle and you lost all four.

We know that if these bills continue to come to us one or two a day, you'll have the Federal Government reopen sometime next spring. Let's do it this afternoon. When we come to this floor, you'll have a chance to vote on a clean CR, if you bring it up.

Let's reopen government today and stop this charade.

□ 1215

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the oldest Member in the history of this body, I rise with more concern today for our country than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member when we had the last shutdown. It spawned a balanced budget. Today, unfortunately, we have a President and a Senate who so far are unwilling to negotiate on a budget that will accomplish these same goals.

We need to rein in Federal Government, cut wasteful spending, fix the Tax Code, protect and strengthen Medicare and our national defense, balance the budget, and address the harmful ObamaCare. And now people tell me to continue to object to ObamaCare and don't let up.

The President needs to give the American people the same privileges he's given to big business and small business—a 1-year delay and a mandate on ObamaCare.

The Senate rejected all four negotiation attempts proposed by the House. The result of their refusal? A shutdown of the government. They, with this President, shut this government down.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President and Senator REID to work with us on a responsible budget. We should all work toward the same goal: protect the best possible opportunity for Americans to prosper, the greatest good for the greatest number, our children.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the insistence of some to act irresponsibly and shut this government down is disappointing. But more importantly, it is harmful to the American people, to American businesses, and, if prolonged, to the long-term prosperity of our country.

Because of this shutdown, over 800,000 government workers are furloughed and don't know when they will see their next paycheck. In my district, as but one example, 2,500 people at Naval Station Great Lakes, the Navy's only training facility, have been told not to come to work.

Hardworking people around the country have been locked out of their jobs because some in Congress see fit to hold idealogy over good governance.

I remind my colleagues that we were sent here to govern and act responsibly—but at this moment, Congress is doing neither.

The businesses, working families, veterans, and seniors in my district and across this country cannot afford for Congress to continue this game. Let's start putting this country on a long-term, fiscally sustainable path forward, and let's do it together.

I am and I always will be committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a solution to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let's end this shutdown today.

THERE WILL BE NO SURRENDER

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1836, a dictator showed up at the Alamo in Texas and demanded a complete, full surrender without negotiation. William Travis responded with a cannon shot: There will be no surrender.

Now comes the President and the Senate Majority Leader demanding that this House of Representatives surrender. We will not surrender. We are fighting for the American people. Tea partiers knew in the Colonies that King George's dictatorial methods wouldn't be tolerated. We won't tolerate them here.

Like it or not, Mr. President and the Senate Majority Leader, this House is a part of this process. We understand that we are fighting for the American people. We will not surrender. We are going to fight to make sure that we keep our liberty. Americans expect nothing less and deserve nothing less.

I am RANDY WEBER and damn proud to be an American.

SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in my district, thousands of government employees are being forced to work without pay. Thousands more have been laid off. All because Congress can't get its act together long enough to do our most basic job: to keep the government running. They're ready, willing, and able to do their jobs, but can't—because Congress has failed to do its job.

Folks back home ask me: Why do you get paid, but we don't?

We're told that the Constitution requires that Members of Congress get paid, whether or not they do their job. I think that's wrong, and I have introduced legislation to change it. While folks at home don't get paid, I don't think we should get paid.

I'm not talking about asking the Clerk to sit on our checks until after this is over; that's no sacrifice. That's why I'm donating my pay to the Augusta Warrior Project for the duration of the shutdown. I'm giving it to folks who can use it, and I'm calling on all of my colleagues to do the same.

It's about accountability, Mr. Speaker. If Members of Congress didn't get paid for not doing their job, maybe they would appreciate those who do their job a little bit more.

NETWORKS' BIAS SHOWS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks leading up to the government shutdown, ABC, NBC, and CBS tried to make sure that it would be the Republicans who were responsible.

A Media Research Center analysis found that from September 17 through September 30, the networks' evening newscasts ran a total of 39 stories about a possible government shutdown. Of these stories, over half blamed Republicans for the potential shutdown. Not one news report placed the blame on the Democrats.

Yet it is Republicans who have passed such bills as keeping the National Institutes of Health open and making sure that veterans get their benefits. These bills are opposed by the President and the Senate Democrats. Republicans want to reduce the pain of the shutdown for the American people, but they are blocked by those who want the entire government to remain shut down.

Americans deserve a national media that gives them the facts rather than one that is in the pocket of the Democratic Party.

END THE CRISIS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I stood with hundreds of American workers who came to this place that they consider a place of responsibility and respect—holders of the Constitution—to beg for their jobs. They represent a small segment of 800,000 Federal employees.

As I was standing there, a representative, Ms. McNeill from AFGE, indicated that this morning she had just received a call from an unemployed Federal worker and an unemployed husband, a wife and husband. They're in crisis. The woman is now being abused, and they had to escort her to a shelter—crisis, Mr. Speaker.

It's not about surrendering. It's about caring about the American people. It's about caring about Diane, who was able to get health insurance after being diabetic and hearing bad things about ObamaCare. And it's about Senator Dole and JOHN DINGELL, two World War II veterans who have said: Don't insult us with this piecemeal.

A Republican and the dean of the House want us to stop and put a clean CR for the American people and to end this crisis. I'm here to end the crisis right now.

WASHINGTON DEMOCRATS MUST SUPPORT OUR VETERANS AND GUARD MEMBERS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a bipartisan group of the House passed two commonsense pieces of legislation: first, to provide resources for our Nation's veterans; and, second, to ensure that our men and women in uniform serving in the National Guard and Reserve are able to be compensated for their efforts.

We should all agree that legislation designed to protect our national security should be above partisan politics. Unfortunately, Senate Democrats have rejected the legislation. Additionally, the President has already threatened to veto these bills.

As a 31-year veteran of the National Guard, I hope, for the sake of our brave men and women in uniform and military families, that obstructionism will cease. It is now up to Washington Democrats to put politics aside, do the right thing, and protect our national security by promoting these bills.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations to our chaplain today, Senate Chaplain Barry Black, for recently being awarded a doctorate from his alma mater, the University of South Carolina.

TURN THE SWITCH ON, MR. SPEAKER

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a dark day today in America and the lights of the greatest government of the greatest democracy in the world are out. The only person who can turn those lights back on, the only person who controls the switch is Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, not the Tea Party.

Turn that switch on, Mr. Speaker. Turn it on for the Federal worker at Camp Parks in Dublin, California, who is seeking unemployment benefits and asking to extend the mortgage on his house. Turn it on for the children who are awaiting clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. Turn it on for our veterans, whose claims will be delayed. Turn on the lights, Mr. Speaker, for the hungry women and children who will be affected by delayed WIC funding. Turn on the lights for our Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard at the people's House without pay.

Mr. Speaker, you can turn back on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world. Just give us a vote.

FUND THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's time to fund the government.

So far, House Republicans have passed four bills to fully fund the government. Since then, that wasn't enough for the Senate, and they shut the government down.

On a bipartisan basis, we have passed bills to ensure our National Guard and reservists are paid, we're funding Federal benefits, reopening national parks, reopening the National Institutes of Health, and allowing the District of Columbia to expend their own local funds. All of these passed with bipartisan votes.

A clean CR is not the answer. A clean CR funds the gold-plated health care plan for Members of Congress. Members of Congress cannot be treated one way and the American people another way. We need fairness for every American and to stop the chaos of ObamaCare.

It's time for HARRY REID and President Obama to come to the table in good faith to work together with House Republicans for the good of all Americans. Let's pass the bills that we have bipartisan support for today.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of a government shutdown that should never have happened.

I'm deeply disappointed that my Republican colleagues have decided that their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act is more important than the rest of the country, more important than 800,000 government workers going without a paycheck, more important than children and families of less means going without the nutritional support they rely on, more important than providing cancer victims and survivors with the reassurance that this government is continuing with critical research to find a cure for cancer.

Why are they letting this shutdown drag on when it could be over today? How much longer do the American people have to suffer?

I urge my colleagues to turn this ship around right now and give us a bill that will fund all of the government without any strings attached, that restores critical services to our seniors, to our veterans, and to our families. Enough already.

PAY OUR GUARDSMEN AND CIVILIAN DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACT

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I and most of the Members of this House have voted now for five different measures that would have paid our Nation's civilian defense workforce and all of our guardsmen and reservists. The first of those bills passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support in July, Mr. Speaker—July. Unfortunately, the Senate and the President have refused to pass four of the five measures.

And in the Pay Our Military Act, the President unilaterally deemed many of the civilian workforce and our National Guard nonessential to our national defense. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but what the President is doing is wrong. The civilian workers that design, build, and maintain our planes, our ships, and our infrastructure and support our warfighters in everything that they do are essential and should not be furloughed simply because the President chooses to do so.

Every member of our National Guard and Reserve stand ready to defend our Nation, and they should be paid while we wait on HARRY REID and the President to agree to negotiate. That's why I've introduced the Pay Our Guardsmen and Civilian Defense Personnel Act. Our national security depends on these men and women, and they should be paid while we're waiting on the President and Senator REID simply to do their job and agree to negotiate with us.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the good people in my Arizona district are disgusted with this Congress. They see Washington treating this shutdown as a political game.

News reports now confirm that there are enough votes in the House—Democrats and Republicans—to pass a clean funding bill and reopen the government right now. Yet the House GOP keeps bringing up piecemeal bills that are going nowhere, designed to create campaign attack fodder.

This week, the House majority cynically used piecemeal votes on veterans and national parks. My district has the Grand Canyon and many national parks; and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I'm disgusted with these dead-end, piecemeal games. And you know who else is disgusted? Veterans.

Yesterday, the commander in chief of the VFW said:

> We expect more from our elected leadership, and not a piecemeal approach that would use the military or disabled veterans as leverage in a political game.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the piecemeal games and restart our government now.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that there is plenty to disagree about in Washington, D.C. The House majority continues to believe that funding special treatment for Members of Congress in the Affordable Care Act is wrong. The House majority continues to believe that the American people need a reprieve from the new government insurance mandate for 1 year—the same reprieve that has been given to businesses, unions, Congress, and other groups. We should all be treated equally and fairly under the law, and Congress should have to follow the same laws it dictates to the rest of America.

But as we continue to negotiate over this divide, let's start funding the things we agree on. Let's fund veterans programs. Let's fund the NIH clinical trials. Let's fund Head Start, WIC programs. Let's open up the World War II Memorial. Surely, even in the divided times we live in, we could set aside our differences and start reopening the doors of government. This shutdown is wrong and the American people are hurting.

Let's please start working together, getting past our differences, finding points of agreement, and let's forge ahead together united as Americans.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFF

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct the record regarding the health benefits for Members of Congress and their staff.

Recently, many on the other side have been falsely claiming that Congress is trying to exempt itself from the Affordable Care Act in an effort to distract the public from their failure to do their job and keep our government open. The fact is that Members of Congress and their staff are the only people who are required by law to give up current employer-provided health care and go into the exchanges.

I support this because I know the exchanges will provide all Americans, including Congress and its staff, quality, affordable health insurance. The exemption my friends want to get rid of is ending Congress' employer contribution, which all Federal employees currently receive.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues probably have, like many of us do, young staffers working in their offices that make around $25,000 a year. We are going to ask these devoted civil servants to pay $5,000 to $12,000 more per year for health insurance than they currently pay just to score a cheap political point?

Ask the Speaker. He supports maintaining this contribution. Case closed.

MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Manufacturing Day.

America is an exceptional Nation. Over the last 2¼ centuries, our country has been an example of freedom. Our Founders' belief in the free enterprise system helped ignite a transformation in manufacturing that has changed the world.

However, as we all know, arbitrary regulations and excessive taxation unfairly punishes hardworking Americans and impedes our industrial capability. This hurts our national strength and is simply unfair to our manufacturers, especially in the aftermath of a recession, whose effects still linger to this day.

I am proud to represent the second-highest manufacturing district in the country. Every day, I hear from Michiganders who share these concerns with me. Instead of unnecessarily exerting its influence on the economy, the government should promote conditions that make it conducive to invest and grow our economy.

As I always say: ''Investment always goes where it is welcome and stays where it is appreciated.'' The goal of tax reform should be to grow the economy. If we want businesses, especially manufacturing businesses, to grow and create jobs, fixing depreciation rules by moving closer to full expensing would be a great start.

END THIS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I remain appalled by the gimmicks that the House continues today.

The majority claims that the bills before us will fund WIC and FEMA programs. But let's be clear. The only way these programs will be funded is by ending this irresponsible and reckless government shutdown.

I have no doubt that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want FEMA to function and WIC recipients to continue to receive life-sustaining nutritional benefits. But to put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of these issues when they do not, or to take care of the American people when they do not, is shameful. We should not be using FEMA and critical safety net programs as political footballs.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want to end this shutdown and help American families, we must allow a vote on the floor to end this government shutdown. Let us do what we all know is right.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THE SENATE, AND THE PRESIDENT MUST SIT DOWN AND TALK

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we can continue to march ourselves down here and throw barbs and insults at one another while watching our meager approval rating fall from 10 percent to perhaps 5 percent. We can continue to do that. Or maybe we can re-frame this whole discussion and agree to something—that we should keep working steadily to get this government back running while also working on the right type of policy reform, tax reform, and spending reform that could restore America's greatness.

Now, in the midst of this difficulty, and seemingly with no way out, this could actually be an historic moment. But it will take the House of Representatives and the President of the United States and the United States Senate talking to one another. That conversation must begin now.

BRING A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION TO THE FLOOR

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, our democracy is supposed to be the example for the world. But the example we have set with this Republican government shutdown is beyond shameful.

Some of my Republican colleagues are actually celebrating this shutdown, saying: ''This is exactly what they wanted.'' Who are they listening to? It certainly isn't the American people.

I fear the survivors of Hurricane Sandy, who have lost everything, will be left without the relief they need. That the 31,000 Federal workers in New Jersey on furlough will wonder how they will make ends meet. I worry about the veterans who have fought for this country but have come home to broken promises. And the more than 9 million women, infants, and children who will be cut from WIC, the nutritional assistance they need to survive.

We cannot choose winners and losers in this fight. I urge my Republican colleagues to act responsibly. Bring a clean CR to the floor and let's start working for the American people again, because they shouldn't have to suffer for the Republicans' inability to govern any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against this unnecessary Republican-led government shutdown.

Republicans should work with Democrats to keep our government open. Republicans have cut off basic government services relied upon by millions of Americans, including millions of Americans who call themselves Republicans.

This effort to shut down our government is costing hardworking taxpayers millions of dollars. 800,000 Federal employees around the country didn't go to work this week and will not return to work until Republicans end this senseless shutdown.

Instead of working across the aisle, Republicans would rather score political points by the Tea Party. They would rather take our government hostage over an issue that was voted on in March of 2010, upheld by the Supreme Court in June of 2012, and held to a public referendum by the reelection of President Obama in November of 2012.

The Affordable Care Act is law. It has gone through the checks and balances of our government and should not be an issue when it comes to funding our government.

I ask my Republican colleagues to let us return to reason. Let's keep our government running. Let's do the right thing. Stop these games, stop the obstruction, and let's get back to work on real issues.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this week, a Republican colleague spoke of the need to shut down the government. He said: ''We just want to help Americans get past one of the most insidious laws ever created by man.'' He was referring to the Affordable Care Act, but his words sounded eerily familiar to statements from this body's past.

A Congressman once said:

> Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery—to enslave workers.

Another one said:

> We cannot stand idly by now as the Nation embarks on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, from which the patient will be the ultimate sufferer.

These aren't quotes about the Affordable Care Act. The quotes are from Congressman Taber in 1935, opposing Social Security, and from Congressman Hall in 1965, opposing Medicare.

What if opponents of Social Security and Medicare shut down the entire government because they didn't get their way? What if the majorities gave into the demands of those on the wrong side of history? This country would be very different today.

These may be forgotten, but this reckless shutdown will not be, and the American people will remember who caused it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 371

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 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. The joint resolutions reffered to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(d) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) making continuing appropriations for national intelligence program operations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(e) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(f) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(g) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making continuing appropriations for the National Weather Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(h) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) making continuing appropriations for the Impact Aid program of the Department of Education for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(i) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(j) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees. 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 Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 21, 2013.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 20, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of 10 different joint resolutions, all of which demonstrate House Republicans' continuing commitment to reopen necessary portions of our government.

The rule is a closed rule, which provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for each joint resolution. Additionally, the rule provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill or joint resolution.

Additionally, the rule extends same-day authority for resolutions reported by the Rules Committee through the legislative day of October 21, 2013, thus continuing to allow the House the flexibility to continue to address the government shutdown. Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules until October 20.

Here we are again, Mr. Speaker—day four of a government shutdown. Unfortunately for the American people, not much has changed. The Senate is still recalcitrant, unwilling to consider legislation that would reopen parts of the government. I do want to add an exception, though, and thank our friends in the upper Chamber for actually agreeing with us to exempt our military from these cuts, both civilian and uniform. The Senate, however, is still unwilling to go to conference to discuss the very serious fiscal issues facing this country. The Senate is also unwilling to consider any of the five pieces of legislation the House passed in the last 2 days, which will reopen parts of our government. Even so, House Republicans continue to bring legislation to the floor to meet the needs of American citizens.

Today's rule will allow for the consideration of resolutions that reopen the Bureau of Indian Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, the WIC program, the National Weather Center, FEMA, our intelligence agencies, Impact Aid, Head Start—and the list goes on and on.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rule makes clear our commitment to the 800,000 Federal workers currently furloughed that they will, indeed, be paid. It is not their fault that Washington is dysfunctional in that Congress can't agree on the size and scope of government. Yet they are caught in the crossfire, wondering if they will be able to afford their mortgages and pay their utility bills. Mr. Speaker, that simply isn't fair. H.R. 3223, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would codify what we have done in every previous government shutdown: pay our Federal employees from the date on which the government shut down.

I particularly want to compliment in a bipartisan fashion our friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, who worked together on this measure, who brought it forward and gathered many dozens of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Quite frankly, I think their example of bipartisanship and working together is something that we could all learn from.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike agree that that's the responsible thing to do. House Republicans are working to deal with the real-world problems of our constituents. Republicans are working to reopen the government. However, we lack a willing partner in the Senate and in the President. Every time we have attempted to negotiate with them, they have told us to accept their plan. They have even rebuffed our attempts to go to conference. Therefore, House Republicans have been left with little choice except that of passing a number of smaller bills to see if the Senate would be willing to accept those. Again, I remark on one occasion, with respect to the military, that they

did, indeed, accept one, so I would urge them to do that with the others.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unless the silent Members of the majority speak up, today's debate is a fait accompli.

For the last 2 days, Members of the majority have said publicly that they wish this government shutdown would end. In fact, a coalition of more than 218 Democrats and Republicans has publicly declared that it is ready to vote on the clean Senate CR. This 218 would be the majority, and we would pass it; and that's why the powerful minority, who has taken the government hostage, is doing all it can again today to prevent the Senate CR from coming to the House floor. It doesn't make any sense. Not only doesn't it make any sense; but, actually, were we to do that, we wouldn't have to be here today, trying to do these piecemeal pieces.

Last night, the Rules Committee proposed a rule for these 11 piecemeal funding bills before us today. They didn't go through a single meeting of a committee. At least, in the committee process, the subcommittees and committees would have given both Republicans and Democrats an opportunity to weigh in on these measures. Remember that half the population of the United States is represented by Democrats and that, in the last election, Democrat candidates for Congress achieved a million more votes than our Republican friends, but we are shut out of the process. Indeed, these bills were written yesterday afternoon and were brought straight to the Rules Committee, as so many are lately, in order to be rushed to the floor.

During our hearing, a colleague promised that the reckless approach would continue, even suggesting that we could see 150 more of these piecemeal bills before the majority agrees to end the government shutdown. That should take us to, maybe, October of next year. Yet, while they're willing to take 150 votes on bills the President would veto—and everybody knows the President would veto them—and the Senate would reject, they haven't allowed a single vote on the cure to the problem: bring up the CR, and put the government back to work.

Fortunately for the American people, no minority—no matter how powerful—can stop the will of the House if we exercise it. Unlike the Senate, a majority in the House can only be held back for so long. Thanks to the democratic spirit baked into our Chamber's rules, the majority will always succeed. For the more than 218 Members—a majority who has expressed a desire to vote on the clean CR—our most powerful tool is voting down the previous question and bringing the clean Senate CR to the floor to vote on.

Now, earlier this week, my Democrat colleagues and I urged the Chamber to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we could bring the Senate bill to the floor. Not a single Republican joined our cause. Today, we are going to give you another chance. Following the debate on the rule, we will have a chance to vote down the previous question. While that may simply be legislative language to most people, what that will do is give us an opportunity—those of us who very strongly believe this government should work—to bring the CR, bring the shutdown to a close and put everybody back to work. I want to see by the end of this day that we can accomplish that, because words are no longer enough. Those Members of the majority who claim that they want to end the government shutdown get the opportunity today to stand up and vote. As I said the other day when we had the same opportunity, I would like them to put their voting cards where their mouths are.

Over the next hour, I encourage every Member of this Chamber to reflect on the damage that has already been wrought on our Nation because of the shutdown and on the damage that will ensue if we wait another day. The shutdown is costing the Nation $300 million a day, and more than 800,000 workers are furloughed without pay. Today, we are going to vote—and, I think, almost unanimously—to pay them when the shutdown ends. A logical person would say, Why don't you bring them back to work? If they're going to be paid anyway, let them work. There is no answer for that. There must be some reason here that is available to only a few people as to why the majority wants to keep the government shut down.

We have to also end this because our State Department and intelligence employees need to go back on the job. A hurricane is bearing down right now on the State of Louisiana while 80 percent of the FEMA workers are furloughed. NASA had to turn off the Mars Rover, which was giving us so much information about the universe—stopping all the space exploration in its tracks.

I think one of the best things I've read to describe what we are doing in this House was said by a Republican. Because there is no plan here—there is no end game here—he is saying that what they are doing is laying the track ahead of the speeding train as it bears down on them.

The majority started the shutdown because they were dead set on repealing the Affordable Care Act; and I think, by doing this piecemeal, they think they can still do that. Throughout the process, they have issued dire predictions about the health care law and have warned that the law would hurt American workers. It is absolutely turning out not to be true.

In the last week, two of our Nation's biggest companies have responded to the Affordable Care Act by giving tens of thousands of their part-time employees full-time jobs. Guess who they are? One is the largest employer in the United States—Walmart. They are raising 35,000 of their part-time employees to become full-time employees in order to make them eligible for health insurance. Walt Disney announced that 427 employees at Disney World who have been hired as full-time employees will be given access to the health insurance plan. We also hear all the time—and I've really got to research this—that Delta Air Lines has said, they tell me, that the affordable care plan would cost them $100 million a year. I surely would like to know how that's possible unless they plan to hire 70 million new employees, which would certainly be good for employment, but I see no earthly reason for them to do that. We need to know whether that's true or not since all of the rest of the dire predictions have turned out not to be.

The Affordable Care Act is working; but because of the majority, the government is not, and it's time for the majority to give up this losing game. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and on the underlying legislation; and, so importantly, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question. Then, Mr. Speaker, we can bring the clean Senate CR to the House floor, as we should have done weeks ago, and end this government shutdown today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a couple of points that my good friend raises; but before I do, I want to agree with her in that I think we all think the government ought to be open. I, actually, don't think there is much division about that, and folks have actually tried to do that. On our side of the aisle, every single piece of legislation we've brought to the floor during this period has either kept the government open in whole or in part, and I suspect we will continue to try and do that. So it's not the aim of either side here to shut down the government.

In terms of the Affordable Health Care Act, I certainly don't support it—I voted against it, and voted multiple times to repeal it and delay it—but I'll agree with my good friend on that, too, in the sense that there are times when we have actually worked together on both sides of the aisle to change it. My friends like to quite often mention there have been 41 or 42 efforts to repeal, delay, defund the bill; but they usually forget to add—and, quite frankly, some people on our side of the aisle forget to add—that seven of those have actually succeeded, that is, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President agreed with them.

The proposals that we have on the table now in terms of the Affordable Health Care Act are immanently sensible and overwhelmingly popular. To put it quite simply, we just don't think that political appointees and elected officials ought to be treated differently

than other Americans. Now, we can get into a big fight about health care; but the reality is, right now, under the law, Members of Congress and their staffs can bring subsidies with them onto the exchange. No other American can do that. We can do this either way as far as I'm concerned. I could leave them back as Federal employees, and they could be treated like every other Federal employee—that's the acceptable solution to me at least—or we could allow other Americans to bring subsidies onto the exchange just like Members of Congress; but the underlying principle is that we ought to treat them all the same. Washington political appointees shouldn't be treated differently than the average American.

The second thing is, I think, very simple. We're not talking about delaying all of ObamaCare; but if we are going to allow big businesses to wait a year before they implement what they're required to do—if we are going to allow 1,100 organizations and many labor unions to do it—why shouldn't we allow the average American, at his choice, to delay it as well?

□ 1300

They don't want to delay. They can go onto the exchanges. The subsidies are still there. The tax programs are still there. Why shouldn't the average American have the same privilege that we've bestowed on Big Business, Big Labor, and countless organizations? That's what we're talking about.

To my friend's point here—and I suspect this is true of the debt ceiling a little bit further down the road—the Democratic approach is very simple: do everything I want, and then I'm willing to negotiate. We would like to sit down and talk now and see if we could find some common ground. We've got negotiators, conferees—the technical title—available to sit down and find common ground. We're not asking for something that is unreasonable, in my view. We're certainly not proposing something that is outside the scope of the type of things we've been able to agree on before.

The President, I want to add, is taking the same approach that the Senate has taken with regard to the continuing resolution with the debt ceiling. He has just simply said we have to raise it unilaterally. That's not a particularly popular vote, probably on either side of the aisle. It's certainly not on my side of the aisle.

I'm willing to work with the President on the debt ceiling. I did it in 2011. And I want to note for the record, that is something he never did when he was a Member of the United States Senate. He didn't vote to raise the debt ceiling when he had the opportunity to do it. Instead, he engaged in a lecture about debt. It probably was a lecture that was needed. Regardless, he did not do for George Bush what he's asking us to do for him.

I'm willing to do that. I'm willing to work with him on the debt ceiling. If you voted for the Ryan budget, you envisioned the debt ceiling as being something that has to be raised while you deal with the underlying deficit. I do want to do something or be in a negotiation with the President about what to do on that deficit. I don't think that's an unreasonable position.

I think the real central issue in this is not the Affordable Care Act, not the debt ceiling, and, frankly, not even the government shutdown, as serious as that is. The real issue is whether my friends and the President of the United States will simply come to the table to negotiate. Will they put a counterproposal out there, or is it simply going to be: We insist in getting our way, in full, all the time? I don't think that's an acceptable way to arrive at common ground, and I don't think it's likely to succeed.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm so pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), our incredible member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of the Republican shutdown of the people's government.

The other day after meeting with the President at the White House, Speaker BOEHNER said:

> At some point, we've got to allow the process that our Founders gave us to work out.

Mr. Speaker, I've studied American history, too, and what the Republican leadership is doing with this rule is a million miles away from what the Founders had in mind.

I'm comforted that Speaker BOEHNER has said privately that he wants to extend the debt ceiling. He also said he didn't want to shut down the government, yet here we are. I don't know what Senator CRUZ is saying privately, which is important, because he's apparently calling all the shots around here.

The rule before us today extends martial law rule until October 21. They have decided that they have the right to throw the rules and traditions of this House into the trash can for the next 2½ weeks. That's 4 days after we default on our obligations. That should make all of us very nervous.

The rule also makes in order 11 separate bills—many of which were never considered in committee or on the House floor—under a closed process with no amendments. I've been on and around the Rules Committee for quite a few years, Mr. Speaker, but I have never seen a rule like this.

I find it astounding that the Republicans have suddenly found religion on the need to go to conference on the budget, because for months and months and months and months they have refused to appoint budget negotiators. Suddenly, as the American people rise up in outrage over their tactics and their poll numbers fall off a cliff, my Republican friends all of the sudden now want to negotiate.

There's a very easy way to get past this: bring up the short-term clean continuing resolution that has already passed the Senate—at Republican sequester numbers, no less—and we will pass it with a bipartisan vote and end this unnecessary, harmful Republican shutdown. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this process awful, so are many of the bills made in order under this rule. I want to talk about one in particular, the one that provides funding for WIC, the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program. After months of trying to cut $40 billion from the SNAP program, after months of demonizing poor people, after months of trying to slash food assistance programs across the board, Republicans would like us all to believe that they care about hunger in America all of the sudden.

Give me a break. Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. I say to my Republican friends: Where have you been? Where have you been on this issue?

Because of the sequester, we've already seen WIC clinics close and participation in the program fall. That means that fewer and fewer low-income women and children are getting help, the nutritious food that they need. This bill does not fix that.

The National WIC Association urges the House to oppose H.J. Res. 75, calling it ''a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends.'' They are right, Mr. Speaker, this is a cynical ploy.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, pass the clean CR, and let the American people get on with their lives.

I would say to the Speaker of the House that all you need to do is schedule a vote. You don't even have to vote for it. If you schedule it, it will pass in a bipartisan manner and we can end this shutdown once and for all.

Please, Mr. Speaker, practice a little democracy in the people's House. Please, Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

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

Just a quick point. My friend is always quite eloquent, and I know, frankly, very passionate and very well-meaning and very expert when he talks about nutrition programs, where he spent a great deal of time.

For the record, it's worth noting that we have increased nutrition programs broadly by 400 percent since George Bush became President. We doubled them, roughly, when Bush was President. Doubled them again since President Obama has been in office. What the Republican program is talking about is a 5 percent cut after a 400 percent increase based on reforms. I think it's maybe not quite so dire.

Again, I recognize my friend's good work in this area and hope that we have an opportunity to get to conference, have that discussion. I suspect the bill, if it comes back, may be closer to his liking than the bill that went out.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My objection with the Republican approach to the SNAP program is that 3.8 million people will lose their benefits, 170,000 veterans would lose their benefits, and we have a problem with hunger in America. We have close to 50 million people who are hungry, and 17 million are kids. We should all be ashamed of that. We should be coming together to solve the problem and not making it worse. That's where my frustration comes from.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, the rolls have been going up in a period we're supposed to be recovering. I think we have some genuine problems in this program in terms of reform. Again, that's the initial proposal. It's not out of bounds considering a 400 percent increase to have a 5 percent cutback. We'll wait and see what comes out of the conference committee.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding, and I thank Ms. SLAUGHTER for the extraordinary leadership she has shown and the work she has been doing.

Mr. Speaker, the people want their government open. A government of the people and for the people and by the people ought to be open. They want their dedicated Federal employees, who have been unfairly furloughed, to go back to work. They want to end the shutdown that is having negative consequences for our economy and for our national security and for the confidence of Americans that their government can work.

The only way to do so is by passing a clean, get-the-government-open funding bill to keep the government open while we discuss, negotiate, put forward our positions, a longer term agreement on the budget.

The Senate has acted, and acted responsibly, by passing a bill that will keep the government operating. They passed that bill with a number that was suggested by the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker. Now we have the opportunity to do the same thing right now and end this shutdown. Get the people's government back to work.

There are a growing number of Republicans who say they would vote for a bill which is so-called ''clean,'' not with any of the poison pills that have been on it time after time after time. I tell them that this is your opportunity to back up your words with actions. Don't just say, ''Let's end the shutdown.'' Vote with us in just a few minutes to end the shutdown.

On Wednesday, Majority Leader CANTOR said this:

We're trying to get this government open as quickly as possible.

''As quickly as possible'' is in about 5, 10, 15, or 20 minutes. That's ''as quickly as possible.'' I don't know if it's as quickly as probable, because I'm not sure that the majority leader means those words or that his party means those words, but we're going to have an opportunity to vote on it.

I say to my friend from Virginia, here is our chance to do so. To the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), Mr. COLE's colleague, who said about the shutdown that he and his Republican colleagues have imposed: I would like to end it this afternoon; I say we can do it—he's right. In just a few minutes, Mr. LANKFORD is going to have the opportunity to vote that way. It's either empty rhetoric, or he means what he says.

Let's do it. Let's open government. Let's get the people's public servants back to work for them. Right here, right now, we can end this shutdown today, this afternoon, in just a few minutes.

We don't differ. As I understand it, everybody on both sides of the aisle says they don't want to shut down government. Mr. COLE says that. Ms. SLAUGHTER says that. I say that. We have the power, in a few minutes, to put people back to work for all of our constituents.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this motion—the previous question, we call it, jargon for saying ''let's move on.'' If we vote ''no'' on the previous question, we can put a bill on the floor which will put the government back to work this afternoon. Mr. COLE knows we can do that. I don't know that Mr. COLE will vote to do that. I think Ms. SLAUGHTER will vote to do that. I will vote to do that. Mr. ANDREWS will vote to do that. Others will vote to do that. If they do, if they match their actions with their talk, then we can open this government in just a matter of minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what my friend, the minority whip, just said. He said, There are things that we agree on, why can't we get those things done? I would say that every single Member that the majority whip pointed out that said, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that—we have an opportunity today to vote to reopen parts of the Department of Homeland Security. I know we agree on that. Let's do that. We have the opportunity under this rule to go ahead and fund the WIC program. I know we agree on that. Let's do that.

I didn't come to that conclusion on my own, Mr. Speaker. I sit in the Rules Committee, and I listen to my colleagues. This happens to be a statement from the minority whip in a Rules Committee hearing. He said this: ''The American people are obviously deeply distressed. They are distressed that when they see agreement, that that agreement is not made into law. We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that which we agree.''

I agree. Every single provision that we are bringing to the floor today, I say, Mr. Speaker, is something on which we agree.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman used my name. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield if I have time remaining. The gentleman knows I would be happy to yield, and I absolutely will.

Let us move forward on that with which we agree. There is not one provision in this rule on which we disagree. And Mr. Speaker, you will not hear anyone on this floor say otherwise.

But it's not just the minority whip, who I would very much like to yield to if I have time remaining; it's the minority leader. The same Rules Committee hearing: ''Here is a place where we are all in agreement. Whatever else we have, we can continue that conversation later.''

''We can continue that conversation later.'' Let's do what we all agree on.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I agree with my friend, the minority whip. I agree with the minority leader.

As I have said to my friend very respectfully, if I have time remaining at the end, I would be happy to yield. But at the moment, I do not. Very respectfully to my friend.

And it's not just my friend, the minority whip. It's not just the minority leader. It's President Barack Obama: ''I want the American people to urge Congress soon to begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. We already all agree on making sure middle class taxes don't go up. So let's get that done.''

We did. Now some Republicans voted ''no,'' and some Democrats voted ''no.'' But the Chamber came together, and we got that done. We're in the same place today, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disagrees with any one of these provisions, believes any one of these provisions is not worthy of their vote, if they do not affirmatively want to see these programs reopen, I would like to hear that from my friends. But Mr. Speaker, they do.

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

Mr. COLE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

I now yield to my friend from Maryland, the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman believe that we should shut down the government?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will say to my friend, I spent the entire month of August at every town hall meeting I could find, telling folks that government shutdowns were not the right plan for this Nation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield.

Then we agree not only on the small slices of which the gentleman has spoken and would draw on the floor today but on the whole. And we could put every employee back to work for the American people today because, as you say, we agree.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that, no, we do not agree because the gentleman wants to continue to support those programs that are putting workers in my district out of work. They want to continue to support those programs that are taking health insurance away from families in my district. They want to continue to support those programs that we know are broken.

Folks, my constituency wants to do away with preexisting conditions. My constituency wants to ensure that every child has access to health coverage. But my constituency does not understand why we had to re-regulate the entire health care industry, destroying the 40-hour workweek, as my union friends have said, destroying quality health care plans that folks in my district have had but have now lost, breaking the promise the President made that if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. There's not a man or woman in this room that believes that promise has been kept. We were duped, Mr. Speaker, by that promise.

Today, however, we have straightforward, narrow bills. Not 2,400 pages of legislation, Mr. Speaker, but one idea at a time. Stand up, Mr. Speaker. Who doesn't believe that the Department of Homeland Security, focused on our Nation's security, should be funded? Stand up, and vote ''no.'' But you believe that it should be, and you're going to vote ''no'' anyway.

Who doesn't believe that the Impact Aid Program from the Department of Education which helps children not just in my district but in every district, Mr. Speaker, who doesn't believe that ought to be funded? The truth is, everyone believes that ought to be funded. And yet they are going to stand up today and vote ''no'' anyway. They are encouraged to vote ''no'' by leadership. It's disappointing to me, Mr. Speaker.

I'm disappointed we can't agree on everything, but I recognize that we can't. I know that we agree on most things. Let's do those things on which we agree. Don't take my word for it. Take President Obama's word for it. Let's begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. Take NANCY PELOSI's word for it—let's do what we all agree on. We can continue the rest of that conversation later. Let's do what my good friend, the minority whip, who just left the floor, said: We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that with which we agree. I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a strong ''yes'' vote for this rule and a strong ''yes'' vote for every single underlying provision.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

My colleagues have confused the fact that they have gone around saying how, indeed, throughout August and all the rest of this time, that they don't want to shut down the House, in some hope, I guess, that nobody would understand that when they shut down the House, that they had actually done it.

Now what my colleague is talking about from the Democrat side, what they are saying, let's do what we agree with, they are taking their word for it that you didn't want to shut down the House. So let's not do it. You cannot superimpose that notion onto the idea of setting up this government by dribs and drabs. None of us are for that. The Senate won't do it. You know this is an exercise in futility. But pretty soon, the previous question is coming up. You are going to have a chance to do what you said you didn't want to do, shut down the House. But I understand from what you have said that because of health care, because of health care and what you think it has done to people in your district, you are holding this country hostage.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I don't have the time. My time has been given out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell me how much time the gentlewoman from New York has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the great State of Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Friday. The government has partially been shut down for some 4 days now.

Republicans have tried to be reasonable. Many of us did not like ObamaCare. Some folks, like myself—my family didn't have health care at certain times. And I thought we had a responsibility to help people who had preexisting conditions, help some of our young people. And we disagreed with the other side. They passed it. They said you'd know what was in the bill after we passed it. After we passed it, and it became the law, we saw what was in it. The President, some 17 times now—many times in contravention of the law that was passed—changed the law.

Now when we came a few days ago, October 1, there wasn't money to run the government, but there was money to run ObamaCare. Still, many people were left in the lurch after many exceptions were made for special interest folks, even business. And I admit to being pro-business. They gave them a waiver.

We said that Members of Congress and also the White House staff and others should be under ObamaCare, and we said that the individual should also have a break here.

This is a system that some Democrats said was a train wreck. We didn't say that. But we should have the opportunity to make some changes. And we offered three opportunities to make changes—some of them minor—that we thought were fair.

But when you go out golfing the Saturday before the government is about to run out of money, when you don't show up for work on Sunday, and you come to work on Monday, as the United States Senate did, you can't negotiate. When you send people to the White House and sit there and say, we won't negotiate——

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

Mr. COLE. I yield my friend from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MICA. But our leaders, in good faith, went to the White House.

As a staffer, I used to get calls. I was a staffer for Senator Hawkins, and Ronald Reagan would ask me to help work with my boss and others to get things done.

I voted on this floor to impeach Bill Clinton. And Bill Clinton came back and worked with us. We balanced the budget.

Remember, after we had the last shutdown, '95, within 2 years, we balanced the budget. We reformed welfare. We balanced the budget. Actually, the debate here on September 11, just before September 11, was what to do with the surplus. So some good can come out of this, good people working together.

But when they won't negotiate, when they call you to the White House and they won't talk, when they go to Maryland, as they did, or wherever it was in the region here, and then tell folks that we're holding a gun to their heads, that's wrong.

Let's negotiate. Let's get this done for the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am feeling quite badly. I didn't know how much time I had remaining.

I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), if he would like.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I oppose this rule, and I oppose the bill. I don't oppose it because my district does not need the assistance. I represent one of the most impoverished and disadvantaged districts in America. We have great need. Fortunately, many of my constituents know the difference between genuinely trying to help them or, as the guys in the barber shop might say, ''gaming them.'' Or they may say, ''Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.'' Or they could say that this piecemeal approach is not going to cut it.

Poverty in my State of Illinois is at nearly 15 percent. And in my district, child poverty is 40 percent. Women, 28 percent; African Americans, 38 percent. Twenty-three percent of Asian Americans and 24 percent of Latinos in my district live in poverty. Overall, 196,478 people in my district live in poverty.

So you can see we need the assistance. But we also need affordable health care. We need LIHEAP. We need mortgage assistance. We need to get homeless people off the street during Chicago's cold winters. Therefore, I cannot support this piecemeal approach. What we need is a clean CR so that our employees can return to work and our people can receive the services and benefits that they so greatly need and rightly deserve. We need a clean CR.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Kentucky, the Honorable HAL ROGERS, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Might I engage in a colloquy with the gentleman?

Mr. COLE. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. What is the normal time-honored procedure in the Congress when the two bodies disagree?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, we schedule a conference, we go to conference, and we try to negotiate our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That's the time-honored tradition. That's the way the place works. It's the way it should operate. That's regular order.

Now the Senate has passed the bill. The House has passed a bill, which disagree with each other. The House, two or three nights ago now, passed their motion to go to conference, and it passed the House. The Speaker of the House then appointed conferees from the House side and sent that to the Senate, waiting for the Senate to appoint conferees so that we can meet together, work out our differences, and bring that agreement back to each body, the House and the Senate.

□ 1330

Why aren't we proceeding on regular order in this case?

Do you have an answer?

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman will yield, no, Mr. Chairman, I do not. I would just highly recommend to my friends we do, since it seems to be a good way to resolve our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, that's the way we've done it for 200 years or so, and that is, when we disagree with the other body, we each appoint our conferees. The conferees go off and haggle and amend and argue and debate until there's some agreement that can be brought back to each Chamber, which then can reject or accept that conference report.

The House has acted. We're waiting on the Senate to appoint their conferees so that we can go off and work, 24 hours a day, if necessary, to come to an agreement, which we can do.

And I would urge the other body to honor the age-old tradition in the Congress. When you disagree with the other body, you appoint conferees to work out the differences, bring it back to each body, and I would hope that the Senate would do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that regular order has not been the order of business in this House for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. This process is about appropriations. That's how we keep government open.

Unfortunately, we've never been able to get any of the appropriation bills to the floor because the Republicans won't appoint conferees to the joint committees, so we're doing a continuing resolution.

The continuing resolution is not new in this Congress. It's been done every year. The shocking thing is it's never been used as a weapon of destruction until now. We were here last year, same argument.

The health care bill is not the issue here. That's been law in this country for 3½ years. So for 3½ years, we've been appropriating money to keep government open.

What's the difference now?

The difference now is a new attitude, new breed, very mean, very conservative, very anti-government; and they're willing to bring their internal kind of power within their caucus to shut down the whole country, if not the whole world. It's totally irresponsible.

They argue, well, we can do this if we could change the health care. If the health care bill needs changing, bring it up in a bill. That's how we change things.

So I'm opposing this rule because this rule says, okay, let's bring up 10 parts of government. Let's bring up 10 parts. Let's just have multiple choice. Let's have a triage.

Which parts of government do you like?

I'd like to compliment my colleague, Mr. COLE, because in it we can't be against all health care because we keep open, in one of these bills, H.J. Res. 80, the Indian Health Services, so obviously we're going to provide health services for some low-income people; but we're against any other system that might provide assistance for other kinds of low-income people.

So this is government by multiple choice. It's not working. That's why we oppose it. Let's bring the whole family, the whole Nation together.

Reject this rule. Defeat the previous question and defeat the rule, and get on with a CR that is in this House and can be voted on right now.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I've only got one more speaker in the room, so I wanted to inform my colleague that, after Mr. ANDREWS, I may be prepared to close.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. Speaker, there's been an avalanche of talk from both sides, an avalanche of opinion. That's democracy.

I think there is one indisputable fact, and that is the one way to end the government shutdown today is for the House to pass the Senate bill and send it to the President. That would end the shutdown immediately.

Now, it's my opinion that a majority of Members of the House would vote in favor of that proposal if it reaches the floor. I think that's what would happen.

But it's my conviction, and I think it should be our shared conviction, that we ought to take a vote on it. We ought to let all 433 Members that are present here cast a vote on whether they want the Senate bill to pass or not; and if our side wins, fine. If our side loses, that's fine too. That's democracy.

After this avalanche of talk, there is going to be a chance, in a few minutes, for people to actually vote on this question; and this is not the technical, procedural language, but it's the reality language.

What this vote's really going to ask is this: Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If you vote ''no'' that you don't want the government shutdown to continue, the Senate bill will come to the House floor this afternoon, and we'll take that vote.

If you vote ''yes,'' then the Senate bill will not come to the House floor, and we'll continue on this everlasting process of burdening the American people, talking the issue to death, and not getting anything done.

I think we owe it to the American people to all stand up and raise our hands, either say ''yes'' or ''no'' on the Senate bill. If your answer is ''no,'' your answer is ''no.'' Mine would be ''yes.''

But the way to make that happen is to cast this vote in a few minutes. The question on this vote is, Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If your vote is ''no,'' then we vote on the Senate bill. If your vote is ''yes,'' then we don't, and the shutdown continues.

The American people deserve this vote.

Mr. Speaker, give us this vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news I want to announce here just shortly.

But I want to note, for the record, my friends quite often make the point that they don't like a piecemeal approach. The reality is, if you look at actions, sometimes they do. They like it until they don't.

I would point out we had, of course, H.R. 3210 here, which funded the military, by our good friend from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN). I think, in a very bipartisan way, we voted overwhelmingly on both sides to fund the military and most of the contracting and civilian employees.

There is a little disagreement with the administration about that right now, but that's half the discretionary budget taken care of in a ''piecemeal approach.''

Today the administration just announced, and I commend them for doing it, and I commend my friend because she announced she was going to be supportive of this too, and I think we all are. It was very evident in the Rules Committee, H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

The administration's just announced that they're going to support that legislation. The President looks forward to signing it, and that's a bipartisan agreement between both sides and, frankly, a product of the work of our mutual good friends, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who found common ground and, in a piecemeal approach, moved us closer to a solution.

So I think that's maybe not the greatest news in the world, but on a day where there's not as much good as we would all like, some good news. And I would hope my friends would look at the individual pieces of legislation that are coming, where we mostly agree, and accept those.

We don't have to agree on everything, as the point's been made by several, to agree on some things. Those are areas that we do agree. And if we can fund our military in this fashion, and if we can make sure that our Federal employees are not going to lose any pay, retroactively, certainly, one step at a time, we can walk in the right direction and turn back on critical parts of our government. I hope that's what we're moving toward, Mr. Speaker.

So my friend knows, I'm quite prepared to close whenever she wishes to close.

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

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

I am absolutely going to vote to retroactively fund the Federal employees because that's the best I can do, on that one issue. It is a matter of basic fairness, but it is not good enough.

The fact is that the Federal employees will not get paid their retroactive money until after all this charade is over. We have no idea when that's going to be.

Let me reiterate again what all my colleagues have said: we can do it right now, put them back to work and let them get their paycheck.

I'm embarrassed every time I pass the Capitol Police at what's happening to them. It bothers me terribly to hear my friends at the State Department say that they're working on fumes.

We cannot run the Government of the United States, which is the beacon of democracy, has been the pattern for countries all over the world, by saying we're going to fund this piece over there and that piece over there, and we don't care what happens to the rest of it. That's not what we are here for.

Certainly, we will fund that one piece; but I can tell you right now, the Democrats are not going to do any of the rest of it because the Senate is not going to take it up and the President is not going to sign it.

We are simply wasting time, and we're taking up valuable time, and we are worrying the country half to death.

For heaven's sake, when we do this previous question, let us do the right thing. Vote ''no'' and get all these folks back to work.

Does it literally make sense to anybody who either manages a household or their own business that we would say to everybody, go home and rest around here or there; we'll pay you later when we decide you can come back, for not being here. That makes absolutely no sense.

Let them go back to work. We're going to pay them. Pay them now for the work they're doing. Pay concurrently with work.

Doesn't that make more sense?

Does it really make any sense at all that we're saying to them, we have no idea what the end game is here. You may be sitting around for a very long time, while the country pays $300 million a day of the cost of the shutdown.

For heaven's sake, I would say once again that we have to do this previous question today. We have to stop this nonsense. It is humiliating us. We cannot go on with this another week.

We're only here today to try to make it look like we're doing something because the government's shut down, and we know it. Those bills that we're voting on today had no committee action, nothing. The Senate has made perfectly clear they're not going to take them up. They will not become law, as every school child knows.

Now, those who vote ''no'' on ordering the previous question will be giving this Chamber what the leadership of the majority has not, and that will be the real chance to vote this down so that we can put the CR on the calendar and stop the shutdown now, today.

It doesn't have to go back to the Senate. The President's waiting for it.

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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, I do implore my colleagues, for goodness sakes, come to the floor, defeat the previous question. Vote ''no.''

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

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

I want to thank my good friend from New York. She's always a terrific, frankly, counterpoint and debater, and we agree on some things. We both agree that the government shutdown's not a good thing.

Frankly, there's a strong bipartisan agreement. It's not something that either side wished to achieve, and it's something we ought to be working together, step by step, to try and undo; and, frankly, we've made a little bit of progress.

Again, the idea that it never works to work piecemeal, it certainly did with respect to the United States military, civilian defense force, and contractors. That's exactly what we did.

We passed something out of here; and the Senate, which said it wasn't going to agree to anything, magically did.

Now we're going to, hopefully, eventually pass H.R. 3223 out of here to guarantee back pay. I think most people on both sides of the aisle will support that. The President's indicated he'll sign it, which suggests to me that the Senate will probably take it up and move on it. So, voila.

Once again, just working through the process, we've found something that we can agree on. The differences here should not be so great that they can't be bridged.

Just to remind everyone of the history, we have placed multiple offers concerning the Affordable Care Act before the Senate. The last offer seems to me something that we ought to be able to agree on, or certainly be willing to sit down and discuss. It only has two points, and it's basically a question of fairness.

Why should Members of Congress and high appointees in the executive branch and our staffs go into the exchange and be able to bring subsidies with us, when no other American can do that?

It's just not fair.

Now, we could amend the law and let everybody come into the exchanges with subsidies. That would be fair. Or we could say, you know, really, Members of Congress and their staff are at a fundamental level employees of the Federal Government and they ought to be in that, and that would be fair. But let's treat everybody the same.

More fundamentally, currently, the President has unilaterally decided to exempt 1,100-plus organizations. He's unilaterally, in a questionable measure, constitutionally, decided to suspend parts of the law for a year and exempt Big Business.

We think, gosh, if you're going to do that, shouldn't every single American have the right to decide whether or not they want to participate in this for just 1 year until everybody is actually operating under the same system?

That too is a question of fairness. Give every individual American the same relief from a mandate that you're giving Big Business and Big Labor. It just seems to me commonsensical.

It doesn't mean you have to stop the exchanges.

□ 1345

You don't have to undo the program. Just treat everybody the same. Be fair. That's the Republican proposal in front of the Senate right now, and, frankly, I think they probably don't want to discuss it because it's a hard one to say ''no'' to because it's fundamentally fair. And that's all we've asked, is that the Senate, which has rejected it, at least come to conference and talk about it.

The real issue here beyond the questions of policy is whether the Senate is going to be allowed to dictate unilaterally what the House does. Is it just going to say, no, you've to do it our way? We're not going to negotiate. We're not going to go to conference. We're not going to deal with you. You have to do it our way. That's not the way the system was set up.

My friend, Chairman ROGERS, pointed that out quite succinctly. We've got a way to handle this. It's called go to conference, argue, and work out the differences. And I suspect we're going to see the same thing a little bit down the road from the President, who's told us and told the Speaker this week, I'm not going to negotiate with you on raising the debt ceiling in the United States. You just have to do it unilaterally. You have to put the country further into debt without any discussion of what we can do to change the trajectory of that debt.

Now, that's a remarkable change from where he was in August of 2011. A remarkable change. He was in a very different place and position and was willing to sit down and talk. I don't know why he would change that now.

So I think we should do something in this bill to build on this piecemeal approach. We should pass these different measures. We agree these parts of government ought to be open; and we should continue to work through, conference with our friends in the Senate and ultimately in negotiation with the President of the United States on the debt ceiling.

And so I urge the adoption of this rule.

In closing, I'd like to, again, say that one of the basic functions of Congress is to fund government. This rule would allow 10 or more pieces of that government to open again to provide for crucial services that they provide. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution.

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 to fund while leaving unfunded other programs critical to our nation and its future.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing because the 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.

Mr. Speaker, USA Today said it best and I quote:

> House Republicans who forced the government closure offered to reopen some of the most popular programs, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs, on a piecemeal basis. It's like seizing a school bus full of kids then offering to release the cutest ones. The mounting toll will increasingly expose the shutdown's foolishness. The sooner the Republicans free all their hostages, the better.

Initially, our friends across the aisle were content to take the whole nation hostage by refusing to fund the government unless the Affordable Care Act was defunded. That effort failed. Undaunted, House Republicans tried again. The effort failed again.

This past Monday, the House Republicans refused for the third time to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate last week, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign.

Instead House Republicans voted to shut down the government.

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'' providing minimal funding for the following programs that enjoy strong and broad public support:

(1) Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act (H.J. Res. 75);

(2) Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act, (H.J. Res. 76);

(3) Food and Drug Safety Act (H.J. Res. 77);

(4) Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act (H.J. Res. 78);

(5). Border Safety & Security Act (H.J. Res. 79);

(6) American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act (H.J. Res. 80);

(7) National Weather Monitoring Act (H.J. Res. 82);

(8) Impact Aid for Local Schools Act (H.J. Res. 83);

(9) Head Start for Low-Income Children Act (H.J. Res. 84);

(10) National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act (H.J. Res. 85); and

H.R. 3223—Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act (H.R. 3223).

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, as well as the doctors, nurses, and hospital workers who take care of our wounded and healthy warriors.

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 our IT security folks who protect us from cyber-attacks, and our astronauts who risk their lives to push the technical boundaries of knowledge for all mankind.

These exceptional Americans, and the people who depend on them and benefit from their work, do not deserve to have been locked out of their workplaces since Tuesday.

These exceptional Americans deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps America open for business.

For these reasons and Tore, I oppose this rule and the underlying amendments it makes in order and urge my colleagues to join me in urging the passage of H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate so that the federal government will reopen for business to serve the American people 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.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

Sec. 6. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 6 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 371; adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the bill (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 184, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—184

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Cárdenas
Cummings
Grayson
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Jones
King (IA)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter
Pittenger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Tipton
Vargas
Visclosky
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1453

Messrs. LUETKEYMEYER and KINZINGER of Illinois changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—183

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Cárdenas
Cummings
Grayson
Gutiérrez
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Jones
King (IA)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nolan
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pittenger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Tipton
Vargas
Visclosky
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1501

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify House Resolution 371 with the correction placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike ''reffered'' and insert ''referred''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading ''Protection, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery—Federal Emergency Management Agency''.

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

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

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

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

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

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

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

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 85, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to the House a bill to fully sustain funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, commonly known as FEMA.

Right now, at this very moment, dedicated men and women at FEMA are preparing for the possible landfall of Tropical Storm Karen along our gulf coast, and they're not being paid. Right now, at this very moment, FEMA has begun to recall furloughed employees in Atlanta, Georgia, and Denton, Texas, as the agency prepares for a potential significant natural disaster.

According to the National Weather Service, a hurricane watch is currently in effect from Grand Isle, Louisiana, eastward to Destin, Florida. A tropical storm watch is currently in effect from west of Grand Isle to east of Morgan City, Louisiana, and New Orleans and east of Destin to Indian Pass, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major storm, and we have to take it seriously. So this bill before us provides for continuing appropriations to ensure FEMA can fully render assistance to the impacted States and fully support our citizens and our brave first responders.

Mr. Speaker, all of us were aware that the government is shut down despite numerous attempts to move forward. We have repeatedly offered visions of a continuing resolution to sustain this government's operations, but to no avail. Furthermore, we have offered to negotiate, to convene a conference, and to work out the differences in a professional and orderly manner, but such offers have been refused out of hand. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another offer to the other side of the aisle to at least fund vital components of this government.

We have a duty to ensure that our Nation is adequately prepared for disasters and that our States are fully supported when they require Federal assistance. This bill does so without increasing the rate of spending and in a manner entirely consistent with the text of the noncontroversial H.J. Res. 59.

In short, this bill before us today is all about getting our priorities right. It's my hope that passage of this bill will not only support our Nation's emergency preparedness but also lead to a reopening of the entire Federal Government.

In closing, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to lower their partisan blinders, come to the table, and work out our current impasses so that we can get on with the business of fixing our Nation's budgetary mess.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer are we going to continue this charade? At what expense are we going to continue this charade?

The Federal employees who serve our country are being disserved, as well as the American people who depend on their services. How much longer are we going to continue this same tired old dishonest debate?

Today it's about FEMA. We appreciate the Republicans' concern for FEMA. Like them, we are also anxiously watching the approach of Hurricane Karen. It's too bad that our Republican friends didn't think a little bit more about such things on Monday midnight when they shut the government down.

The issue, of course, is not whether we want to provide funding for FEMA or for any other particular activity or particular group of Federal employees. I'll take a back seat to no one when it comes to supporting the men and women who serve on the front lines of our national disaster preparedness and response efforts. And we know they will be there, whatever Hurricane Karen amounts to.

The issue here is whether we are going to pick winners and losers by providing temporary funding for governmental services, operations, and personnel when everyone in this body knows that we could reopen the entire

Federal Government in one fell swoop this afternoon by calling up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. That's what Democrats and a growing number of Republicans are advocating, and it's the only path that will get us out of this mess.

Instead, the House majority continues to bring to the floor piecemeal measures like this one, measures that may be red meat for TED CRUZ, but they have no chance of passing the Senate or being signed by the President because they don't solve the basic problem.

□ 1515

Therefore, they are a cynical and cruel deception. We all know that. So let's quit playing games, and let's actually do our job for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to resume funding for parts of the Department of Homeland Security, I'd like to ask, where's the bill that's going to fund the Secret Service, whose importance was on full display yesterday?

Where's the bill to ensure our aviation system remains safe and secure through TSA?

Where's the bill to keep us safe from cyber attacks?

Of course we all want to provide funding for FEMA, but what about all the other employees of the Department of Homeland Security who work every day to ensure the security of our Nation?

What about the Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents?

They're all protecting our Nation, and they're protecting it without pay at this moment.

Well, maybe the House majority will eventually get to them or, then again, maybe they won't. It's becoming more and more difficult to tell whom the Republican majority cares about at any given moment.

Now, there have been charges of a lack of willingness to negotiate and compromise on the part of the President and congressional Democrats.

Let's be clear: the only ones who have compromised on anything related to funding the government are Democrats. We have compromised to the tune of $60 billion, that is, agreeing to a short-term continuing resolution well below the President's budget request, well below the Senate-passed budget resolution.

And by the way, that's the same budget resolution that Republicans have refused to work on with the Senate and that would have headed off this shutdown in the first place. It really must take some nerve for our colleagues now, all of a sudden, to be singing the praises of conference committees!

But as to the Senate's clean bipartisan funding bill, we don't need a conference committee. We don't need to talk. We need a vote. The clean continuing resolution would pass this House easily, right this minute, if the Republican leadership would simply put it up for a bipartisan vote.

So let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to our basic job description which, surely, by any measure, involves keeping the government open. It also involves paying the country's bills, and it must involve a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, revives our economy, and reduces our deficit.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

And I say to my colleague from North Carolina, my friend, whom I've served together with on the Appropriations Committee and subcommittees for a number of years, I say to him, where is the bill for the Secret Service?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for ICE?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for Border Patrol?

Stay tuned and be ready to talk about those when they come up shortly.

Now, I rise in support of this bill, which will help ensure that our government can help prepare for emergency situations. As we well know, you can never be too prepared.

Over the past year, we've seen the damage natural disasters can wreak. From Hurricane Sandy in the Northeast, to the tornados in the Midwest, to the raging wildfires out West, no area is immune to Mother Nature's wrath.

And now, with a tropical storm brewing in the Gulf of Mexico, we are reminded, once again, that disaster can strike when you least expect it to, or when you can least stand it, though we hope that's not the case with Karen.

This bill will provide immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency at the current annual funding rate of $10.2 billion. As with the previous five short-term funding bills this House has passed in the last 2 days, this will last until December 15, but could end sooner if we can find a way to fund the entire Federal Government before that time.

And as with the previous five short-term funding bills, this language, for all intents and purposes, mirrors that of the clean CR that I offered several weeks ago.

Passing this bill today is important to fulfill our duty to the people of this country that their government should help communities prepare for disasters and be there in their times of greatest need.

However, our end goal isn't to fund each government program bit by bit; it's to reopen the whole Federal Government as soon as possible. I believe this bill inches us closer to that goal, but there's obviously much more to be done.

And let me point this out, Mr. Speaker: if this bill is approved today, this will be the sixth clean, short-term funding bill we send to the other side of the Capitol. These bills provide more than $300 billion in annual funding so far, and at the sequester level. That's one-third of the discretionary budget, and it's one-third of the original continuing resolution that we filed in September; one third of the way toward opening the entire Federal Government with clean funding bills.

This is what the Senate says they want. So why aren't they voting on these bills?

In addition to these clean bills, we've also sent over to the Senate seven other appropriations bills to fund portions of the Federal Government. The answer: a loud snore.

This House, since the Republicans took over in 2011, has been serious about trying to return to regular order; but it takes two to tango, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate has passed zero regular appropriations bills this whole year. Zero.

I say we must come together. On Monday night, the House passed another amendment, sent it to the Senate, that would have funded the entire government. And we asked for a conference with the Senate. We even appointed our conferees, the House, sent that to the Senate.

What have we heard from the Senate since that time?

Another loud snore. They will not agree to talk.

It's the time-honored tradition of this Congress, in the United States of America, that when one body disagrees with the other body, which is quite frequent, what happens, we appoint conferees to work out the differences.

The House appointed its conferees. The Senate has refused to appoint conferees. Otherwise, we could sit down and talk and solve this problem and put people back to work in the government and make sense of the mess that we're in. It just takes the Senate agreeing to go to a conference.

What's difficult about that?

That's as simple as pie. It's what we've done since we've been a Nation.

I would urge the other body to appoint conferees. Let's sit down and work out the differences. We've got a table waiting downstairs, or we can meet over there, whatever. We can meet in their conference room or ours. We can sit down, as gentlemen and gentleladies, and work out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill as we normally do.

We've got to come together, Mr. Speaker, Senate, House, Republican, Democrat, Mugwump. We've got to have a meaningful discussion on how we can fund the entire Federal Government, first, to reopen its doors, then to fund it as it should be funded, with regular order, full-year appropriations bills.

The bill before us continues trying to make sense of the situation we're in, working toward ending the shutdown, and to ensure that from today forward FEMA has the resources it needs to prepare for whatever should come our way.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee is, in a time-honored House tradition, criticizing the other body. I've done some of that myself.

But let's be clear about a couple of things. Our Republican friends, as I recall, for years were badgering the Senate to pass a budget resolution. This year they did it. They did it and were ready to go to conference months ago; they were ready to go to conference with a budget resolution that was comprehensive in dealing with the deficit. And had that been agreed upon between the two Houses, it could have prevented this whole mess.

From all indications, it is the House Republicans, the leadership of this body, that has refused to go to conference. I don't really think that's in dispute.

Secondly, my friend from Kentucky, and many speakers in the last few days, have talked about all those appropriations bills and how they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate. What they didn't tell you was why they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate.

Again, I don't think this is open to dispute. The Transportation-HUD appropriations bill was ready for floor action on the Senate side. It was a threatened Republican filibuster that kept it off the floor and that has kept all subsequent bills off the floor.

I assure you, the Senate leadership and Senator MIKULSKI, the appropriations chairman in the Senate, were more than ready to take those appropriations bills to the floor. In many cases, they had been written with good bipartisan cooperation.

But it is the Republican leadership who dictated that the Senate would not pass those appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend, the ranking member of our full committee.

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

Of course we support disaster assistance. Time and time again, Democrats have voted to provide expeditious disaster assistance; but FEMA also needs State and local first responders, the National Weather Service, transportation, housing assistance, and other items that are not funded in this bill.

This bill is perhaps the most cynical political ploy Republicans have put forward since the shutdown began. Just a week ago, this body strongly supported Federal assistance for devastating floods in Colorado. I'd like to remind my friends that its sponsor, ironically, voted against much-needed recovery funds following Superstorm Sandy.

Too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the Federal Government until they need it; and, boy, do they need the Federal Government now. Since it shut down, they are paying a political price and using irresponsible bills like this one to shift the blame.

Not only should the Federal Government be available to respond to every Federal disaster; it should be open to keep Americans on the job, to support law enforcement, to ensure Head Start centers are open so parents can work, and to continue lifesaving medical research, to name a few of its vital functions.

You claim to want to negotiate. We have already said we will vote for your spending bill at your funding levels, and I know my friends on the other side of the aisle understand that.

So let's stop playing games. Allow a vote on your bill to end the shutdown that the Senate passed and the President will sign.

We can open this government in the next 30 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the hardworking chair of the authorizing Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response and Communications.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I rise in support of the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act, which does provide the vital funding for Federal Emergency Management Agency, funding that can make a difference right now.

And it is right now that we need to be caring about the citizens of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi, as Tropical Storm Karen is in the Gulf of Mexico headed toward the gulf coast. Landfall is expected this weekend. We don't know what to expect, much like we didn't know what to expect when Hurricane Sandy hit.

FEMA has begun its response of preparations and has recalled those furloughed staff because they know it's their duty to serve and protect. So this bill would ensure that all FEMA personnel and capabilities are available to respond to this storm and support the States in its path.

□ 1530

Hurricane season doesn't end this weekend. It doesn't end officially until November 30. We have to make sure that these agencies are ready to respond, whether it's a natural disaster, a terrorist attack, or other emergency needing Federal support.

I have tell you, this is not a game. This is not a charade. And until now, I have been so pleased to serve on Homeland Security, where it enjoys so much bipartisan support. We have much bipartisan support when it comes to FEMA and homeland security. And I would like to say that, until now, they do not play games when it comes to supporting first responders, when it comes to supporting flood victims, when it comes to supporting storm and hurricane victims.

But I must say the time to act with Congress is now. Do the right thing. We are encouraging our colleagues across the other side of the aisle to put the politics aside and join us in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), ranking member of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much, Ranking Member PRICE, for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 85. This is the latest in a string of measures that the Republican majority has brought to the floor in an attempt to cherry-pick what gets funded in the Federal Government, or a piecemeal approach to running government.

Later this weekend, Tropical Storm Karen is expected to hit the gulf coast. Last night, there were strong reports of tornados in Nebraska, and a strong storm is expected in our area. I guess that explains this cynical exercise where FEMA is funded in a mini-CR.

When the majority learned that tourists could not visit our national monuments, they whipped up a mini-CR for the national parks. A storm is coming so their answer is a mini-CR for FEMA. The way the majority does business, there will need to be another West, Texas, explosion before they try to fund CFATS.

We can't fund the government crisis to crisis. FEMA should have its full staff available this week to begin preparations for Tropical Storm Karen. Instead, FEMA is beginning to recall furloughed employees today—a rush to prepare for the storm.

And as we know, restoring FEMA's funding alone is not enough to ensure a successful disaster response. We need the full resources of the Federal Government—from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Small Business Administration. We also need the full resources of the Department of Homeland Security.

It's time to stop the games. The events on Capitol Hill yesterday should have served as a wake-up call. The Speaker must allow a vote on a clean CR.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Federal employees who return to work to help to respond to Tropical

Storm Karen, the forecasted tornados, or any other disaster that strikes should be able to do that work with the peace of mind that their paychecks are coming and that their bills will be paid. All Federal employees deserve that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), whose State seems to be possibly in the path of this coming storm.

Mr. CASSIDY. First, let's put in perspective exactly what is before the House for overall government funding.

House Republicans have put forward a bill that would fund the government. We had two amendments, which are opposed. One would end the special deal that only Senators and Members of the House of Representatives get as regards ObamaCare exchanges. The other would treat employees of the employers whose mandate has been postponed the same. So if an employer's mandate to purchase insurance for employees has been postponed, the obligation of the employee to purchase is also.

It's on these two amendments that these folks object, Mr. Speaker. One, they want to preserve the special deal for Members of Congress; and, two, they don't want workers to have the same deal as does the employer.

Now that said, this brings us to this. If we can't fund the government because we have to preserve a special deal for Members of the Senate and of Congress, then at least we can mitigate its harmful effects.

My gosh, a hurricane bearing down on your coastline is the ultimate in a harmful effect. I don't think we should hold hostage protection for those in harm's way so that Congress can preserve a special deal that only accrues to Members of Congress, speaking of cynicism. We cannot sacrifice the security of those on the gulf coast.

I call upon the Senate to call on a vote both on these special amendments, but if not that, at least on funding of FEMA. In so doing, we can do something really good for those who do rely upon the Federal Government not all the time but in times of need.

And also, if we can vote on those two special amendments, we can do something good for the taxpayers who really, despite all the effort to obfuscate, are beginning to understand that our budget agreement is being held up by the need to preserve a special deal for Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a fellow Appropriations member.

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm an appropriator, like a lot of the speakers here today; and every time we have to deal with the CR, we're embarrassed. That's not our work. Our work is in appropriations bills, which we spend all year putting together. And we've been doing that.

We were in the same situation last year, everything being the same. The Obama health care bill was in the law, Members of Congress had their insurance, and whatever issue was being brought up—we can't approve the CR because—those were the same issues last year. And guess what? We moved the CR without rancor and without partisan politics. So what's the difference here?

I feel very sorry for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to now have to defend appropriations by choice.

Ronald Reagan used to be fond of saying, Here we go again. And today, it's open choice. It's pick your government. We've got 10 items on the menu.

Mr. Speaker, I want the whole menu, not just the Tea Party special.

What an irony that we are bringing up the first of these menus, FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Shut down the whole government, but we want to keep those emergency employees. I was a firefighter. I was a first responder. I was part of a team like the team that was lost in Arizona—the Hot Shot crew—when I was in college. They're not a part of FEMA. They're not a first responder. So firefighters are out.

All of the cleanup that has to be done from the Colorado fire and the Rim fire in California, those people aren't part of the first responders. They're not in this.

This bill is a process of just selection, of chaos, and of a menu—pick off what you can support, take the popular things and pass those. But guess what? These first responders have children. They have no access to the school lunch program. These responders have spouses. There's all kinds of programs for families that they have no response for.

This first responder bill doesn't go to school cops, Centers for Disease Control, food safety officers, or any of the others.

Please defeat it.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another appropriations colleague, the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from North Carolina.

Let me first address the issue that we just heard about on the floor and I seem to hear about every time I turn on the news when a Member of the other party is speaking about it. It's this suggestion that Members of Congress want to keep some special treatment for themselves in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the vast majority of large employers pay for most of their employees' health insurance costs. Members of Congress are part of what is called the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan. On average, about 72 percent of our insurance is paid for by our employer.

I know in my case, since I have a family and had a daughter that had a massive malignant brain tumor, I'm not going to go without insurance. But I pay $6,000 a year, which I suspect a lot of my colleagues do. And then I pay another few thousand in terms of copayments and deductibles. And yet mine is one of the best plans that you can get with Blue Cross Blue Shield. So that's not out of the mainstream in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the President only delayed a reporting requirement with regard to large employers.

Now, let me get back to this case in point with regard to FEMA. When we have a natural disaster, such as this hurricane that's bearing down on the coast of Louisiana, the Federal Government comes in as a team. We know that. I know Mr. CARTER knows that. I know my good friend from Kentucky knows that the Federal agencies all get together as a team.

And they know how important, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers is. The Army Corps of Engineers works hand-in-glove with FEMA. The Interior Department provides firefighter and emergency response before and after a disaster. We just had these large fires in California and Idaho. The fire is out so now they're furloughed. Is that really what we want to do?

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MORAN. I greatly thank my close friend from North Carolina.

The U.S. Geological Survey has to activate stream gauges and storm surge measurements. It's technical, but it's important. But 99 percent of the USGS is furloughed.

The Small Business Administration Office of Disaster Assistance comes in in an emergency and tries to help small businesses that have been wiped out, which invariably happens and will happen with this storm, unfortunately. But they're all furloughed. They're not going to be able to be there.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service, they play a critical role. Ninety-nine percent of those employees are furloughed. The Farm Services Agency, 99 percent of those employees are furloughed.

That's the problem. They need to work as a team, and here we are with these bits and pieces of the government, and we think we're going to patch this up. We're not. The fact is that the whole of government needs to be put back to work. That's our argument.

Let's do this the right way, not in this kind of piecemeal fashion. That's

why we're forced to vote against these things. The fact is we voted to keep them open. The side that's proposing this piecemeal approach voted to shut down the government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we ever took a vote to shut down the government. If we did, I certainly missed it. I don't believe anybody ever took a vote recently to sustain the government.

But it's an interesting comment, and I thank my friend for making it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Border and Maritime Subcommittee of Homeland Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his courtesies.

I am sad that I have to rise to debate this conflicted position from my good friends on the other side of the aisle. Yes, they care about homeland security. It's a committee I've served on since 9/11. We have a great camaraderie. We work in a bipartisan manner, but today I'm saddened by the approach that's been taken, particularly since they all know that this is a fool's errand.

USA Today said that this piecemeal process is like seizing a school bus full of kids and then offering to release the cutest ones.

We don't have time to fool around with the cutest ones.

FEMA works closely with States, cities, tribes, and territories, and communities large and small. Those of us who are now looking to the barreling down of Karen on the gulf region understand about hurricanes and tornados and other disasters.

So I offer to my colleagues Allison, which killed 23 in 2001, with some $5 billion in damages. We need FEMA.

□ 1545

Or Hurricane Ike, that cost some $29 billion in damage in Galveston. We need FEMA. Or the tornados in Oklahoma on May 31 that killed 23. We need FEMA. Or maybe talking about the issues of dealing with Hurricane Katrina—the largest and most devastating hurricane that we have seen. We need FEMA. But yet my friends are willing to piecemeal. And by doing so, Homeland Security is dashed, Border Patrol Agents are not funded, and the Secret Service protection activities are not funded.

I am aghast at the fact that Federal air marshals'—as we thank our Capitol Police, who yesterday showed themselves willing to sacrifice themselves, and other law enforcement—Federal air marshals' travel and training is shut down. And then ICE is shut down.

Homeland Security is comprehensive. It deals with fighting al Qaeda and the terrorists who would do us harm, and it deals with being a helping hand, as FEMA is, as I've worked alongside of FEMA in the gulf when people were devastated.

Mr. Speaker, we can't do this. Put a clean bill on the floor, the CR, vote for it, and open the government now. And let Homeland Security and FEMA do their job as Hurricane Karen barrels toward us.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of its Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I rise to speak on H.J. Res. 85, the "National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act," which makes continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for FY 2014.

I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should pass the clean CR passed by the Senate to end this Republican shutdown and reopen the Government and end the damage that the shutdown is causing to our economy and the lives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, FEMA works closely with states, cities, tribes, territories, and communities large and small to help prepare for and respond to disasters and emergencies of all kinds. It provides funding through homeland security grants, support training and exercises, assess state and local response capabilities and recommend needed improvements. FEMA supports recovery and rebuilding efforts after a disaster. Cuts to FEMA would have significant, negative impacts on our nation's disaster preparedness, response and recovery efforts.

Weeks after Congress passed the recent FY 2013 Disaster Assistance Supplemental Act (P.L. 113–2) to aid the victims of Hurricane Sandy, sequestration reduced the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) by over $1 billion, which adversely affected recovery efforts in the communities struck by Hurricane Sandy, the tornadoes in Tuscaloosa and Joplin, and other major disasters across the Nation. Sequestration cuts could also require FEMA to implement Immediate Needs Funding Restrictions late in the fiscal year during what is historically the season for tornados, wildfires, and hurricanes, which would limit funding for new projects in older disasters.

Finally, state and local homeland security grants funding has been reduced to its lowest level in the past seven years, leading to potential layoffs of state and local emergency personnel across our country.

Hurricane Sandy, recent threats surrounding aviation and the continued threat of homegrown terrorism demonstrate the continuing importance of vigilance and preparation to protect our nation and its people. Threats from terrorism and response and recovery efforts associated with natural disasters will not diminish because of the House Republicans' desire to reduce funding for DHS and FEMA and continue their shutdown of the government.

Even in this current fiscal climate, we do not have the luxury of making significant reductions to our capabilities without placing our Nation at risk. If we are to continue to prepare for, respond to, and recover from evolving threats and disasters, we will need sufficient resources to sustain and adapt our capabilities accordingly. While we will continue to preserve our frontline priorities as best we can, no amount of planning can mitigate the negative effects of sequestration.

The bill before us today, is $40 billion less than what we have been working with as a result of the draconian sequestration. H.J. Res. 85 will significantly and negatively affect frontline operations and our Nation's previous investments in homeland security. This bill, while providing minimal funding for FEMA, is wholly inadequate because it does not provide funding for:

Army Corps of Engineers which supports emergency preparedness and response for critical infrastructure such as dams, flood control levees and navigation channels.

Interior Department which performs firefighting and emergency response on Federal lands during and after a disaster. Currently, all damage repairs have stopped except for emergency repairs. While firefighting personnel are on call to deal with any fires, postfire work has stopped, including damage assessments of the recent large fires in California and Idaho. Hazardous fuel projects to prevent future fires have been put on hold during the shutdown.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) would normally activate additional stream gages and storm surge measurements but instead will have to rely on existing monitoring stations for any hurricanes that happen during the shutdown. 99 percent of USGS employees are furloughed.

Small Business Administration, Office of Disaster Assistance provides affordable, timely and accessible financial assistance to homeowners, renters and businesses following a disaster. Employees in the Office of Disaster Assistance continue to work without being paid.

USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides assistance to communities to address watershed impairments that pose imminent threats to lives and property. 99 percent of NRCS employees are furloughed.

USDA, Farm Services Agency (FSA) provides funding and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers to restore farmland and forestland damaged by natural disasters. 99 percent of FSA employees are furloughed and therefore can't begin to survey the damage and preparing estimates of the need.

Mr. Speaker, so far this past year our nation has experienced several major floods, record snowfalls, catastrophic disasters and terrorist attacks. In fact, many communities throughout our great nation and country are continuing to recover from previous disasters and terrorist attacks. We must provide aid for our constituents and not allow politics to get in the way of protecting our homeland.

A fully functioning FEMA is needed to continue the work of helping communities recover from recent disasters and terrorist attacks. It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that FEMA has the needed resources to respond to future disasters and terrorist attacks. I assure you that I am aware of the challenges our communities face once we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack.

My constituents in Houston understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

I would like to say a few words about the devastating hurricane that struck Texas several years ago because the response to those events demonstrated the need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Ike, there were insufficient quantities of generators forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

My fervent prayer is that Texas and the nation will be spared the wrath of another devastating storm this hurricane season, but we cannot avert disaster indefinitely. By continually testing, evaluating, and improving our emergency response capabilities, we increase the possibility that we as a nation may one day answer the question ''Are we ready?'' with a resounding ''Yes.'' That is the purpose to which we will dedicate our efforts here today and for the foreseeable future.

Since the terrorist attack in Boston, Massachusetts, this Nation has recognized how remote threats and distant trouble can pose near and present dangers to our shores. We have learned as a nation that we must maintain a constant, capable, and vigilant posture to protect ourselves against new threats and evolving hazards. But we have also learned that vigilance and protection are not ends in and of themselves, but rather necessary tools in the service of our national purpose. Just as today's threats to our national security and strategic interests are evolving and interdependent, so too must our efforts to ensure the security of our homeland reflect these same characteristics.

As we develop new capabilities and technologies, our adversaries will seek to evade them, as was shown by the attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009. We must constantly work to stay ahead of our adversaries. Among the forces that threaten the United States and its interests are those that blend the lethality and high-tech capabilities of modern weaponry with the power and opportunity of asymmetric tactics such as terrorism and cyber warfare. We are challenged not only by novel employment of conventional weaponry, but also by the hybrid nature of these threats. Countering such threats requires us to adapt traditional roles and responsibilities across the national security spectrum and craft solutions that leverage the capabilities that exists both inside and outside of government.

The attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009, powerfully illustrates that terrorists will go to great lengths to try to defeat the security measures that have been put in place since 9/11.

More specifically, the threats and hazards that challenge U.S. interests from a homeland security perspective include:

High-consequence weapons of mass destruction (WMD), in particular, improvised nuclear devices and high-consequence biological weapons, which would have the greatest potential effects if used against the United States. We know that non-state actors actively seek to acquire, build, and use such weapons and technologies, and that foreign states continue to develop high-consequence weaponry with the intent to intimidate or blackmail the international community and proliferate to other potentially hostile state or non-state actors.

Dangerous materials, technology, and know-how circulate with ease in our globalized economy and are controlled unevenly around the world, raising the possibility of theft or accidental use and making it difficult to track and prevent proliferation.

Al-Qaeda and global violent extremism, which directly threaten the United States and its allies. Terrorist networks exploit gaps in governance and security within both weak and advanced states. Some terrorist organizations benefit from active state-sponsorship and from the failure of other states to counter known terrorist organizations or sources of support within their borders. Terrorist organizations have expressed the intent to employ mass-casualty WMD as well as smaller scale attacks against prominent political, economic, and infrastructure targets in the United States and around the world.

High-consequence and/or wide-scale cyber attacks, intrusions, disruptions, and exploitations, which, when used by hostile state or non-state actors, could massively disable or impair critical international financial, commercial, physical, and other infrastructure. This in turn could cripple the global movement of people and goods worldwide and bringing legitimate and vital social and economic processes to a standstill. These cyber attacks involve individuals and groups who conduct intrusions in search of information to use against the United States, and those who spread malicious code in an attempt to disrupt the national information infrastructure.

Pandemics, major accidents, and natural hazards, which can result in massive loss of life and livelihood equal to or greater than many deliberate malicious attacks. Certain public health threats, such as disease outbreaks and natural hazards (e.g., hurricanes and floods), occur organically. Others can be introduced into the United States through the movement of people and goods across our borders.

Illicit trafficking and related transnational crime, which can undermine effective governance and security, corrupt strategically vital markets, slow economic growth, and destabilize weaker states. Transnational crime and trafficking facilitate the movement of narcotics, people, funds, arms, and other support to hostile actors, including terrorist networks. Importantly for the American homeland, the dramatic detrimental effect of illegal trafficking and transnational criminal organizations is apparent in societies within the Western Hemisphere.

Smaller scale terrorism, which may include violent extremists and other state or non-state actors conducting small-scale explosive and cyber attacks and intrusions against population centers, important symbolic targets, or critical infrastructure.

In addition to these specific threats and hazards, America's national interests are also threatened by global challenges and long-term trends. These include:

Economic and financial instability that can undermine confidence in the international order, fuel global political turbulence, and induce social and political instability in weak states abroad.

Dependence on fossil fuels and the threat of global climate change that can open the United States to disruptions and manipulations in energy supplies and to changes in our natural environment on an unprecedented scale. Climate change is expected to increase the severity and frequency of weather-related hazards, which could, in turn, result in social and political destabilization, international conflict, or mass migrations.

Mr. Speaker, on any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, including' terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

With an increasingly vast array of enforcement issues at hand, including ''arms trafficking, identity theft, environmental crime, money laundering, theft of cultural property, drug trafficking, crimes against women and children, organ trafficking'' and cybercrime, it is increasingly clear that coordinated, strategic criminal intelligence must be employed, bringing together diverse agencies and employees in the fight against serious and organized crime. Cybercrime, especially, will only continue to increase as globalization fosters higher levels of digital interconnectivity.

Every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises.

I believe it is important to acknowledge the efforts and commitment of the men and women who are our law enforcement personnel, first responders, emergency managers, and other homeland security professionals not only in our home State, but also across the country who have worked tirelessly to make this Nation secure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should re-open all of the Government.

The harmful impacts of a shutdown extend across Government, affecting services that are critical to small businesses, women, children, seniors, and others across the Nation.

The Senate acted in a responsible manner on a short-term funding measure to maintain Government functions and avoid a damaging Government shutdown.

We should settle our differences and allow a straight up or down vote on the Senate-passed H.J. Res. 59.

Mr. CARTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. CARTER. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending the annual awards dinner of the Partnership for Public Service, the so-called Sammies Award. These are awards that are given each year to outstanding public servants.

Last night's awardees had touching, inspiring stories of the work they had done within the Centers for Disease Control in polio eradication, the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children—an agency we know very well in Homeland Security. The Central Intelligence Agency, story after story of devoted public service—public service, I must say, that has taken place in recent years in an atmosphere where public service is often denigrated and public servants often have their pay frozen by virtue of the budget nonsense of the sort we are witnessing here this week.

Half of those awardees last night were on furlough. What a disgrace. What a commentary on the honor that we should be paying to those who serve our country so well. So we're asking today, it would take about 30 minutes; there would be a bipartisan majority easily in this body for ending this shutdown and opening the Federal Government.

And on the issues before us—the budget, health care, whatever—you know, you live to fight another day. But we have no business in this body demanding a ransom for doing our basic job, which is to keep the lights on, keep the government running, and to pay our country's bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59. Enough is enough. We must get our people back to work and bring services to the people of this country. Enough is enough.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. In brief closing, Mr. Speaker, we have a storm coming toward our shores. We need to get this done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 85, a bill which claims to fund operations at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, but in reality is a piecemeal approach to funding government operations in order to score political points.

Let me be clear, I support FEMA and appreciate greatly the dedicated men and women who work on behalf of FEMA, but I do not support this bill because, in the end, it does more harm than good.

I believe the proper way to fund FEMA is for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility and pass regular appropriations bills. The House passed a full year funding bill for DHS in June that would provide $40.1 billion more for DHS than the bill before us today.

Using a piecemeal approach to fund selected programs within an agency neglects other important programs within that same agency. In this case, supporting H.J. Res. 85 funds FEMA at the expense of the Secret Service, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Office of Disaster Assistance at the Small Business Administration.

The fact is that by taking up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and sending it to the President for his signature tonight, we can fund FEMA, DHS and all the other important programs and services of the government. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the Senate CR so we can end this shut down and get all our federal workers back on the job.

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

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form I am, yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman'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:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 85 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York (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 gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would allow a vote on H.J. Res. 59, the Senate continuing resolution. If we were to pass the continuing resolution, the entire Federal Government would reopen, not just an isolated slice of it. All we're asking for is a vote on the Senate resolution.

I would ask: Is not taking a vote on issues of great importance to our country the very essence of our democracy? And I would further ask what it is that our friends on the majority are afraid of in terms of allowing such a vote to happen on the floor of this House?

Mr. Speaker, Tropical Storm Karen is bearing down on the gulf as we speak. It is expected to be upgraded to at least a category 1 hurricane and could reach my district along the east coast as soon as Tuesday of next week.

We're still picking up the pieces from Sandy, and we can't afford to be hit by another storm. Have we forgotten the lessons of Katrina? of Sandy, which clobbered the shores of New York and New Jersey?

If we are funding FEMA, why aren't we providing funds for every single agency so that human lives can be protected and storm damage taken care of immediately? These storms require all hands on deck, and yet 800,000 employees are currently furloughed.

After Sandy took eight lives, destroyed thousands of homes, and shut down dozens of businesses in my district, my district needed much more than just FEMA. We needed the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Interior, not to mention the Army Corps of Engineers and the Small Business Administration, to name just a few of the agencies that joined together in the coordinated recovery effort to deliver emergency relief and to begin the rebuilding process.

Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government

and denying taxpayers the protections from natural disasters that they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to people who have to work hard every day to make a living and are now concerned that they are in the path of an oncoming storm.

I just want to raise one point about how destructive this government shutdown has been. I have just come from a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marines Academy—one of the four service academies that each Member of this Congress has the honor to nominate outstanding young men and women to be able to attend. That service academy right now is closed, it is shut down. No classes are being offered. So we have nominated the cream of the crop that this country has to offer to this academy, and they are attending a school which cannot schedule and hold classes. This is madness. This is madness. And the capacity to change that is right here within our grasp. It's called H.J. Res. 59.

Let's schedule a vote on that and let's see what happens. I'll bet that if we do have a vote on H.J. Res. 59 it will pass, we'll be able to send it to the President, and he will sign it. And we'll be able to reopen the government within hours.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in this motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

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

So, Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I do, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I would just raise a couple of questions.

The first is, the bill before us funds a slice of the Federal Government. What I am struggling to understand is why funding the entire Federal Government would be out of order and not germane, when it is germane to schedule or to fund a piece of the Federal Government? It strikes me as illogical in the extreme that it is in order to fund a piece of the Federal Government, but not in order to fund the entire Federal Government. I would ask the Chair to explain why it is that the motion to recommit would not be germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia seek to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This should be ruled germane because we have to look to see where we are in the process.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would have been the motion to recommit, which would open up all of government.

He has made the point of order, and the Speaker has indicated the previous rulings have been to sustain the point of order. And if the normal course takes place, the next motion will be to appeal the ruling of the Chair. If that motion were to prevail, if we were to sustain the appeal of the Chair—not table it, but sustain it—we would in effect make the motion to recommit in order and we can finally get an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling would be that we would forego all of that and just let us have an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open without having to overrule the ruling of the Chair.

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

The gentleman from Texas makes the point or order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to other funding.

As the Chair ruled on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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. CARTER. 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.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 185, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—185

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

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

NOT VOTING—22

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

□ 1626

Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 164, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

YEAS—247

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

NAYS—164

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

NOT VOTING—20

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

□ 1633

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.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 75

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe that every Member of this House of Representatives believes that WIC participants need and should get the participation they need, and I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution, that we supply adequate nutrition for women, infants, and children as we move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

□ 1645

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

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

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

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

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

But our colleagues in the Senate should also support it. This would be the seventh bill we've sent them to help reopen the Federal Government in the last 3 days. The seventh bill. We've heard nothing from them. Altogether, these bills provide nearly a third of the discretionary funding that's needed to operate the entire Federal Government. So in the last 3 days, we've passed bills to fund a third of the government.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. If you really care about the mothers and infants who benefit from this program, you should vote ''no'' on this bill and demand that the Republican leadership allow the House to vote on the Senate bill to immediately end this reckless Republican shutdown.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge people to vote against this legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would ask my colleagues, again, to look to your heart, look to your heart. We're not talking about defunding ObamaCare or anything like that. We are talking about women and their children and their babies. I would hope that we can join together today across the aisle, pass this bill, and see to it that mothers and infants and children in Michigan and all across America get the support that they need.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1700

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

Or is it just politics?

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Listen, we have a shutdown right now. Why?

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

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

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

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

Join us, Mr. President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, I know there's many important pieces of legislation in front of the Senate today. For instance, they earlier passed a resolution calling next week National Chess Week. Now, that's obviously an urgent matter for this country. But women and kids in need shouldn't be political pawns in the Senate's game.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How hypocritical can they get?

Americans are not fooled. They want the government, the entire government, open.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, there are nearly 50 million people who are hungry in this country. Seventeen million of them are children, and because we are still emerging from this difficult economy, hunger is not getting better in America. The only reason why people aren't starving is because of the essential safety net programs that we have put in place.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge you to vote ''no.''

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1715

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I'm very proud of my community. The banks, credit unions, and the Tampa Bay Partnership are coming together to ensure they have bridge loans so the families stay afloat. But it should have not come to this. It is so irresponsible for the GOP to shut down the government because they disagree with a duly enacted law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

You are not going to be able to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In my congressional district, 67 percent of children under the age of 4, or 41,300, are eligible for WIC. This is the ninth highest district in the country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This would be unconscionable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

USDA

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

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

For information about available government services, visit usa.gov

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

Message from the President to U.S. Government Employees

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN JEOPARDIZES WIC PROGRAM

(By Michael Rubinkam)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''That's a lot of money, $15 a can,'' she said. ''Now that I'm out of work, WIC is how I support my family . . . I'm scared at this point to go buy anything extra.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1730

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

Beyond the cynicism of this tactic, WIC cannot stand alone. It is a gateway to health care and social services for families, services that will remain unsustainable due to the shutdown—services like low energy assistance through the Department of Energy, immunizations through Health and Human Services, and early childhood education programs like Head Start. Where is the funding for these programs? The majority proposes a fragmented program that would be crippled.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may conclude.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—185

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

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

□ 1801

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—244

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

NAYS—164

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

NOT VOTING—23

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

□ 1808

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1804

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

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

There was no objection.

OBAMACARE

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

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

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

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

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

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1815

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

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

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Pete Mehas, an important figure in the central valley of California, who dedicated his life to improving education and helping young people in our local community.

Dr. Mehas was a local leader with passion for education. He started his career in education as a teacher and football coach at Roosevelt High School in Fresno, California.

He was elected Fresno County Superintendent of Schools in 1990, and was reelected three more times in 1994, 1998, and 2002. He also served as Secretary of Education for former Governor of California George Deukmejian. At the time of his passing, he served as a member of the board of trustees for the California State University system.

Dr. Mehas is remembered as a tremendous motivator who encouraged people to reach their full potential. The central valley lost an iconic advocate for education, children, and minorities.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to pay tribute to Dr. Mehas for his lifelong dedication to helping central valley youth through his work and education and his devotion to improving the community.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, we're here today to honor a true public servant and a longtime friend of mine, Superintendent Pete Mehas. My Republican colleagues, Congressmen Nunes and Congressman VALADAO, and I certainly have our disagreements, but among those things we all agree on is how important and meaningful the work of Pete's life was to so many in our valley and those that he touched throughout the State of California because he was a true public servant.

He committed his life to the furtherance of education for the young people throughout California. He and I worked together on so many issues, from special education, to bringing the Keeping Score program to the kids of Fresno County, to dealing with challenged school districts like West Elementary, the implementation of charter schools, and, yes, one of the last tasks that Pete did, even though he was in retirement, was to head the selection committee for the new president of Cal State University of Fresno, Dr. Joe Castro. A good selection that was.

It's time that we set our differences apart and find the solutions to the impasses that are affecting this Congress and this country today. It's what Pete would have done. It's what we should do.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. NUNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I'd like to pay tribute, as Mr. COSTA said, to Dr. Pete Mehas, an enthusiastic leader of the central valley and a man whom I was privileged to call my friend.

Pete was a major force in shaping and improving our local school system, serving as a schoolteacher, administrator, school superintendent, CSU board of trustees member, and he leaves a legacy of excellence and commitment that is an outstanding role model for future educators.

Pete's passion, of course, was sports, and it's hard to imagine what athletics around Fresno would be like today without his decades-long contribution as a high school athlete, college football player, soccer, football, and tennis coach, his work on sports scholarships and the Fresno Athletic Hall of Fame. Through the coaches he later hired at various schools and institutions, he left a lasting impact on the sports programs throughout the central valley.

Aside from his long list of accomplishments, Dr. Mehas was friendly, optimistic, and outgoing, with a constant, infectious smile. He was widely known in the community and deeply loved. Characteristically, he seemed to be at every Fresno State football game. I'll miss seeing him there.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, I was supposed to be in Memphis with the head of the faith-based group from Washington. Because of the sequester, she wasn't able to travel. Because of the shutdown, I'm here.

So we had 42 pastors come to my office with the navigators in Memphis, and we talked about the Affordable Care Act and how to sign up people in the community and what the Affordable Care Act did. It was a very beneficial program in telling people in the community how to sign people up for needed and important health care. I wish others would do the same thing. It would be constructive.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. We need to help our citizens get adjusted, get involved, and get the benefits.

LET THE SENATORS VOTE FOR FAIRNESS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, consider the common ground the House has offered Senate Democrats, common ground Senator HARRY REID is squandering by refusing to talk.

We want to reopen government. We want to restore vital services. The Senate won't budge. They won't even negotiate. Why? Because ensuring fair treatment for Americans under ObamaCare is evidently too radical for some in the Senate.

The President provided big businesses a 1-year break to ready themselves for ObamaCare. Shouldn't he provide American families the same? The House thinks so. So does Democrat Senator JOE MANCHIN:

Give them at least a year, he said. You gave the corporate sector a year, don't you think it'd be fair?

Yes, because it is.

But Senator REID won't talk. He won't end the shutdown because he's insistent the double standard remains intact.

Senator REID, let's not waste the common ground we have. Let's talk. Let's treat Americans fairly. Let's open their government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I received the following email from Stu Harris in El Paso yesterday. He's the vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, Local 1929. He writes:

> Our Border Patrol agents in the El Paso sector are outraged by this nonsense. We cannot understand tying the fight against the Affordable Care Act with funding the government.
>
> I can only hope that nothing happens to any of our agents in the field putting their lives on the line and doing it for free. Imagine having to be in a state of heightened awareness for 10 hours a day, all the time not knowing if or when the paycheck will come in or how we're going to pay the bills and feed our families.
>
> Due to the shutdown, all Border Patrol agent trainees that were at the academy have been sent home. This amounts to yet another delay in adding measures to secure the border.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reopen the government and allow an up-or-down vote on funding this government.

SPENDING CUTS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this has been a tough week for my constituents, a tough week for all Americans.

I've been reflecting on the goals I set when I decided to run for office a little more than a year ago. I came here to tackle the growing debt that is saddling our country. I want to make sure

that we reform the way Washington spends money, and I want a better and more responsible America for my children and your children.

Madam Speaker, I hate the bickering that has consumed this institution. I dislike the fighting. But even more, I dislike the $17 trillion in debt that's preventing American exceptionalism.

It is unacceptable that last year our country spent a trillion more than we had. It is unacceptable that our President does not want to talk about how we get out of the red or the fact that ObamaCare will add another $1.3 trillion to our deficit.

We had historic spending reforms in this House and have begun the process to reprioritize how Washington spends your tax dollars. I will continue my efforts to get our fiscal house back in order. I will continue to advocate that we return to a constitutional appropriations process and begin passing all of our spending bills.

One of the most important powers the Constitution outlines is in article I. It is for Congress to control Federal spending. We must get back to that system of checks and balances that our forefathers designed and the Constitution demands.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I want to apologize to the people of southern Ohio in Pike County at the uranium enrichment facility for not being able to be with them today. We did not anticipate that our schedule would be completely disrupted by the shenanigans here due to the GOP shutdown of our departments of government, which is so unnecessary and so absolutely discourteous to the people of this country.

Initially, when this happened, the calls that came into our office were calls of dismay and shock and upset about the inability of this Congress to reach agreement because of a very reckless faction on that other—majority's side of the aisle.

The calls have changed. Now we're getting calls from people who've gone to apply for Social Security benefits and there's nobody there to take their application. Now we're getting calls from veterans who are returning from theater and there is nobody there to process their benefit claims.

We have over 800,000 people furloughed from the Federal Government. Guess what? One of my communities had sent officers for training at one of the FBI academies, and they're riding back home right now because that training was not available.

Madam Speaker, our responsibility is to provide a stable government that gives confidence to the people of this country, advances economic growth, and meets our responsibilities. All Republicans have to do is send a clean continuing resolution to the floor and this could end.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I did not plan to take the floor today, but I was receiving a call this afternoon from Felecia Shelor, who runs the Poor Farmers Market in Meadows of Dan. She was calling both on her behalf and on behalf of her friends who run Mabry Mill, an establishment just off the Blue Ridge Parkway.

She told me that they were having similar problems to what we've read about with Mt. Vernon being closed down, even though it's not run by the Federal Government and isn't owned by the Federal Government. Mabry Mill is not a Federal facility, but it's just off the Parkway. We know in North Carolina there was a facility where they blocked the parking. We don't have the ability to do the regular things, but we can block the parking of businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a tragedy. Sixty-some employees in the various businesses there may be affected negatively by the actions of the park service. I call your attention to this. I ask you if you're in the neighborhood, go to the Blue Ridge Parkway, travel down it, go to Mabry Mill, shop the stores nearby. They need you to show that they're not going to allow the government to play cheap tricks, as one park ranger said they were doing in an article in the Washington Times today:

> We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting.

That's what an angry park ranger said.

Everyone, Madam Speaker, in this country should be angry, and they should go out to the Parkway.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, it's very clear to The Wall Street Journal, it's clear to the Chamber of Commerce, it's clear to USA Today, and it's clear to the American public that the Republican right wing, the Tea Party, has shut down the government.

Now I find out that we're going home. Speaker BOEHNER has decided that Congress will go home tomorrow. How can we possibly go home? There are people who are not being paid, people here who are not being paid. The police were not paid that work here every day. Across this country, people are not receiving what they paid for, and we're going home. I'm embarrassed about this.

We should stay here. If they can't agree to accept the fact that they lost the vote on the health care law again and again, if they can't agree to that, can they at least agree to work on jobs? There's plenty of work to do in this country, and we have no right to go home until we get this job done.

□ 1830

OBAMACARE

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, my colleague who just spoke failed to tell the American people that we're going home tomorrow after we get our morning work done to hug our children, see our spouses, and we're going to be back here Monday.

So with that said, several years ago, before ObamaCare was implemented, or right after it was, the media asked the other side of the House, What's in it? And the other side of the House responded, Well, we don't know. We have to pass it to see what's in it. To see what the language says, the people are going to have to read it.

So now we are reading it. Big business is reading it; they don't like it. Unions are reading it; they don't like it. Most Americans don't like it.

So what does that mean? When ObamaCare was passed, it was supposed to cost $900 billion and some change and cover 60 million people for 10 years. The latest numbers today, it may cover 24,000 people at a cost of just shy of $2 trillion. Every year, this country is spending $1 trillion more than we bring in. Who's going to pay for it? Where are we going to get the money? Borrow it from the Chinese? Or put it on the backs of the hardworking middle class taxpayers? It has to stop.

LET'S TALK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, today is a historic day. It is the fourth day of the Democrats' government shutdown. There is a profound difference of opinion on not just ObamaCare but on the size and role of government in our lives. The future course of our country and what we look like hangs in the balance. Will we continue down the path of a bigger government that takes more of our hard-

earned money, inflicts a substandard health care system on us, and tramples our rights? Or will we be a Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people that protects our rights, ensures our liberties, and allows us to keep our hard-earned money? These are big decisions. And America is watching how we, as leaders, solve these problems and come to a resolution.

As Republicans, we have been here and have put forth proposal after proposal to fund the government and keep it open and protect the American people from this onerous health care law. We have sent over to the Senate numerous proposals to keep the government open while ensuring no one gets special treatment under ObamaCare. Unfortunately, HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats rebuffed every attempt to negotiate and slammed the door to talking.

They went home last weekend. We stayed here and worked. They tabled each of our proposals. We appointed conferees. HARRY REID refused to appoint conferees. He has slammed the door to reopening government by refusing to talk.

President Obama called Speaker BOEHNER to the White House yesterday. We were encouraged. Sadly, the message was, I've called you here to tell you I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. Good-bye.

You can't negotiate if you won't talk.

My mother is a pretty special lady and a pretty wise woman. When I was a little girl, she knew how to get my sister and I talking again when we were mad after a fight. She'd make us sit in a room together for half an hour. We hated it. It was uncomfortable at first. We didn't want to make eye contact or communicate. But by the end of 30 minutes, we were always talking again, and we were ready to set aside our differences and move forward. That's what needs to happen here.

I have got a poster here, Let's talk. That's what we need to do. But instead, the President has resorted to tactics and over-the-top political stunts that are not only harmful to moving the discussion forward but are harmful to American citizens. He furloughed defense civilians and Reserve personnel. This is in spite of the legislation we passed and he signed to prevent that.

The Pay Our Military Act appropriates funds to our military and allows all defense workers to remain on the job, but the President has decided to furlough workers anyway. As a result, over 150,000 Army civilians and 75,000 Navy civilians were sent home. Reports are coming in that long overdue maintenance at shipyards is being delayed and not completed. Our national defense is jeopardized because our Commander in Chief has sidelined our military.

But that's not all. The President has chosen to try to inflict as much public pain as possible to get his way. For the first time in history, he has closed the U.S. memorials in Washington, D.C., and around the world. Despite many of these memorials being open air venues with 24/7 access 365 days out of the year, he has spent precious tax dollars renting barricades to close them.

Earlier this week, President Obama ordered the National Park Service to close the World War II Memorial despite the fact that numerous World War II veterans had been planning for months to travel to D.C. to visit the iconic memorial as part of the Honor Flight program.

Here's a picture of what they were greeted with: instead of being greeted like heroes, these veterans came to D.C. to see metal barriers surrounding the monument in the middle of the Mall erected to honor their service and their sacrifice. There was no need to ever close the World War II Memorial other than to make a political point, as keeping these monuments open would not cost a thing and were funded primarily through private donations by those wishing to honor these veterans.

When I went down Wednesday morning to help remove the barriers for veterans from Missouri so they could see their memorial, I was ashamed of the President's action and continuous lack of respect for the men and women who fought and died for our country. The unprecedented action of closing monuments has never been authorized during any previous government shutdown by any other President, including President Clinton, and underscores this President's desire to purposely do everything in his power to make Americans suffer from his political games.

The President has since seen the public outcry and opened the World War II Memorial but only to veterans. Unfortunately, it remains barricaded to the general public and all other war memorials. President Obama has also barricaded other venues in D.C., such as the FDR Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, and the new Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial. Here they are in this poster doing that.

He, himself, dedicated this memorial in 2011. And during his dedication speech, he referenced many important milestones in the life of Dr. King and made reference to the fact that this monument was meant for all who seek freedom and testament to the numerous—and here are the President's words—''the numerous barricades that have fallen since Dr. King started his fateful journey to push for social justice.''

However, the President has chosen to needlessly punish Americans who travel to D.C. to pay homage to the monument and has literally erected barriers to keep out those visitors.

In that same 2011 speech, the President points out that if Dr. King were alive today, ''He would want us to know that we can argue fiercely about the proper size and role of government without questioning each other's love for this country—with the knowledge that in this democracy, government is no distant object but is rather an expression of our common commitments to one another. He would call on us to assume the best in each other, rather than the worst, and challenge one another in ways that ultimately heal, rather than wound.''

I sincerely wish the President would heed Dr. King's wise words and sit down with us so we can work out our differences instead of needlessly punishing Americans for his inability to find common ground and civilly pass legislation.

Let's talk.

Now I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to share their thoughts about this important time in history. So I yield to my good friend from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, ObamaCare is having disastrous effects on Americans across this country. And in my home State of Tennessee, premiums are rising by as much as 190 percent. And now schools are being forced to reduce hours for substitute teachers.

Every day, constituents contact my office with stories about how this devastating law is hurting them. Louis in Hendersonville told me that his premiums are going up, and I quote:

> We do not know how to address this huge additional burden. Please help.

Tracy in Smithville wrote to me and said:

> I will have to close my business due to ObamaCare. I'm a veteran, and I have spent 21 years building this business. It's a shame that it has come to this. Everything that I have worked for will be gone because of this bill.

Jeffrey in Goodlettsville is a small business owner who wrote to me:

> Please continue fighting back against this law.

My constituents and Americans across the country never supported this law that is being rammed down their throats by the President and Senate Democrats. My House Republican colleagues and I have repeatedly worked to try to protect them from the law's disastrous effects. But instead of listening to the American people, the Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their own ObamaCare carve-out. Madam Speaker, this is shameful. And it's past time that HARRY REID negotiate with this House to address the concerns of the American people over this disastrous law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Diane, for those great words.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. RON DESANTIS, who knows a little bit about serving his country in multiple ways, including being a part of the Navy.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to address some things that I have been hearing out there that just strike me as wrong. The President

said that ObamaCare has nothing to do with the budget. Now that is very rich, considering it was passed using budget reconciliation in order to ram it through the Senate with less than 60 votes. So it was a budget issue then. Somehow it's not now. Of course the individual mandate has been ruled a tax by the Supreme Court, and it authorizes trillions of dollars in new spending.

Now some say ObamaCare is the law and, therefore, cannot be changed. Well, this body has the constitutional authority to legislate. We can always amend or change the laws. But I would also say, if this particular law is somehow so special and sacrosanct, then why isn't the President enforcing it, as written? Indeed, he has given waivers and exemptions to politically connected entities, including a bailout for Members of Congress, giving them relief from the text of the very law that they passed without reading.

I think ObamaCare is dangerous in terms of how it's going to impact economic growth and medical care in the country. But just in terms of good government, this really is a recipe for institutionalized cronyism. You have burdens imposed on society. And then those who have political connections can get those burdens removed.

So employers can get it removed. We know there will be something for labor unions at some point. But if you are an individual, well, you've still got to abide by ObamaCare's dictates.

Some say doing individual bills is simply cherry-picking, we can't pass individual spending bills, which the House has been doing very resolutely over the last several days.

Big omnibus CRs, that is not the way business is supposed to be done. You are packing all the departments into one big bill. You are forfeiting Congress' ability to make good spending choices, forfeiting Congress' oversight authority, locking in bad policy. We haven't done appropriations bills in this House for years. A lot of this stuff that's locked into these CRs was done when we had the previous Speaker of the House. So individual bills are better. The Senate should absolutely act on our bills.

And then just finally, I would say, before I yield back to the gentlewoman from Missouri, ObamaCare is the only major piece of legislation that's passed in the last 80 years that had zero support from the other party. Social Security had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; the Civil Rights Act had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; Reaganomics, the Reagan economic program, had 78 percent of Democrats in the Senate. So typically, these big laws have broad bipartisan support. This one didn't. And we have a lot of constituents who didn't want it to begin with and don't like living under it now.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. I think that is very true. It shows that we are here fighting for a bunch of people in this country whom it's hurting. And that's why we need to repeal it or amend it or do something to stop this onerous law that's hurting people. So thanks for bringing that up.

Now I yield to my good friend from Colorado, DOUG LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to talk about negotiations. The President, unfortunately, has said he's not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling. And HARRY REID has said, he's not going to send negotiators to sit down with Republicans and talk about the continuing resolution and the government shutdown.

But that begs the question: Who does the President negotiate with? Well, take a look here. Bashar al-Assad, the dictator of the regime in Syria, who has used poison gas on his people about 15 times; 100,000 people have died in that civil war. And after the latest explosion of poison gas, the civilized world was outraged that 1,500 people were killed. And John Kerry now has entered into negotiations, with the Russians acting as intermediaries.

□ 1845

So the Russians are going to help negotiate with the Syrians. This has the blessing of the President. I wish them success on this venture. I hope the negotiations come to something, but they are willing to negotiate with these reprehensible dictators from around the world, and that includes Iran. Iran now has entered into discussions with the State Department and the President. The President has talked to the President of Iran, Hassan Rouhani, and I wish success upon these negotiations. They are trying their best.

But when you think about these characters around the world, and in some cases evil regimes that the President is negotiating with, who is he not negotiating with? The Republicans in the House.

JOHN BOEHNER is the Speaker of the House, and the Republicans in the conference represent over half the people in America. Over half of Americans are represented by Republicans here in Congress, over half the country; and yet the President won't even negotiate. HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader, won't even send negotiators to talk to House negotiators. I think this is wrong. I think we should have some negotiations. I think we should have some discussions. If these people merit negotiation and discussion, certainly half of the country, the Republicans here in the House who represent half of the country, should enter into negotiations.

So I call on the President to negotiate with the Speaker and House Republicans on the debt ceiling. I call on HARRY REID to send negotiators to meet with House Republicans to talk about the government slowdown or shutdown or whatever you want to call it.

We need to negotiate, Mr. President. We need to negotiate, Mr. REID.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Doug. What great points. We have extended our hand to the Senate and to the President this entire time, and yet we have had the door slammed in our face. But you're right, he has negotiated with others. It's time for him to negotiate with us. Thank you for bringing up those excellent points.

Now I yield to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JEB HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I especially thank her for her leadership on this Special Order, and her leadership on behalf of all of our men and women who serve in uniform, many in her district. And she is well respected within this institution for what she has done for our military.

Madam Speaker, I know the American people occasionally get somewhat confused by what is going on in Congress. Here's what's easy to understand: House Republicans have put not one offer on the table, not two, not three, but four; four different offers to negotiate with the President and the Democrats. What do we hear from the President? What do we hear from HARRY REID, no negotiations.

You know, I still recall vividly my mother-in-law who has a saying, the least you can do in life is show up. President Barack Obama and HARRY REID have not shown up. Now I know that the President says at one time in his life he taught congressional law. Some of us find that somewhat ironic because if the President actually knew the Constitution, then he would know that it is the Congress that has the power of the purse. It is Congress that appropriates funds. Nowhere will you find in the Constitution that Congress is relegated to the power of the rubber stamp. So we know that the President and HARRY REID want us to rubber-stamp the health care policies of this administration that we hear about every single day. Every single day I'm hearing from one of my constituents, Congressman HENSARLING, they just cut me back to 29 hours because of ObamaCare. Congressman HENSARLING, my health care premiums are going up $1,500 because of ObamaCare. And yet we're told by the President, it's the law, don't touch it. Well, it's a law that he has already changed seven times, and it is a law that's hurting our constituents. And, no, Republicans are never, never, never going to give up on our quest to have patient-centered health care that's right for our families and doesn't harm our economy and is not an affront to our freedom. So we'll never give up on that.

Madam Speaker, we know that the President is not going to sign away his signature item, and we know since so much of this spending is what we call mandatory spending, automatic spending, we know that the President is not going to cooperate to repeal it or defund it, and we'll never give up our

quest. But, Madam Speaker, all we're asking for now is if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on the American people, then it ought to be imposed equally—none of these special interest deals, none of these sweetheart deals. You know what, if it's good enough for the American people, it ought to be good enough for the President.

Why wasn't he the first one, the very first one signing up for this? Why wasn't there a line at the White House? Well, I can tell you why, Madam Speaker, because, guess what, they exempted themselves. The American people are tired of Washington elites passing laws that the rest of us are supposed to live under. That's not what the American people expect, and so Republicans are asking one thing: if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on America, no special deals for big business, no special deals for big labor. If they are going to get a 1-year reprieve, then working Americans ought to get a 1-year working reprieve. And if it's good enough for working Americans, it ought to be applied to the President, his Cabinet, and everyone in the White House and the Congress.

Listen, I don't want to put my family in the exchanges. I don't want to lose the employer contribution that the taxpayers have so generously given us, but we're not going to have the President act like he can make the law. No Member of Congress, no one in the White House is above the law. So that's what we're trying to do. We want negotiations. If we're going to get stuck with ObamaCare while the President is the President, then let it be applied equally; but this is bigger than this.

Millions and millions of our fellow countrymen are either unemployed or underemployed. They need our help. This is a spending bill. The President's economic policies have failed. We want fundamental tax reform. We want to get rid of the red tape burden. We want to take our Nation off the road to bankruptcy. I say this not just as a Member of Congress, but as the father of a 10-year-old son and an 11-year-old daughter. So somehow when the President says you can't mess with this spending bill and we want you to rubber-stamp the debt ceiling, the Republicans say, no, no, no, Mr. President. We will negotiate with you in good faith and maybe the electorate gave you the White House and the Senate, but the American people gave the House to the Republican Party, and we will not sit idly by while men and women are unemployed and underemployed, wondering how they're going to feed their families. We're not going to sit idly by while he bankrupts this Nation for future generations.

No, no, no, we will not sit idly by. We are ready to negotiate, but we are through negotiating with ourselves, and the American people will demand ultimately that the President and HARRY REID negotiate and we work together to get this economy back and put us on a road to fiscal solvency so that our best days will once again be ahead of us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, so much. What wise words about what this fight is about for the future generations of our country and how we are fighting for a better health care system and a government that lives within its means. It's time to do that, and it's time to negotiate for the President and the Senate to come and talk to us. So let's talk.

I am glad to have a friend of mine, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP). We have the honor of serving together on the Armed Services Committee, and I really respect him and his views not only as a patriot and a member of the Armed Services Committee, but also as a doctor. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This slowdown, shutdown has taken on many particular angles and a lot of accusation and a lot of discussion; but as we get to this point, although ObamaCare isn't driving the shutdown, it isn't merely about the millions who will still be uninsured, and its not merely about the 50 percent or more of this country who will be on Medicaid where access to care is extremely limited, and it's not only about rates going up. It is about that health care is going backwards in America, not forward. The government shutdown is not only about the fact that in Ohio we passed a constitutional amendment that made the mandate in Ohio, only to be overturned by the Supreme Court. Sixty-six percent of the people in Ohio did not want this law, and I'm from Ohio and I'm here to continue to fight for that.

I'm bothered as we go through this and I hear the arguments and I hear people referred to ''terrorism,'' ''jihad'' and ''bombs strapped to their chest.'' Well, as someone who served in Iraq as a combat surgeon during the bloodiest time of the war, 2005–2006, I guarantee you what's taking place here is not that, and it's shameful when people use those types of references. And I bet those who have served in war understand that's not appropriate.

We are here to negotiate, we're here to discuss, and we're here to represent the American people. Really, I thought when I came here, I'm new, I'm a freshman—I thought that fair treatment for all Americans would be something that's common ground for all of us. I thought that having special subsidies for Members of Congress would be something that we would all disagree with, and that would be another area of common ground.

Those are the basic premises that are driving this shutdown right now, because we have passed continuing resolutions that would fund the government completely if we would just sit down and agree that these portions of this law are wrong and they go against what we as Americans believe in, that we're to be treated fairly, that there is no special premise for one group over the other. I thought those would be areas of common ground, and I'm surprised that this still goes on.

We'll continue to fight over things we disagree with within ObamaCare and try to improve our health care system as we go along; but it interests me when people say it's the law, get over it. Well, it's not the law that was passed when you're changing things, and that's the problem.

I wonder sometimes if the Presidential election was different. Say, for example, Mitt Romney had won and he went into the Presidency and said, I'm going to exempt this group and I'm going to exempt that group. I'm going to change the law and provide a subsidy for those it's not written into the law for. What would the outcry be? The outcry would come from me because I believe in the rule of law, and I believe in fairness under the law.

We need to sit down and figure this out. The President is the President, and he has the seat at the head of the table; but he was not the only one elected. We've all been elected to represent the people, and we all have a seat at the table, and that's what needs to take place.

I hear arguments from the other side talking about while we're passing these resolutions, you're picking and choosing now. That's exactly what ObamaCare has done. Throughout that law, there is picking and choosing. So when I hear the other side say we're picking and choosing, I say thank you for making our argument because that's what we're having problems with.

I pray for a better day. And Lord willing, we'll all sit down at the table and get these things figured out on behalf of the American people. That's what we were sent here to do, and I hope we can get that done, and I urge those who will not come forward to think about it and to come forward and sit and talk with us.

With that, I appreciate the gentlelady putting this Special Order together for us to have a chance to discuss these issues.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank you very much. You've really spoken to the heart of this whole issue. We want fair treatment for all. The President has given over 2,000 waivers from this law to special interests and to certain groups, given special treatment to Members of Congress and their staff and has said that businesses and large corporations don't have to comply for a year. But yet he has been unwilling to give a 1-year extension to the hardworking families in my district and your district and individuals who work so hard and the ones that we're hearing about, so that's not fair.

So we hope—I hope—that the President and the Senate will listen to your words tonight and be willing to come forward and to sit down with us and find that common ground, and where we can delay this for a year and move

forward as a country. Thank you for bringing up those great points.

I am very happy tonight to yield to a friend of mine from Missouri, Representative JASON SMITH. He is here and he's doing a fantastic job, and I'm very honored to serve with you. The people of the Eighth District of Missouri know that you're doing a fantastic job on their behalf. I would love to hear your thoughts at this historic time about the matters before us.

□ 1900

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you very much. It's a great honor to be here this evening to talk about the effects that ObamaCare has on the folks in rural Missouri. I also want to thank my colleague and my neighbor just west of me in Missouri, Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER, for having us and for putting on this Special Order.

Just over a week ago, I posted a question on my Facebook page asking the folks back home to give me examples and comments of how ObamaCare has affected them. It's amazing. We were inundated with people and just different story after story. I want to share a few of those stories of real families that are facing the struggles of ObamaCare back home.

We have folks all the time that ask, Is the fight worth it? Is the fight worth defunding and delaying ObamaCare? And I'll let you all decide. But let me give you a few examples.

Paul from East Prairie, down in Missouri County, in Missouri, wrote on Facebook that he checked to see what his insurance premiums would be next year after ObamaCare completely goes into effect. Paul and his family would be forced to pay $1,035 a month, with a sky-high deductible of $12,700. Paul said he could get coverage from his wife's employer—his wife is a teacher—but with increased costs. The employer's insurance for their family plan would take his wife's entire paycheck because of the new regulations under the Affordable Care Act, which is everything but affordable.

Madam Speaker, I ask, Is the fight to defund ObamaCare worth it?

Let me give you another example. Another constituent, Noel, said he has worked for 35 hours every year for the last 12 years. But, guess what, his employer now has changed it to where he only works 28 hours a week. Guess why? Because of the new regulations under ObamaCare.

Is the fight worth it for Noel?

Donald from Festus, Missouri, just south of St. Louis, told me that his health care premiums are rising from $480 to $740 per month. He went on to say that because of his increased insurance costs, he will be contributing $3,000 less a year to our Nation's economy.

Madam Speaker, do you think fighting ObamaCare is worth it?

These are just a few examples of my constituents. These are real people, President Obama. These are people that are affected and are required to be in this program, which you are not required to be a part of, which the Vice President of the United States is not required to be a part of, which NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID are not required to be a part of. This is wrong, folks. This is completely wrong.

In the last week, this body has voted to defund and to delay ObamaCare because it is worth the fight. Democrats in the United States Senate must now justify to the American people why the individual mandate is too harmful for businesses and unions, but should still be forced on families and individuals. The Senate must justify why special interests are eligible for waivers and delays while average Americans will be hit with an ObamaCare's tsunami of mandates, fines, and confusion.

Madam Speaker, the fight to defund ObamaCare is a good fight to have, and I will keep fighting until folks in my district are treated the same way as big businesses and special interests.

Madam Speaker, this fight is about fairness. The fight is about families in my district who are seeing skyrocketing insurance premiums and lost wages and lost jobs.

Madam Speaker, this is a fight worth fighting for.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much for those excellent comments.

This is about fairness. Fair treatment for all. That's all we're asking. That's something that Americans everywhere can agree on. So as the Senate and as the President hear these words, I hope they will come and let's talk and let's move forward with this.

Now I'm happy to yield time to my friend from south of Missouri, in Oklahoma, a fantastic representative and leader here, JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentlelady for hosting this time to be able to talk about some of the serious issues.

Madam Speaker, I want to bring to our attention tonight something that we're trying to bring up over and over again. It is a simple injustice and an absolute avoidance of the law.

A week ago, this body, Republicans and Democrats together, agreed unanimously to make sure that the United States military, civilians, and all civilian contractors would be exempt in case there was a shutdown.

The United States military has taken the brunt of the sequestration, and in bases all over the country and all over the world they have suffered. They have stopped training missions, they slowed down the process, as they've rapidly try to adjust to very fast-moving furloughs and sequestration. But they have. They've done what they've been asked to do.

So we make sure as a body, Republicans and Democrats together, that in case we got to a government shutdown, the United States military, all civilians, and the civilian contributes that serve with them would not be affected.

We passed it. We sent it to the Senate. The Senate approved it unanimously. The President of the United States signed it. That's a done deal.

We are dealing with every other aspect of the shutdown or what really is to be better described as a slowdown of the United States Government, which is serious. But we knew at least the United States military would not be affected by this. They were held entirely exempt.

There were three aspects of this law. You can look it up. It's H.R. 3210.

Aspect number one: all title X individuals, all active duty military, without exception, would be held exempt from this.

Number two: all civilians that support them—all of them—if they're connected in any way as a civilian to supporting our military, they were to be held exempt from this and the government shutdown would not apply to them.

Number three: all civilian contractors.

It's a 1-page bill with very broad language giving authority to the Secretary of Defense to say whoever you determine in any area supports in any way military, they should not be affected by the government shutdown. It's clear. It's plain language.

And then it went to the United States Pentagon; and in the Secretary of Defense's office, they have a group of lawyers. And those lawyers say they're studying the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to.

For this entire week they have studied the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to, and our members of the United States military and the civilians that serve with them are on furlough this week—against the law.

Republicans and Democrats agreed 100 percent in the House and the Senate, and the Pentagon lawyers can't decide how this should work. A first-year law student could read that bill and could tell it applies to all military title X, all civilians that support them in any way, and all contractors. It's not hard language.

It is time for the Secretary of Defense to turn to the lawyers in his office and say, Release those folks. The law is clear.

Our own Defense Department is violating the law. The President is allowing it. It's time to get on with this. Why are we holding them back?

Well, the President stands up and says the Republicans are holding America hostage. The Defense Department really is holding their folks hostage, in clear violation of the law.

Let's fix it. This is not something that's hard for us. It's already been passed. Let's get on with it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. What a great point. It is unbelievable that the Commander in Chief of this country has sidelined his own men and women in uniform and the civilians that support and defend this country.

Thank you for bringing that up. I agree with you, we have done everything we can. When this first happened,

we signed a letter and sent it to the President. We said, We did not intend for you to be able to furlough these people. We want everyone back on the job.

So far, we haven't heard a thing. As Representative LANKFORD said, they're still studying the issue.

Well, I call on the Commander in Chief of this country to step forward and be a Commander in Chief and to put that order out to bring them back for the good of our country.

And now I am pleased to yield to my friend from Minnesota, the wonderful lady, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank Representative HARTZLER for her wonderful leadership this afternoon. We've heard wonderful comments about why we're here and why this is so important.

People all across the United States want us in to get our act together in Congress and with the White House and put this country back in the position we've always been in—the greatest economic and military superpower that the world has ever known. But we can't be that superpower, as Representative LANKFORD of Oklahoma said, if our Commander in Chief is illegally furloughing employees who are civilians actively supporting our defense initiative when we need them at this critical time in world history.

And I want to bring attention to one particular area and underscore what Representative LANKFORD said, because this is so extremely important. It was highlighted today by one of our Members, Representative LEE Terry of Nebraska. What he told the Republicans today at the microphone was chilling. A story is written about it today in Breitbart.com by Ben Shapiro.

In the article it says President Obama is illegally furloughing civilian defense employees at STRATCOM. What is STRATCOM? STRATCOM, Madam Speaker, is where thousands of people work to deal with missile defense in the United States. That would include nuclear missile defense.

Madam Speaker, we are being told that upwards of 60 to 70 percent of the civilian employees, which are thousands of individuals, have been illegally furloughed. Their job is to secure the safety of the missile defense system in the United States and the nuclear defense system in this United States.

The most important title of the President of the United States is to be Commander in Chief because the number one duty of our government is national security.

There can be politics played in this town. We get that. You never, ever, ever, ever play politics with missile defense and nuclear defense and the safety and national security of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I call on the President of the United States, before the clock strikes midnight tonight, if nothing else, put these civilian employees back in place at STRATCOM. The American people and the world need to know that our missile defense and nuclear defense system is at 100 percent capability.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you.

I now would like to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE. I not only serve on the Armed Services Committee with him, but he has a very good perspective on all these issues.

□ 1915

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to take a moment because there's a lot of information out there, Madam Speaker, about what's going on in our country right now—and a lot of misinformation. I thought it would be appropriate just to set the record straight.

A little over a week ago we sent a bill to the Senate. That bill funded the entire government. It kept the government open and it defunded ObamaCare in its entirety. Senator HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats stripped from that bill the defunding mechanism and they sent it back to the House. So we looked at it and we said, What can we do that they might agree to?

Well, the President has already unilaterally delayed major provisions of ObamaCare, including the employer mandate. He did that because he saw the jobs report. People were being forced from full-time work to part-time work. Many of them were being forced out of a job. In my district, I talked to an employer that has 57 employees; they're trying to get down to 49. And guess what they did. This is happening across our country. So the President unilaterally decided he's going to delay the employer mandate.

So we said, okay, if he wants to delay that for 1 year, let's give him an opportunity to delay the entire ObamaCare for 1 year. So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and we sent it to the United States Senate with a 1-year delay of ObamaCare. We did that at about 1 o'clock in the morning.

Interestingly, the next day, the Senate Democrats took the day off, and the day after that they didn't even show up until 2 in the afternoon. This was my first indication—as somebody who's new to Congress, I've seen a lot of crazy things—it was my first indication that maybe they wanted a government shutdown. Astonishingly, they just didn't show up. When they did show up, they tabled it.

So then we said, okay, well, what if we just delay the individual mandate? He has already given multibillion-dollar corporations a 1-year reprieve. He's given Members of Congress a subsidy. It's not written in the law; in fact, it's illegal. He had a meeting with HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI, and the next thing you know Members of Congress get a subsidy.

So we said, look, if Members of Congress are going to get a subsidy and multibillion-dollar corporations are going to get a break, why don't we give hardworking Americans a 1-year reprieve? So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and delayed the individual mandate for only 1 year. Of course HARRY REID took that bill and he immediately moved to table it.

So then at about 1 o'clock in the morning we decided, okay, let's just ask for a conference so that we can have some people from our side and some people from their side get together and work this out. Astonishingly, they didn't even want that. If you can imagine that, they didn't want to sit down and talk to Members of Congress.

Interestingly, the President called on the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, to go to the White House, and he went and he talked to the President. Guess what the President told him? The President said, We're not going to negotiate. He said, We're not going to negotiate on the continuing resolution to fund the government, nor are we going to negotiate on the debt ceiling.

This is not how it's supposed to work in our constitutional Republic in split government, but that's where we are. This is indicative of the fact that this is HARRY REID's shutdown. This is President Barack Obama's shutdown. This is not the Republican shutdown. We have done everything we could to keep this government open, and HARRY REID and President Barack Obama have shut it down.

But here's the good thing. Here's what we have done: We passed a bill, and that bill said we're going to fund the troops. We passed it unanimously in the House of Representatives. We passed it unanimously in the Senate. The President signed it into law. That's a good thing.

Then we had another bill. We thought we could pass it under suspension, so it would require a two-thirds vote. That bill was to fund the veterans of the United States, the Veterans Administration. Interestingly, Members of this body on the other side of the aisle killed it, if you can imagine that. It is every bit as indefensible to kill funding our veterans as it is to not fund our troops, every bit as indefensible.

Then, after that occurred, we wanted a bill that would fund our National Guard and our Reserve. I'm a reservist. I've been on Active Duty. I've been a reservist. I can tell you firsthand that reservists serve this country every bit as honorably as those on the Active Duty side. So we wanted to fund them. And guess what? We brought up a bill. We passed it under a rule so it only required a simple majority, and we passed it. We sent it to the Senate, and they haven't done anything with it.

This is where we are. HARRY REID and Barack Obama are holding our veterans hostage and they're holding the National Guard and our reservists hostage to ObamaCare. It's that simple.

And, by the way, it's not just to ObamaCare. It's one very simple provision that is only a 1-year delay of the individual mandate. When you think about it, it's really they're holding it hostage to having a meeting. At the end, we just said, Okay, let's have a meeting. They said, No, we're not going to have a meeting, and, oh, by the way, we're shutting down the government.

That's where we are.

So I just wanted to clarify that for my constituents back home. We are opening the government one bill at a time, and we're being blocked by the Senate. Certainly it's in nobody's best interest in this country to have a government shutdown. It's nothing any of us wanted. Yet HARRY REID and Barack Obama gave it to us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that was very helpful to review all the steps of what we have done to keep this government open, and how each one of our attempts has been rebuffed and how the door has been slammed in our face time and time again. But we are still here. We are still working. We're not going to give up. We want to talk. We want to negotiate. And we're going to continue to put forth proposals to fund different aspects of government to make sure that people aren't harmed in this whole process.

So thank you for coming today and sharing those thoughts.

I would like to yield now to my good friend from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) just across the way here, a fellow farmer. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this very important time.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank my colleague from the East and also my colleague from the South for their comments.

I'd like to follow up first on Congressman BRIDENSTINE's laying out the record of what has occurred. Here you see a list of the votes the House has taken since the government shutdown began.

First, as was mentioned, the Senate refused to negotiate, sit down and actually talk. That happened at 1 a.m. on October 1. Senator HARRY REID said, We're not going to talk; we're not going to negotiate.

Since then, we've gone to work. The U.S. House, House Republicans said we're going to try to take care of the veterans. Let's try to take care of funding our national parks. Let's take care of funding the NIH, cancer research for our children. Let's take care of making certain that folks that serve at FEMA are taken care of—a list of vote after vote after vote for the last 4 days.

And Congresswoman HARTZLER, I appreciate you being here to take the opportunity so that we can show we are at work. We would like to open up the government. The Senate does not.

But I'd like to point out how busy the Senate has been for the last 4 days. This, Madam Speaker, is a list of all the votes the U.S. Senate has taken since the shutdown occurred:

October 1, the first day of the Harry Reid shutdown, no votes. Day two in the U.S. Senate, no votes. Day three in the United States Senate, not a single recorded vote. Day four—they must be getting tired over there—not a single recorded vote in the U.S. Senate. The entire week.

Now, don't forget, the weekend before, the U.S. Senate took the weekend off. HARRY REID came back into session on Monday to make certain the U.S. Government would be shut down to the applause of the White House. That was Monday. Tuesday, no vote; Wednesday, no vote; Thursday, no vote; Friday, no vote. They're home on vacation again. We're going to go back to work tomorrow, and we're going to send another bill to the U.S. Senate.

It's clear to me, Madam Speaker, it's clear to me the Senate does not want to open up the U.S. Government, but we cannot give up.

One other item I would like to mention—and the Congressman from Oklahoma has made it very clear—that under ObamaCare, every Member of Congress, every Member of the U.S. Senate, everyone in this body, under ObamaCare, is required to sign up for ObamaCare.

Monday afternoon, as the government was about ready to close, almost the last thing the President did before they locked the doors on the Federal Government is they issued a special rule to allow Members of Congress to ignore ObamaCare, to create our own health care system just for U.S. Senators and Members of Congress and our staff. The last bill we sent over said, HARRY, you know what? We're not going to take part in ignoring ObamaCare. That's the very last thing the President did before they shut down the doors.

One thing I've done personally is say, You know what? I don't accept that. I will not accept the President of the United States saying that Members of Congress and Members of the U.S. Senate—indeed, Kathleen Sebelius and the entire Cabinet—should be exempt from ObamaCare. If it's good enough for all of America, it should be good enough for them.

I went online, as many of us have done, and started to do my responsibility—I don't know if any Member has done that—and said I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. At 12:01 a.m., when the government shut down, the Senate's going home, I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. Madam Speaker, I've been trying to sign up for ObamaCare on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. Here we are Friday, 91 hours later, and I still am on virtual hold.

You've seen the pictures. Go on and look it all up yourself. You can't get online. It's an absolute failure. But I will say I am absolutely required under the law, Mr. President, despite your regulations that were inspired and requested by the former Speaker of this body and the current leader of the Senate, we are not exempted.

Members of Congress, Members of the U.S. Senate, Members of the Cabinet, the President himself, sign up for ObamaCare. Lead by example and do the right thing. We can open the doors of this government, put Congress back out of the role of a privileged class.

And again, one thing I'd like to remind this body, the first individual in the entire United States of America that signed up for ObamaCare, the very first individual who was willing to lead by example was a man by the name of Harry Truman.

Mr. President, if you are listening, if you have any convictions of leadership, if you have any integrity you would like to show us, sign up for the D.C. exchange; be the next person to sign up online. Hopefully it won't take you 91 hours to get through, but lead by example. No gilded class. No special rights and privileges. The Constitution says ''no nobility clause.'' I agree with that.

I want to thank the Congresswoman from the East, my fellow sophomore, VICKY HARTZLER, for her leadership on this issue.

So let's talk. Let's have some action. And, oh, by the way, I'm confused. Was the Senate on furlough all last week, all this week? Get back to work, HARRY. I appreciate you joining the battle to open this Federal Government.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that shows that the Senate has been, it seems like, on furlough. It's too bad they didn't have time to vote on the NIH funding bill that we sent over there that would ensure that money goes and continues for very vital research, such as cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes and heart disease. We sent them that bill to make sure that research continues and it's fully funded, but it's just sitting over there. They haven't voted on it.

We passed a bill dealing with veterans, to make sure the Veterans Administration, everything remains open. But they haven't voted on it; it's just sitting over there.

We passed a bill to ensure the memorials stay open, to clarify and make sure the President isn't able to close them down and barricade them like he's doing now. But they're not voting on them.

This has got to stop. It's time for us to get together and talk.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come here tonight to share their thoughts at this very historic time in our country's history, first of all, to let people know why we are fighting. We're fighting for our families, and we're fighting for quality health care in this country, and we're fighting for fairness. We believe in fair treatment for everyone.

It's not right that the President says this health care law isn't good enough

for corporations, and I'm going to grant over 2,000 waivers for my special interest groups, but yet you, as an American family, hardworking family, you have to comply. And then I thank the gentleman for bringing up the point that, even as the law went into effect, it's unworkable; people can't even sign up.

Do you know that the President has had over half of his deadlines he hasn't been able to meet in this law, he's had to extend them? So that's why we're fighting. Let's wait just at least a year and not force every person in this country to comply.

I'm from Missouri and I know Harry Truman, and he said, ''The buck stops here.'' The buck should stop here with the Commander in Chief when it comes to him allowing the civilians in the military to be furloughed in this country. That has got to stop.

I appreciate my colleagues who brought up this excellent, excellent point about what has happened and the travesty and the injustice and the danger that this Commander in Chief is putting our country in. It's wrong and it needs to stop.

He also needs to open up the memorials. We all understand we have differences of opinion here. We all understand we have to talk about policy. But no President ever has closed open-air memorials in this town that are open 24/7, 365 days a year. But this President has chosen to barricade not only the World War II Memorial, but also the Martin Luther King Memorial and all the others here in Washington, D.C.

□ 1930

We have learned today that they have even closed Normandy. Around the world they are closing the veterans cemeteries. This has got to stop. We can discuss the policy, but these tactics have got to change.

We want everyone in America to know tonight that Republicans, we are here willing and ready to keep working and to talk. It is time for the President and HARRY REID to negotiate, to meet with us, and to discuss our differences and come to an agreement that will result in less government—it will keep our government open though—spend less money, and protect the American people from this onerous health care law.

We can do it. The American people do it every day. We do it in our families. If we have a disagreement, we sit down and talk. My sister and I did it when we were little girls. My mom made us talk. It works.

So let's sit down, let's talk, let's work this out. Let's get our government back open, let's get all the military reinstated, let's reopen the memorials here around this country, and let's put the American people first. We can do it.

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERS of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance to hold this Special Order with some of my freshman colleagues.

I heard some discussion from yesterday, and even some tonight, and thought that it would be appropriate for some of the freshman who just got here and don't have some of the perspective that has pervaded some of the discussion, haven't been here for a lot of the most bitter battles, maybe have a little bit more of a problem-solving attitude, to give our perspective on some of these things and maybe have a constructive discussion of the government shutdown and also the debt ceiling, which I think is a very, very serious thing to discuss as part of a negotiation.

The news today in San Diego will be about the cancellation of the Miramar Air Show that was to take place this weekend. This is a great tradition for our community, an important fundraiser for military families, and really a sad casualty of the current shutdown.

I would like to start my comments by highlighting a more hidden and much more serious effect of the shutdown, just by sharing a couple of emails I received from constituents in the last 3 days. First:

> I am an engineer that has supported the Navy and Marine Corps for 26 years and have always given 100 percent to ensure that our military has the best capabilities in the world. Most of the people I work with have gone above and beyond to give the Navy and USMC our very best, especially during the many years of wartime.
>
> Due to sequestration and previous furloughs, I have already lost $10,000 of income this year and completely depleted my family's savings account. Now I am being furloughed again and this follows 3 years of frozen pay. I am worried for my wife and two young children because I cannot pay the bills if this shutdown continues.
>
> I do not blame one party or the other. I am sure they both think they are doing the right thing. But I worry that they do not know the pain they are causing for the families of dedicated and hardworking civil servants.

A second one:

> I am writing to you today concerning our government shutdown. I am an Active Duty spouse of 15 years with two children.
>
> We recently moved to Coronado from Naples, Italy. I have made several sacrifices over the years to follow my husband's career. I have always felt that my husband's job as an officer in the United States Navy was worthy of my sacrifices. I have stood proud by his side.
>
> We have moved 11 times within our 15 years of service, and as always we have budgeted our housing allowance, cost of living, and pay. Today, as I read all the negative comments on social media threads, I feel as though I have wasted 15 years of my life.
>
> I almost fell off the treadmill on the base gym this morning when it hit me: all of the holidays my husband has missed—the birthdays and the anniversaries spent alone—for what reason? For 535 of you to shut us down? Thank God I did not fall off the treadmill this morning, as now our medical staff is on furlough and the area is severely understaffed.
>
> Finally, I am a proud American and that is why I proudly work at the Naval Medical Center in San Diego as a nurse practitioner with the Department of Surgery. I have already endured one furlough. This resulted in a 20 percent pay reduction this summer. I was grateful it ended earlier than planned, but now I am furloughed with a 100 percent loss in pay. It has to stop.
>
> As a San Diego resident, I know you are aware that your mortgages are higher than most. I am also a single mother of two wonderful girls. This makes the additional furlough that much harder to swallow.
>
> Please work with your fellow Representatives to make this government shutdown end as soon as possible. It is hurting the average American much more than D.C. seems to understand.
>
> If our elected officials were forced to take a 20 percent pay reduction and have that followed by a 100 percent pay loss, I am sure the budget would be fixed. I just want to continue to do my job and would appreciate being allowed to do just that. If this continues further, I will be forced to seek other employment.
>
> My faith in our government is failing quickly. Again, please work together to end this situation.

There are stories like that from all these Federal workers. More than 800,000 Federal workers are out of work during the government shutdown. It is not just the D.C. metro area that is affected, as you've heard. From Hawaii to Georgia, workers in regions all over the country rely heavily on the Federal Government. San Diego is the seventh-ranked city with a high share of Federal employees. We have 151,000 workers—10.9 percent of our workforce is affected by this government shutdown.

Obviously, the same is true in Colorado Springs, which is number one; Virginia Beach; Honolulu; the D.C. region; Ogden-Clearfield, Utah; El Paso; Augusta, Georgia; San Diego; and Charleston. Every one of those places has thousands of stories, just like the ones I have told.

It is important for us in D.C. to remember the effect that we are having in the real world. That has often been the biggest surprise for me, that when I leave my district and I've heard these stories and I come here, and we hear that people are talking in these terms of blame and calling each other names and not really doing credit to this institution, and far from solving the problems that have gotten us here.

I have heard a lot of people say: We don't want to shut the government down. Well, we don't have to. I have heard a lot of finger-pointing about who caused it.

But the fact is that today the power to reopen this government rests solely

within the House of Representatives. We know what we have to do. We don't have to wait for the Senate, and we don't have to wait for the President. We can pass a continuing resolution, which is the resolution that funds the government only for 6 weeks or 10 weeks that the Senate has passed. We don't have to have any amendments or anything. We can do that today—or we can at least do it tomorrow—and all these people will be back to work and we can end these stories of fear and pain that are affecting our families and the businesses that they work for.

There has been a lot of yelling about attaching conditions to the continuing resolution. We have been voting on these really literally for weeks now. I am not going to add my voice to those, but I will just say that it seems that those have run their course. None of them has gotten anywhere.

I myself supported some of these conditions. In fact, earlier this year, I voted to delay the individual mandate to match the business mandate. That wasn't something that was popular in my party. I voted for that. But in the context of this continuing resolution, I supported the repeal of the medical device tax. It happens also to be one of my major legislative priorities. I think that is a bad way to fund any part of the government. That got some Democratic votes, but didn't get any support in the Senate.

Today, we got an email from the majority leader who said that ''House Republicans believe it is critical we continue to engage and offer meaningful solutions for the American people,'' which is why he said, on a bipartisan basis with a total of 57 different Democrats voting with us, we have passed bills to reopen the NIH, ensure that the National Guard and Reservists are paid, fund veterans benefits, reopen our national parks, and allow the District of Columbia to expend their local funds.

I voted for all these too. Most of my party didn't. But I thought we had one chance to open these areas up to make sure that they go back to work. It is not the best budgeting thing. I voted for them. But the point is they went nowhere. The Senate will not approve them. If the Senate approved them, the President wouldn't sign them.

So it is time to recognize that we have reached the end of this road and this is not getting us anywhere. We know that these things won't sell, we know that they won't get support in the Senate, and it is time to move on to a basic continuing resolution without amendment.

Now, I have heard people say—some of my colleagues on the other side—say: Well, we need to get something. I just point out that if you look at the numbers—and we all talk extensively about the need in general to control spending and lower our debt—the Senate approved spending until November at the Republican level.

President Obama's budget proposal was for $1.2 trillion. The Senate's budget was for $1.06 trillion, or about $2 trillion less. And the Senate approved a spending level of the continuing resolution at an annual rate of $986 billion. That is a cut of $72 billion from the Senate budget—that is 7 percent less than the Senate had proposed—and $217 billion less than the President's proposed budget, 18 percent.

So to say that you needed to get something, I think certainly at this point the Republicans have won the war over discretionary spending. Now, that is not a war that people are going to give up on. But in the continuing resolution, which we are asking to vote on, have a chance to vote on in the House, the Republicans number was the number used.

At this time, I would like to yield to my colleague from the State of Washington, DEREK KILMER, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee and also on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the good gentleman from California for organizing this time.

Far and away the most common thing said to me over the last year has been: Dear God, why on Earth would you want to be in Congress, particularly when you have two little kids and Congress is such a mess?

I will tell you, at every occasion I have responded the same way: It is because I got two little kids and Congress is a mess. I actually care about what kind of country they grow up in. I think if people who think that this is okay and sit on the sidelines, we are never going to fix it.

I will tell you, it is strange to join an organization that, according to recent polling information, is held in lower regard than head lice. Having only been here for about 9 months, I have a pretty good sense of why.

When I got here, Congress was in the process of enacting this policy of sequestration across-the-board cuts, which have had dramatic impacts in my neck of the woods where you have seen workers furloughed, cuts to critical agencies and critical services. In Kitsap County, where I serve, they have ended mental health outreach to senior citizens because of sequestration.

We have seen impacts to our region's largest employer—the United States Navy. We have seen impact after impact. If that wasn't enough, we have gone beyond—we all remember the fiscal cliff. We are now at, like, the fiscal mountain range, where we go from self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis. First, it was sequestration, then it was a government shutdown, and coming up next is the possibility that our Nation defaults on its financial obligations.

Unfortunately, Congress is earning the low regard in which citizens currently hold it.

Let me talk a little bit about the shutdown and how it affects the folks that I represent. You have heard a lot about furloughs. I have got in my district 3,500 workers at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard who are now on furlough. Just outside of my district we have Joint Base Lewis-McChord—10,000 workers have been furloughed. The largest land base in my district is Olympic National Park, which is an extraordinary tourist destination which is now closed for business—103 workers at Olympic National Park out on furlough.

But it is actually not just the impact to the Federal workforce that should concern us; it is the impact to the private economy. Before I came here I spent my professional career working in economic development. I spent 10 years working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington.

I am concerned, for example, that you are seeing a delay in the issuance of Small Business Administration loans because of a government shutdown. I am concerned that this shutdown is at a cost to taxpayers of $150 million to $300 million a day. But primarily I am concerned that, as you have seen Congress govern from crisis to crisis, that we figured the one thing that more than anything businesses want from government.

In the 10 years I worked in economic development, the thing I heard more often from employers than anything else was that they looked to government for an environment of trust and predictability. I think Congress has completely messed that up.

□ 1945

I will tell you that I don't think it has to be like this. In fact, I came out of a reasonably functional State legislature. The last three bills we passed in the Washington State Senate before I left were a balanced budget, a debt reduction proposal and a jobs bill. Out of the 49 members of the Washington State Senate, the balanced budget passed with all but two votes; the debt reduction proposal passed with all but seven votes; and the jobs bill passed with all but one. It was largely because we worked together. We didn't define ''success'' as making the other side of the aisle look like a failure.

I think, frankly, given the challenges facing our country, that gig ought to be up. We should be leading by example. We ought to be working together. We should be solving problems together. I am certainly, as one of 435, trying to do that. It means, for example, when the government shuts down and when the people whom I represent are no longer drawing paychecks, I am not either. That's why I supported a bill that many of us supported that was known as No Budget, No Pay, which said: if Congress can't pass a budget, Members of Congress shouldn't get paid.

When I served in the legislature, I knocked on 52,000 doors. The biggest change in recent years was that people were home because they were out of

work. I talked to parents who were concerned that our community's largest export was going to be our kids, and the vast majority of people I talked to actually did not give a rip about whether we get more Democratic or more Republican or move more to the left or more to the right. They just want us to stop moving backwards and to start moving forward again. So, in the brief minute I have remaining, let me talk about what I think ''forward'' ought to look like.

''Forward'' ought to look like reopening the government. End this government shutdown now. It should mean taking action to make sure our Nation doesn't default on its financial obligations, which is an act that would ensure that costs go up for our small businesses, that costs go up for our families and that everyone's retirement goes down. It means working together to ensure that we actually pass a budget, and that's going to take Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate to work together to pass a budget.

We're all freshmen up here. When we went through freshman orientation, there was a presentation on how the budget process works. The way it works is that the House passes a budget, and the Senate passes a budget. Then it goes to conference. The House passes appropriations bills, and the Senate passes appropriations bills. Then they go to conference to compromise. After about 40 minutes of presenting that, they then said, Well, that hasn't happened, though, in years.

It ought to happen. We should get that back on track. We should get this country back on track. We also need to focus on the economy.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said: ''We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day forever.'' If we think our competitor nations are participating in the frivolity that our government is currently participating in, we have another think coming. China in the last decade has doubled its number of higher education institutions. They have multiplied five-fold their number of students at colleges and universities on top of the 200,000 students who are studying abroad, primarily in fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

And what are we doing? Here we sit with a government shutdown, impeding our economic recovery, hurting our businesses in this Nation.

We can't afford this. We should stop this. We need to get people back to work, but, Madam Speaker, we need to get this Congress back to work, too. That's why all of us as freshman Members are here. We want to get this country moving forward again.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman.

You talked about how we define ''success.'' I know you and I have spoken, as have many Members, about how we can get away with what we call ''success'' here.

So what happens—and what has happened in this context, too—is that a number of things will be proposed, and they won't go anywhere. Then what will happen is a bunch of finger-pointing will come after: well, I proposed this, and I voted for it and I voted against it. Imagine if you were a CEO of a company that made a product and that you said, I created a great product, and I think you'll really like it.

It sounds great to the CEO, and the CEO says, Oh, that sounds terrific. How many did you sell?

I didn't sell any, but they really should buy it.

That's what Congress is doing. That's kind of how we define ''success'' around here: well, I stuck them with a good bill even though no one's going to vote for it. Of course, in business or in your family, you'd actually have to listen to what the other side wanted if you wanted to reach a result that was a success. That's what ''success'' would be, and I thank you for pointing that out.

I would also say, on No Budget, No Pay, which I also supported, it was the concept that, if Congress doesn't do its job, we shouldn't get a paycheck. We were proud that day when we worked together with our Republican colleagues, and we passed No Budget, No Pay. We forced the Senate, controlled by Democrats, to pass the first budget that they passed in 4 years. That's all well and good unless we actually talk together. I saw a picture this week of Mr. CANTOR and some of his colleagues waiting at a table for people to come have a conference. We've been waiting for that all year on this budget, and we came in good faith and tried to pass No Budget, No Pay. Wouldn't it be good if we could use this time or if we could use the next few weeks to sit down and actually hammer out a budget through that process, and this is the time to do it.

Before I turn it over to another colleague, I'll just remind my colleagues of the report from The Washington Post last December regarding President Obama's budget proposal back then, which said that, for the first time, he is formally proposing to trim Social Security benefits—a GOP demand that is anathema to many Democrats; that he is also offering to make meaningful reductions in Medicare benefits, including higher premiums for couples making more than $170,000 a year; and that he visited each of the caucuses earlier this year and told the House Democrats, by the way, you can't take $3 out of Medicare for every dollar you put in. He said that our corporate tax rates were too high for our companies to compete internationally.

This has been going on all year, ladies and gentlemen, with no effort to negotiate at all because it's the leadership of the Speaker here who won't appoint conferees because, apparently, they're concerned about getting it. So we waited until this moment of crisis to talk about something that you and I have been waiting for all year.

With that, I would like to yield some time to my colleague from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS) for the opportunity this evening to talk about civility, to talk about coming together and finding common ground and, most importantly, to talk about getting things done.

I first ran for Congress because our Congress here, our government, was mired in dysfunction, and I truly felt that our country needs our help. I want to say that I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are new Members of Congress, including the gentlelady in the chair, share that concern. We have found common ground on a number of issues. I was very proud to work with another freshwoman, Mrs. WALORSKI, to pass a bill unanimously in this House to help victims of medical, sexual trauma. We came together, and we got 110 bipartisan sponsors, so I know that what we bring to this august body is the ability to find common ground.

Then, as now, my goal is to bring people together. These are commonsense solutions. My colleague Mr. PETERS has just reiterated discussions that have been going on in various rooms in this building—from the White House to Capitol Hill—throughout this year about entitlement reform, about tax reform, about controlling spending, but, most importantly, about providing the services that people across this country need from our government.

I come from New Hampshire, the Granite State. We are frugal people, and New Hampshire families don't need more bickering in Washington. They need real solutions to grow the economy, to foster job creation and to expand opportunity for the middle class. That's what they sent me here to do. One of my staffers said to me today that, after the week we've just had, you can't fix the roof when it's pouring out by plugging up just a few holes.

We've got to come together and solve the whole problem; and I, for one, know that we can do it. I know that we actually have the votes in this body right now to come together and take that vote, a bipartisan vote, to get the country and our government opening again.

Honestly, Granite State families don't expect Congress to agree on everything. We don't. We have significant differences. Some of them are religious. Some of them are political. Some of them come from our backgrounds and our life experiences. We have real disagreements on issues of significant importance to our country, but they do expect us to work together when we can find areas of agreement. We cannot have cooperation without open dialogue. That's what we're asking for here tonight—civility—which is a common theme, and coming together and creating dialogue, especially now.

This is the moment for which we ran for Congress. Our government is lurching from crisis to crisis, and what the American people expect and need from their leaders is to come together and find that common ground, to work across the aisle, break the gridlock, end the shutdown, take this bipartisan vote, and restore services for the people we represent and get our country and government working again. We won't get this done solely with Democratic ideas or Republican ideas. Frankly, I don't care if an idea is proposed by a Republican or a Democrat. If it's a commonsense solution to the problems we face, let's support it.

In New Hampshire, here is how we get things done. I've been making calls all week back to my district as we've been here, voting, to find out what is the impact of the Federal Government shutdown and what I can do to help. So I've talked to mayors all across my district. Let me tell you that these are real people's real lives, and it's going to cause serious pain. I called a small town up north, near the Canadian border. It is a paper mill town. They've lost thousands of jobs in this community.

So I asked the mayor, What is it that's happening on the ground there?

He started to tell me about a woman who works for the United States Department of Agriculture, and what she does is help with rural economic development. She helps with small business loans.

He said, She's not at work—she has been furloughed—and there are eight small business applications sitting on her desk.

Now, this is a small town. If there are eight small businesses in this town that won't get those loans and can't create new jobs, that's a problem.

Because this is the kind of person he is and this is the kind of town it is, he said, And she is a single mom without a paycheck.

He wanted me to know that.

Then I talked with mayors of big cities and smaller towns. I talked to businesses. I wanted to understand what's the impact on the business community. Now, I've talked to lots of Federal employees this week, and I've talked to their unions, and I have tremendous compassion for the folks who have been sent home, but I want my colleagues across the aisle to understand the impact on our economy.

So, today, I was talking to large employers. These are government contractors. They're vendors. They build things, and they provide services for our military, for IT—for everything that we use in this country to keep us safe and to keep us strong. They said thousands of jobs will be lost; and if you read the headlines today, we have already lost thousands.

I know that, with civility and trust and mutual respect, we can resolve these tired, partisan battles and that we can renew our focus on what really matters: fostering job creation, making smart spending cuts, taking the responsibility to reduce the deficit, encouraging innovation, growing the economy, growing opportunity for the middle class. With a little more civility in the Halls of Congress, I am confident that we can resolve this crisis and redouble our focus on our shared priorities.

Finally, I spoke with our Governor. Our Governor, Maggie Hassan, said to me, Annie, tell them how we get this done in New Hampshire.

We have a Democratic Governor and a Democratic House and a Republican Senate. It sounds familiar. It's a little bit twisted from what we have here in Washington, but it's the same effect. It's a divided government. Yet, in New Hampshire, we don't see it as a divided government. We see it as an opportunity to reach across the aisle and to bring people together and find common ground.

She said, Remind them that we have just passed a budget in New Hampshire that was unanimous in the Republican Senate, virtually unanimous in the Democratic House, signed by the Democratic Governor and, most importantly for all here in Washington, it was a balanced budget. The revenues and the expenditures were equal.

□ 2000

That's what I'm talking about here today. Come together and have the discussion about how to get our fiscal house in order, how to create jobs, and how to provide opportunity.

Finally, I'm going to close with a phone call that I got this week, SCOTT, that made a tremendous difference in my perspective on this. It was a crackly line coming into my office. A young intern answered the phone. When she could finally understand the speaker on the other end of the line, he said, This is Joe. I'm calling from Afghanistan.

He is a soldier in Afghanistan, and he's there to serve our country. He said, I am here working hard for my family and my country, and I want you to do the same.

The message that Joe had for me is that he wants affordable, accessible health care for his family and for families all across New Hampshire and all across this country. He said, Do not give up on that, but you have got to open this government.

People need the help that they deserve. Our economy needs the strength and the vitality. We can't leave thousands of people without their jobs, without their pay. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to please bring this vote to the floor. We can pass this with a bipartisan vote, and we can move our country forward.

I thank the gentleman from California for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire. Again, you're absolutely right. All we have to do to get this started again is to put the Senate resolution before this House. We could vote on that tomorrow, and the government would be open immediately thereafter. I think obviously that's what we would all like to do.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. PETERS) for organizing this important discussion this evening and reminding all Americans how important it is to end this ridiculous and disgraceful shutdown we're in right now.

The damage this manufactured crisis is causing is unacceptable. I've heard daily from hundreds of my constituents who have already felt the pain from the shutdown over the past 4 days. They all express the same sentiment: Enough already. I share this frustration.

I received a letter today from a local Navy veteran, and it particularly stood out to me. I just want to share a brief part of this story that I read.

> I'm a recently discharged veteran of the U.S. Navy.
>
> During the 5 years I served, I was told continually that when I left the service behind, I would be taken care of, and I believed that implicitly. Well, I couldn't have been more wrong.
>
> Since I was discharged over 2 months ago, I've struggled to get unemployment and find work. I am currently receiving VA disability for service-connected injuries, or at least I was before the government shut down yesterday.
>
> I rely on my disability to survive, and now I don't even know when the next payment will arrive. To complicate matters further, I've attempted to start up school and use my GI benefits only to find out that the VA will run out of money by the end of this month if the shutdown continues. So no more disability or education benefits, benefits I've earned, benefits I got for sacrificing 5 of the best years of my life for. So, essentially, I paid into this program, made sacrifices too numerous to count, was deployed around the world twice in support of the global war on terrorism, and now I come to find out all of that amounts to nothing.
>
> This shutdown has negatively impacted my life more than I ever thought possible. The mere fact that veterans benefits were even on the table as part of the shutdown is an outrage in itself. Have we not done enough? What more do I need to sacrifice? We have a hard enough time surviving overseas, and this is the treatment we come home to, our own government shutting down and unable to take care of us.
>
> I plan on applying for food stamps soon. I never dreamed my life would come to this, especially after serving my country. But, hey, I guess that's what our government has come to.
>
> Please do whatever it takes to end this shutdown.

Well, Joshua, I never dreamed it would come to this either, that our Nation would be willing to break its promise to the brave men and women like you over partisan games.

I called Joshua today to let him know that I, too, am appalled and that I am here fighting for him, alongside my colleagues, alongside our Nation's veterans, seniors, and all Americans who have had enough, enough of the shutdown, enough of the games,

enough of these manufactured crises. That is why I'm leading efforts urging leadership to immediately vote on reopening the government. Our fragile economy cannot afford one more day of this disgraceful shutdown, and neither can veterans such as Joshua.

I urge the House to pass a clean spending bill immediately and put an end to this nonsensical shutdown.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I guess it is cold comfort to Joshua to hear that the House has been voting on these piecemeal approaches. I'm not saying that they were ill-motivated. Many of us supported them, but they're not working. It is time for us to learn the lesson, I believe, and I agree with you. Put the Senate resolution on the floor and open this government back up, and we can do our work in Congress that we were sent to do and we were paid to do without stopping the government. I think those comments were very well put, and I thank the gentleman.

The other thing we heard about, in addition to we need to get something or we need to sit down and talk, is the idea that we have to repeal or do away with the health care law. I would just say this about being a freshman. We weren't here for these votes. None of us cast a vote either way on the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, but we heard a lot of questions about it and we took those questions very seriously. Most of us said we should try to fix them, but we're also realistic.

We've seen that the health care law was passed by Congress a few years ago, signed by the President; it was okayed by the Supreme Court, and it survived a number of additional repeal votes here in the House of Representatives. It appears that it's here to be with us to stay. It's been rolling out with mixed reports this week, but I think in many places people are finding hope that they can get affordable health care. Clearly, we have more work to do, and I stand here willing to help fix the Affordable Care Act to the extent we need it.

I've expressed my own concern about the medical device tax. I think that's something that should be repealed. There are others, like the Cadillac tax. I think we should provide new incentives for wellness. I think we should get out of the way of technology and encourage technology as an approach to lower costs. I'm willing to get to work on that.

That law took a long time to pass. It was very contentious. Those problems won't be solved to the satisfaction of the Congress or to the completion of the task within the time we're talking about while shutting the government down, so let's get to work and not hold the government up for that.

My final observation about this shutdown is that I feel I'm reminded of when I practiced law and I tried cases. I liked having a case with a good lawyer on the other side, because a good lawyer knew where he or she was going, and you could tell kind of what the strategy was and where you were going to end up. I feel, in this case, like I'm trying a case against a lawyer who is inexperienced or doesn't know what he's doing in the sense that I can't figure out where he's going. I'm hoping that if there is some resolution that can happen, we would love to be a part of it. I think it starts with passing the continuing resolution that the Senate passed and getting this government open right now.

I would like to close with a few comments on the other issue that we haven't gotten to, but I think it concerns me greatly. That's the debt ceiling. It's one thing to argue over the continuing resolution—we've been talking about that—and shutting down the government. That's a bad thing. It's something I hope we'll end soon. As I said before, it's something that's entirely within our power to do without the help of the Senate or the President. We just vote for that resolution that the Senate passed, and the government would be open tomorrow.

I hear talk about the debt ceiling as though it's the same thing. It is not. The debt ceiling is a dangerous tactic for negotiation. It's bad business, it's bad economics, and it's bad government.

First, I'd start by talking about what it's like to do business in this way, and it occurs to me that my parents must be asking themselves about the people who would play with the debt ceiling, Who raised these people?

What we're doing here with the debt ceiling, talking about not paying our debts, it's like getting the credit card bill, opening it up and seeing how much you bought, and deciding at that point, Well, no, I've got to control spending. I don't want to pay this. That's too late to have the discussion.

I remember my parents—my father is a minister. My mom stayed home, worked part time to help us with college. I have vivid memories of them laying out the bills on the dining room table to make sure they could figure out their cash flow, how they were going to pay each bill, what day of the month each bill was due. They made every payment because they always taught me about making sure you kept good credit. We know now about credit scores and how important it is to be on time, and families all over the country understand that kind of approach. For us to take this approach that we're not going to pay the debts that we've incurred is just the wrong way to do business, and it's terrible economics.

The Treasury reported this week:

> With the government likely to exhaust its cash reserves around October 17, the Treasury said being forced into nonpayment of any of its obligations—and in particular, its debt—would spark turmoil in the financial markets and possibly send the country back to recession as deep as that of 2008 and 2009.

We know we've been coming out of that, but very slowly. We don't want to go back there.

> In the event that a debt limit impasse were to lead to a default, it could have a catastrophic effect not just on financial markets but also on job creation, consumer spending, and economic growth.
>
> Credit markets could freeze, the value of the dollar could plummet, U.S. interest rates could skyrocket, the negative spillovers could reverberate around the world, and there might be a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse.

This is not some political statement. This is what we're hearing from The Wall Street Journal, from the banking community, from the financial sector. They're saying stay away from this. CNNMoney said:

> Forget the current government shutdown. Economists say it's the upcoming debt ceiling impasse that could plunge the Nation into a recession.
>
> About half of the 22 economists surveyed by CNNMoney say a recession will be unavoidable if Congress fails to raise the Nation's debt ceiling before the Treasury runs out of cash later this month.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's not get to that point.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot mess with the debt ceiling. The government shutdown is bad enough. We're kind of playing around the edges. I urge that we put the Senate resolution before the House so we can vote on it and open this government tomorrow. Let us not touch, let us not play with the notion, let us not suggest to anyone that America won't pay the debts it's incurred.

Finally, from an article called ''After the Shutdown'' posted by James Surowiecki, I just offer this—he is speaking in partisan terms, but anyone who thinks this I think it applies to:

> This is why the Republican approach to the debt ceiling is not, as people like Zeke J. Miller of Time have argued, the kind of hostage-taking that's a ''standard way of doing business in Washington.'' This is really an attempt to remake the legislative process itself and to do so by threatening to do something—default—that no one, including the people making the threat, believes to be in the best interest of the United States. We can't be sure of exactly what would happen if the U.S. stopped paying its bills, but at the very least it would lead to havoc in the bond market and the financial system (which depends on U.S. treasuries as risk-free collateral), higher interest rates, and an immediate hit to economic growth. It's not a road that anyone should want to go down.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is not a road we should even be considering going down. As bad as the continuing resolution is and the fight over the shutdown, I know that just behind us is a much more dangerous prospect, and I want to warn of that.

Finally, I suggest to folks that I have offered two bills that would provide an alternative and would help us deal with the national debt. They would work very simply. When debt was declining as a percentage of the economy, which means we have it under control, the debt ceiling would adjust without a vote, payments would go out; and when debt started to increase as a percentage of the economy, which means we're

not having it under control—we all understand that long-term debt can't continue to rise as a percentage of the economy without hurting our economic future. In that case, we need a mechanism to do something more than just yell at each other and call each other names, which I know the freshmen that were with me tonight are still amazed that that's what happens here, but that's what happens way too often.

□ 2015

We need a mechanism to force a discussion of really how to manage the debt. And our bill would provide that, if we are in the condition where debt's rising as a percentage of GDP and the President and the leaders of Congress didn't do anything about it, which is a condition we find ourselves in today, then individual Members, Mr. Speaker, would be able to propose their own measures without the blessing of leadership but with the sponsorship of only 50 of their colleagues to force a discussion on how to manage that debt and get it under control. Now that's just one idea. But at this point, I think it's the only idea on the table to actually avoid this in a constructive way.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to offer some thoughts on these issues with my colleagues. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about ObamaCare, as most people call it. It's just difficult after the hundreds of stories we're getting from back home—not just me, but so many Members of Congress. It's just hard to call it the ''Affordable Care Act'' when we're hearing from so many that are saying, it's so very unaffordable.

It was interesting, so many members of the media were chomping at the bit to find somebody who was able to get online and sign up for ObamaCare successfully. They grabbed a young man, Chad Henderson. He talked Thursday about his Internet experience, applying for insurance through the Affordable Care Act, through the Web site. So he was kind of a media icon.

Gee, this young 21-year-old kid, this young man from Georgia got right on, and signed up for ObamaCare. Then we find the rest of the story. So many were using his story. Oh, Chad Henderson. He got signed up very easily.

But here's a story by Kate Harrison today, on Friday, that says:

> A day after a 21-year-old Flintstone, Georgia, man became the subject of national media attention—including a front page Times Free Press story—for being one of the first Americans to actually get through ObamaCare's glitchy Web site and enroll for coverage, he acknowledged that he hadn't completed that process.
>
> Amidst the initial publicity, Chad Henderson was hailed by supporters of the Affordable Care Act as an example of the new system working and was attacked by those against the law for buying into the plan and for being a volunteer for Organized for Action, a nonprofit promoting President Barack Obama's agenda.
>
> Today, a libertarian magazine, Reason, called Henderson's account into question after a conversation with Henderson's father, who said that he and his son had not actually bought a plan off of the ObamaCare site yet.
>
> In an interview today with the Times Free Press, Chad Henderson confirmed that he hadn't actually purchased a plan, but he insisted he hadn't lied. He said the confusion was in the wording.
>
> ''I never actually said I purchased a plan,'' he said. ''I said that I submitted an application, and so I enrolled. I haven't actually paid for a plan, though I found one that I liked. I never meant to mislead anyone.''
>
> When he first talked with the Times Free Press on Thursday, Chad Henderson said he had ''picked'' a bronze plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia that had a premium between $175 and $200. He said that the specific plan fit into his budget, though he wished it covered more.
>
> In his initial tweet, Henderson said ''Enrolled in #ObamaCare just now! Looking forward to having affordable health care for the first time!''
>
> Today, Henderson said he stood by those comments, but repeated that he never specifically said he had purchased a plan.

Then Ace of Spades apparently does a lot of online looking and comes up with some interesting things. He posts this today:

> Chad Henderson actually disclosed that he was a partisan paid to post ''advocacy things'' on social media.

So who's the bad guy here? Chad Henderson was not coy about his passionate support of Barack Obama or his volunteer (?) position with OFA. And here he says, ''Something you should know about me,'' and then discloses he's paid to post advocacy stuff.

And then it has an inset where the following is quoted from his posting:

> I'm often labeled ''the guy who always talks about politics.'' And it normally has negative affects LOL. So I'm here to clear things up. If you were to hang out with me one night, you'll see I'm not that obsessed with politics at all. Yes, I do post political stuff on here and other social networking sites, but it's for good reason. For one, I think it's good if people get some insight into the world they live in. Secondly, I work for an organization that pays me quarterly to post the political stuff as advocacy. So it's kind of my job.

It's kind of the way it seems things go around here. You have people with the Tea Party who seem to have one thing in common—they all pay income tax. Different races, age, national origin. I've met people at Tea Parties from countries all over the world, as I've been around the country. They pay income tax. They want the government to be responsible.

And as we've been out each day to the World War II Memorial, where somebody in the administration thought it would be cute to make veterans suffer, would create a good visual image of how much suffering, since they knew 21 out of 21 stories by the mainstream media would blame the Republicans, which they did. I thought, Wow, if they will all blame the Republicans even though they appointed negotiators, ask us to just negotiate, we wouldn't negotiate. We told them we wouldn't negotiate because we knew the mainstream media would blame everybody on the Republican side so we could do whatever we wanted. So let's create as much pain in this country as we possibly can because the mainstream media will help us ensure that the American people are duped into believing Republicans are to blame.

So this was the game from the beginning. There were no paid veterans out there from World War II to see the memorial that was constructed to them. They were out there hoping to roll in their wheelchairs down the granite open sidewalks, around the outdoor open air memorial that was constructed in such a way it would never have to be closed, that it could be open 24/7.

And I can tell you, I've been down there all hours of the day and night—10 p.m., 10 a.m., 2 a.m., 4 a.m. And no, I don't drink. I just go down there sometimes with folks to see the memorials that were constructed for America. And most of the time, I don't see any park rangers, no Park Service people.

But someone in this administration, some people in this administration thought it would be really cute to put barricades up at the World War II Memorial, the open air granite sidewalk, open 24/7 without guards most of the time, that would be cute. Because that would really play well in the media.

Then we find out, as protesters came down there as we were getting some more veterans in this week, Patrick Poole, a reporter, had his camera going when he saw these protesters, these union protesters coming, protesting supposedly because they're Federal workers who were put out of a job and are out there protesting, demanding Republicans get them back to work.

When one with a McDonald's employee shirt on was asked about—they saw the McDonald's shirt, Patrick said, How much are you getting paid to come protest? And he says into the camera, $15. Well, it took an SEIU supervisor, who must have put the whole thing together, to come running over eventually to explain, Oh, but he works as a franchisee in a museum. He was not a Federal worker. He worked for McDonald's, and he got paid $15 to go protest down where these World War II veterans in wheelchairs were just trying to enjoy a moment which for so many of them was very poignant, very emotional as they thought about their time in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, fighting for freedom in lands so far from home.

To some, it's a game. We heard the leak from the administration that, Why would we bring this shutdown to an end in this Obama administration when we're winning, as if it were a game.

People know that right here at this podium, I have criticized Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. Let me tell you, he had it right today when he said, This is not a game. You're playing with people's lives. But apparently, it's a game to some.

In the Organizing for America, the new-found ACORN that's gotten all this money to support the President's agenda, they're organizing, they're lobbying like crazy and, apparently, paying people to come protest and create havoc where some World War II vets are just trying to observe their memorial. It's not a game to them.

It's apparently a game to some in this administration who are not satisfied to close the Normandy Cemetery. We heard from some from Texas who had been scraping their money together because they knew the patriarch of their family may not have long—certainly would not have another chance in his life to go back to Normandy, where he fought, where his friends died. They scraped together money and got him over there only to find that whoever it is in this administration—and it starts at the top, and it stops at the top—but whoever made the call decided, let's inflict emotional pain and suffering not only on the World War II vets—that will look good because the Republicans will be blamed—but how about over in Normandy. People get clear! Oh, yes, that will be great, won't it?

Because the mainstream media, they'll blame Republicans. And then they'll be furious at them. And just like whoever it was in the administration today that said, You know, why would we stop the shutdown? We're winning. They think they're winning when Americans travel before the end of their lives to see where they fought for liberty and their friends died for liberty and their friends are buried there. Some kind of game. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

Here's a report from Todd Starnes today entitled, ''Catholic Priests in Military Face Arrest for Celebrating Mass'':

> The U.S. military has furloughed as many as 50 Catholic chaplains due to the partial suspension of government services, banning them from celebrating weekend mass. At least one chaplain was told that if he engaged in any ministry activity, he would be subjected to disciplinary action.

□ 2030

Archbishop Timothy Broglio of the Archdiocese said:

> In very practical terms, it means Sunday mass won't be offered. If someone has a baptism scheduled, it won't be celebrated.

They were told they cannot function because those are contracted services and since there's no funding, they can't do it even if they volunteer.

John Schlageter, general counsel for the archdiocese, said any furloughed priest volunteering their services could face big trouble. He said:

> During the shutdown, it is illegal for them to administer on base and they risk being arrested if they attempt to do so.

Look, one thing we know for sure about the military, the Commander in Chief is in charge. And I know there are a lot of distractions, but somebody needs to get word to the Commander in Chief that his military members are not going to be allowed to get to mass if they are Catholic and their Catholic priest has been told that he can be arrested if he shows up on post because the Commander in Chief can give an order and that's gone, and every Catholic priest that wishes to volunteer that has got clearance will be back on that post or base to provide mass.

For goodness sake, we have more suicides in our military now than at any time in the history of the country. You might have thought that would have been at Valley Forge. But, no, it's now and in this time in this country's history. Good grief, Mr. President, let the Catholic masses go. Rescind the order that you won't even let them volunteer there. They are people that are serving this President, Mr. Speaker, that deserve to have the comfort of their spiritual ministers.

My friends here, I respect and I really do, I appreciated their comments because as they've indicated they're freshmen and they are new. They talked about the Democrats and they talked about to get budget conferees. Wow, after all these years, the Senate finally passes an unrealistic budget, after the President waited longer than any other time and violated the law to get a budget out, and he put it out at a time when it was past time to be helpful. We are way beyond budgets at this time.

The Federal Government in this country is in a new year fiscally, so budgets are not what does it now. Now we are into appropriations; and before the shutdown we had a bill that after three compromises were offered, we said, okay, here's our negotiators, all you have to do, HARRY REID, appoint negotiators and we can have this done by morning and the people in the country won't even have to know. At least send negotiators. And as we have found out today, the administration does not want to end the shutdown because they believe they are winning this game while real people are suffering.

I heard my friend, my heart went out to Joshua, a military member who was in the military for 5 years, 1 year longer than I served, and he couldn't find a job, and now he's told his benefits are about to end at the end of the month if the government is still shut down. He can't find a job, and he may have to apply for food stamps.

Well, I would think my Democratic colleagues would come and say, you know what, ObamaCare clearly has done damage, just as the economists have said it would, and it has, and businesses have repeatedly told us it was going to create havoc in the workplace, and it has. And we have ongoing reports of businesses, because of ObamaCare, having to lay off full-time employees and put them to part-time so that they can continue to be competitive and stay in business. And some have said even doing that because of ObamaCare, they are going to be crushed. They may not make the year in business. So, yes, our hearts go out to Joshua. Let's at least stop ObamaCare for a year. It isn't working, and it has got people not working, and it is costing people more than they ever dreamed it would cost.

Here's another from one of my constituents:

> I just ran quotes for one of my insurance clients in Marshall, a family of four. I was shocked when their premiums were not lower than their current rate. President Obama said insurance rates would go down $2,500 per year in one of his many speeches in the past. I have to quote one of my heroes and one of your fellow Congressmen who said ''You lie.'' Please note a $2,121.12 increase for this family if they change their insurance to an approved ObamaCare plan for 2014.

So that's about a $4,600 swing wrong from what the President said.

This says:

> I did not attend Harvard, but I can add and subtract. This family's current cost is $706 per month. The new and improved government-approved plan is $882.76 per month, and this is the lowest price for this family.

He goes on. It's a lengthy letter. He's obviously upset for clients who are not going to keep the same insurance at the same rate. We have heard from so many who have lost their doctor, lost their insurance.

Here's another. This one has quotes from a letter he got.

''Dear Paul.'' It has his full name. He's another one of my constituents.

> Thank you for trusting Anthem with your health plan. We recently sent you a letter explaining how you can continue your coverage with us. If you've already chosen to change your policy effective date and extend your coverage through December 1, 2014, then we'd like to thank you for your continued patronage. You can disregard the message below. However, if you have not decided on your health plan for the coming year, you need to know that your current plan is being discontinued. Starting January 1, 2014, we're no longer able to offer or renew your plan because it doesn't meet the requirements of the new health care reform laws. Your new plan, Anthem Core DirectAccess, is available at $224.25 per month.

Paul says:

> I currently have a plan that costs me $65 a month, and I have a $5,000 deductible. It just covers me. The new plan with the same benefits is 3.45 times what I am currently paying.

He's pretty upset so I won't read everything he says. But he says:

> My wife and I now have to make rather large sacrifices to raise the extra $1,908 so we can keep a plan that is already mediocre.

I won't read the rest of that. He's pretty upset.

We got another insight into the strategy. Here's a story from Wesley Pruden:

> The games politicians play: Barack Obama is having a lot of fun using the government shutdown to squeeze the public in imaginative ways. The point of the shutdown game is to see who can squeeze hardest, make the

most pious speech and listen for the applause. It is a variation on the grade school ritual of ''you show me yours, I'll show you mine.''

President Obama is not a bad poker player, but the man with all the chips always starts with the advantage and he gets all of the aces. He has closed Washington down as tight as he dares, emphasizing the trivial and the petty in making life as inconvenient as he can for the greatest number. It's all in a noble cause, of course. Access to most memorials is limited and often in curious ways. The Lincoln Memorial is easy to reach, with the streets around it remaining open. But the Martin Luther King Memorial is made difficult to reach, relegating it, you might say, to the back of the bus. Not very nice.

The Park Service appears to be closing streets on mere whim and caprice. The rangers even closed the parking lot at Mount Vernon where the plantation home of George Washington is a favorite tourist destination. That was after they barred the new World War II Memorial on the Mall to veterans of World War II, but the government does not own Mount Vernon; it is privately owned by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. The ladies bought it years ago to preserve it as a national memorial. The Feds closed access to the parking lots this week even though the lots are jointly owned with the Mount Vernon ladies. The rangers are from the government, and they're only here to help. ''It's a cheap way to deal with the situation,'' an angry Park Service rangers says of the harassment. ''We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. Its disgusting.''

So for somebody here in Washington at least who is giving park rangers orders to make life as difficult as possible, it is a game. There was a time in America when we had a President, we had Congress Members who would encourage people in this country that there was always a way to make something happen. And the volunteer spirit across this land made us the envy of the world because people volunteered. We could do anything. And yet people around Washington have seen just what the park ranger said. They've been told make things as difficult as possible. So here is a playground in Washington, D.C., that never has a Federal officer there supervising it I'm told by people whose children play their constantly, but they found a need to go lock it up and somebody spent a bunch of money all over this town printing up new things to emphasize not just closed, I'm sure they have plenty of closed signs they could use, oh, no, we have to print up all new signs that say because of the Federal Government shutdown, this National Park Service facility is closed. And they're putting it in places that isn't even National Park Service facilities.

Well, they're following their orders. They're making life as difficult as they can for as many as they can.

Here's another: ''Because of the Federal Government shutdown, all national parks are closed,'' and this one is at the World War II Memorial. See the wide open sidewalks. They're made of granite. They're not going to hurt them. I can tell you, there are enough veterans, there are enough people, those of us who have served, we're not going to let people deface this. Yes, it is possible somebody could sneak down there in the night and do that. And I can tell you they could sneak down there and do it at night even with the barricades. So the only people that barricades like this stop are people like our World War II veterans in wheelchairs because somebody has given the order, the disgusting order, to make life as difficult as possible for as many people as possible, maybe they'll blame, they will surely blame the Republicans, even though we're the ones who refused to even appoint negotiators to negotiate, as called for in the Constitution, the law, and the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate. I didn't like the idea of appointing conferees. It was basically a capitulation. All right, all right, you didn't like our compromises, here's our people to compromise. You don't have to worry, I wasn't one of those that Speaker BOEHNER appointed, and you wouldn't even appoint people to come sit down and talk about it.

Instead, rushing around all over the place, shutting places like the Moore Park, the Moore family farm that has been around since George Washington days in the 1700s. It hasn't taken a Federal dime since 1980.

□ 2045

They sent park rangers over to Virginia Tuesday to run the McLean Chamber of Commerce out of the farm, costing the farm money, costing the Chamber all kinds of headaches as they tried to relocate, for no reason other than what we have learned is someone gave the order to make life as difficult as you can.

So this farm that really gets a lot of business in fall—this is their prime time—the director says they have lost $20,000 because they rented barricades to put up to block a park that doesn't get a dime of Federal money.

People all over the country are finding the same thing. And it's time it stopped. This is not a game. Let's help Americans for a change.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 6 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO H.J. RES. 85, NATIONAL EMERGENCY AND DISASTER RECOVERY ACT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregate budget levels and committee allocations set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as deemed in effect by H. Res. 243. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays for provisions designated as disaster relief, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, contained in H.J. Res. 85, the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. For purposes of such Act, these revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as included in the levels of the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 25 and H. Rept. 113–17, as adjusted.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year	
	2014	2014–2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,761,492	[1]
Outlays	2,811,568	[1]
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:		
Budget Authority	6,079	[1]
Outlays	230	[1]
Revenues	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,767,571	[1]
Outlays	2,811,798	[1]
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015-2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	966,924
OT	1,117,675
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	92,289
OT	48,010
Adjustment for OMB Correction to BCA Spending Caps:	
BA	549
OT	308
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:	
BA	6,079
OT	230
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,065,841
OT	1,166,223
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3226. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule —

Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1141; Airspace No. 12-ASW-12] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Commerce, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0269; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-3] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Bryant AAF, Anchorage, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0433; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-5] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacles Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30911; Amdt. No. 3546] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30912; Amdt. No. 3547] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30910; Amdt. No. 3545] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30909; Amdt. No. 3544] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0164; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-17513; AD 2013-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3234. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0638; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-026-AD; Amendment 39-17519; AD 2013-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3235. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0623; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17516; AD 2013-14-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243. A bill to provide support for K-12 teacher professional development programs at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to provide support for organizations to promote the Manufacturing Skills Certification System; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a maximum threshold for episode reimbursement to skilled home health agencies under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that all civilian and contractor employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are paid in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for operations of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Res. 372. A resolution providing for the consideration of legislation to reopen the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 3245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WATT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 32: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 274: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 366: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 460: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 494: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 508: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 541: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 562: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 647: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 685: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 728: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 784: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 812: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 855: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 863: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 920: Mr. ENYART, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 952: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SIRES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1015: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1187: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1252: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1429: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1620: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1652: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1677: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1725: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1731: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1750: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1751: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1771: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1803: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1814: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1884: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2001: Mr. HANNA and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2182: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2241: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2288: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2385: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2480: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2504: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2509: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2548: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2591: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2675: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2694: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2727: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2839: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2866: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2907: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2911: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2939: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3040: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3086: Mr. RADEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3090: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3097: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3108: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3118: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 3121: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3142: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3150: Mr. ENYART and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3151: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 3160: Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3163: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 3179: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3223: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3224: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3232: Mr. LANCE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. VELA, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3236: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3239: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3241: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSS.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 56: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H. Res. 97: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 247: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 348: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 355: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 365: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. TONKO.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2013 No. 136

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for the many mercies You extend to us each day. Lord, we are grateful for our law enforcement agents and first responders and pray that we may emulate their patriotism and self-sacrifice. May we go beyond applause in expressing our gratitude but make decisions that will ensure their timely and fair compensation.

Today, give our lawmakers the vision and the willingness to see and do Your will. Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism. Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

DECORUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the suggestion in the prayer of Admiral Black, I want to take a few minutes to talk about Senate decorum, Senate procedure. This is constructive criticism for the entire Senate and self-criticism for me.

I think we have all here in the Senate kind of lost the aura of Robert Byrd, who was such a stickler for Senate procedure. I think we have all let things get away from us a little bit. The Senate is a very special place with very particular rules. These rules help to keep debate among Senators civil, even when we are discussing matters in which Senators completely disagree.

One of those rules concerns how we address each other here in the Senate. The practice we observe is that when Senators speak, they address themselves only to the Presiding Officer, through the Chair to the Senator from Missouri, or whatever the case might be.

When Senators refer to other Senators—this is something we all have to listen to—whether those other Senators are in the Chamber or not, Senators must address and refer to each other in the third person and through the Chair. Thus, Senators should refer to the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Nevada or the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the President pro tempore or the manager of the bill.

Senators should avoid using other Senators' first names. Senators should avoid addressing other Senators directly as ''you.'' These rules are a little unusual, but they have been in place here for a couple of centuries. As people would generally talk directly to other people if they are in the same room with each other, they are a little unusual, because that is how we address one another.

But the Senate rules preserve distance—a little distance, not a lot of distance, but distance. So Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely to talk about personalities. I think all of us—that is why I said I am directing a little self-criticism here. I think we all have to understand that these rules create a little bit of distance so Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely talk about personalities. If we do that, we maintain more civil decorum as a result. So I bring this matter to the attention of Senators, because we have fallen out of this habit. It has gotten worse the last month or so. I will work harder. I hope my Senators will work their best to maintain these habits of civility and decorum going forward.

The Parliamentarians and Presiding Officers have all been directed to make sure we do a better job of following the basic rules of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every day Members of Congress come to work at the U.S. Capitol. I said some of this yesterday afternoon, but because of the melee, the death and destruction outside the Capitol, the sound system did not work, so I want to make sure that people understand a few things about how I feel about the Capitol Police force.

Members of Congress come to work here, and we come with 16,000 staff people. We are here with millions of tourists every year. These good men and women, most of whom are in uniform, but not all of them are, are here to keep us, members of our staff, and the public safe from harm.

Yesterday's events were a sobering reminder of that fact. I spoke yesterday afternoon, shortly after the incident, to Brian Carter, a 23-year veteran of the Capitol Police force who was hurt during yesterday's incident. I talked to police officers whom I came in contact with over the last 16 hours

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

or so. I said: Do you know Brian? Almost everyone knows him. Almost everyone said the same exact thing: What a fine man.

As I spoke to him yesterday—he is expected to make a recovery—I wished him and his family the best during this difficult time for him and for all of us. I wish a speedy recovery to the Secret Service agent who was also injured yesterday.

But I thought the most memorable thing we had in our short telephone conversation was, he said: My job is to keep you safe. He was not referring to me, even though he and I were on the phone. He meant his job was to make sure everyone is safe. That was something I will always remember.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day, Capitol Police, other law enforcement agencies who work here in the Capitol. Why do they do that? Because that is their job.

So my thanks go out to every Capitol Police officer. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. I want to remind everyone listening that yesterday and today, the Capitol remains closed to most business. The Federal Government remains closed. In the newspaper today, it lists all of the layoffs. Today it has a graph of those in the administration area—not the legislative or judicial but in the administration. We have tens of thousands of public servants who are not furloughed, but they are working, including law enforcement officials, without pay. A number of people yesterday were out there risking their lives without pay. There are hundreds of thousands more, such as intelligence officers, to keep the Nation safe, who have been forced to leave their jobs, forgo their paychecks altogether.

Because of these furloughs, the Capitol Police, the FBI, and other Federal law enforcement agencies face additional risk, as they are asked to do their jobs with limited manpower and without the support they can typically depend on.

Congress owes it to them and to every American family to get past our differences, work through our disagreements, and work toward reopening the Federal Government. It is hard to comprehend what is going on. This is all because of President Obama's signature legislative issue that we were so fortunate to pass, to allow all Americans to have health care, as is the case in every industrialized nation in the world except our Nation.

We have as many as 45 million or 50 million people with no health insurance. I would hope my Republican colleagues understand the bill is 4 years old, it has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, it is in effect. Millions of people have gone on line this week to find out what they can do to have health insurance.

Mr. LEAHY. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

(Ms. HIRONO assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the leader has noted a number of times that a small group in the House of Representatives has held up and closed the government because they want to do away with what they call ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. So my question to the Senator is, in all of these discussions they have had, the 40 times they voted, have they ever once come up with an alternative piece of legislation that would provide for your children, if they are in college, to be on your health care policy, or if you have a member of your familiy with a preexisting condition such as diabetes or has gone through cancer, have they come up with any alternative or is it just: We want nothing?

Mr. REID. Madam President, to my friend, the most senior Member of the Senate, in today's newspapers and in commentary on television and radio, even Republicans, prominent Republicans, former chairs—I have in my mind, which I read today, two former chairs of the National Republican Party—said: We have got to be for something, not just against everything.

That is the problem we have. They are against everything. Against everything. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont said, what are they for? We know what they are against, but what are they for?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished leader, because I know in my State of Vermont, people are happy, if they have children going to college, that they can keep them on their health insurance. Or if they have a spouse who had breast cancer, for example, they can still get health care, or whatever—diabetes and so on.

I think the distinguished leader has answered, no, they want to do away with all of this, and nothing in return. That is a nihilistic approach that makes no sense.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, several people have spoken. I was touched so much by the Chaplain's prayer and by the words of the leader about our Capitol Police. The leader, in his young days as a student, served as one of the Capitol Police.

Because I am President pro tempore, I do have a security detail. But long before I had that, I made it a point to go—every time I would see a police officer on this campus, I would say: You keep us all safe. Keep yourself safe. We worry about you.

I am wearing this pin applauding them today. I think we have to know, tourists who come here, Members, staff—everybody is kept safe by these brave men and women. I asked those who are assigned to me to join me in my office for a silent prayer yesterday for the safety and the recovery of the officer injured, but also for the safety of all of those police officers.

They rush in. They rush in when there is trouble. They do not say: Oh, gosh, I am not getting paid. Or, gee whiz, I am supposed to go off duty in a minute. They rush in, no questions asked. They are extraordinarily well trained, one of the best trained police departments anywhere in the country. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude.

We have also heard a lot over the last few days here on this floor about the costly impacts of this needless government shutdown. It is needless. Of course, the solution to repoening the government is an easy one: the Senate has passed a resolution which would reopen the government while we work on a meaningful compromise to address our budget and our national debt. Because of a small radical group of tea party activists in the House of Representatives, they will not even vote on it.

The House of Representatives has decided on a different approach. The irony of their parochial, bit-by-bit funding proposal is not lost on the hundreds of Vermonters who were given furlough notices on Tuesday, or the veterans in Vermont and across the country who fear the long-term impacts of a government shutdown.

They are holding the government hostage, and with it the millions of Americans impacted by this shutdown. They wish to pick and choose little popular things and say: Here, we are for that. They don't want to stand and vote yes or no on actual appropriations, because if they do that they have to take a position. It is easier to vote maybe. If they vote maybe, they can go home and say: Oh, we are for medical research. We are for the veterans.

No, they are not. They voted to shut it down. We had a Member of the House of Representatives on television posturing to a group of veterans saying isn't it terrible the administration is closing off the veterans' memorial. One of the veterans caught them and said: No, it is not the administration that is closing it, it is you. It is you people, the small group of the House of Representatives that has closed it down.

Why don't they bring the Senate-passed resolution to the House floor for a vote? This vote would end the shutdown. Instead, a handful of extreme ideologues in the House are deciding—

arbitrarily—who is worth supporting in this crisis, and when. Bring it to a vote. Have all 435 Members stand and vote, yes, we will open the veterans programs, the medical research, and everything or, no, we will not. They have to be on record yes or no.

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony yesterday—the distinguished Presiding Officer is a member of that committee, the distinguished deputy majority leader is. We heard from the Director of National Intelligence about the danger to our country from the threat that increases every day because of all the people who had to be furloughed. Every day the shutdown continues, our readiness and preparedness declines.

That was evident on Tuesday when the Department of Defense released guidance to the National Guard that it would need to issue massive furloughs, even though the National Guard is essential in this country.

That included 450 technicians of the Vermont National Guard and an additional 100 Vermont Guardsmen who were recalled from Active orders—their weekend drills, cancelled. This is where 3,000 members of the Vermont Guard come together for joint training, so it results in a decrease in that readiness. This also impacts our national security just the type of scenario that Director Clapper mentioned.

Some of the 450 military technicians in Vermont who received furlough notices on Tuesday are at home without pay, after forfeiting 20 percent of their pay for six weeks this summer because of sequestration.

I know many of them personally. Some are neighbors of mine in Vermont. These are real people. I have heard from some of them. They have called and emailed my office. They are asking why their service to the country and their local communities, which is so essential to our military readiness and to our ability to respond to crises like natural disasters, can be so readily dismissed. I could not agree more with them. They are not getting paid every week as are the Members of the House of Representatives—the tea party group—who are holding them hostage.

I believe the number of furloughs in the National Guard was a misinterpretation by the Department of Defense. This week, the House and Senate adopted legislation to ensure that members of our Nation's military receive their pay, despite the government shutdown. I am the cochair of the National Guard Caucus. I supported this effort in part because the legislation specifically mentioned the Guard and reserves. Today, I have joined Senator MANCHIN and others in a letter asking the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the Department's interpretation.

The government shutdown also affects our veterans. There are nearly 50,000 veterans who call Vermont home. This shutdown is not how we thank our veterans and military members for their service. This is not how we show them our support.

I have received phone calls and emails from Vermonters about the impact of the government shutdown on services for veterans, but my distinguished colleague from Vermont, who is the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, has also heard from these people. These are real people. They showed up in support of this country when they were asked. Now they say: Why aren't you supporting us?

Veterans across the country know that while their benefits payments will continue in the near-term, furloughs within the Veterans Administration are unfair to our veterans who, after their service, were promised our support. Our veterans and military members, including those of our National Guard, should never question our commitment to their well-being, especially after all they have sacrificed to ensure ours. They now have a real question: what is our commitment to them? We didn't question their commitment to the country when they served, but now where is our commitment to them?

We are not going to solve this problem by adopting a piecemeal approach, meant to win headlines and promote the blame game. That is no way to run a government. The Senate already passed a bill, a clean continuing resolution, to keep our government running, and to fulfill our commitments. It's time to stop picking winners and losers. If we are serious about caring for our servicemembers and veterans, we need to get serious about moving beyond this shutdown.

The distinguished chair of the Budget Committee is on the floor. She got a budget through this committee. I remember passing the last vote—I think it was 5:30 on a Saturday morning after we had gone all day long. Then, when we wanted to go to conference to actually work out the differences with the House, oh, no, then they might actually have to vote on something. It is blocked by a Senator working with the tea party in the House, saying: Oh, no, we can't go to conference.

The same people are giving speeches saying: Why can't we have a budget? We passed a budget. Oh, no, now we might actually have to vote on something. We might have to vote yes or no instead of maybe. We are elected to vote yes or no, not maybe. Have the courage to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to thank the President pro tempore, as well as the majority leader for their comments this morning. I am wearing a button, as many of my colleagues are, that says thank you to the Capitol Police.

The one I am wearing is not one that was issued today but one I asked to be commissioned after 9/11 because I thought about the extraordinary courage these men and women showed that day when an imminent attack on this building was well known. Yet they did everything in their power to protect all of us who work here and those who were visiting. I give a special thank you to them.

Yesterday was a tragic day. A young woman—it is still unclear what motivated her—was involved in an incident at the White House, backing into a police vehicle and then trying to escape, followed by a Secret Service officer. She drove toward the Capitol Building and, sadly, her life was taken.

It is understandable. We live in an era where this campus, the U.S. Capitol grounds are carefully guarded for obvious reasons. It is a clear, visible target to those who hate the United States. Someone in a car is a threat. We know that because car bombs are so common in some parts of the world and we are wary of vehicles that may be used to harm innocent visitors or people who work in the U.S. Capitol Building.

It will be some time before we sort out all the details of what led to this incident yesterday, but there is something we know very clearly; that is, that the men and women in the Capitol Police stepped forward to defend this Capitol Building and all those who work and visit here. They did this risking their own lives.

This morning's Washington Post has a few paragraphs on this which bear repeating for the record:

> What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and probably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.
>
> Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.
>
> ''We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery,'' tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R–Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

How many times have we listened on the floor of the Senate as those from the other side of the aisle criticize federal workers, try in some way to demean the contribution they make to this great Nation, trying to find some way to lay them off, if not fire them, or to restrict their pay over and over; they are trampled on; they are political casualties time and again on the floor of the Senate.

Yet each and every one of us, every Member of Congress in the Senate and the House, our staffs and our families and those who visit are safe because of these men and women, these Federal workers. It is about time we realize when we shut down the government, it is the ultimate disrespect to these men and women who simply want to do their job to make this a safer and better nation.

It was very visible on the grounds right off the Capitol Building itself yesterday afternoon. While many of us were told to stay in our offices, don't move, for at least half an hour, these men and women risked their lives during a government shutdown when they aren't receiving a paycheck. It was very visible—and should have been visible to everyone—the irony of this situation that we shut down the government and yet ask them to risk their lives without promise of a paycheck.

I wish to mention one other thing that happened yesterday that may not have been noticed, where the impact of government shutdown is not quite as visible. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State, testified about the fear of Iran developing a nuclear bomb and sanctions imposed by the United States and the civilized world to persuade them not to develop a nuclear bomb.

She went on to say: The government shutdown that has furloughed 72 percent of the civilian intelligence employees in our government is not making this a safer country or giving us the eyes and ears around the world we need to make sure Iran does not develop a nuclear bomb, a nuclear weapon.

She added: Within the Department of the Treasury, 90 percent, 9 out of 10, of the people working in the agency which has the responsibility of specifically watching that the sanctions in Iran are enforced have been furloughed—90 percent of them.

It isn't only a matter of the visibility of Capitol Police risking their lives, despite this demeaning government shutdown, it is also that less visible, such as 72 percent of our intelligence workers charged with keeping America safe, avoiding another 9/11, have been sent home. Ninety percent of those who are watching carefully so Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon were sent home because of this government shutdown.

This is the third embarrassing, shameful day of this government shutdown. People say how could it possibly end? It could end very simply. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has on his desk in the House of Representatives a continuing resolution which is a spending bill which will reopen the government for at least 6 weeks. He should call that for a vote today. He will receive bipartisan support. He shouldn't fear that. He should celebrate it, bipartisan support to reopen this government.

Then I hope he will accept the invitation of Senator REID and others to meet with Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Budget Committee, sit down, plan the spending, plan the savings, and plan the important policy decisions—which we have for 6 months tried to bring to this floor—in a conference committee. Let's do it and do it today. Today should be the end of the government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from today's Washington Post and an article from The Daily Beast on Iran.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 2013]

ESSENTIAL WORKERS: THOSE DEDICATED TO SERVING THE PUBLIC DESERVE MORE THAN A BRIEF MESSAGE OF THANKS

The order went out to Capitol Hill personnel Thursday afternoon in capital letters: SHELTER IN PLACE. It was a terrifying moment for a community already on edge. The scare ended with less carnage than we have come to fear in such moments—but not before we were reminded again of the dedication of those who work for the government. Maybe that reminder will bring some politicians to their senses.

As we write this, investigators are trying to sort out the series of events that apparently began when a woman tried to drive her car through a security barrier near the White House and ended with shots fired near the U.S. Capitol. What the woman, who was killed, intended, whether police responded appropriately, what lessons may be drawn about the efficacy of security barriers: All of that remains to be examined.

What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and probably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.

Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.

''We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery,'' tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

Beyond the shooting Thursday, Washington was full of the usual posturing, speculating, rumor-trading and jockeying for public relations advantage. Maybe the shutdown would be wrapped into the default. Maybe the Obamacare demands would be subsumed into ''grand bargain''demands. Maybe this, maybe that.

Meanwhile, there are mothers who depend on federal assistance for nutrition for their children. There are motel owners and workers on Skyline Drive whose livelihood is threatened because the national parks are closed in what should be their peak season. There are dedicated scientists and food inspectors and intelligence analysts who have been told by Mr. Boehner that he and his fellow Republicans do not consider their work all that essential to the nation.

Those scientists and inspectors and analysts are not the nonessential ones.

[From the Daily Beast, Oct. 2, 2013]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EMPTIES OFFICES ENFORCING SANCTIONS ON IRAN

(By Josh Rogin)

The shutdown has forced the Treasury Department to furlough most of the employees enforcing sanctions on Iran, just as the U.S. is beginning new negotiations. Josh Rogin and Eli Lake report on the potential fallout.

With the government shut down, most U.S. officials enforcing sanctions on Iran are not at work, potentially undermining pressure on Tehran as U.S.-Iran negotiations recommence, according to administration officials, lawmakers, and experts.

The Treasury Department has furloughed approximately 90 percent of the employees in its Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence (TFI), which is responsible for the monitoring of illicit activities and enforcement of sanctions related to several countries, including Iran, Syria, and North Korea, Treasury officials told The Daily Beast. The drastic scaling down of personnel working on those activities comes just as the Obama administration is engaging in its first set of diplomatic negotiations with the new Iranian government, led by President Hassan Rouhani (/articles/2013/09/26/what-hassan-rouhani-really-said-about-the-holocaust.html).

A subsection of TFI, the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC), which implements the U.S. government's financial sanctions, has been forced to furlough nearly all its staff due to the lapse in congressional funding, said a Treasury Department spokesman.

''As a result, OFAC is unable to sustain its core functions of: issuing new sanctions designations against those enabling the governments of Iran and Syria as well as terrorist organizations, WMD proliferators, narcotics cartels, and transnational organized crime groups; investigating and penalizing sanctions violations; issuing licenses to authorize humanitarian and other important activities that might otherwise be barred by sanctions; and issuing new sanctions prohibitions and guidance,'' the spokesman said. ''This massively reduced staffing not only impairs OFAC's ability to execute its mission, it also undermines TFI's broader efforts to combat money laundering and illicit finance, protect the integrity of the U.S. financial system, and disrupt the financial underpinnings of our adversaries.''

Two other subsections of TFI, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (OIA) and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), also are working with a skeleton crew. According to FinCEN's shutdown plan (PDF (http://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Documents/FinCEN%20Shutdown%20Plan__revised%20FY%202014__ Web%20Version.pdf), 30 of 345 employees were kept on after appropriations ran out Oct. 1.

Administration officials often tout the various rounds of sanctions (/articles/2013/09/23/lawmakers-set-a-high-bar-for-iran-to-escape-sanctions.html) passed by Congress and signed by President Obama as crucial to pressuring the Iranian regime to strike a deal to bring its clandestine nuclear program into accordance with international standards of transparency and convince the world it is not developing a nuclear weapon.

''If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves.''

''Because of the extraordinary sanctions that we have been able to put in place over the last several years, the Iranians are now prepared, it appears, to negotiate,'' Obama said Monday (http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/09/30/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-netanyahu-israel-after-bilate) after meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at the White House. ''But we enter into these negotiations very clear-eyed. They will not be easy. And anything that we do will require the highest standards of verification in order for us to provide the sort of sanctions relief that I think they are looking for.''

Pressures must be kept in place and even strengthened as new negotiations with the Iranians begin, Netanyahu responded. But the furloughs are making it more difficult to

enforce the sanctions during the budget stalemate.

FinCEN processes tips from banks about suspicious activity and possible money laundering, and shares the data with law enforcement. The network and OFAC are two of the most potent tools the U.S. government has used to pressure Iran.

''Given the fact that the vast majority of FinCEN employees have been furloughed, important pieces of financial intelligence will not be sifted through and analyzed by the agency charged with this task,'' said Avi Jorisch, a former policy adviser for the Treasury Department's TFI office. The government is shut down, Jorisch said, but ''money launderers are certainly not taking vacation.''

Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, said Iran could capitalize on the lack of monitoring and sanctions enforcement to replenish its coffers and advance its nuclear program while no one is looking.

''If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves,'' he said. ''If you don't have the resources to investigate, identify, and designate the tens of billions of dollars of Iranian regime assets, then you've extended the economic runway of the Iranian regime and increased the likelihood that they could reach nuclear breakout sooner rather than later.''

In Congress, top Democrats blame House Republicans for failing to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government running.

''Today, we learn that the Republican shutdown is hurting the Treasury's efforts to implement sanctions against Iran to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon,'' Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) told The Daily Beast. ''This insanity has to stop. We must not allow a few extreme members of the Republican Party to threaten our national security any longer. Speaker Boehner should put a clean bill on the floor and allow an up or down vote on reopening the government today. Any further delay clearly threatens our national security.''

Top Republicans involved with Iran sanctions said the administration is to blame for not keeping the Treasury employees at their jobs.

''Enforcing sanctions and stopping illicit financial transactions are core national security missions,'' Sen. Mark Kirk (R-IL) told The Daily Beast. ''The administration should not be putting our national security at risk to score political points. All sides need to find common ground and do what's right for the American people.''

Treasury officials say they are implementing the shutdown guidelines given to them by the Office of Management and Budget and doing the best they can with limited resources.

''The House Republicans' decision to shut down the government has real consequences, and it goes to our ability to execute our mission, which is integral to protecting our country and advancing our interests,'' a Treasury Department official said. ''We are still enforcing our sanctions, we are still capable of taking action if necessary, but it's a hell of a lot harder and we can't be nearly as nimble and comprehensive as we could be if Congress would pass a clean CR.''

Meanwhile, the State Department, which has somehow managed to avoid any significant staff reductions due to the shutdown (/articles/2013/09/30/how-the-government-shut-down-hurts-national-security.html), is beginning a new round of negotiations with Iran in conjunction with its partners in the P5+1, set to take place later this month in Geneva (http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130930/eu-plays-down-deadline-iran-talks-0).

State Department officials told The Daily Beast on Wednesday that the shutdown won't affect those plans.

''Dealing with Iran's nuclear program is an absolute top priority for the State Department, and Undersecretary Wendy Sherman and the State Department team are working hard every day on this issue preparing for the next round of talks in Geneva with Iran and our international partners,'' said Marie Harf, deputy State Department spokeswoman.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I join with our majority leader who spoke just a moment ago, the majority whip who just spoke so eloquently, as well as our President pro tempore who just spoke, to thank our Capitol Police, Secret Service officers, and all those who responded so courageously yesterday to the situation in the Nation's Capital. We depend on them to be there to do their jobs for all of us. We need to be there to do our jobs as well today.

I thank all of them for doing their jobs, and I plead with our colleagues to do our jobs.

I am so disappointed that we find ourselves again in the morning waking up where the government is shut down, where families and communities across our Nation are feeling the impact today and worried about what the impact will be tomorrow.

I spoke to some small businessmen only a few days ago in my office from the construction industry. The impact on their contracts, lack of contracts or uncertainty about their contracts is affecting their ability—and they are now worried they are going to have to lay off some of their employees because they can't sign contracts when they are so uncertain whether our government is going to be paying our bills in the future.

I met with some Head Start moms a few days ago. I spoke with a young woman who told me this passionate story about being homeless and on the street with a brandnew baby because of an abusive spouse. The Head Start folks in her community found her, found her a shelter, placed her in some education courses about how to be a mom. In 2 years, she is now on her own, working, and back in school because of a government service that was there for her. She didn't plead to me; she pleaded for those other moms or dads who are out there who now face uncertainty and may not have that help in the future.

I have talked to veterans, as the President pro tempore knows, the former chair of the Veterans' Committee, about having worked so hard to make sure our veterans get the services they need as they come home. They are not here pleading for themselves, although they are very worried about whether, as this goes on, they will get the services they need. They are pleading, as veterans always do, so selfless in their service to our Nation, for us to get the government moving again so our country is back on track, this country that they have so proudly fought for and that people are now hurting.

Today, of course, we are hearing news of a storm, a tropical storm that is approaching our Nation as well.

Families across the South are paying attention to that and they are worried about what a government shutdown or impact might be to them as they face that news on their television and radios this morning. Of course FEMA will be there. They have told us they will be able to call back their furloughed workers. They are prepared to respond to this, as our great Nation always must. But we have to be very concerned about what happens in the future if this government remains shut down—whether there will be reimbursements in a timely fashion, whether cleanup will be able to move forward, and whether there will be an ability to pay for that.

Thousands of members of the National Guard, who have been furloughed, as this approaches us, will need to be called back to get ready for that emergency. Of course, if there is any significant damage—and we all pray there is not, but if there is—cleanup and recovery will likely be impacted because of furloughs at the SBA and at the Department of Transportation. All of our government agencies and government employees who are normally there to respond in a disaster are today not at work, not getting ready, not possibly there in the future, if this shutdown continues.

So I hope for the best for these communities as this storm is threatening. I know our Federal workers will do everything they can to protect these families. We owe it to these communities that are impacted by this storm and to communities across the country to get our government back up and running as quickly as we can, which can happen very fast.

And by the way, Madam President, I will be here later today to talk about the impacts on my State. The impacts of this shutdown are real, and as it continues, so is the uncertainty it produces. Our ability to respond as a Nation to any kind of disaster is a concern for every family.

But I am here today to say it doesn't have to be this way. The answer to this is so simple. As the majority whip just said, there is a bill in the House of Representatives right now, this minute, that is sitting there, and Speaker BOEHNER can simply bring it up for a vote. We know it has the votes to pass. It will say this government will continue to run until November 15, and it will give us the opportunity to then negotiate and to deal with the broader issues that we all know we need to deal with in terms of our budget. But we cannot hold our communities and the future of this country hostage while we negotiate those bills.

So it is so easy. The Speaker can take up this bill, put people back to

work—our government employees, who need to respond to any kind of emergency. Our National Guard will be back at work. Our veterans will not have to worry about payments coming for them, and this will be the country for our fellow countrymen as we always have been—all that, simply by Speaker BOEHNER bringing up a bill that would quickly pass. It would then go to the President, and then this would be over.

I know there has been a lot of talk the past few days about a grand bargain. No one on this floor has worked harder than I have to get us to a budget compromise so we have a path in the future to deal not only with our debt and deficit but also with our deficit in terms of transportation and education and our deficit in terms of our investments that we need to make as a country to be strong in the future. We all know what the sides are on that. We all know we need to come to the table and solve that—that is, the differences we as leaders of this Nation need to address.

I have worked extremely hard on that, and it is time for us to do that. As everyone on this floor knows, we were told by our Republican counterparts and told and told and told the Senate needs to pass a budget. I became budget chair at the beginning of this year. We did our job. Our committee passed a budget. We brought it to the floor. We lived through 5 days of amendments. We brought up every amendment possible and voted on over 100 of them and then we passed that budget. That was the time, 6 months ago, when we should have then said, the House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget, let's go to conference and figure out those differences so we don't end up in this crisis today.

That is the expectation people have of a democracy. Unfortunately, we were told time and again: No, we are not going to allow you to go to conference. So here we are in a crisis. Well, let's address this crisis first. First, let's put people back to work. Let's get our country and our economy moving quickly again, and then allow us to go to conference to deal with those issues that are so critical to this Nation in terms of our fiscal responsibilities and the investments and priorities we need to make as a Nation.

So my plea today is to the Speaker to take up the bill, to allow the country to work again, and then for us to take up our responsibility to find solutions to the disagreements we truly do have as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to urge the Speaker to allow the country to get back to work, and then let's get to the table and let's solve this.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I want to first thank the Capitol Police for their bravery and for the important work they do in protecting all of us in the Capitol. Yesterday really showed how important they are. So I want to thank them for everything they did yesterday to make sure people were protected.

This is day 4 of the government shutdown—a shutdown that did not need to happen. I had hoped when I came to the floor a couple of days ago, and when I heard congressional leaders were meeting with the President, at his request, that they would emerge from that meeting with a plan to end this impasse and get the government open again, to come to an agreement as to how we can responsibly fund the government and address the challenges we face as a Nation. But coming out of that meeting, what we got, of course, was a President who said he will not negotiate.

From the beginning, I have said this strategy was an ill-conceived strategy by some Members of my own party who thought that defunding ObamaCare—therefore, shutting down the government—would, No. 1, stop the exchanges from opening. But we knew that was not going to happen. In fact, it has already happened, even though we shut down the government. It was ill conceived because, again, we knew that with the President and the Senate Democrats in charge, they were not going to defund their signature piece of legislation.

As much as I support repealing that piece of legislation—because I have seen the impact already in my own State of New Hampshire, in terms of premiums and in terms of less choice for individuals, and I do believe there is a better way to address health care in this country—where we find ourselves right now is unacceptable for America. It is unacceptable as leaders elected by the people of this country. We owe it to our constituents to resolve this now. Both sides need to get together and we need to resolve this.

I would say to my Republican colleagues in the House and to some in this Chamber, it is time for a reality check. Defunding ObamaCare did not work as a strategy, so let's find common ground and work together, yes, to address the very legitimate concerns we have with this health care bill, but also to get this government funded. I would say to my Democratic colleagues here in the Senate and to the President, come to the table and negotiate. Let's work this out on behalf of the American people. I will say it again: I think where we are is the result of an ill-conceived strategy by many in my party, leading to an immature response that says we will not negotiate and talk and try to work this out on behalf of the American people.

We all know the American people are the ones suffering the most from this shutdown. I have heard it from our guardsmen in New Hampshire who have been forced to go to the unemployment office, Federal employees who wonder whether they will be able to pay their mortgages, furloughed civilian workers in New Hampshire at one of our proudest military installations in this country, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and small business owners who can't get the help they need from the Small Business Administration. They deserve better than this.

I hope, as we head into this weekend, the President, the leaders of the House, the leaders of the Senate will get together, and that we will get behind them on behalf of the American people, to get this government open, to resolve our differences, to find common ground and do the people's business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. First, let me also start, Madam President, by thanking the men and women of the Capitol Police and the District of Columbia and the Secret Service. It reminds us they are the thin blue line standing between us and danger. This is a moment to extend our thanks to all law enforcement and first responders around the country who, on a daily basis, are on that thin blue line as well. So we are all grateful for what you do for us and how you keep us safe.

I wanted to talk, of course, about this week. It has been an interesting week, to say the least, beyond the events of yesterday. When we turn on the cable news, it features these countdown clocks leading up to the government slowdown. Now, in the aftermath of it, we see the countdown about how many days we have been into this thing.

Look, there is no doubt this impasse we are at is a problem for the country. This is not the best way to run the most important government in the most important country in the world.

There are people around here who all they do is focus on politics. For them, every day is election day. They are focused on who is winning, who is going to get the blame, and who is this going to help in the next election. I suppose that has a place in politics and in the governing process. But let me answer the question: Who will get the blame? We all are. Every single one of us in the House, the Senate, and in the entire Federal Government will get the blame.

And let me tell you why. Because there are people who woke up this morning who didn't get enough sleep last night. Maybe they were up late helping their kids with their homework. They got up, guzzled a bunch of coffee and forced themselves to work. They didn't want to work. They were tired. But they had to. And they are going to work today, and they are going to get home and go through all that again. And they are wondering: Why can't you guys do that? Why can't you do your job? I think that is a very valid frustration that people have with this process and with those of us here today.

I am not happy about some of the things we have seen this week or over

the last couple of weeks. I think it is very unfortunate—some of the rhetoric that has been used around here, both in this Chamber and in the public domain. But each day that goes by, what I am more and more worried about may not be what everybody else, or at least too many people here, are worried about. See, I think it is wrong that those of us who stand on principle, who believe, for example, ObamaCare is going to badly damage our economy—I think it is wrong we have a Congressman from my home State who compares us to the Taliban. We have a spokesperson for the White House who says we are like people with bombs strapped to our chests. I think that is wrong.

I think it is wrong too by the way, that the President has used the megaphone of the Presidency not to bring Americans together but to deepen these divisions. Mr. President, you are not the chairman of the Democratic party. You are the President of the United States. Act like the President of the United States. Rise above that stuff. Your job is to bring this Nation together. I know people are going to say things about you that you don't like. It comes with the territory. You have to rise above it. And I hope he will.

But those are not the things that concern me the most. What I am most worried about is that this country faces a very serious crisis, and we are running out of time to fix it. There is no doubt this government slowdown is not good, but it is not the crisis I am referring to. This issue about hitting the debt limit is a problem, but that is not the most serious crisis we face either. The single most important crisis we face in this country is that for millions of Americans the promise of the American dream is literally slipping through their fingers. With all the focus around here on whatever the crisis of the day may be, I fear we are simply not spending enough time focusing on that reality.

It reminds me of a story I know. A few years ago, a friend of mine in Florida was on a twin-engine airplane flying from one part of the State to another. At some point during that flight, a fire broke out in the cockpit. That fire was a problem. But the bigger problem was that both of the pilots started to put out the fire, and no one was flying the plane. Within a few seconds, the plane began to plunge, and it lost hundreds of feet of altitude. Luckily, they figured it out quickly and were able to correct it. But they were so focused on the fire in the cockpit, they weren't flying the plane. Luckily, they realized in time if they didn't start flying that plane that fire was going to be pretty insignificant for them in just a few seconds.

So we have a government slowdown, and this government slowdown is a problem, yes. We have the upcoming debt limit issue, and that is a problem, yes. But the fire in our cockpit and the one we need to address is the erosion of the American dream.

If we think the slowdown of government is problematic, that is a vote away from being solved. All we have to do is take a vote in either Chamber and we can solve that problem. But the slowdown in government is going to be a big problem when this government no longer has enough money to pay its bills, and if we keep doing what we are doing now, that is going to happen.

We think this debt limit situation is a problem? That is one vote away from being solved. When it is going to be a real problem is when no one wants to buy our debt anymore because they don't think we can pay them back.

We think all this division and dysfunction in Washington is bad for our economy? Yes. But what is worse is a tax code that kills jobs, regulations that on a daily basis are killing jobs, and a national debt that is killing jobs. By the way, one of the greatest destroyers of jobs in America today is ObamaCare, and that is why we are so passionate about it.

The American dream—which people throw around so loosely as a term—is basically the notion that no matter where you start out in life, no matter how many obstacles you have to overcome, you have the God-given right, through hard work and perseverance, to achieve a better life and leave your children better off than yourself. But it is being eroded on a daily basis, and not nearly enough attention is being paid to that. I don't see any countdown clocks on cable television about the American dream.

The most dangerous thing happening in Washington today is that everyone is so busy fighting about the problems before us today that there doesn't seem to be enough focus on the crisis we are headed to pretty soon; that we are on the verge of losing the American dream. I say that because, to one extent or another, we are all guilty of misplacing that focus.

So my speech here today as much as anything else is a reminder to me of why I wanted to serve here. The reason I wanted to serve here is because I know—I don't think; I know—that America is special. I know this partially because I was raised by and around people who know what life is like in places other than America. In places other than America, you can only go as far as your parents went. You are trapped. Whatever your family did is the only thing you are allowed to do by those societies.

But we have been different, and I have seen it with my own eyes. Both in my neighborhood and in my family, I have seen people who came here with little education and no connections and through hard work and perseverance achieve a better life, achieve a meaningful life, and leave their kids better off than themselves. I also see how every single day there are millions of people out there now trying to achieve the same thing, and they are finding it harder and harder to do that. We are on the verge of losing that. If we lose that, every day that is eroded, so too is the exceptionalism of this country. People love to use that term, an ''exceptional nation,'' and I believe it is exceptional, but it is exceptional primarily because of the American dream.

Many countries in the world have powerful militaries. Every country in the world has rich people and big companies. What makes us different is that here, if you are willing to work hard, if you have a really good idea, you can be rewarded for it with a better life. That is eroding. If we lose that, we lose what makes us special and different, and no one seems to be fighting enough about that.

The only reason all these other issues matter is because they relate to the American dream. The reason the debt really matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason our Tax Code, which is broken, matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason I am so passionate about ObamaCare is because for millions of people it is undermining the ability to achieve the American dream.

The reason I ran for office is because as a country we are headed in the wrong direction because we are losing the American dream. We still have time to fix this, but we don't have all century. We don't even have all decade. We have to begin to take these issues seriously or we will be known as the first generation of Americans who lost the American dream and left our children worse off than ourselves.

We still have time to refocus ourselves. With all this noise about politics and who gets the blame and who is responsible for what, I hope we can use these challenges before us as a catalyst to begin to focus on these issues and why they matter. They matter because they are hurting people, and they are hurting people who are trying to achieve a better life. If we do that, if we focus on that and if we solve the problems before us with an eye toward that, then I think we will have the real opportunity to do what every generation of Americans before us has done: to leave our children better off than ourselves and to leave for them what our parents left for us—the single greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor again today to talk about the effects of this government shutdown that are being experienced in New Hampshire. As I begin, let me start where a number of my colleagues have this morning, and that is by thanking the Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police for the great job they did yesterday, and particularly the Capitol Police, who are willing to put their lives on the line, as we say frequently, every day to protect us, but in this case where they are doing that and they are not getting paid, that is certainly a tribute to the commitment

and the dedication they have to this Congress and to this government.

I hope that as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, we will take inspiration from that dedication and recommit to trying to end this government shutdown and end the negative impacts it is having on people across this country. We are just 4 days into the shutdown—this is day No. 4—but every day we see more and more of the effects it is having across the country and in my home State of New Hampshire.

My colleague Senator AYOTTE was on the floor earlier talking about some of the frustrations people are experiencing as a result of the shutdown. As I said earlier this week, hundreds of Air National Guard civilian employees have already been furloughed. We have Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers who are facing furlough. We have new SBA loan originations that have come to a halt, so businesses aren't able to get the capital they need. So many other important services and so many other people are being affected.

I really wanted to talk today a little more in-depth about the effect of the shutdown on one of New Hampshire's national treasures, the White Mountain National Forest.

This time of year the Kancamagus Highway in the White Mountains really starts to see bumper-to-bumper traffic. You might not expect traffic jams in a remote location like that in the middle of the mountains, but when tourists come in to see the beautiful fall foliage in New Hampshire, it really is a boon to New Hampshire's economy, and they are everywhere.

New Hampshire's director of travel and tourism, Lori Harnois, estimates that about 7.8 million people will come to New Hampshire between September and the end of November, which is 2 percent higher than last year. According to Lori, more than spending time, these visitors will spend over $1 billion, which is about 3 percent more than was spent last year. That is why this season is so critical for the small businesses in New Hampshire that depend on the tourism industry. This is really about the economics of New Hampshire and the ability of so many of our small businesses and their owners and employees to survive throughout the year. Local stores, restaurants, and attractions rely on this season to meet their bottom lines.

Many tourists coming to New Hampshire visit our Federal forest lands in the White Mountain National Forest. Those lands are administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The White Mountain National Forest stretches over 800,000 acres in New Hampshire and Maine, and it is one of the most visited outdoor recreation sites in all of United States, with nearly 6 million visitors a year. More visitors than go to Yellowstone or Yosemite Parks come and visit the White Mountains of New Hampshire. For everyone who has been there or visited one of the many landmarks in the forest, it is no surprise because its natural beauty has kept visitors coming back for centuries. Given its proximity to cities such as Boston and Montreal, it is a great place to bring families. Nearly 60 million people in the United States alone live within 1 day's drive of the White Mountain National Forest.

Unfortunately, this year, during the busiest few weeks of the year, tourists are going to be shut out of important services because of this unnecessary government shutdown. Restrooms for families in bumper-to-bumper traffic will be closed along the highways and trails in the national forest. Garbage collection is going to be suspended. Campgrounds will be closed starting over the next few days. Families looking to camp in the White Mountains will have to find new lodging or change their plans.

Ongoing repairs to bridges and roads in response to Hurricane Irene—we are still cleaning up as a result of the damage from Hurricane Irene—those projects are going to be put on hold, and only a few staff members are going to still be there to respond to emergencies, conduct repairs, and help direct people.

This is leading to a frustrating experience for tourists, and it is frustrating for all of the businesses that depend on the people who come to visit. The shutdown could really hurt a very important industry in New Hampshire at a critical time.

All told, about 120 employees for the White Mountains have been told to stay home until Congress reaches a budget agreement. And as we have heard here in Washington, as we know from our own staffs, these employees have done nothing to deserve these furloughs. They have worked hard, they have been dedicated, but they are going to have to try to make ends meet because Congress can't get its act together. No wonder people are outraged.

Our Federal forest lands are not only critical drivers of the tourism industry, they support New Hampshire's timber industry. If this shutdown continues, the Forest Service will have to determine whether to suspend existing contracts for timber-harvesting on Federal lands, and these companies will have to shut down their operations at one of the best times to harvest timber. So the impact will also be on all of those people who work in the timber industry and depend on that industry for their livelihood.

I wish to highlight some of these effects because we need to remind ourselves just what this government shutdown means for the people who are being hurt, what it means for the small businesses and their employees, and what it means to the economy in my State of New Hampshire and the economy across the country. We are clearly seeing the effects of the shutdown in New Hampshire. If we don't act, these effects will become more and more severe every day.

I hope we can begin to see talks going on between Members of the House and Senate. I hope those who are holding up the continuing resolution in the House—the legislation that would get this country operating again—will reconsider. All it takes is the Speaker to bring that legislation to the floor. He keeps saying we haven't negotiated. In fact, we have negotiated. We negotiated for over 1 year before we passed the Affordable Care Act. We negotiated before this continuing resolution was agreed to, and the Senate, in fact, accepted the numbers, the cost of that continuing resolution to keep the government open. We thought our numbers were better, but we accepted the House numbers because we wanted to try to negotiate and reach an agreement. Unfortunately, what we have seen is that the House has reneged on that agreement.

It is now time to bring that legislation to the floor, to get this government operating again, and to end the negative impact and the real hardship so many people across this country are experiencing.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, in Vermont and all over this country there is profound anger and disgust at what is going on here in Washington. The reason is that today we remain in a significant and very serious economic downturn. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent. Over 20 million workers are unemployed. And what the American people are saying as loudly and as clearly as they can is, Congress, we want you to create millions of decent-paying jobs. All over this country, people are struggling with wages of $9 or $10 a hour. What the American people are saying to Congress is: Congress, Mr. President, we want you to raise the minimum wage.

In the midst of a serious economic crisis, the American people want us to act to improve the economy, to create jobs, to raise wages. But what are we doing today? We are saying to 800,000 hard-working Federal employees: Don't come in to work. We don't know when and if you are going to be paid. We are saying to 1.2 million other Federal employees who are at work: Thank you very much for coming in to your job today. Thank you for your work as a Capitol Hill police officer or FBI agent or somebody in the CIA or somebody working at Head Start or somebody delivering meals to low-income senior citizens, thank you all very much for your work but we don't know when and if you will be paid.

What we are doing right now is the exact opposite of what the American people want. They want us to create jobs and raise wages. What we are saying to 2 million American workers is: You are not getting paid. Some of you are furloughed. Some of you are coming in.

These Federal employees are not millionaires. They are hard-working, middle-class Americans. They are struggling as is everybody else in this country to pay their mortgages, to send their kids to college, to afford childcare, to do what other middle-class families need to do. We are putting all of them under extreme anxiety today. In an unstable, volatile economy, that is not what we should be doing.

In addition, this shutdown is having a very negative impact on the entire economy. The estimate is that we are losing about $10 billion a week as a result of the government shutdown, according to Goldman Sachs. If the government is shut down for 3 weeks, the economy will lose over $36 billion. Moody's has estimated if the shutdown lasts 4 weeks, it will drain $55 billion from the economy.

Does any sane person believe that when our economy today has so many problems—when we are just beginning to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month, when we are trying to get our feet on the ground economically—does anybody think it makes sense to not be paying over 2 million workers and to be losing billions and billions of dollars in the economy as a result of the shutdown?

This is the start of the flu season. Every fall the Centers for Disease Control closely monitors the spread of flu and directs vaccines to where they are needed the most. But because of the shutdown, the CDC is today unable to support the annual seasonal influenza program. Does that make sense to anybody? We are endangering the health and the lives of millions of Americans because of the shutdown of the CDC.

During the shutdown the Food and Drug Administration is stopping most of its food safety operations. We have seen over the years outbreaks of salmonella and other types of food problems. Does anyone think it makes sense to shut down the FDA?

Most of the Department of Labor is closed. Ironically, we are supposed to be receiving a report from the Department of Labor telling us what kind of unemployment rate we now have, but we cannot get that because they are shut down.

The WIC Program, Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program, is being shut down. This is a program that provides good nutrition to low-income pregnant women and their babies so that the mothers and the babies will be healthy in these critical times in their lives. We want healthy children in this country. We don't want to see children die at birth. That is what the WIC Program is about.

Social Security services are being delayed. In Burlington, VT, where I live, there was a rally yesterday. Social Security workers are being furloughed. Others are working without pay. We owe it to the seniors in this country that when they are eligible for Social Security and they apply for Social Security their papers are processed in a timely manner. That is what they are due.

Head Start Programs for thousands of lower income kids are starting to close. Today Head Start provides education, health, nutrition, and other services to roughly 1 million children throughout our country. The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday on the impact the shutdown is already having. Four Head Start Programs that offer preschool activities for 3,200 children in Florida, Connecticut, Alabama, and Mississippi have closed and officials said 11 other programs would be shut down by week's end if Federal funding is not restored. Does any sane person believe we should be shutting down Head Start Programs at a time when preschool education is so important? We all understand that.

And it is so hard to come by. What we are telling parents today is next week you may not be able to bring your kids into a Head Start Program. How does that impact your employment? What do you do with your kid? Does anybody around here care about that?

The United States is the only nation in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care to all people. Today we have about 48 million people with no health insurance. ObamaCare, to my mind, is not a solution to the problem but it is a step forward. We are talking about 20, maybe 25 million people who are in desperate need of health insurance being able to get that insurance; others who are paying more than they can afford perhaps getting insurance that is more affordable to them. We should be going farther in terms of health care, but for rightwing Republicans in the House of Representatives to be saying we are going to keep this government shut down until we deny millions of people the health care based on legislation that we passed is inexcusable. It is not acceptable.

The point I think many of my colleagues made and everybody agrees with now—this is not in debate and the American people have to understand this—No. 1, the Senate passed a continuing resolution that in my view simply underfunds many of the programs out there. I am not happy about that bill. It should be much higher than that. It is not a good bill, but it was passed. Everybody understands that if Speaker BOEHNER chose to be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and not the Speaker of the Republican Party, and if he brought that bill that we passed here in the Senate on the floor this morning, there is no debate, they have the votes. The Democrats and moderate Republicans and maybe more would vote for that legislation and government could be reopened this afternoon. The Speaker there has an issue he has to deal with. He has to understand that he represents all this country and not just an extreme rightwing faction.

I hope very much the Speaker will do the right thing, bring that to the floor, and reopen the government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I want to follow up briefly first on the comments of Senator SANDERS. We have a continuing resolution over there. The annualized cut is $70 billion. Usually when you compromise, one side gives a little, the other side gives a little. On this continuing resolution that passed out of this body, we took their numbers. Compromise means you take a little bit from both sides. We took 100 percent the numbers from the House, a $70 billion annualized cut. That is what we took. So to people who keep saying we are not negotiating, we did. As a matter of fact, we went much farther than many of us wanted. We did it because we wanted to keep the government open.

So let's not get fooled by some of the political speeches they are making on the floor or over there, outside in the courtyard. We met their annualized reductions—they wanted $70 billion—with this continuing resolution. When they sent bills over here we have voted on them. They have not prevailed on their side, but we have voted on them.

We sent the bill over there. It is sitting. We know by public statements by many Republicans and Democrats over there, they are ready to vote on this bill, a clean CR, continuing resolution, to keep the government open.

What is amazing about this is we are debating this. What we should be getting back to—I know the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, would—as a member of the Appropriations Committee we would like to get back to appropriations, annual bills. Then we would not be in this start-and-stop deal that I think the American people are fed up with, this manufactured crisis that a few over in the House used to set us up in a situation where we create more uncertainty in the family, more uncertainty with small businesses, more uncertainty with individuals in the Federal Government on furlough. Eighty percent of my staff is on furlough. Every day they are on furlough I donate my salary. I am doing my part because we should not be exempt from this situation. But at the same time we have to recognize the impact it is having to our economy.

I get it; they are passionate about their view on the Affordable Health Care Act. They do not like it, some of them over there. Some of them also said we should work to fix it. I proposed multiple solutions and ideas how we can move forward on that. But to hold up the economy, hold up the budget over this issue is ridiculous. I don't like No Child Left Behind. I hate it. For Alaska it doesn't work. It destroyed many efforts in our rural communities. But to hold up the government over that? I am going to work to fix it, and if I can't fix it I am going to

vote against the reauthorization. That is the right that we have here. But they are playing, as I called it last night, Russian roulette economics, and the American people are on the back end. It is shameful.

We have to get back to doing what we should be doing, annualized appropriations bills, create certainty in our economy, create certainty in our government, focus on this economy that has moved, for 4 or 5 years now, from this recession, a great recession. It is a slow climb out, but it is in the right direction. Let's keep it moving in that direction with the right kind of policies.

In my State, winter is setting in. The Low-Income Housing Assistance Program is critical for Alaskans who are living in areas where their income is not able to purchase the energy they need to supply their house with winter heat, and they depend on the Low-Income Housing Assistance Program. It is not about some fluff program or some luxury program. It is for them life or death. If you cannot heat your home in Alaska when it is 30 below, you may not survive. It is that simple.

I said earlier I think the Members on the other side clearly understand that we have to get the government running, and there are Members on both sides who are ready to do that over there if the Speaker would just put it on the table so people could vote on it. If it fails, we go back to negotiations. My bet is it will not fail. Because it passed here. People forget the cloture vote here, the vote to move the bill forward here in the Senate passed 99 to 0. I am not sure when that happened recently around this place, but we did it—after great passionate speeches by some, but we did it. We debated it, we moved the bill over because it was the right thing to do. Again, reminding people, we met the House numbers. We didn't lift our numbers up or down, we went all the way down to their number—$70 billion in cuts in annualized savings—annualized cuts to the Federal budget on this 6-week or so continuing resolution.

In Anchorage—a columnist just wrote about it—we estimate about 13,000 Federal workers are in some form impacted by this, laid off or impacted because they are working longer hours with no pay.

I want to detail a couple of examples in Alaska where it is impacting. Take this Federal worker who has now been furloughed. They are in the midst of remodeling their home. I got this call. Everything stopped. The contractors who are expecting to get paid are not getting paid. The contractor working for the employee who was remodeling their home—that will not happen because of the uncertainty. His comment was, I thought, pretty clear: Life doesn't stop just because Congress says you can't come to work anymore.

Life continues, and these costs pile up.

In my State, the Bering Sea crab fishery—many people see this on the TV show the ''Deadliest Catch''—is worth about $80 million a year. The amount of crab they can catch is determined by NOAA Fisheries and the State of Alaska.

Crab season starts October 15. If they do not have these quotas set, then making sure that the process is safe and the product is exactly what people expect when they get it on their plate to eat or at the grocery store—the problem is those employees are furloughed, so the quota will not be set. As a result, the permits they need to catch the crab will not happen, and the end result is a multimillion-dollar hit—and not to some government employee.

I heard people criticize the bureaucrats. Well, not only are 1 million or so employees furloughed across this country, but now it is affecting second and third options. In this case it is the crab industry, which will affect people all over this country and people all over the world. Again, we have delay after delay.

Alaska receives about $1.2 billion from the Federal payroll every single year. A lengthy disruption will have an incredible fiscal impact to our State and will trickle out because these folks travel. I see my colleague from Washington State. We have lots of people who go to Seattle, WA. They may not take that trip and spend in that economy because they are afraid of what might happen with this stop-and-go situation.

We are now about to move forward—after decades of waiting—on the National Petroleum Reserve for oil and gas exploration. What does it take? It is a Federal Reserve so it takes Federal permits. Without the Federal permits, it cannot happen or it gets delayed, and it is costly.

When we look at the issues and the calls I have received, it is all the way from an elder in the Artic Circle who said: Please, get the people back to work. It has a direct impact, not only on Alaskans, but on people all across this country.

There has been a lot of great debate. Yesterday, I saw a press conference given by a small group of the minority over there who said they were concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I am concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I can tell you story after story of how those medicines are critical for young people and adults. What they failed to mention was the billions they have already cut. They forgot that little detail. Amnesia is like a prerequisite for some Members around here, and they forgot that little detail. It's amazing to me.

I will mention again—because I believe the public has not heard this enough because they say over there that we are not negotiating—we have negotiated with them. We have taken their numbers and have gone down by $70 billion in annualized cuts. We have taken them for this continuing resolution. Every time they sent something over here, we voted on it. They may not have liked the vote outcome, but we voted on it.

We sent one continuing resolution over there. We also have the farm bill, the immigration bill, and the WRDA bill. It has not piled up over there because they have not taken action. They would rather play party politics and figure out what elections they can win or lose rather than focus on what is important for the American people, and for my constituency, specifically, in Alaska that I represent.

I hope we end this debate, get on with business, and re-open the government. Let's negotiate. They have some ideas to fix the health care act. I am happy to talk with them. I have several bills I have introduced, but I never have heard from them over there. As a matter of fact, I know they mentioned my name over there quite a bit. I have seen it on TV. The House somehow recognizes that I have some influence, and I do in some ways. If they want to have a conversation, I'm game. Pick up the phone or walk across the Capitol.

Let's be real: The continuing resolution is about managing our budget and putting people back to work so we can keep this economy moving and get on with the big issues that we have to deal with. If they want to fix the health care act, I am happy to sit down with Members. If they want to move the immigration bill, I am happy to work with folks. We can go through the list.

Let's not hold the American people hostage for a simple situation. If they were to put it on the floor, it would pass. I would bet on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows. We had testimony by Secretary Sherman as to the enforcement of sanctions against Iran in order to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon state, which would be a game changer.

During the course of that hearing, it came out that as a result of the government shutdown, we are not as effective as we could be. There is always more that can be done in working with other countries, and the shutdown is affecting our full preparedness for enforcing the sanctions internationally against Iran.

One of my colleagues started to challenge the representative from the State Department as to why they couldn't do more. Of course, it was the Treasury Department's budget that was primarily affecting the attention to this. The Secretary assured us that we are enforcing our sanctions.

Senator KAINE made the observation—and the right observation—don't blame the administration; blame the Congress. It is the Congress that has the responsibility to make sure the government is functioning with all cylinders. This tea party shutdown is

jeopardizing our national security. It is not putting us where we should be as far as taking care of the needs of the people of this country.

I was on the floor a couple of days ago, and I quoted from the Baltimore Sun as to the responsibility for the shutdown, and I'm going to quote a little bit more from that article. It said:

> It would be tempting, of course, to write that this impasse—the inability to agree on the continuing resolution to fund government past the end of the fiscal year—was the fault of Democrats and Republicans alike. But that would be like blaming the hostages for causing the perpetrator to put a gun to their heads.
>
> As President Obama noted, he and congressional Democrats put forward no agenda other than keeping government operating temporarily at the current levels.

I want to review how we got here on October 1. It was 6 months ago that the Senate passed the budget. It was different than the House budget. Then, we, the Democrats said: Let's go to conference. That is what we should do, negotiate a budget, so that when it comes to October 1, we have a budget in place to fund government at the levels we agreed to—Democrats and Republicans. The Republicans refused to go to conference.

Fast forward to October 1. We didn't have a budget, and, therefore, it was necessary to pass a continuing resolution. That is what you do. When we can't pass a budget, we keep government operating at the current levels until we can agree on a budget. So that is what we decided to do, but we went further. The majority leader met with the Speaker of the House, and rather than negotiating about what level we thought should be in the continuing resolution—what the Democrats and the Republicans thought—we went along with the lower number. We negotiated the continuing resolution at the lower level, and that is what we passed.

The Republicans in the House decided they would not go for that, and they attached their changes in the health care system as a condition to passing a continuing resolution. Make no mistake about it; it is a tea party shutdown.

Now the Republicans are saying to us: Why aren't we negotiating? Well, let me quote from this morning's editorial in the Baltimore Sun. I think this morning's editorial really captures where we are as far as negotiations. The headline says:

> There is no room to ''negotiate'' when extremists take the federal government hostage—and threaten to do the same to the economy.
>
> How can the tea partiers in the House expect to be offered anything for doing the equivalent of strapping C–4 and a detonator to their chests and holding the government hostage?

The editorial goes on to say:

> Reward these tactics and you'll only see more of it in Congress. And that's critically important given that the stakes are about to rise. Should Republicans engage in similar behavior with the debt ceiling, they risk not only the health of the U.S. economy but the global economy. To default on the debt—to refuse to pay bills already incurred by the federal government—has the potential to pull the nation back into recession and put thousands, if not millions, of people out of work.

It is very clear: We have compromised, and the tea party Republicans have shut down government. We can't negotiate with a gun to our head. It reminds me of a football team that played a game and didn't like the results, so they say: Let's just play that game all over.

Last Sunday the Baltimore Ravens didn't play a very good game. They lost. They didn't say: Let's play that game over. They are going to be here this weekend playing again and trying to improve their record.

I heard one of my colleagues use another sports analogy. He said we could do a mulligan on ObamaCare. We are the big leagues. There are no mulligans at the U.S. Open. There are no mulligans in golf. Let's use the regular order.

Yes, we want to negotiate a budget for the next year, but we can't do it with a gun at our head and say: Open government and pay our bills.

Then the Republicans are saying: Well, let's do this piecemeal. Why don't we just take up small provisions.

This is another quote from this morning's Baltimore Sun:

> Even the little fixes the GOP is offering is outrageous if they slow down the return of a fully-funded government. Reopening parks would be great, but what about cancer patients denied treatment? And for every National Institutes of Health reopened, what about the funding for inspectors that are making sure our food isn't tainted, or intelligence officers monitoring the next al-Qaida attack, or FDA scientists reviewing the next miracle drug? It's impossible to even keep track of all of the hardships the shutdown has created, and why do so when the solution is at hand?

This shutdown is hard on our country. My colleagues have talked about it. It has affected our welfare, it has put our Nation at risk, and it has hurt our economy—including my own State of Maryland. Senator MIKULSKI is here, and she will be speaking as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The State of Maryland loses $15 million every day in our State economy.

We literally have over 100,000 workers who are on furlough and not getting paid, and it is costing the taxpayers money. The last shutdown in 1995 cost $2 billion. What a waste of taxpayers' resources.

Let us put an end to this tea party shutdown. Let us also assure those who are on furlough that they will get paid. I have introduced legislation in this regard. I believe the House is going to be passing that legislation. Let's make it clear that our Federal workers—who have endured 3 years of pay freezes, furloughs under sequestration, and have been asked to do more with less—will be made whole when this shutdown ends.

Let's put an end to the shutdown and make sure we pay our bills. Let's meet together to work out a budget for the coming year, as we should.

The tragedy here is that the votes are in the House of Representatives to pass the Senate continuing resolution. If Speaker BOEHNER would just vote on the resolution we sent over, the shutdown would end and we could get on with the business of this Nation.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I intended to give remarks and then promulgate a series of unanimous consent requests. However, the majority leader requested, for purposes of scheduling, that I begin with the unanimous consent requests, which I am happy to do to accommodate his schedule. I ask that at the conclusion of these unanimous consent requests, I be given 20 minutes to speak to lay out the reasons why I believe the majority should cede to these unanimous consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 72

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for the fiscal year 2014, which was received from the House.

I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas has offered a unanimous consent request that we take care of veterans in this shutdown of government. I would note that there is no Senator or Member of Congress who does not care deeply about making sure our veterans are taken care of, including this Senator from the State of Washington.

As the Presiding Officer knows and our colleagues know, I have spoken often of my own father who was a World War II veteran and who spent most of his life in a wheelchair and received a Purple Heart. I know the sacrifices our veterans make.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee previously, I fought to make sure every veteran had what they need, to make sure we said more than just thank you but provided them what they need. So I know our veterans well.

What I also know about our veterans is that they, above everyone else, are suffering. They went to serve our country and said we will take care of the rest of you at our own personal sacrifice. They would be the last to come before us and say, Take care of me before everyone else. They would say to

us, Take care of our fellow man and leave no one behind.

So I am going to ask that the Senator modify his request and do what our military has always asked their fellow man to do and leave no one behind. Our request will ensure that everyone who fights for our country, takes care of our country, works for our country in emergencies, depends on our country to make sure they have the opportunity every one of us has here is able to have that opportunity and they are not held hostage to a government shutdown, so we can get back to work and solve our country's problems. We need to end this tea party shutdown and we can do it with the request I will ask right now.

I have a modification to suggest to the request of the junior Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that this request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and it is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly now has the support of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, I thank my friend from Washington State. I know she talked about leaving no man or woman behind. I would note the continuing resolution the House has passed to fully fund the Veterans' Administration treats our veterans the same way the House and Senate have already treated active-duty military.

Just a few days ago, this body unanimously passed a bill that said the men and women of the military would be paid. Unfortunately, it seems to be the position of the majority in this body that veterans should be treated not as well as our active-duty military and, in particular, that the full funding of the VA should be held hostage to every other priority the Democrats in this Chamber must have.

I understand the Democrats in this Chamber are committed to ObamaCare with all of their hearts, minds, and souls, but the veterans of this Nation should not be held hostage to that commitment. It is likely, given the majority's refusal to negotiate, refusal to compromise, refusal even to talk to find a middle ground—it is likely that this shutdown, instigated by the Democratic majority, will continue for some time, and during that time we ought to be able to find common ground that, at the very minimum, our veterans shouldn't pay the price.

If moments from now my friend from Washington simply does not object, by the end of the day the VA will be fully funded. If, as we all expect, she does object—if she repeats the objection her majority leader and her party have made throughout the course of this week—then much of the VA will remain shut down because of that objection.

She has asked if we can reopen the entire Federal Government. If the request is not granted to refund every single priority in the Federal Government that the majority party wants, then the VA will remain without sufficient funds.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object on behalf of all Americans who should not be left behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3230

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the second unanimous consent request I will promulgate:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which was received from the House; I ask further unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas launched this government shutdown with a 21-hour presentation here on the floor of the Senate. It is clear from the actions of the House and his actions today that he is starting to try to reconcile in his mind all the damage which this government shutdown, which he inspired, is causing across the United States.

This particular unanimous consent request relates to National Guard Reservists, a group which we hold in high esteem. But if the junior Senator from Texas is really focused on veterans and those who have served our country, he should take into consideration the 560,000 Federal employees who are currently facing furlough or are on furlough, who are veterans, a fourth of whom are disabled veterans. So what the junior Senator from Texas is doing is picking and choosing who he will allow in the lifeboat. At this moment, it is National Guard and Reserve, while leaving 560,000 veteran Federal employees out in the water thrashing for themselves. That is not the way we should manage or govern this country.

I can understand the anxiety the Senator feels about the problems he has created, but trying to solve them one piece at a time is not the American way. I object. And I ask unanimous consent, though—before I object, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the bill be amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, including the National Guard, Reserve, VA, NIH—all of them. It is something that is already over in the House of Representatives and reportedly has the support of a majority of Democrats and Republicans and could pass today.

I ask for that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, no one watching these proceedings should be confused. We are in a shutdown because President Obama and the majority leader of this body want a shutdown, because they believe it is in the partisan interests of their party to have a shutdown.

Four times the House of Representatives has come to us, four times the House of Representatives has endeavored to meet a middle ground, and four times the majority leader and every Democrat in this body has said, No, we will not talk, we will not compromise, we will not have a middle ground, and 100 percent of the priorities of the Democrats in this body must be funded or they will insist on a shutdown.

I thank my friend from Illinois for making clear that the members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces, in his judgment, are not worthy of being paid during the shutdown that the Democrats have forced. I could not disagree with that judgment more strongly. Let us be clear.

This bill that has passed the House doesn't mention ObamaCare; it has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It simply says the exact same thing my friend from Illinois already agreed to, which is that the active-duty men and women of the military would not be held hostage and would be paid if it so happened that the Democrats forced a shutdown.

Apparently, the position of the majority of this body is that we have a double standard, that Reserve members are not treated as well as active-duty members; that Reserve members will not get their paychecks.

Let's be clear that this bill could be on the President's desk for signature today if my friend from Illinois would simply withdraw his objection. Unfortunately, in a move I think reflects a level of cynicism not befitting of the responsibility all of us have, my friend is prepared to object and to say that

not just veterans but Reserve members shall be held hostage in order to force ObamaCare on the American people; that that is the objective. I guess now the Democratic Party has become the party of ObamaCare, by ObamaCare, and for ObamaCare all of the time, and every other priority recedes. So veterans are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you to force ObamaCare on the American people. Reserve military members are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you as a hostage to force ObamaCare on the American people. That is cynical. We ought to take these individuals off the table.

I note my friend from Illinois spoke of the great many Federal employees who have been furloughed. I would be very happy to work in a bipartisan manner to cooperate with my friend from Illinois to bring a great many of those Federal employees back to their vital responsibilities. But, unfortunately, the position the Democratic Party has taken is that not a one of them will be allowed to come back until this body agrees to force ObamaCare on the American people, despite the jobs lost, despite the people being forced into part-time work, despite the skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and despite the millions of people who are at risk of losing their health insurance.

I find that highly objectionable and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would say to my colleague from Texas, some of the language which he has used in this debate relative to impugning motives of Members may have crossed the line. I am not going to raise it at this point, but I ask him to be careful in the future.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

For the edification of all Senators, rule XIX reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any forms of words, impugn to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I now promulgate my third unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, which was received from the House; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will object, but let me say a couple of things here.

First, in reference to the colloquy the Senator from Texas had with my good friend from Washington State, he noted that the Senator from Washington talks about leaving no man or no woman behind. She does, indeed, and that is one of the reasons so many of us oppose this piecemeal approach. It is leaving lots of people behind.

The bottom line is, the junior Senator from Texas is advocating shutting down the government and now he comes before us and says, Well, why don't we pass the parts of the government I want to open? No one would want to do that. It makes no sense: Let's shut down the government and then I will come to the floor and be magnanimous and offer a few places where the government opens.

I note that no other colleagues are standing here on the floor with him. I note that, at least according to press reports, most of the many conservative colleagues in this body reject this approach. And I note that it makes no sense to pick a few—to shut down the government and then pick a few groups to reopen.

Who wants to shut down the government? In my view, it is the tea party. They have said it all along. They have advocated for it.

There are countless instances where even in 2010 tea party folks said: Let's shut down the government. Then it is said, after the government is shut down, that President Obama or this side or the Senator from Illinois caused it, when we had a bipartisan resolution, with a majority on this side? There was an opportunity. I believe the junior Senator from Texas urged his colleagues to vote against that resolution, but 25 of them did not, and that kept the government open in the Senate.

There were many—everyone on this side. The other side of the aisle opposes ObamaCare, but the majority did not want to use a bludgeon and say: Unless you reject ObamaCare we are going to shut down the government or, for that matter, not raise the debt ceiling.

We are not in an ''Alice in Wonderland'' world, where those who advocate shutting down the government then accuse others of shutting down the government. That is not washing with the American people, and it will not wash in this body with the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would say to my colleague, if he wishes to have debate on what parts of the government should be funded and at what level, it is wrong, in my opinion, to say: Shut down the government and then we will decide piece by piece which we open. That is ''Alice in Wonderland,'' in my judgment.

It makes much more sense to have the government open and then have the debate in the proper place—a conference committee that decides future funding, in an omnibus appropriations bill—what level of funding, if any, each part of the government should get.

So to first deprive our national parks of dollars by advocating shutting down the government and then accuse others who do not want to leave 98 percent of the government behind and the people who work there behind and the American people who depend on so many other programs, whether it is student loans or feeding the hungry, is wrong.

So I ask consent that the request be modified as follows: that an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, actually leaving no man or woman behind, and is something that is already over in the House and has the support reportedly of a majority of the Members of the House, including Members of both parties.

Would the Senator agree to modify his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from New York for his heartfelt concern for the Republican Party. I note that the Senator from New York stated that I ''have advocated shutting down the government.'' That statement, unfortunately, is a flatout falsehood, and I know the Senator from New York would not do so knowingly, so it must have been a mistaken statement. Because throughout the course of this debate I have said repeatedly in every context we should not shut down the government, a shutdown is a mistake, and I very much hoped that the majority leader would not force a shutdown on this country. We are in a shutdown because the Democrats in this body have refused to negotiate, refused to compromise.

I would note as well, I am quite grateful for the majority leader's admonition this morning toward civility on the floor and the admonition from the Senator from Illinois toward rule XIX. That is an admonition well heard. Indeed, it was quite striking. It has been several days since I have been to the floor of the Senate, and yet I feel I have been here in absentia because so many Democrats have invoked my name as the root of all evil in the world. Indeed, the same majority leader who gave an ode to civility just a few days ago was describing me and anyone who might agree that we should stop the harms of ObamaCare—describing us as ''anarchists.'' So I think the encouragement toward civility is an encouragement that should be heard across the board.

I would note also that my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have

described what they claim to be as the piecemeal approach as following my priorities. Several Democrats have used that language publicly. I must note, I find it quite ironic because if I were to stand here and say it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund veterans, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund the National Guard, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund our national parks, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund research for health care, they would, quite rightly, be able to rise and claim under rule XIX that I was impugning their motives.

I cannot imagine a greater insult than to claim it is not the priority of Members of this body to treat fairly our veterans, and yet what I find so striking is that so many Democrats go out publicly and embrace that. They say: Funding the veterans is CRUZ's priority, not ours.

Yet I will note, even on that front, the funding proposals the House of Representatives has passed are not even the House's priorities—although under the Constitution they have a legitimate role laying out their priorities for funding—they are President Obama's priorities.

Just a few days ago, the President gave a speech to this country, a speech that all of us watched closely, in which the President said if a shutdown occurred ''veterans who've sacrificed for their country will find their support centers unstaffed.''

The President also said, with regard to parks, as we are discussing now, and memorials: ''Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty immediately closed.''

To the credit of the House of Representatives, they listened to the President's speech, they listened to President Obama's priorities, and the House of Representatives acted with bipartisan cooperation. They said: Mr. President, we have heard your priorities. Let's fund them. Let's work together.

I would note my friend from Maryland a moment ago gave a speech about how important it is, he thinks, that we should fund food inspectors in the Department of Agriculture and also our intelligence community. I would note to my friend from Maryland, I fully agree with him and, indeed, would be happy to work arm in arm and to fund the intelligence community, fully fund them today. The only impediment to that happening is that the Democrats in this body are objecting, and that is what should be abundantly clear.

When it comes to parks, when it comes to memorials, we have all read about World War II veterans being turned away from the World War II Memorial. We have all read about Mount Vernon, which is privately owned—the Federal Government blocking the parking lots.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask permission to direct a question through the Chair to my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question from the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my question is that I was under the assumption that my friend would offer the consent requests, as we do here with brief responses in the competing consent requests, and then the Senator would speak for 20 minutes. My only concern is this: one, two, three—I have five or six Senators over here wishing to speak. So my question is this: Does the Senator wish to take 20 minutes following this in addition to what time he has taken now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the majority leader for his question. At his request I began with these unanimous consent requests. It was my intention to give my remarks at the end. But I would note, in each of the objections, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have chosen to stand and give their remarks. If remarks are to be given by the Democrats, then it is certainly appropriate that some response be given. So if the courtesy the majority leader was asking was that none of the remarks that his friends and colleagues make have any response, that was not a courtesy I was prepared to give. I was prepared and am prepared to work and cooperate on timing but not to allow only one side of the discussion to be presented.

Mr. REID. Further, Mr. President, I propound a unanimous consent request, and the request is: When the Senator from Texas finishes his consent that he is asking—and there is one more, as I understand it—then I ask permission that the next Senators to be recognized be Senator MIKULSKI for 10 minutes, the Senator from Florida—so it is not bad. Only a couple speakers. So we have Senator MIKULSKI, who will be recognized for up to 15 minutes. I apologize for the interruption. The floor is the Senator's from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. CRUZ. The modification——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the request of the Senator from Texas by the Senator from New York?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, the modification that the Senator from New York has suggested is that he is unwilling to open our national parks, to open our memorials, unless every other aspect of the government is opened immediately and ObamaCare is forced upon the American people. That is, quite simply and directly, saying that the Senate will not respond to President Obama's priorities.

President Obama gave a speech to this country saying we should open our parks, we should open our memorials. The House of Representatives said: Mr. President, we, the Republicans, will work with you to do that, and today the Democrats in the Senate are objecting and saying: No, we want every park closed, every memorial closed. All of that will be held hostage until ObamaCare is forced on every American.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, and I will be brief——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just want to make this point: The junior Senator from Texas has said it is President Obama and the Democrats who are shutting the government down. My modification, which he just objected to, would open the entire government. We put it on the floor. We are all for it. He objected to it. Therefore, I object to the proposal of the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 73

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the fourth unanimous consent request that I would promulgate: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 73, making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014; I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to my responding to my friend, I would use just a few minutes of leader time—I will be very brief—with permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Here is what I am going to say.

Mr. President, we have heard this back-and-forth stuff about veterans. But in addition to what the Senator from Washington said, let me read one paragraph from the RECORD of yesterday:

> I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for

the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

I reserve the right to object to the request of my friend from Texas.

I object, as do most Americans. There is no reason for us to have to choose between important government functions, as has been said by my three colleagues so brilliantly this morning. But I guess my objection is best paraphrased by reading a column from the Washington Post by Dana Milbank. Here is what he said:

House Republicans continued what might be called the lifeboat strategy: deciding which government functions are worth saving. In: veterans, the troops and tourist attractions. Out: poor children, pregnant women and just about every government function that regulates business. . . . Here are some of the functions not boarding the GOP lifeboats: market regulation, chemical spill investigations, antitrust enforcement, worksite immigration checks, workplace safety inspections, the Environmental Protection Agency . . . communications and trade regulation, nutrition for 9 million children and pregnant women, flu monitoring and other functions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and housing rental assistance for the poor.

I spent, 1 month ago, a day at the National Institutes of Health. I remember so clearly one Institute I went to where this young girl, about 12 years old—she had come back for her second visit. She has a disease that they do not know for sure what it is. But they were trying to figure out what she had, and they felt they were on the cusp of being able to figure that out. Her parents, of course, were very happy.

We know how important it is that little children, babies, adults be taken care of, especially toward the time when they have no hope. That is what NIH is about: hope.

I truly believe we should open the government, all the government. This is a trip down a road that is so foolish. We need not be there. If people have a problem with ObamaCare—and I know my friend, the junior Senator from Texas, does not care for ObamaCare—let's do it in a context that is reasonable and fair, not have all the people in America who are so troubled with this——

I heard an interview with the Governor of Maryland this morning. They are losing $15 million or $20 million a day because of the government being closed in Maryland. I would ask my friend to accept a modification. It is a modification that is so well-intentioned. What it would do is open the government. It would take care of the National Institutes of Health, it would take care of the veterans, including all the stuff that is left out of the consent we have here before which I read into the RECORD a minute ago, it would take care of the national parks, and in Nevada we are really desperate to have those open. We have one 70 minutes outside of Las Vegas where 1 million people a year visit. We have one about 12 miles outside of Las Vegas where we have 600,000 people a year visit, Lake Mead. The other is Red Rock, and others. We have a Great Basin National Park. We want to open that. That would solve this problem.

So I ask unanimous consent that the consent of my friend from Texas be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of Members of the House.

Finally, the statement I made, if that little girl came back there now for her clinical trial, likely she would not be able to have any help, just as we learned earlier this week there were 200 people who were turned away from clinical trials, 30 of whom were babies and children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would note that the majority leader made a plea for compromise. I think most Americans want to see a compromise. The House of Representatives has repeatedly compromised already.

It is the view of every Republican in this body and, indeed, every Republican in the House that ObamaCare should be entirely and completely repealed. Nonetheless, the House started with a compromise of saying not repealing ObamaCare but simply it should be defunded. They funded the entire Federal Government and defunded ObamaCare. It came to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Democrats voted in lockstep to say: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise.

The House then came with a second compromise. They said: Fine. If the Senate will not agree to fully defund ObamaCare, then let's all agree to a reasonable 1-year delay.

President Obama has already delayed ObamaCare for big business. Let's treat hard-working American families at least as well as big business. Let's have a 1-year delay, because we are seeing how badly this thing has worked. Now that is a big compromise from defunding.

It came over to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down.

The House came back a third time and said: Okay. How about we simply delay the individual mandate, one small portion of ObamaCare, and we revoke the congressional exemption that President Obama illegally gave Members of this Congress to exempt us from the burdens of ObamaCare that are inflicted on millions of Americans.

That offer represented an enormous compromise from the view of Republicans that ObamaCare should be repealed in its entirety. What did the Senate say? Did the Senate say: Let's sit down and work something out? Did the Senate say: Let's meet and find a middle ground? No. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: Absolutely not. No, we will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down. That is why the government is shut down right now.

Just a moment ago, the majority leader gave his latest offer. It was: Give us everything we demand, 100 percent, no compromise, no middle ground. That is the position of the Democrats in this body. That is not a reasonable position. That is not the way people work together to find a middle ground.

You know, it was reported that the majority leader urged the President not even to talk to congressional leaders. The President apparently had a change of heart and sat down with congressional leaders and had what, by all accounts, was an extraordinary conversation, where President Obama told Congressional leaders: I called you over here to say I am not going to talk to you. I am not going to negotiate. I must admit, that is a remarkable conversation, to call someone over to say: Hi, good to see you. We are not going to talk.

If this matter is going to be resolved, we need to see good faith among Members on both sides. Republicans have repeatedly been offering compromises to resolve this shutdown. Unfortunately, the behavior of the majority party in this body has been my way or the highway.

One can only assume their stated public belief, from a senior administration official from the Obama administration who said: We think we are winning politically.

I am paraphrasing.

But we don't care when the shutdown ends.

That is a paraphrase. That is not exact. But that was certainly the thrust of the statement by what was described as a senior administration official. I think that is cynical. I think that is partisan. I do not think that is what we should be doing. So I wish the majority leader and the Democrats would accede to what should be shared bipartisan priorities. But it appears right now that they are not, that their position is: Give us everything. Fully fund ObamaCare and force it on the American people. That I cannot consent to. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, still reserving my right to object, my friend from Texas—and I have developed a relationship with him—talks about a meeting

that he did not attend. I was there. I was one of five people, the President, Speaker BOEHNER, Leader MCCONNELL, Leader PELOSI, and me—the Vice President was also there. I am sorry.

I attended that meeting. The President did not say: Come on in, I am not going to talk to you, I have nothing to say, words to that effect. The meeting lasted an hour and 20 minutes. There were a lot of things said. But one thing that was not said is this ''Alice in Wonderland'' what took place in that meeting, when someone talks about the meeting who was not there.

Let's talk about compromise. My friend brought up compromise. We have before us a continuing resolution. My friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, called me and said: We have got to work this out. We have got to get this done quickly.

I thought: So how are we going to get it done? This was on September 9 after our recess ended. He said: We have got to have the 988 number for this year.

I said: I cannot do that. I cannot do that. Chairman MURRAY's number is $70 billion above that that we passed here in the Senate. We passed that. I cannot agree to 988.

He said: You have got to do it. I do not want to be fighting. I want to get this done.

So I talked to Chairman MURRAY, Chairman MIKULSKI, and others. Even though it was desperately hard to do—because we do not like the number 988, we do not like it. It is not our number—we agreed to do it. That was a compromise. I have been in Congress 31 years. That is the biggest compromise I have ever made. My caucus did not like it, but we did it in an effort to have a clean CR.

You talk about compromise, that was big time. But, Speaker BOEHNER, I am sure, was well intentioned. He could not get it done. He could not get it done. It was his idea how to get it done.

Then, talking about further compromise, one of the last things we had walked over from the House is: Go to conference. So I thought: I have something. It is an offer so good that he cannot refuse. What did I do? With the cooperation of all 53 Democratic Senators, here is what we agreed to do: Open the government. What we will do is go to conference. Not on little select areas. We will go to conference on a list of everything. I listed everything—not everything, but everything I could think of. We listed agriculture, we listed discretionary spending and, yes, we listed health care.

I gave the letter to the Speaker. I talked to him 45 minutes later. He said: I can't do it.

Wow.

I know what legislation is all about. It is the art of compromise. I understand that. We have compromised in big-time fashion. The problem is that the Speaker and some other Republican Members of Congress are in a real bind because the only thing they want to talk about is the law that passed 4 years ago, which the Supreme Court declared constitutional. This is a little unusual, I would think, in my experience here.

So we are where we are because we not only have the government shutdown, but we have the full faith and credit of our Nation before us in a week or 10 days.

I suggest, I do not want anyone to say I have not compromised. All one needs to do is talk to any Member of my caucus and they will talk about how difficult it has been for us to accept that number, and agree to go to conference on anything.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. If my friend would yield, following his statement of 20 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized: MIKULSKI already has 15 minutes; MURRAY, I ask unanimous consent that she follow MIKULSKI for 10 minutes; HEINRICH, 10 minutes; SCHUMER, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are those the next Senators in order or on the Democratic side?

Mr. REID. If some Republicans want to come and talk, my friends, I would be happy to yield to any of them. But we have not had a large number of people over here this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Bismarck famously talked about legislation being like making sausages. There are aspects of both that are not pretty. I wish we saw our elected leaders in both parties working together to listen to the American people.

You know, the majority leader talks about a meeting at the White House. I will note, he noted that I was not at that meeting. That is certainly true. But the statement that the President said he would not negotiate came directly from Speaker BOEHNER who was at that meeting, who came and gave a press conference immediately thereafter.

I know the majority leader is not impugning the integrity of the Speaker of the House or disputing that that is exactly what President Obama said and what the position of the Democrats is. Their position is: Give us 100 percent of what we want or the government stays shut down. That, quite simply, is not reasonable.

I would like to address for a moment a few of the arguments that have been raised against these very reasonable bipartisan proposals to fund essential priorities in our government because I think the arguments do not withstand scrutiny. There are some on the Democratic side of the aisle who have said: We are not going to pick and choose. Indeed, the majority leader said: There is no reason to have to choose between government priorities.

Let me suggest that is the essence of legislation. We have a $17 trillion debt, because far too many people have said, as the majority leader just did, there is no reason to choose between priorities; we should spend on everything.

I would note also that what the Democrats in this Chamber deride as a piecemeal strategy is the traditional means of appropriating and legislating. The only reason we have this omnibus continuing resolution is because Congress has failed to do its job to appropriate on specific subject matters.

So we should be considering the VA on its own merits. I would note, the majority leader is right, that the House bill funded the most critical components of the VA: pension, home loan, GI bill, and disability payments. But I would readily accede to the majority leader that if he would like a continuing resolution that funds the entirety of the VA, including the elements he laid out, I think we could reach a unanimous consent agreement on that within hours.

The traditional means of legislating is one subject at a time. It is not typical when considering funding for the VA that the argument be about unrelated matters, whether it is the Department of Agriculture or ObamaCare. The way this body has always operated is it has considered one subject matter at a time—except when Congress has failed to appropriate, and then everything has gotten lumped together in a giant omnibus bill. But there is no reason for that.

Secondly, every bit as critically, we have done it already. This is not theoretical. At the beginning of this proceeding the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill saying: Let's fund the men and women of our military. When it came over, a great many people expected the majority leader to do what the majority leader just did—to object to funding the men and women of our military. Indeed, some 20 Republican Senators came to the floor prepared to make the argument that we shouldn't hold the men and women of the military hostage. Yet, much to our very pleasant surprise, the majority leader reconsidered. He decided, one must assume, that it was not defensible to hold hostage the paychecks of the men and women of the military. The majority leader agreed, and this body unanimously passed funding for the men and women of the military. He said: Regardless of what happens with a government shutdown, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines should not be held hostage. They should get their paychecks.

Indeed, I rose on the Senate floor. I commended the majority leader for doing the right thing and for acting in a bipartisan manner. Yet, sadly, that was the last of that behavior we were to see. I hope that majority leader returns. I hope the majority leader who said we are going to fund the men and women of our military returns to say the same thing to our veterans. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our National Guard. I

hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our parks and war memorials. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to the National Institutes of Health and to say the same thing to children who are facing life-threatening diseases such as cancer.

We may not be able to resolve 100 percent of this impasse today; there are differences. To resolve those differences will take sitting down, talking, and working through the matters of this disagreement. One side of this Chamber is prepared to do this. The Democrats are not. In the meantime, it ought to be a bipartisan priority to fund our veterans.

A second possible objection—I can see some watching this debate who think, well, OK, but if you fund the VA, doesn't that mean the Democrats have given in on ObamaCare? Somehow it has to be connected to ObamaCare, right?

As every Member of this body knows, the VA is totally disconnected. The VA bill that passed the House doesn't implicate ObamaCare, doesn't mention ObamaCare, and does nothing on ObamaCare. We have a disagreement on ObamaCare. Part of this body thinks it is a terrific bill. Part of this body thinks it is a train wreck, a disaster that is hurting millions of Americans. That is an important debate. Whether our veterans get their disability payments shouldn't be held hostage to resolving that debate. It is exactly like the bill my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle already voted for to fund the men and women of the military. It is exactly the same. They have done it once, and yet, for whatever reason, they have made a decision that certainly appears to the public to be cynical and partisan.

There should be no confusion. The House of Representatives has overwhelmingly voted to protect our veterans and fund the VA, and 35 Democrats joined Republicans in the House to do that—35. It was bipartisan legislation. It came over here. Every Senate Republican agrees we should fund the VA, we should pass this bill. There is unanimity. Indeed, the President, when he addressed the Nation, said his priority was to fund the VA. We have Republicans and Democrats in the House agreeing we should fund the VA. We have Republicans in the Senate and a Democratic President of the United States agreeing we should fund the VA. Sadly, we have Democrats in the Senate and a majority leader in the Senate objecting and stopping the VA from being funded.

If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood right now and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day the VA would receive its funding. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our friends in the Reserves would receive their paychecks or have the paychecks and the funding returned. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our national parks and memorials would have their funding and we would be able to open our Statue of Liberty and open our war memorials. By the end of the day we could restore the funding to the National Institutes of Health.

Let me note that there are many other priorities. My friend from Maryland, when he was talking about other priorities, said there are a great many aspects of government. For example, earlier this week the Director of National Intelligence and the head of the NSA testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee. The head of national intelligence said that some 70 percent of civilian employees in the intelligence community have been furloughed and that represents a real threat to our national security. If that is right, where is the Commander in Chief? Why is the President of the United States not saying: Regardless of what you do in the rest of the budget, don't expose us to national security threats. Let's fully fund the Department of Defense. Let's fully fund our intelligence agencies.

Indeed, I would note that one Senator, the junior Senator from Arizona, asked the head of national intelligence: Have you advised the President that Congress should pass a continuing resolution funding the intelligence community as we did for the members of the Armed Forces?

The answer from the head of national intelligence, appointed by President Obama, was this: Yes, Congress should do it, and, yes, I will advise the President.

Now we have Senate Democrats who are not listening to the testimony and advice of the members of our intelligence community who say there is a grave national security threat against which we are not adequately prepared to defend ourselves. Surely partisan politics should end. Surely at that point we should be able to come together and say: We can keep fighting on ObamaCare. We may have disagreements, and eventually we will work it out, but surely we shouldn't expose our national security to threats from terrorists or attacks on our homeland in the meantime. That ought to be 100-to-0.

At the end of the day, there is only one explanation that makes sense for why you saw one Democrat after another standing up and objecting: No, don't fund the VA. No, don't fund the Reserve members of our military. No, don't fund the parks. No, don't fund the memorials. No, don't fund the National Institutes of Health.

The only explanation that is at all plausible is that many Members of this body agree with some of the pundits that this shutdown benefits the political fortunes of Democrats. I hope people are focused on things other than political fortunes and partisan politics because I know each one of us takes seriously the obligation we have to our constituents back home. I hope that is not going on, but it is hard for the American people not to be cynical when they read about Mount Vernon—which is privately owned and operated and doesn't get its money from the Federal Government—being effectively forced to shut down because the Federal Government blocked the parking lots and put up barricades to prevent people from going to Mount Vernon. It is hard not to be cynical when we read about what my friend Senator JOHN THUNE told me about Mount Rushmore. The Federal Government erected barricades on the roads leading to Mount Rushmore—spent the money to do it, mind you. There is a shutdown. They spent the money to erect the barricades. The problem is that those aren't Federal roads, those are State roads. The Governor said: Take them down. The only conclusion that is possible there is that we are seeing cynical, partisan, gamesmanship—a decision by President Obama and, unfortunately, by Democrats in this body that inflicting maximum pain on the American people will yield political benefits.

We ought to be able to agree that our veterans are above politics. We ought to be able to agree that our war memorials are above politics. We ought to be able to come together and agree that defending national security and defending against terrorist threats is above politics. Everyone in Congress is prepared to do so except for the majority leader and the Senate Democrats who are insisting that everything be shut down.

If a Federal Government worker is at home today furloughed, you should know that the reason is in large part because the Senate Democrats refused to let you come back to work, because we could agree, for significant portions of the Federal Government, to come back to work Monday morning if, simply, the Democrats would stop objecting and stop insisting that they get everything on ObamaCare.

Let me note that the issue on ObamaCare is very simple. Is there a double standard? President Obama has exempted Big Business and has exempted Members of Congress. Yet he has forced a government shutdown to deny that savings exemption to hard-working Americans, millions of hard-working Americans who are losing their jobs, being forced into part-time work, facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and losing their health insurance.

Let me remind this body of the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters: ObamaCare is destroying the health care—he used the words ''destroying the health care of millions of working men and women in this country.'' If you don't believe me, perhaps James Hoffa—who put it in writing that it is destroying the health care of millions of men and women—will underscore what this fight is about. All of the seniors, all of the people with disabilities, all of the people who are now

getting notices that they are losing their health insurance—that is what this fight is about.

At a minimum, we ought to agree on common priorities. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund the VA. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our reservists in the National Guard. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our national parks, open our memorials, and stop barricading and sending police officers to prevent World War II veterans from visiting to the World War II Memorial. We ought to come together, right now, to fund the National Institutes of Health because everyone agrees on that.

The decision to hold those priorities hostage because the Democrats want to force ObamaCare on everyone—it is not related to them, has nothing to do with them, and it is all about political leverage. That is not the way we should be doing our jobs. We should be listening to the people, and we should make DC listen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be the next Democratic speaker following Senator SCHUMER's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before I go into my commends, I want to express my thanks to the Capitol Police, to the Secret Service, and to all who responded to yesterday's pretty scary and dramatic incident. I also want to express my hope that the injured Capitol Police officer quickly and fully recovers, and to the little girl who has now been left without her mother—I hope that as this great tragedy unfolds, we give support to the people who have suffered.

My colleague from Texas has laid out a vision of how he would like to see the day end. He would like to see the day end with funding for VA, NIH, and with the Park Service open, and I think there was one more item, but I will stick with those three—NIH, FDA and VA. He would like to see them open for business at the end of the day.

I have a different vision for the end of the day. At the end of the day today, I would like to see the House of Representatives consider and vote on the Senate-passed continuing funding resolution that would reopen the entire Federal Government and keep it open—not for a long term because we have fiscal issues through November 15—at fiscal year 2013 levels. At the end of the day, if they took up the Senate-passed resolution and actually voted on it, the Federal Government would be open.

At the end of the day, people would actually be back on the job, getting paid for the job they signed up to do, and we would have the Government of the United States of America working the way it should.

At the end of the day, it means the Capitol Hill police officers who were at their duty stations would get their pay. Now they are working without pay.

Under my vision of America, if we open the entire U.S. Government, it means FBI agents who are currently working and doing their job protecting America would be paid. Right now, FBI agents and other Federal law enforcement are working for IOUs. Those very FBI agents we count on are using their own money to put gas in the cars they need to use to go after the bad guys or the bad girls. So under the Mikulski recommendation that was passed by the Senate, at the end of the day, FBI agents would be paid and they wouldn't have to use their own money to put gas in their cars. That is what my vision of the end of the day is. We have to reopen government.

The cynical strategy of the other side, given with ruffles and flourishes and pomp—self-righteously standing up for our veterans, opening our national parks, and funding NIH—really is hollow. It would be great if they actually understood how government works.

Let's take the VA disability claim process. In order to get your disability benefits, your eligibility is determined not only by the VA but with information you get from the civilian workforce at DOD, from the Social Security Administration headquartered in Woodlawn, MD—where 9,000 Federal employees are furloughed—or you would get it from the Internal Revenue Service—also headquartered in Maryland, where 5,000 Federal employees are furloughed. So if we reopened the government, at the end of the day, yes, veterans would get their benefits, but they will get them because not only is the VA open but so is Social Security, and the civilian workforce will be working at DOD and the people who work at the Internal Revenue Service will be there making sure all the paperwork is done in the way it should be. That is what the end of the day should look like.

My colleague from Texas talks about how he would like to reopen NIH. Oh, boy, so would I. Seventy-one percent of the people at NIH right this minute are furloughed. He wants to, at the end of the day, open NIH. So do I. But I also know that after they do their research and they have engaged in all of that, our private sector comes in and begins to develop the products, and they need to take those great ideas—the great ideas that turn into the new products that will save lives and create jobs in the United States—to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration.

So at the end of the day, we want to help NIH stay open, to find the cures for the diseases we want them to find, but we also want the private sector inventing the products to be able to take those great ideas and turn them into what can save lives here and to be able to sell them around the world because they have been certified as safe and effective. So at the end of the day, I would like to open the FDA.

But I don't want to do it one agency at a time. I want to reopen the entire Federal Government. It seems that whenever we now shame them with regard to the reality of the closing of a particular agency, they then decide that agency is important and the House then passes a bill. I don't want shame, I don't want blame, and I don't want political games. I want the Government of the United States of America to be open.

Now let's go to another agency. They haven't even talked about some of these other agencies. Let's take the weather service. Right now storm clouds are gathering not only here in Washington, DC, over politics, but they are gathering in the Southeast. A hurricane is on its way. The weather service is also in Maryland. Eight hundred people are supposed to be on their job.

I was there during another hurricane, just a few months ago. Last October, I was there while they were at their duty station for Hurricane Sandy. We watched this hurricane come. It was devastating. We all recall how devastating it was. In my own State, my mountain counties were hit by a blizzard, and down over on the eastern shore, they were hit by the hurricane, wiping out whole communities and neighborhoods, some people owning family homes and farms that go back generations.

Those very weather service people are furloughed. They are absolutely furloughed. The weather service is calling them back, but they are going to be working without pay.

Let me put a human face on what I am talking about. Yesterday I spoke to Amy Fritz. She works at the weather service. She has two master's degrees, one in meteorology and the other as a physical oceanographer. Her job is to predict storm surges coming from the hurricane. Her work helps to predict how walls of water will come ashore and knowing where that is going to happen, what is going to happen, and how we can begin to protect ourselves so that while we try to save property we can definitely provide protection for lives.

Amy is the primary breadwinner in her family. She is now not getting paid. She has $130,000 in student loans so she could get that great education. And she wanted that great education because she thought: I can serve America. I can be a good scientist and a great American. Well, at the end of the day, I want the weather service open. At the end of the day, I want Amy getting paid.

At the end of the day, I want the entire Federal Government open, not just whatever agency emerges as part of their strategy. Every part of the Federal Government somewhere is playing an essential part in the lives of people in this country and to the communities which they serve.

Last night there was something called the ''Sammie'' Awards. These are awards given to Federal employees

because of their outstanding service. They have either saved lives or they have saved money. Well, let me tell you, there was one Federal employee at the National Institutes of Standards. He has a new way of being able to protect us against fires. Another Federal employee, who has also been furloughed, has come up with how to save $1 billion. Employee after employee.

I say to all the Federal employees who might be watching: At the end of the day, I think you are important. At the end of the day, whatever job you do, I want you to do it well. I want you to strive for competence and excellence. But I want to do my job well. I extend my hand to the other side of the aisle, as I have done repeatedly during the year I have chaired this Committee on Appropriations. I have negotiated, I have compromised, and I will continue to do the same, because at the end of the day I want the Federal Government open doing the job those people were trained to do and that we hired them to do. I want the Federal employees to be able to be at their job, doing the duty they signed up for. Every job has an important mission, whether you are a meat inspector, a poultry inspector, or you work at the weather service.

So we can continue to do this, where they send over to us one program at a time. My gosh. Once again, we are wasting time. And where is our standing in the world? At the end of the day, I want us to be respected. I want us to be respected. What do they think about us around the world? In hearing after hearing, there is a lot of hand-wringing and chest-pounding over what we need to do about China, but China isn't doing this to us. We are doing it to ourselves. There is no foreign predator attacking our Federal Government, we are just defunding it. That is what a shutdown is. We are not funding the Federal Government.

This is not the way the United States of America should be operating. I know the calls I am getting from the over 100,000 Federal employees I represent, and they want to be on their job. It is not only they want to get paid, they actually want to work. And you know, they are prohibited from taking anything home where they could be working. This is terrible.

So at the end of the day, let us find a new way. At the end of the day, let us find a new way to keep the government open. At the end of the day, let us be proud of ourselves and let the Federal Government be reopened.

I once again conclude my remarks by saying to the House of Representatives: Please, take up the Senate's continuing funding resolution that would reopen the Federal Government right away and get us at the desk so that we could negotiate further fiscal compromises. That is the way I would like to see the day end.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very emotional response and her great statement. I hope all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol listen to what she just said to us. She represents a State that is probably impacted as much, if not more, than any other State because of the number of Federal employees who work at FDA and NIH and our other Federal agencies. But she did not come to the floor and say: Open all of the jobs in my State and make sure my State is taken care of. She came to say: Open the Federal Government so every American in every State in every part of our country is taken care of.

And she is right. I share her vision for the end of the day, not that we take a few here and a few there—whatever one individual decides is important here today—but that our entire country gets back to work. And I really share her vision that Speaker BOEHNER simply take up the bill that is at his desk. Allow it to pass. It has the votes. And at the end of the day, we can be proud our country is back to work. So I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very well-stated remarks.

I wanted to speak today about what is going on. Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN said something that I think sums up the House Republican position perfectly. He said yesterday: We're not going to be disrespected. We have to get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

We have to get something out of this—the Republicans in the House. I think that statement makes it very clear. First of all, House Republicans have exactly one set of interests in their mind: Their own. And secondly, they couldn't be more removed from the impacts of the shutdown being felt across the country. Every day Speaker BOEHNER refuses to reopen the government is another day of inconvenience and stress and uncertainty for families and communities we all serve. And because House Republicans clearly aren't getting the message yet, today I want to describe some of what my constituents in Washington State—over 2,000 miles away from here—are saying about the effects of a shutdown.

The families I talk to in Washington State aren't interested in the partisan, political strategizing that goes on in Washington, DC. They have a lot more important issues on their minds right now. Every day they are reading about how the government shutdown is affecting their community. Many are feeling the impacts themselves.

There are about 50,000 Federal employees in Washington State. Thousands are being sent home without pay. The shutdown is going to put a serious burden on many of these workers' families, but the consequences reach even further. This week, the Seattle Times spoke to a deli owner, whose job happens to be in downtown Seattle. She gets about 30 percent of her sales from Federal workers in the building that is across the street from her.

Without their business now, they are all home. And without knowing how long this shutdown is going to last, she is concerned about how she is going to pay her rent and pay her employees. She says, ''I don't think [Congress] is thinking of people like us.'' Well, it is hard to disagree with that. The shutdown is affecting so many. In fact, it is affecting other crucial parts of my home State of Washington. Our national parks are closed—campers and hikers have been asked to leave. And if the government doesn't open soon, participants in the Bering Sea king crab fishery—about which my colleague from Alaska spoke earlier this morning when I was on the floor—many of them are based in Washington State, and they are going to face significant economic losses. Why? Because NOAA employees are needed to process and issue their quotas. They have all been furloughed. There is no one to do the work they need to do their job.

I spoke to some of my constituents in the Washington State construction industry. They told me their business is slow because of all of the uncertainty about where our economy is going because of the shutdown and because of the looming guidelines. And there is so much more.

While our active duty military will continue to get paid, some of those who have heroically served our country are being affected. Furloughs in Washington State and across our country have forced our veterans to stay home and lose pay. As the shutdown continues, veterans are watching, and they are waiting, because if this government doesn't open soon, VA benefits—which many of our veterans rely on just to make ends meet—and support from the GI bill is going to stop.

Our veterans should not under any circumstances be burdened by partisan games. But unfortunately, the longer this shutdown goes on, the more they are having to sacrifice. And this shutdown is affecting the dedicated civilian employees who support our military. We have as many as 8,000 civilian employees at Joint Base Lewis-McChord who have been impacted. Some are going to work without pay and some have been sent home without pay, without any sense or idea of when they are going to be able to return. And, by the way, many of those workers are veterans—and many have already been victims of the gridlock and brinkmanship here in our Nation's capital.

A Washington State news station spoke with Joint Base Lewis-McChord employee Matthew Hines earlier this week, and he said his family already lost $1,300 because of the sequestration furloughs this summer. They are struggling to pay their bills and had to refinance their mortgage. This week, Matthew and his family were left wondering whether they would face more lost pay and more uncertainty.

The shutdown is creating uncertainty for struggling families as well those who depend on nutrition assistance programs. The Spokesman-Review

in Spokane, WA, talked with Rosa Chavira, the mother of an 11-month-old girl. Rosa gets support—because she needs it right now—from the Women, Infants, and Children Program, WIC. It helps her to put food on the table. We are now hearing that the Washington State Department of Health is estimating that WIC funds would be threatened as early as next month if this continues. So next month, just a few weeks away, if we are still in a shutdown, Rosa might take her vouchers to the grocery store and be unable to buy any food for her family. As Rosa told the Spokesman-Review, that is a scary situation.

What I just talked about are a few of the examples we are seeing in my home State of Washington, but I know that families and communities across this country could tell a lot of similar stories. This is beyond frustrating for me. It is beyond frustrating for my fellow Democrats and many Republicans—including, by the way, at least 20 in the House of Representatives, so far, who see absolutely no reason why this shutdown has to continue. We may not agree on much, but there does seem to be bipartisan agreement that the shutdown has to end. And once it does, we should begin the negotiations that many of us, including myself, have been calling for on the floor since March and work toward a bipartisan agreement that ends the brinkmanship, ends the manufactured crises that are so harmful to our workers and to the economy.

I know Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party aren't on the same page as the rest of us about that yet. But as we continue to hear from thousands of Americans—from fishermen to small business owners to struggling moms—who are being hurt as this shutdown occurs, I hope they will at least stop standing in the way of those of us who are ready to get to work.

I will close by quoting Kirsten Watts from Tacoma, WA. She works with the Bonneville Power Administration in Seattle, and she told the Seattle Times:

> It's just sad that the government is playing games with people's livelihoods.

Kirsten said that workers at her agency would still be coming in, but she is worried about the others who will not be. She was thinking about how this shutdown will impact others.

I think Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party—who, according to Representative STUTZMAN, are laser-focused on what is in it for them—could learn a lot from that approach.

So I say today to Speaker BOEHNER: Open the government. Let everybody go back to work. Stop hurting our economy.

All that it requires is bringing the Senate-passed continuing resolution up for a vote on the House floor so that the Democrats and Republicans who want the government to reopen can pass it. Once the government is open, we would be more than happy to sit down and work out our longer-term budget agreement. But we are not going to do it with our families, workers, and small businesses being held hostage.

This is not the time to talk about opening the government. It is time to actually do it. The entire country is watching and wondering how we got to this point. Let's do the right thing and show them we can work together and fulfill the basic responsibilities we were elected to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like many other Members who spoke on the floor today, I too want to acknowledge the extraordinary work that is done by the Capitol Police officers.

Every single day they work around here protecting the people who work and visit here. Yesterday was another great example of the skill, the professionalism, and the courage that they display on a daily basis in a very quiet and humble way, and I wish to express—on my own behalf and for the people that I represent—our appreciation for their extraordinary work and the remarkable way in which they go about their jobs and express how very grateful we all are for that.

I wish to talk about what is happening here in Washington, DC. Unfortunately, we find ourselves on the 4th day of what is a completely avoidable partial government shutdown. It is not like we didn't see this coming. The fiscal year ends every year on September 30. So it wasn't a deadline that we didn't know was coming. In fact, as I pointed out before, the House of Representatives completed work on four appropriation bills. Unfortunately, here in the Senate we didn't move appropriation bills across the floor to comply with the Budget Control Act. We didn't pass a single one this fiscal year.

Then recognizing the need to act at the end of the fiscal year as it approached, the House passed and sent to the Senate a continuing resolution on September 20—2 weeks ago. Instead of acting quickly to bring us to a resolution to keep the government funded, Senate leadership continued to stall, unwilling to negotiate.

The House has now sent us four comprehensive proposals to fund the government and to provide fairness under the law when it comes to ObamaCare. One of these proposals included a request for a conference committee so we could get to work resolving our differences. It was a very straightforward request. The other proposals that had been sent over here—which had other elements in them dealing with ObamaCare, as well as government funding—were rejected by the Senate. They were tabled here. So this was a proposal that was very simple and straightforward. All it asked was, let's have a conference. Let's sit down and try to work out our differences.

Unfortunately, the Democratic majority here in the Senate insisted that they will not negotiate. They tabled the motion—the request to go to conference with the House of Representatives.

So far this week the House of Representatives has sent us five bills to fund various parts of our government. I understand they are continuing to work on additional bills today. These are bills that would ensure that our veterans get paid and that children can continue to have access to life-saving treatments.

Yesterday morning my Republican colleagues and I came to the floor and requested that several of these commonsense bills that the House has sent to us be agreed to by unanimous consent here in the Senate.

Specifically, I asked for a unanimous consent agreement for the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill would ensure that the men and women who proudly serve in our National Guard and Reserve—those who have bravely answered the call to protect and defend our country—continue to train and to get paid for their service. Congress should send a clear message to these men and women who stand ready to serve in overseas conflicts or to respond to domestic disasters, that they will not be impacted by the spending disagreements here in Washington. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle objected to these requests and, unbelievably, the President of the United States has actually threatened to veto those very measures.

Congress has already passed by unanimous consent a bill to ensure that active duty military personnel are paid during this lapse in government funding. It is unclear to me why Senate Democrats wouldn't pass similar measures to fund these important services. After all, taking care of active duty military personnel is something that everybody agreed to here by unanimous consent. That rarely happens around here in the Senate. But Democrats and Republicans agreed that this is a priority. We have to make sure the active men and women in our military who defend this country on a daily basis get paid despite the dysfunction here in Washington, DC. All the bill I offered yesterday simply would have done is to apply that same treatment to our Guard and Reserve.

In my State of South Dakota, we have about 4,300 members of the Army and Air National Guard—a couple hundred of which are deployed right now, and the remainder have training functions that they perform on a regular basis. If we don't get this issue resolved, they are not going to be able to meet those training requirements. As we all know, they respond to domestic disasters, to emergencies that require their assistance here at home, as well as on a regular basis are now being deployed to meet the military requirements that we have in many of the

conflicts in which we are involved around the world.

So it strikes me as very strange that Democrats would refuse to act or engage in a meaningful debate in order to find common ground on issues like this and to get our government back up and running.

I think the people I represent in the State of South Dakota, like a lot of other people across the country, expect their leaders to work together to resolve their differences. The position of the Democratic leadership is that they will not negotiate and simply work together. That is not a position I believe is reasonable. We have heard it from the President; we have heard it from the Democratic leaders here in the Senate: We are not going to negotiate.

I think most Americans believe they sent us here to Washington, DC, to work together, realizing there are differences—legitimate differences—about how to solve problems and how to approach issues. But they believe, on a very basic level, that the responsibility we have as their elected officials is to sit down and to try to figure out how to solve these problems.

To say that we will not negotiate as a starting position is a completely unreasonable position to take, in the eyes, I believe, of the American people.

The dysfunction and the gridlock that we have here in Washington, DC, is simply unacceptable.

On Wednesday, the President invited congressional leaders to the White House for what, unfortunately, turned out to be yet another photo opportunity, a publicity stunt. The President waited until after the 11th hour, 2 days into a partial government shutdown, to even engage in a face-to-face way with congressional leaders. It strikes me that when you invite people to the table and in the same breath make explicit that you are not willing to negotiate, that very little work is going to get done for the American people.

I hope we would see better from our President and better from our leaders in the Senate. It seems like the Democrats are very content to take their ball and go home. Four days into a partial government shutdown, they still refuse to negotiate.

We haven't experienced a government shutdown for nearly 20 years. I pose to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the willingness of leaders in both parties to negotiate in good faith during previous negotiations is something from which we could take a lesson.

Going back to 1995 and 1996, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, when he was talking about the shutdowns in that period, said:

> Bill Clinton and I would talk, if not every day . . . we would talk five days a week before the shutdown, after the shutdowns.
>
> We met face to face for 35 days in the White House trying to hammer things out . . .

As we know, ending this unnecessary shutdown is not the only challenge we are dealing with here in Washington. But when it comes to the debt ceiling—which Treasury tells us will be reached in the next few weeks—Democrats refuse to come to the table to enact responsible spending reforms as part of that package. The American people disagree.

According to a recent Bloomberg poll, Americans by a 2-to-1 margin disagree with President Barack Obama's contention that Congress should raise the U.S. debt limit without conditions. The American people understand that if we continue to borrow and borrow like there is no tomorrow and pile that burden on the backs of our children and grandchildren—they understand that if you are going to increase the debt limit, if you are going to ask for a bigger credit card limit, that you ought to be doing something about the debt. That is why, by a 2-to-1 margin, they believe that if you are going to raise the debt limit, you ought to do something to address the underlying debt. In fact, 61 percent of Americans, according to that poll, believe it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised even if it risks default.

I do not believe we ought to have a default, but I believe a negotiation on the debt limit makes sense if we are serious about doing something about the debt. Every time in the past when we have had major budget deals—when we go back to the Gramm-Rudman deal in 1985 or the 1990 budget agreement or the 1993 budget agreement or the 1997 budget agreement or the one more recently, in 2011, the Budget Control Act, it was always done around and in association with an increase in the debt limit. There is a clear precedent, clear history, when we are facing an increase in the debt limit, of having a serious substantive debate in this country about how to address the debt. In many cases, those led to some of the few times in our Nation's history when we have actually gotten budget agreements that did something to reduce spending.

It might come as a surprise to some of my colleagues here also that inasmuch as many of us do not like the sequester that came out of the Budget Control Act of 2011——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what came out of that was now, for the first time since the 1950s, literally since the Korean war, government spending has gone down for 2 consecutive years.

It can be done. It can be done when reasonable people are willing to sit down and negotiate, but that requires the engagement of the Chief Executive, of the President of the United States, and it requires the good will of the people here in the Senate. It does not entail taking a position that ''we will not negotiate.'' That is not a position. What we need is an opportunity where we can sit down together and focus on these big challenges we have. In the meantime, we continue to have opportunities to vote to fund veterans programs, to vote to fund our National Guard and Reserve, to fund the National Institutes of Health—important priorities many of my colleagues on the other side have talked about.

We have bills coming over from the House of Representatives. We could do like we did with the military pay act—pick them up and pass them by unanimous consent so we do not have to worry about any of these issues not being addressed and important programs and projects not being funded. That is all it takes. I hope that can happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, we are here today with our government doors shuttered because of a failure to understand basic civics. Frankly, this ''my way or the highway'' brinkmanship has been building so long here in Washington that I would not be surprised if the American people say ''a pox on both your houses, Republican and Democratic.''

Why are we in this fix? How did we get here? Sometimes when you are lost in the woods, it helps to retrace your footsteps so you can find the way back out. We are here because some of our colleagues have forgotten their middle school civics lesson. They have forgotten the ''I'm Just a Bill'' episode of ''Schoolhouse Rock'' that some of the folks in the seventies and eighties remember that reminds us all that to pass a bill or repeal a bill, you have to meet certain tests. You need a majority of the House of Representatives. You need a majority in the Senate. If someone is going to filibuster, you need 60 votes. And you need the signature and the support of the President.

We are here because my colleagues who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act do not have a majority of the Senate. They certainly do not control the White House despite waging an entire election over the health care law. Since they cannot repeal the health care law the way we all learned about in middle school, they decided to try something new. They have taken the government hostage. They have said: If you do not give us what we want, we are going to close down the Federal Government.

Can you imagine what it would look like if Democrats employed this kind of reckless and irresponsible tactic? What if we said: Unless you raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour, we are not going to pass a spending bill. Remember in 2009 when our party tried to pass a cap-and-trade bill? We did not have the votes to overcome the filibuster in the Senate, so I guess the lesson here is that we should have refused

to fund the government until Republicans relented and passed a cap-and-trade bill. Can you imagine. That is not how our democracy works, it is not what our Founders envisioned, and it is not compromise. It is extortion.

It is our job to pass a spending bill every year. We can fight about how big that bill is. We can fight about how small that bill is going to be. But constitutional duty is not optional. Some are saying there needs to be further compromise on the spending bill, but it is clear that sometimes the Republican House does not know when to declare a victory. They actually got the spending levels they asked for. In the interests of keeping the government open, the Senate accepted House spending levels, sequester levels, in our funding resolution. I do not like those spending levels. Most Democrats do not support those spending levels. But we are not willing to risk the entire economy or well-being of our constituents just to get our way.

The bottom line is this: It is time to reopen the government—no strings attached, no policy riders, and no more hostage-taking, just a clean funding bill that stops hurting our public servants, our communities, and our economy, a clean funding resolution that keeps the lights on while we negotiate over a long-term budget. The Senate had the votes to pass such a bill, and we did. The House also has the votes to pass a clean funding bill, but Speaker BOEHNER will not bring it to the floor. He will not put it up for a vote because the most extreme Members of his caucus want to play hostage politics instead.

It is time to end this. It is time to drop the hostage politics and simply pass the one plan that has the votes to pass both Chambers—a clean funding bill.

Speaker BOEHNER, let them vote. Let your Members vote their conscience on a clean funding resolution. It is your duty, Mr. Speaker. Just let them vote. That is all we ask.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 4 p.m. and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Alabama has graciously agreed to let us flip the order, so I am going to now, before he does, ask unanimous consent that be done and that it not change the alternating pattern, Republican and Democrat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an aspect of the tea party government shutdown that has not gotten the attention it deserves. Sadly, the effects of this tea party shutdown do not stop at our water's edge. The shutdown is putting our national security at risk. The senior Senator from California, the chair of the Intelligence Committee, has talked to us about how 72 percent of our intelligence employees are not working. They are not all useless or laggards or slackers. In fact, there is a high degree of professionalism in the CIA, NSA, and like agencies. To have close to three-quarters of them not on the job puts every American at risk.

There is another area that is putting us at risk. We all know that the greatest threat to our national security and to that of Israel—or one of the greatest threats to our national security and the greatest threat to Israel is a nuclear Iran. In order to punish Iran for their pursuit of nuclear weapons, Republicans and Democrats, in a bipartisan way, led in many instances by two of my good friends here, the Democratic senior Senator from New Jersey Mr. MENENDEZ and the Republican senior Senator from South Carolina Mr. GRAHAM—they have come together to pass tough sanctions that would have a crippling effect on Iran's economy, and this body in a bipartisan way and the other body in a bipartisan way have passed those.

Just last week we saw some of the first results and progress, as President Ruhani said he was open to talks on the nuclear program. Iran had been intransigent before that. We don't even know if they really want to give up nuclear weapons or whether this is a feint, but we certainly know the sanctions are having a dramatic effect. What has changed Iran's mind? Have they suddenly had a change of heart out of the blue? No. The only thing that changed their minds is the sanctions, and that is why they are at least acting differently than they have acted in the past. Who knows. Hopefully they may actually do something real if the sanctions continue. We know that these tough sanctions are a huge weight around the ankles of the Iranian economy.

But right now, when Iran feels cornered for the first time, the shutdown of our government could well take that pressure off the Iranians, and it comes at exactly the wrong time. That is because the shutdown and its concomitant furloughs are preventing us from fully enforcing the sanctions, allowing the companies that are trying to do business with Iran to escape punishment and allowing the Iranian economy to expand faster than it normally would have. There are many companies that try to evade these sanctions, but the Federal Government has cops on the beat who have been, by and large, overwhelmingly successful in making sure nobody can slip through the cracks and do business with Iran. But now, because of the government shutdown and furloughs, those offices are greatly weakened.

Two of the major offices in the Treasury Department that enforce sanctions—the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network—have only 30 of their 345 employees. Let me repeat that. Two of the most important offices that enforce sanctions have less than 10 percent of their employees. Ninety percent-plus are on furlough. They cannot work.

The Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence—a vital part of our enforcing tough sanctions against Iran—is usually staffed by 10 people. Right now they just have one—10 percent.

The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control—the primary office responsible for enforcing these sanctions and punishing those who violate them—is also operating with a skeleton staff.

Just at a time when we need the sanctions to continue to bite, this government shutdown is making it a lot easier for rogue actors to sell oil and trade with the Iranian regime. We all know that those who try to avoid sanctions find the weakest place. Now, with so few of our people on the job because of the shutdown, it is going to be a lot easier for them. New sanctions designations will halt. We will not be able to investigate sanction violations. We cannot punish those who have violated the sanctions. The government shutdown sends a dramatic and strong signal to those who seek to violate the sanctions and give the Iranian regime hope that they can continue to keep nuclear weapons. It could not come at a worse time. The Iranian sanctions have been our best pressure point, and the shutdown is letting the pressure off Iran at exactly the wrong time.

We have seen a pattern over the last few days, and I have a feeling I know what the response from the other side of the aisle—particularly the junior Senator from Texas—will be. He will say: OK, Democrats, that is a good point. Let's fund the sanctions, and maybe tomorrow or the next day we will have a bill on the floor to restore those offices in the Treasury Department. Then maybe we will point out that the government shutdown is hurting middle-class students from getting college loans. Again, that was something that had bipartisan support. Then maybe the junior Senator from Texas or House Republicans will say: OK. Let's fund it too. After a while, it gets a little ridiculous.

The House Republicans, and their seeming acquiescence to the junior Senator from Texas, have given the junior Senator from Texas a veto power over which parts of the Federal Government are funded and which are not. At the request of the junior Senator from Texas—who has fervently and passionately said don't fund the government unless ObamaCare is

eliminated—the House Republicans have shut down government. Those actions are not a surprise. After all, the junior Senator from Texas said 10 months ago that he and the tea party ''have to be prepared to go as far as to shut the government down.'' It is not a surprise.

Anyway, the Republicans have shuttered the entire Federal Government and they say they are willing to reopen it a piece at a time provided that piece is blessed by the junior Senator from Texas. To allow any one person to pick and choose which parts of the government can reopen is a cynical and ultimately extremely damaging way to run government. It is dangerous for the country, and it is obvious it will not succeed.

I have one final point. It seems today's talking point from my Republican colleagues is: Let's talk. It is obvious they feel the pressure because America sees the intransigence of shutting down the government unless our colleagues in the House get 100 percent of what they want. But it is obvious when their talking point is ''let's talk,'' they left out a key point at the beginning of their new talking point. Because to only talk while the government is shut down does huge damage to millions of innocent people and to our country's economy. They forgot to say: Let's vote. Then let's talk. Their motto should be modified.

Our motto is: Just vote. Vote to let government stay open. It will take a single vote in the House of Representatives, and then let's talk. To say ''let's talk'' while the government is shut down prolongs the devastation to our colleagues.

I say to my Republican colleagues who have come up with this talking point ''let's talk,'' they forgot the first part of their talking point: Just vote, and then let's talk.

I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Alabama for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate Senator SCHUMER's remarks about the Iran sanctions. They are very important. It is an action by the United States that I think has helped in a number of ways with the radicalism in Iran, and we need to keep it up.

Yesterday, I heard Mr. Clapper—or maybe it was the day before—testify before the Judiciary Committee, and he said he had a number of people not working. Senator GRASSLEY said: If they are not critical people, then why do you need so many? If you have a critical job, you need enough people to do the critical duties. How many do you need? You must not need all these people. You said they are not important to us. I don't think Mr. Clapper had a very good answer to that.

When someone raised the question of defense cuts under the Budget Control Act, and he expressed concern about that, which I would share. I think Mr. Clapper is right to be concerned about it. So I asked Director Clapper: Do you know the way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? Have you ever heard of the Commander in Chief of the United States?

The House—the Republican House, I must say—has a half dozen times or more, over several years, passed legislation that eases those cuts and finds other reductions in spending from other departments and agencies that have received no cuts and as a result reduces the burden on the Defense Department. Indeed, the Defense Department represents one-sixth of the U.S. budget and they are being asked to take one-half the cuts and don't think that counts in bringing down the war costs in Iraq and Afghanistan; that is entirely different. I am talking about the base defense budget that has taken half the cuts under the Budget Control Act. It is too much for the Defense Department. It ought to be spread around. The House has voted more than one-half dozen times to do that. It died in the Senate because I guess they want to utilize the military to threaten Republicans: If you don't do what we want, we are not going to fund your military.

My goodness, the President is the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military. Doesn't he have a responsibility to make sure we are adequately funded? I have to say, I am just getting a little frustrated with that argument.

First of all, I don't think he is required to lay off that many people. He indicated he was reviewing it. He was going to bring back more people, as he could have been doing all along, but I think it did allow another example of disastrous complaints beyond reality. One more thing. Senator SCHUMER, and many of our Democratic colleagues, have been conducting a sustained and direct attack on the millions of people who supported and identified with the tea party movement. Make no mistake about it, they don't respect the people in the tea party movement. They demean them in every way virtually every day in this body.

The tea partiers believe in America and thought this U.S. Congress has turned into lunatics and are putting this country into bankruptcy by its spending too much and passing ObamaCare. Democrats passed ObamaCare in spite of the overwhelming objections by the American people. They did it without listening. The tea party spontaneously rose up, and it clobbered a bunch of Democratic House Members and Senators. It switched the whole majority in the House by a big number. So they don't like it.

Everybody who opposes them and says: You are not listening to us, they are now demeaning and attacking. I think the American people and the people who identify with and support the tea party, either directly or indirectly, need to know that. I know the people in the tea party. They care about America. They love America. They can't understand what is going on here and they think they are moving us into bankruptcy and we forgot the entire concept of constitutional limited government.

We have heard a lot of talk about the challenges facing the government during the funding lapse we are in. All of us want to see the government return to normal operations, and I certainly do, but what we seem to be losing sight of is the permanent consequences—the debt consequences—of the Affordable Care Act. It needs to be a part of this discussion. The Democrats have refused to listen. They basically blocked any effort in the Senate to reform in any significant way the Affordable Care Act. It has been going on ever since it passed. Their goal is to put up a wall around it so if anything comes up, they will not listen to it. They will not consider it. They will not discuss it. It is a fact. It is a done deal. We can't even discuss it.

The House has a right to fund what they want to fund under the Constitution and not fund what they choose not to fund. They are trying to initiate and force a discussion on one of the most important issues facing America. One of the things that is so dangerous about this law has not been properly discussed, and I wish to talk about it.

A lot of us are going to donate our pay during this furlough to charity. I certainly will. I wish our friends would begin to be more concerned for the private sector workers. There are millions of American workers who will be permanently affected by the Affordable Care Act. They will be hammered by it. Eventually full funding will resume to our government. We know that. This furlough will end.

If this ObamaCare remains in full effect, the consequences for American workers are going to be lasting and damaging, as will the consequences to the United States Treasury and our financial condition.

In particular, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I would like to focus on the huge and fundamental accounting manipulation that lies at the center of this health care law. I am going to make some statements, and if anybody has detailed objections or rejections to it, I want to see them, and I will respond to them. But I am correct in what I am saying, and I look forward to any discussion that anybody would like to have. So far people don't want to talk; they want to ignore the problem.

We have to deal with these accounting manipulations because it is a colossal blow to our Treasury. The Affordable Care Act was packaged and sold based on a promise that I am going to disprove. The American people knew it wasn't true anyway. Before a joint session of the Congress, the President of the United States said and promised this: ''I will not sign a [health care] plan that adds one dime to our deficits, now or any time in the future, period.''

That is a bold statement. It is as good as ''read my lips.''

As I addressed earlier this week, hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicare savings to the hospital insurance, HI, trust fund were double-counted under the legislation that was passed—at least $400 billion over the 2010 to the 2019 10-year period. I asked for an analysis before the bill passed on December 23. We ended up voting on December 24, Christmas Eve. They rammed it through before Scott Brown, who would have denied them the 60th vote, was elected in Massachusetts—liberal Massachusetts—on the commitment he would be the vote to kill ObamaCare, but they were able to get it through before he was able to take office.

The night before we voted, I asked CBO about it. I insisted they give an answer, and they did. They said:

> The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

That is Medicare—

> under PPACA—

That is ObamaCare—

> would be received by the government only once, so they cannot be set aside to pay for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on the other parts of the legislation—

ObamaCare—

> or on other programs. . . . To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. The CBO went on to conclude to say:

> To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings as both improving the government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double-count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement in the government's fiscal position.

What a statement that was. In fact, CBO estimated that if Medicare savings were truly set aside to pay future Medicare benefits, the new health care law would not decrease but increase the deficit over the first 10 years and subsequent decade. They said it would increase the deficit.

But there is a lesser known, equally shocking, account gimmick that I wanted to mention today; that is, how it was done with Social Security. They have obtained another $100 billion over the next 10 years by double-counting Social Security money.

My time is up, and I could explain it in more detail, but we have to understand this. According to the Congressional Government Accountability Office—and I asked them not too long ago when they issued a report—that over the next long-term implementation of ObamaCare, it would add $6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. That is almost as much as the liabilities that Social Security has and fully accounted for—my budget staff tells me that the ObamaCare legislation will be harder to fund and add more to the deficit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. SESSIONS. Than Social Security will under the current problems. We need to stop digging the hole and we need to start fixing Medicare and Social Security and not adding other programs we can't pay for.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I know this is not a town that has ever been known for having a long memory. In fact, the recent warning bells rung about our deficits and our debt have predictably faded into the background with all of the attention on the rocky start to this fiscal year.

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office released its long-term budget outlook. Headlines and news stories associated with that release use words such as grim and gloomy and raised alarm about our ''long-term fiscal crisis.'' The very first line in that report reminds us that between 2009 and 2012, the U.S. Government recorded the largest budget deficits—when compared to the size of the economy—in over half a century.

Reflecting on the current state of play, CBO noted that the Federal debt currently stands at roughly three-quarters of our gross domestic product. More alarming, they predict our Federal debt will match the size of our economy or be equal to 100 percent of GDP by the year 2038.

I understand the temptation to roll our eyes and politely suggest that those facts and figures are of more interest to green-eyeshaded bean counters or to simply wave them off as last month's news. Frankly, this is made much easier when the administration says things such as ''we don't have an urgent debt crisis'' and when appropriations bills come to the floor at levels that make little sense given our current fiscal realities.

Unfortunately, these facts and figures only tell part of the story. The CBO provides us insight into the impact these facts and figures will have on the economy and the Federal budget deficit. If the growth in our Federal debt is left unchecked, we could eventually see a further drop in private investment, an increase in interest payments, a decrease in Congress's flexibility, and, obviously, a risk of fiscal crisis.

CBO notes that ''the unsustainable nature of the federal government's current tax and spending policies presents lawmakers and the public with difficult choices . . . To put the federal budget on a sustainable path for the long term, lawmakers would have to make significant changes to tax and spending policies.''

We all know that given the current environment, it is difficult to do that. It is difficult when we have a problem just bringing routine spending measures to the President's desk. So this is not an easy conclusion to hear.

But within our dim current fiscal landscape and even dimmer outlook, there has been at least one bright spot. In 2011, Congress agreed to and the President signed into law the Budget Control Act—the BCA. This included statutory discretionary spending caps as well as automatic, across-the-board spending cuts for our failure to enact additional deficit reduction measures.

Certainly trimming Federal spending via across-the-board sequestration cuts is an inelegant means, at best, of addressing our spending problem. It is often referred to as a ''blunt instrument.'' At a minimum, it is a lazy way to legislate. I believe I join a number of my colleagues when I say I am open to providing additional flexibility while staying within the budget caps with respect to the sequester. But we simply can't deny that locking in discretionary spending caps and enforcing them with automatic sequestration has yielded some of the most significant spending cuts we have seen in Congress in years.

As my colleague from Tennessee, who recently came to the floor, said, 2 years ago, discretionary spending stood at nearly $1.5 trillion. Last year, under the BCA spending caps, that number dropped to just under $1 trillion. This year, if no changes occur to the sequester enforcement cap, we will be at $976 billion. That is a significant drop. That is significant. And that is a good thing.

A recent Wall Street Journal story entitled ''The GAO's Unheralded Victory on Spending'' quoted the head of Americans for Tax Reform as concluding that we had ''made a fundamental shift in the size of the government equation.''

While runaway spending on mandatory programs represents an ever-present issue we have to get our arms around, the BCA spending caps and sequester have put real and meaningful downward pressure on discretionary spending that represents about a third of our Federal budget.

My colleague from Kentucky, the minority leader, recently pointed out that the BCA which passed 2 years ago ''actually reduced government spending for 2 years in a row for the first time since the Korean War.'' I agree with him when he urges that we not walk away from the spending reductions we have already promised taxpayers.

I have made no secret of the fact that I do not favor the strategy of tying the funding of ObamaCare to the current continuing resolution. As the resulting shutdown drags on and there are more stories about the fights over funding next year, and then the coming debate over the debt ceiling, I find myself favoring this strategy even less. It is entirely likely that the sequester opponents will use the larger debate to push to undo the gains we have made of

meaningful spending cuts by abolishing the sequester by replacing it with meaningless savings, budget gimmicks, or even new taxes.

Far from a conspiracy theory, in recent months there have already been calls for a 2-year sequester hiatus. I agree with Taxpayers for Common Sense when they say that ''this may be the convenient answer, but it is no way to get our fiscal house in order.''

It is my hope we can find a way through this shutdown sooner rather than later. It is also my hope that we can at some point have a real conversation about the long-term drivers of our crushing debt that underlie our need to regularly hike the debt ceiling. In the meantime, and as this debate unfolds, I urge my colleagues to resist any effort to undermine the sequester-enforced Budget Control Act spending caps.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, House Speaker BOEHNER is sending the Senate a series of bills to put one Band-Aid at a time on the House Republicans' government shutdown. It is an obvious attempt to fool the American people into thinking House Republicans are acting to end the shutdown. But their transparent tactic is not fooling many people, and here is why: The people of this country know the harm of the government shutdown isn't about the handful of programs that House Republicans will dangle in front of us. The House Republican gambit will not put food inspectors back to work. It will not put Centers for Disease Control experts back to work tracking outbreaks of infectious diseases. It is not going to reopen Head Start classrooms for kids. Their piecemeal approach won't restart lending to small businesses or bring back the FAA inspectors who make sure commercial aircraft are safe, and it won't restore hundreds of other vital services and functions.

No matter how many rifleshot bills the House Republicans try, all they do is leave our government full of holes. We could spend months legislating in bits and pieces while House Republicans ignore the obvious solution: The House should vote on the clean continuing resolution the Senate has sent to them, because that vote will end the shutdown.

The Republican bits-and-pieces strategy is like smashing a piece of crockery with a hammer, gluing two or three bits back together today, a couple more tomorrow, and two or three more the day after that. House Republicans should stop before they do any more damage, put down the hammer, pick up the Senate's continuing resolution, and at least put it to a vote.

I heard one Republican on the Senate floor yesterday argue that we should adopt the piecemeal approach because, after all, he said, under regular order, we pass separate appropriations bills for different parts of the government one at a time. While that is true, it is irrelevant. We have a mechanism for keeping the government open while we go through the regular order process. It is called a continuing resolution, and it keeps the full government open while we adopt appropriations bills one at a time.

Five days ago, the Senate passed, for the third time, a continuing resolution to keep the government open and sent it to the House. It is well past time for Speaker BOEHNER to bring it to a vote.

Republicans want to negotiate changes in the Affordable Care Act. Of course we will talk about that once the government is functioning, but we should not and will not allow the U.S. Government to be held hostage by the Republicans while we are talking about the Affordable Care Act or any other subject which they or we wish to talk about.

I am keenly aware, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that one of the most devastating effects of this Republican shutdown is its damage to our national security. Already our men and women in uniform have been asked to operate under the damaging effects of sequestration. Those cuts have done serious harm to our military readiness and military families, and the shutdown is making things far worse.

Because of the House Republican shutdown, workers at the Defense Department maintenance depots around the country who should be repairing and preparing vehicles, ships, and aircraft for combat, are instead furloughed, along with hundreds of thousands of other Department of Defense civilians.

Training exercises have largely come to a halt. Anyone who thinks that is no big deal has never spent any time with our men and women in uniform. The key factor in our military's effectiveness isn't our sophisticated weapons systems, as important as they are; it is the highly trained men and women who employ those weapons. Every day of this shutdown wears away the sharp edge of their readiness to respond to crises around the world.

Some troops and their families won't get tuition assistance. Most travel is suspended, including many permanent changes of station. That means military families scheduled to move to a new location who may have already sold a home at their old duty location or committed to a lease or a mortgage at their new location, and spouses who need to start a job search, face financial loss and disruption and uncertainty in their lives. Our troops and their families can't even go to their on-post commissaries because they are closed.

The bill we passed last week to ensure our troops would receive paychecks is all well and good, but that did not address the many shortfalls our troops and their families face during this shutdown.

Another truly outrageous example is that the families of the brave men and women who were killed while defending this Nation will see a delay in the payment of death benefits because of this shutdown.

Some may say, You are right, these problems for our national security are intolerable. Let's pass a bill to fix them.

We have. The Senate passed a continuing resolution three times, the last one 5 days ago, which would keep the government functioning. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to allow the House to vote on the Senate-passed continuing resolution. No matter how many piecemeal bills the Speaker sends to us here in the Senate, he will be leaving out millions of Americans who will continue to suffer from the shutdown that he and tea party-dominated Republicans have created. Every day they spend obsessing over ObamaCare is one more day of unfairness and uncertainty for our troops and their families. Every day of the House Republicans' destructive submission to the tea party is another day food is not inspected, it is another day FBI agents are working without pay, it is another day the SBA is not approving loans for small businesses, it is another day scientists are barred from their labs and on and on.

Speaker BOEHNER can bring this chaos to a halt by bringing the Senate's continuing resolution to the floor of the House for a vote. The Senate has voted three times on House versions of continuing resolutions. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to vote even once on the Senate bill. Why? This is the question, by the way, the media has not yet asked Speaker BOEHNER. Why? Why has he not brought to the floor of the House the Senate-passed continuing resolution? Here is to the answer, and it is a stunning answer: Because it might pass. You heard me right. The reason Speaker BOEHNER is not bringing the continuing resolution passed in the Senate to the floor of the House for a vote is because it is going to pass.

That is anathema. It would be anathema—anathema—to the Speaker of the House for a continuing resolution to pass if it depended upon Democratic votes. It is his policy not to depend on any Democratic votes to pass legislation in the House. The policy of the Speaker is truly the epitome of rank partisanship. In fact, I do not know of a clearer example of extreme partisan policy than Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to hold a vote on bills that would rely on some Democratic votes to pass.

One of Speaker BOEHNER's Republican colleagues, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, has verified this sad fact. Here is what Congressman DENT said last night on PBS's NewsHour.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Here is what Congressman DENT said:

I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill to fund the government.

Then he continued:

That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along, but obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill—

Here is his conclusion. This is now a Republican Congressman speaking last night, saying:

. . . a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that's why we're in the situation we're in right now.

That is an astonishing report of abdication of leadership in the House of Representatives. What an incredible statement about the stranglehold that a few dozen ideological zealots now have on the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It is an extraordinary moment in history when a Speaker of the House allows a few dozen Members of Congress to bring the government of this Nation to a standstill.

When we cut through all the claims and all the counterclaims, all the press conferences, all the photo-ops, there is one unassailable, indisputable fact that remains: The Senate has passed a continuing resolution to keep the government open, and Speaker BOEHNER refuses to bring it to a vote in the House of Representatives.

It need not be this way. All that is required to break the stranglehold that the tea party has on House Republicans is for Speaker BOEHNER to bring the Senate-passed continuing resolution that would reopen the government to the floor of the House for a vote. I urgently hope he will do so, and I hope that every hour until he does, he is asked to defend his refusal to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 2 minutes and to be followed by Senator ENZI for the normal time he was allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we share being attorney generals of our States, and I just wish to take a moment to express my sincere and deep thanks—and from all of us—to the men and women who protect us every day, the Capitol Police. We had a very serious incident yesterday. Our people rallied and responded in an appropriate way. I believe they conducted themselves in a professional way.

For example, I saw one young man. He said he had heard and responded immediately, was running toward the scene. We think: Well, that is OK. That is what they do. That is what they are supposed to do.

We need to understand, when one of our young men and women are responding to a scene of a firing, of weapons discharged, they do not know what is there. In this environment, it could be a very serious thing. Their very life is at stake every time. Everyplace they stand on our streets, everyplace they stand in our building, the Capitol, and our office buildings, they are standing there subject to a threat by somebody who could appear out of nowhere with deadly force, and they do it with professionalism and courage every day.

We have been very fortunate in seeing this Capitol be well protected, and I wish to express my appreciation for them and all who place their lives at risk every day to protect the operational functions of this government.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his comments. I too want to add my thanks and appreciation for law enforcement people all over the United States who are doing their job and often have to do things such as give tickets. They do not get anything but bad news and grief for it, but they are out there protecting us at the same time and they definitely deserve credit, our admiration, and our prayers.

Madam President, I also wish to comment a little bit on what the Senator from Michigan said with his indisputable facts. The indisputable fact is that we are only where we are right now with a government shutdown and the attempts to get a continuing resolution through because Congress did not do its job, the Senate did not do its job, the job we have to pass spending bills. If we had passed the spending bills—and there are 12 of them—if we passed the 12 spending bills, there would not be a need for a continuing resolution.

What is a continuing resolution? It is permission for government to continue functioning as it has been functioning, spending one-twelfth of what they spent the year before for each month until we finally come up with a spending bill.

The way the law is written, we are supposed to have a budget by April 15 and that is a very significant day and it is an intentional day. Then, right after that, we are supposed to start doing spending bills, and we are supposed to allocate the amount of money we want each agency, program, department to spend.

We have not done that for years. Consequently, we get into this bind where we are saying: Go ahead and spend money, and we will figure it out later.

We have had a sequester, and the way the sequester works is it is supposed to be a 2.3-percent reduction from each agency, program, department. We did continuing resolutions last year. We did continuing resolutions for at least 7 months—probably 7½, maybe 8 months. So they got to continue spending what they had been spending the year before.

They knew a sequester was coming because Congress again did not do its work and come up with an alternate way to fund government. So they only had 4 months left to take their 2.3 percent out of their total spending, which would be the whole spending for the year. Do you know what that does? That makes it 5.3 percent.

But that is not bad enough. We have an administration that sent out word to make it hurt, and we have an administration that also took care of Washington but did not take care of the people out in the hinterlands of Wyoming—Wyoming and the rest of the United States—people who are out there actually doing the work, person-to-person, that is supposed to be done with what we are funding. Instead, it went to a lot of administration.

I had some people in this week from the Head Start program, and they showed me how they were cut 7.5 percent. What part of 2.3 percent would 7.5 percent be? Part of that is that 5.3 percent because it came so late. But it is 7.5 percent because 2.5 percent of that goes to fund the Federal Government in Washington. That is not where the work is done. That is where the reports are done. That is where the regulations are done. That is where the things are done that stymie the people out there who are having to actually help the people.

The Civil Air Patrol came to me. They do search and rescue from the air when people are lost around Wyoming. They said: We are being cut 60 percent. I said: What part of 2.3 percent would 60 percent be? They are even taking three of their five airplanes. I said: If they do not have any money, how can they take your airplanes? How would they have the money to fly them anywhere?

It is just one more of those things where the administration is saying make them feel the pain. Of course, part of that was closing down White House tours. How much can it cost for a self-guided White House tour? That is what they are. They are self-guided. You get a brochure. It is my understanding it is about an $18,000 savings. That is nothing compared to what we are working with.

We have $9 billion a year worth of duplication just on things under health and education and labor and pensions—$9 billion in duplication. What is $18,000? Why couldn't we take a look at those budgets in detail and get rid of duplication? This is duplication that is evaluated by the White House. But when we have a shutdown, we do not do that. We do not eliminate any of that.

Everybody has seen the World War II Memorial with the barricades. Ever since the World War II Memorial went up, I have never seen barricades there. I have been down there in the middle of the night and been able to walk through the World War II Memorial or any of the other memorials down there. I do not think I could use the restroom, and there is probably some justification for having the restrooms closed because there is the problem of cleaning them—what would require some additional personnel—but just to walk through things?

We are making progress, though, because they also barricaded off Lincoln Park. It is a children's playground up here on the Hill. There were pictures in the paper the other day of a little girl looking at the sign on the gate that was locked saying that the park was closed. I am pleased to report that yesterday that sign was gone, kids were playing in the park. There is no cost to that. So there is no purpose in having any kind of a shutdown regarding that.

The Smithsonian out here is a national park, and there are streets that go through the national park. They go through it one way primarily, but they do not have any additional cost to them. They do not serve anything. But they were blocked off. You could not go through streets that people normally drive through on any given day.

In my own State, Jackson Hole—if you are driving from Dubois to Jackson, on the right-hand side of the road is a gorgeous view of the Tetons. These are some lands left over from the Alps that God had, so he put them in Wyoming. People like to stop and take pictures of them, particularly at this time of year because the aspens are turning to gold and they are mixed in with the pine trees. There is a river that runs through there and then there are these majestic mountains.

The turnouts along that road are barricaded. You cannot turn out. You could not turn out to fix a flat tire. You could not turn out if you needed a nap. You cannot turn out to take a picture. Why? How did they get the barricades? How much did they have to spend for the barricades? How much did they have to spend to have somebody go out and put up those barricades?

Incidentally, if you drive along the GW Parkway out here, it is the same way. The little turnouts that are along there are barricaded. Where did we get all these barricades? If it was a business and they treated their customers that way, they would be out of business, and they would deserve to be out of business. We should be operating differently than that.

I did notice Air Force is going to play Navy tomorrow. But the justification is there is some revenue for that, and there is. If you charge admission to those things, and they are highly popular sporting events, there will be a lot of people who go and they will pay a lot of money for it and it will exceed the cost of putting it on at the venue. That would be the government making money. There is an oxymoron.

But Yellowstone Park is in my State. Yellowstone was the first national park. In fact, it was the first park in the world. It is a huge park. In fact, it is the size of Connecticut. It sits up there in the corner of Wyoming. A lot of people go through Yellowstone in order to get to Idaho or Montana or maybe Montana folks trying to get down to Wyoming. But that is all closed off now.

What is interesting to me is that if you do drive through there, you pay a fee. It is actually revenue. Now, of course, when I brought that up, I was reminded that the revenue goes to the general fund. But I had to say: Do you know where the money for the national parks comes from? It comes from the general fund. So if you do not collect the money, you will not have the money to put back into the park.

Not only that, there are concessionaires who pay to be able to sell gas and food and lodging in Yellowstone Park. Their customers cannot get to them. I do not think we relieved them of paying the fee they have to pay. I am pretty sure the concessionaires were expecting about $4.5 million worth of business this month—not the busiest month but an important month. I think there are ways we could have continued to collect revenue, but we are not doing it. Let's make it hurt.

We are here with this continuing resolution. The last vote I got to do was actually a vote to have a conference committee. It wasn't any demand from the House, it was a request for a conference committee. What happens in a conference committee? The leader appoints some people from here, in conjunction with the minority leader. They appoint some in the House. They get together and try to work this out. But, no, that was voted down by the Democrats, so we are not going to have that.

I have a lot more that I would say. I realize my time has expired. We are in this position because we have been doing a bad job of governing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, we are in day 4 of a tea party Republican shutdown. We need to be very clear as to how we got here. The Senate majority leader negotiated with the Speaker of the House, and after a long negotiation in which the Senate made major concessions, we agreed to pass a 6-week funding bill for services of the government, to keep services open while we negotiate the larger issues around the budget.

We passed a bill with the funding levels asked for by the House Republicans. Republicans asked that we continue funding below the levels we believe are necessary to grow the economy for 6 weeks. Rather than having a government shutdown, at the time we believed it was in the interests of the American people, of all of those who provide those important services to us, that we, in fact, agree with the House on a 6-week extension. We sent it over to them, asked for by the Speaker, agreed to by the Senate. There it has sat.

Let me quote again from Congressman DENT—a Republican colleague of Speaker BOEHNER's—who said last night on ''PBS NewsHour'':

> I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill, a straight funding bill to fund the government. That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along. But obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican conference who were not prepared to vote for a clean bill and that is why we are in the situation we are in.

''A few dozen folks''—part of this tea party wing. He said: That is why we are where we are today.

You can overcome that very simply. Just bring the bill that the Speaker said he wanted, that we were willing to agree to for short-term funding of Federal services, bring it to the floor, and those few dozen folks can vote no and everybody else can vote yes. Then we would have the government back open. So it is truly a question of just letting the House vote. Just vote. Right now, today, before 5:00, we could be done with this irresponsible action. We could then make sure the Federal Government can pay its bills and not default and at the same time go to conference to negotiate the larger budget issues, which we need to do, but that is not what is happening.

So it is now day 4. Government services are still closed. The bill that could open them—which has a majority vote, which has Republicans and Democrats—is sitting in the House because admittedly Republican Members of the House are saying a few dozen folks did not like it.

Well, in our great democracy, our Founders said majority rules, but somehow we seem to have forgotten that around here. We have elections. The person who gets the majority wins. The others are not happy. They lose. Majority rules. Same thing happens on legislation.

So now we are in a situation with a group defined as ''a few dozen folks'' in the House driving the train because there is no leadership in the House to bring up the vote and be able to pass this continuing resolution with a bipartisan vote.

We are paying a very big cost right now as a country waiting for the House to vote. Nearly 800,000 people have been laid off—800,000 people. We are just barely coming out of the recession. We are coming back. We are creating jobs—not enough. When this President came in, we had six people looking for work for one job. Now it is down to three people looking for work for one job. That is better. It is not good enough. There is more to do, and we all know it. So what is the response? Well, let's just lay off 800,000 people in the middle of this effort to try to bring a middle class roaring back in this country.

There are about 7,500 people in my State of Michigan who are providing important services, people who are in middle-class jobs, have a mortgage, have at least one car payment, many sending their kids to college, trying to make sure they can care for their families, proud of what they do providing various public services that we all benefit from, and they are now sitting and waiting.

It is costing our country about $300 million a day—$300 million a day—in

lost wages and productivity, $300 million a day that we cannot afford to lose. This could all be ended in 5 minutes if the Speaker of the House would just allow a vote on a bill that contains the funding levels that the Speaker himself asked for, not those that we would like to see because on a longer term negotiation, we are going to fight very hard to increase opportunities for education and innovation, focusing more on economic growth and jobs. This is a number asked for for a short-term continuing resolution for 6 weeks. They evidently cannot take ''yes'' for an answer.

Today I had an opportunity to meet a wonderful little boy named Kai who is 2 years old. He and his mom Anna were with us talking about the impact on the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, and other public health functions for our country and what it means to families.

Kai was born with a heart defect. He has had two bypass surgeries now in just his 2 little years of life. Thanks to a clinical trial at the Children's National Health System, Kai was able to get innovative treatment that he needs. He was running all over the place this morning, a great success story.

The things we do together as a country are what we should be proud of. The work that is being done by our doctors and researchers at places such as the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Food and Drug Administration are literally saving lives. These men and women who are now furloughed, not working because of the shutdown, have gone through years of training. They are dedicated. They love what they do. These are some of the top experts on infectious diseases and food safety and cancer research in the country and in the world. Right now they are sitting at home, maybe watching us, trying to figure out what the heck is going on—or stronger language. They are not allowed to work. If they are working, they are not working with pay, all because of a few dozen folks in the House of Representatives, tea party folks who are running the show in the House who have decided they want to shut the entire government down over the Affordable Care Act, over the fact that we believe—the country believes there had to be a way to find affordable insurance for 30 million folks who have not been able to find and purchase affordable insurance.

The director of the division at the CDC that monitors food-borne illnesses—scary stuff like E. coli outbreaks—said recently he has three people working in his whole department right now—three people for our country monitoring food-borne illnesses, three people in charge of tracking every possible case of food-borne illness in the entire country.

This needs to be a wake-up call. It is time to get the government open so that people can go back to work who are in positions to monitor and protect our public health, the defense of this country, educational opportunities, and the safety of our country. Get these CDC officials back to work and make sure our families are safe.

CBS News reports that the Centers for Disease Control headquarters, which is in Atlanta, GA, is a ghost town. Folks who monitor infectious diseases have 6,000 employees in Atlanta, GA, and they are calling it a ghost town—in America, the greatest country in the world. The Director of the CDC, the Nation's top doctor in charge of infectious diseases, said he is ''losing sleep'' because ''I do not know that we will be able to find and stop the things that might kill people.''

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Let me go on and conclude. We heard on the floor earlier from the junior Senator from Texas, who spoke eloquently about the great work being done by the veterans health care system. It is unfortunate that it took a government shutdown for my colleague, I might say through the Chair, to understand how important a completely government-run health system is. The VA is completely government run and funded.

My colleagues who are opposing people buying private insurance through private exchanges and making their own decisions about what works for them, who are saying it is the end of the world if families can buy insurance that is more affordable for them and that they can actually get what they are paying for because insurance companies cannot kick them off when they get sick or block them from getting insurance if they have a preexisting condition—they are saying that is awful, but a completely government-run health care system called the VA should be funded.

I happen to agree with that. Our system through the VA is important for veterans. We need to keep it funded. We need to keep the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and every other part of our important system funded.

The House needs to vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELLY. First, I wish to thank the Capitol Hill police and the Secret Service for their bravery, their heroism, and their work, not only yesterday but every day, to keep this Capitol safe and to keep the people in it safe. We are in their debt.

The people of Indiana all want jobs. We want to go to work. We want and we know the dignity that comes with a good day's labor and the chance to take care of our family. The people in Indiana have told me time after time, and they have said it very clearly: Joe, focus on jobs, focus on the basics.

I couldn't be prouder of my home State. Every day I am thankful I have the amazing privilege to represent all Hoosiers in the Senate. But our economy in Indiana isn't as strong as we would like it to be. The national unemployment rate is 7.3 percent; Indiana, 8.1. Indiana's median household income declined 13.2 percent from 2000 to 2012 and it lags behind the national average. We have dropped to 40th among States in per capita income. We have so much work to do in my home State and in our country.

As you know, I am an optimist by nature, but I am incredibly disheartened by what I have seen in Washington recently. Some in Congress are playing a game of chicken with our jobs, with our economy, and with our future. Because these folks haven't gotten their way, thousands of Hoosiers are furloughed and are not receiving paychecks, the paychecks that help them feed their families, pay for college, and invest their hard-earned money in the local-run businesses.

Many of the good people at the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Crane, IN, who keep our troops in Afghanistan and around the world safe, were sent home recently. They can't do their critical work that keeps our Nation safe.

The demands of a few here have caused the scientists at the Centers for Disease Control to be unable to go to work. These actions have also caused many of the patriots at Fort Wayne's Air National Guard Station and Grissom Air Reserve Base and at Terre Haute to have their work and their operations idled.

We are now at a point in the debate where some are putting our economy at risk simply to advance their own political agendas. These folks are shutting down operations across our Nation and in my beloved home State, and that hurts our still recovering economy.

We have so much work to do to move Indiana and our Nation forward, and Congress isn't helping. We talk all the time about providing certainty to our business friends. Hoosier businesses thrive on hard work, creativity, and teamwork. They also deserve a government that provides certainty, a steady hand in choppy seas. They don't need a government that creates the storm.

Most folks back home think Congress can play some role in improving the economy, even if that role is simply not to make things worse. But over the past year, Congress has made and continues to make things much more difficult. It is embarrassing that the actions of some in Congress these days are now the greatest obstacle to future job creation in our country.

America's economic confidence is measured daily by polling by Gallup. It is currently at minus 22. It matches the low for the year. It is worth pointing out that the other low for the year happened right before sequestration took effect in March—another problem, another self-inflicted wound caused by Congress.

The implementation of sequester cuts, which is what happened when Congress proved itself unable to make the tough decisions that Congress was sent here to make, has led to job losses and furloughs, so many families don't have as much to make ends meet.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported we could lose up to 1.6 million jobs next year if these across-the-board cuts continue. Further, a number of economists have concluded that Congress significantly reduced this country's economic growth because we failed to replace the cuts with something smarter. Economic growth is a fancy term for people going to work and people who have jobs.

The American people are losing confidence in their economy because of Congress. Here we are 6 months later, 4 days into a government shutdown, 13 days away from defaulting on our debt. History tells us government shutdowns are terrible for the economy and terrible for jobs.

If we look at the last time the Federal Government shut down in 1995 and 1996 for 27 days, Congress put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, with $1.4 billion in damages, and consumer confidence took a double-digit dip. Back then our country's economy was in a stronger place than it is today and it recovered a little bit more quickly. This government shutdown is damaging our economy at a time where it is very fragile.

However, this government shutdown has damaged our economy, but a default on our bills as we look forward would be absolutely devastating. What happens if we fail to raise the debt limit and if we stop paying our bills? That is what the debt limit is. It is our obligation to pay our bills.

While it is completely unprecedented, well-respected economists warn it could send us right back into a tailspin. We are still recovering from the last recession. At a time when Hoosiers are trying to get back to work and take care of our families, Congress's inability to work together is making it so much more difficult. Congress is not helping and is actually hindering job creation and economic growth.

This is no way to run a country. I stand ready to work with anyone in a commonsense way out of this train wreck. We must find a way to stop hurting the economy and to actually help the people who have made this country such a great place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. As did my colleague from Indiana, Senator DONNELLY, I also wish to take a moment before I deliver my remarks here to thank the Capitol Police, all of law enforcement, and first responders who have put themselves on the line to protect others.

I know I speak for every Republican, every Democrat, and all of our staffs that we deeply appreciate their work and their sacrifice. These brave men and women are here every day whether they are paid or not. We appreciate that.

If there is one thing we are united on, and I wish there were more, it is our respect for those who serve to protect, those serving us here at home as well as those serving us in harm's way abroad. We owe them our support and we owe them our thanks.

I am hearing from a number of Hoosiers, as my colleague from Indiana has, that they are tired of political gamesmanship, they are tired of paying taxes to a government that isn't listening or delivering for them, and now we are in a situation where they are tired of our careening toward these cliffs and shutdown. But when the Republican-controlled House sent over legislation to the Senate, calling for House and Senate leaders to conference together, to sit down in a room, talk through this problem and come to a solution, this good-faith effort was rejected out of hand by the Senate majority leader, Senator REID of Nevada.

We wanted to sit down and debate this issue. Once again, yet another good-faith effort sent over by Republicans to help fund the essential functions of this government was dead on arrival in the Senate. The Senate majority leader, parroting the words of the President, said: We will not negotiate. This was refusing to allow Republicans and Democrats to try to find a way forward to resolve this issue and get our government functioning.

In the past when these things happened, Presidents, realizing that they were elected to lead—we are elected to serve here, we are elected to serve the President, we are elected to serve the people we represent, but the President is elected to serve this country. When the President in the past has come up in a stalemate situation, there has been a reach out to the other side whenever we have a divided government.

After 2008, when the Democrats won control of the House, the Senate, and the executive branch, they had total control. They pushed through a number of measures without any single Republican or opposition support. Those programs now we are dealing with, and ObamaCare is the primary one that has brought us to this particular point. The lesson learned here is when one party has total control without support from the opposition party, we end up with legislation that is dysfunctional, that doesn't work, that reflects the ideology of one party and doesn't have any balance to it. We are now in a position where we have a divided government. What we would like is to have some say on how this goes forward, to point out those things of this bill that are not working, to point out the disaster this is turning out to be, the dysfunction of this particular legislation.

The point I am trying to make here is whatever the issue, whenever we come to a stalemate, historically throughout the history of this country it is the Commander in Chief, the President, who has stepped forward and taken the initiative and said: We need to work together to solve this. We can't impose our will on the body that the American people has divided, giving control of one House to one party and control of another House to another party.

Ronald Reagan reached out to Tip O'Neill, and some very significant measures, stalemates, were resolved because the President reached out and was willing to negotiate.

The Democratic President, Bill Clinton, reached out to a then-Republican Speaker of the House in the 1990s, and we addressed a major issue with welfare reform, much-needed welfare reform. It couldn't have happened without the President reaching out.

I could give other examples, but we are in another stalemate situation. Yet what do we hear? No matter what Republicans send over, no matter what the offer is, if the offer is to let us sit down and conference this, the reaction from the Senate majority leader is: We refuse to negotiate. The reaction from the White House and this President over and over and over again is: I will not negotiate.

Even though the American public sent you control of one House of Congress, even though the Constitution establishes the role of the Congress vis-a-vis the President, and calls for an agreement between the two before we can move forward, this President, for whatever motive, says: I will not negotiate.

We can do something right now to help Americans. We can come together to help fund important programs and departments that should not have been jeopardized because of this impasse. We can at least do that. If we can't get the President to negotiate, can we not at least take some steps forward for those essential functions of government?

Republicans have sent over nine such propositions and proposals. Each one of them has been rejected, dead on arrival, not even allowed to debate, and procedurally stopped by the majority leader.

Let me suggest four that are waiting in the wings and surely, for reasons of health and safety of Americans, surely we can agree to support these four and perhaps more. Some others have been suggested. Surely we have to conclude that this is an essential function. How it was that they were declared nonessential is beyond me.

Let me mention the four: Honoring our veterans and the commitments that we have made to them, providing for our national security, and protecting Americans' health.

I spoke earlier this week on the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act, a bill providing funding for disability payments, the GI bill education training, and VA home loans under the same conditions that were in place last year. The House passed this, but the Senate majority leader has blocked it here.

The House also passed the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component and National Guard component who are scheduled to report for duty as early as this weekend. Denying support for those who wear the uniform and stand ready and are engaged when called on, and have been trained to do so, is a great disservice to the men and women who have dedicated so much and put themselves at great risk to wear the uniform of the United States.

Secondly, funding the Department of Homeland Security. There are a number of ways our homeland security is impacted under the shutdown. One of the impacts on FEMA—the Federal Emergency Management Agency—is the need to be funded so they are prepared to respond to natural disasters. We are only a breaking-news headline away from another natural disaster or from some other need for FEMA to engage. Yet their employees are furloughed and not in place to be ready to respond.

We have a tropical storm in the gulf right now that may turn into something dangerous. Our emergency response efforts to provide for our homeland support is inadequately funded. Can we at least do that?

How about funding for our intelligence community? The House will send us Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act, which will provide immediate funding for personnel compensation and contracts for those individuals who have been determined by the Director of National Intelligence as necessary to support critical intelligence activities and counterterrorism efforts.

Under the current shutdown, 70 percent of our civilian employees in our intelligence community have been sent home on furlough. Director of National Intelligence Clapper said this lapse in funding our intelligence agency is a ''dreamland'' for our foreign intelligence adversaries.

Can we not at least, if we have a delay in resolving our issues here—and we have that delay, as I said, because the Senate majority leader has not allowed us to sit down and work—Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair.

Can we not at least fund those agencies that are looking to protect us from terrorist acts, that are in place to keep the American people safe? How can we reject that?

Finally, let me mention a fourth—and there are others, but let me mention this one. Fund Food and Drug Safety Programs, safety programs for those who are in need of approvals for new drugs and new devices and who are experiencing significant delays because the Federal employees at FDA who review these functions cannot report to work.

Madam President, frankly, I am perplexed why the majority leader continues to oppose even consideration and debate for individual funding bills when they just agreed a couple of days ago to funding for our troops, and I applaud that and support that. But if we did that because of the essential nature of their function, shouldn't we also include these other items? Shouldn't we agree we need to fulfill our commitments to guard and reserve and our intelligence community at this critical time?

The House has already sent over nine proposals to the Senate for consideration—nine—and nine times the Senate has had the opportunity to pass legislation to reopen our government and fund essential programs, but the Senate majority leader chose not to do so and the President refuses to even engage.

A government shutdown is a pox on all our houses. We need to do what the people of this great country elected us to do, and that is to work to find a solution to this government shutdown. How can we do that if the Democratic chair at the negotiating table is empty? What we are looking at here is a Clint Eastwood moment. We are looking at an empty chair. Mr. President, where are you?

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I want to thank the Senator from Indiana for invoking the name of one of my favorite actors and directors. I would say to my friend, I didn't think our friend Clint Eastwood's appearance at the Republican National Convention was one of his finest moments, but it is what it is. It is nice to be with my colleague and to follow him on the floor.

Madam President, if it were left up to the Senator from Indiana and this Senator, as well as our colleagues here from North Dakota and Rhode Island, I think we could probably work out a pretty good budget deal in a fairly short period of time that raises some revenues through tax reform to reduce the deficit, reforms to the entitlement programs to save money and save the programs for the long haul, and to make sure we don't savage old people and poor people. And while we are doing that, probably we can change the culture of the Federal Government a little so that we focus even more—not on a culture of spendthrift but on a culture of thrift.

Those are the things we need to do. And I am always happy to be with him and happy to follow him. It is so nice to be with Senator COATS today.

Following up on what Senator COATS has been saying, it reminds me of a phone conversation I had with a Delawarean today. She asked me: Why don't we all just agree to what the Republicans are proposing and adopt a couple of bills or amendments to fund some pieces of the government but not many? And I said: Let's go back a little in time.

What I sought to do in that conversation was to explain, in pretty simple, straightforward terms, how the budget process works here—how the budget process works here—and where it has gone awry. We have had a budget law since about 1974. The expectation of the Budget Act is that the President, usually in January or February of every year, will give a budget address. This is what the President and his or her administration thinks we ought to do in terms of revenues, in terms of spending—what our priorities should be.

The expectation in the law is also that this body, the Senate, and the House down the hall from here, will agree on a budget resolution sometime by, say late April of the year, for a budget starting October 1 of that same year. For a number of years—about 4 years—we didn't do our job in terms of developing a budget resolution. It was difficult in a divided Congress to do that. So for several years we didn't. Republicans criticized us harshly for not having passed a budget. What they were talking about was a budget resolution.

There is a difference between a budget and a budget resolution. In my home State of Delaware, we have three budgets: An operating budget for the State of Delaware, a capital budget for the State of Delaware, and something called grant and aid, which is something the legislature cares a lot about. It is only a couple of percentage points of all our revenue. But there are actually three budgets. Here we have one, and it is a unified budget with capital and operating expenses thrown in together. But there is no real direct corollary between what we do here and what we do in most of our States.

Most States have an operating and a capital budget. Here we have a budget resolution. The budget resolution is not a nitty-gritty line-item budget. What it does is to set a framework for what is to follow—the appropriations bills, roughly a dozen of them—and what we do on the revenue side through the work of the Finance Committee here and the Ways and Means Committee in the House.

The budget resolution says: This is roughly how much we are going to spend in these general areas, and this is roughly how much revenue we are going to raise from these general sources. That is a budget resolution. It is, if you will, a framework. I call it the skeleton. It is like a skeleton. Later on we have to come along and put the meat on the bones.

The budget resolution is supposed to be adopted here by the end of April. Usually the Senate will adopt one version, our version, and the House will adopt another version. We did that this year, by the end of April, as I recall, and they were different. In our budget resolution we did deficit reduction. We

didn't balance the budget over the next several years, but we continued to reduce the deficit. Remember, 4 years ago, the deficit peaked out at $1.4 trillion—$1.4 trillion. This last year that was just concluded we cut it by more than half, as I understand, and we expect it will be brought down again further this year. Should we do better? Do we need to do better? Sure we do.

The budget resolution we passed here took a 50–50 approach; half the deficit reduction for the next 10 years will be on the spending side and half will be on the revenue side. The budget resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, as I recall, did nothing on the revenue side, nothing on the Defense side, as I recall, and basically took the savings out of, for the most part, domestic discretionary spending. If we set aside entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—set aside Defense, and set aside interest payments, the whole rest of the budget—everything from agriculture to transportation, everything else—that is where they took the savings. And they reduced that part of the budget from about 15 percent of all Federal spending down to something close to 5 percent. That is not my vision of what government should be about.

Anyway, we came to the end of April, and the Senate and House passed different budget resolutions, and there was an effort here to go to conference—to create a conference committee and for us to send conferees. For people who might be watching and asking: What is he talking about, a conference committee is like a compromise committee—some Members of the House, some Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, go to this committee we create for just a short period of time to hammer out a compromise. In order to do that, somebody has to come to the floor—usually the leader comes to the floor—to ask unanimous consent that the Senate appoint conferees, Democrats and Republicans, to help create this conference committee and work out a compromise.

That request was rejected. It was objected to. It has been objected to again and again and again, whether the person making the unanimous consent to go to conference to work out this budget compromise—it has been made by Democrats or Republicans, at least one Republican. Senator MURRAY has made the request—she chairs the Budget Committee—close to 20 times, and JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, and Presidential candidate a couple years ago, long-time friend and colleague, has made the request close to 10 times. He wants to go to conference. He wants to solve the problems. So do I, and I think most of us do.

The ways to do it are those things I talked about—entitlement reforms that save these programs, that save some money but don't savage old people or poor people; tax reform that generates, among other things, some revenues that can be used for deficit reduction; and then to focus on everything we do. How do we get a better result for less money in everything we do?

Long story short, here we are. It is not the first of May, it is not the first of June, not the first of July, and not the first of August or September. It is the first part of October, and we have yet to be able to get the unanimous consent to form that conference committee to work out a compromise on the budget. That is where we have fallen short. That is where we have fallen short.

We hear a lot about obstruction: The majority leader or the President won't let us work with the Republicans on these piecemeal approaches. For everybody here—and I love DAN COATS—but for everybody here in the Senate, we could all come up with our list of four. We could come up with a list of 14 priorities. If you multiply that by 100, that would be 1,400 priorities that ought to be in all this piece work, these piecemeal changes we are going to make to the spending for the next couple of weeks or next couple of months.

Why don't we just do this. Why don't we agree to what the Speaker of the House agreed to, and that is a spending level for a short period of time—a continuing resolution, a spending plan, for a short period of time—not for the whole year. In this case, we have been talking about a continuing resolution, a short-term spending bill, that runs about 45 days, until maybe the middle of November.

The level of that spending, we can argue about that. But what we ended up doing is, our leader, HARRY REID, talking to JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House—and he has a tough job. None of these jobs are easy, but they have really tough jobs. But our leader said to the Speaker: What would be a level of spending for those 45 days or 60 days for the short-term spending bill? What level of spending works for you? My understanding is the Speaker vetted that with his folks over there and they came back and said: How about using the level of spending we are at for the last fiscal year, for 2013, and to fund for those 45 or 60 days whatever is covered by the continuing resolution, funded at that level for that period of time?

That is not our level. The Democratic level, to be honest, is not $986 billion, which is last year's level for discretionary spending. We were more interested in something like, I would say not $986 billion but about $1.05 trillion, something like that. Something like that, in trillion dollars.

So about another $70 billion—that was our number. The House had their number. We agreed to the House number. We said: OK, we agree on the number. Now let's figure out how long we are going to fund the government at the same level as last year.

Then the ship ran aground.

Our friends over in the House said: That is not enough. We also want to defund Obamacare, the Affordable Care Act.

This is not like a proposed bill, this is a law. I was here in the Finance Committee when we debated it, amended it, argued it, reported it out, and here when we voted on it and then the President signed it. It is law. The President ran for reelection on this and was reelected. We pretend it was a landslide reelection. The electoral vote was fairly big, but it was a reasonably close election. But he won, and he won fair and square. When you look at the Electoral College, he won by quite a bit.

It has been litigated in the courts. The Supreme Court looked at the one area that some people think is unconstitutional; that is, the idea of having a so-called individual mandate. They said it is constitutional. Where did we get the idea? We got it from Massachusetts. And who was the Governor that signed the Massachusetts law into effect? The Republican Presidential nominee, who then turned around and ran away from his own idea in the Presidential election last year. I think there is some irony to that.

Then, on October 1, this week, what happened? I think some good news happened, and the good news is there are 40 million people in our country who didn't have health care who had a chance to sign up for something new and different. It is not socialism, it is not communism, it is not government-run health care. It is a Republican idea called the exchange, the health marketplace. And my understanding is that when HillaryCare was discarded in the early part the Clinton administration, the Republican counterproposal to HillaryCare was something like a large purchasing pool, which in the health care exchange we call the marketplace today.

On October 1, all over this country 40 million people who didn't have health care coverage had a chance to start signing up for health care in a large purchasing pool in their State, with a variety of options, health insurance companies competing with each other, driving down costs—in my State, tens of thousands of people; States like Wisconsin, probably hundreds of thousands of people; other States like North Dakota, tens of thousands of people; but States like New York and California, millions of people who don't have health care coverage have a chance to sign up there and take advantage of

driving down the price—competition among insurers—and also taking advantage of economies of scale, driving down administrative costs as a percentage of premiums.

To buy health insurance in Delaware for families or maybe small businesses with five employees—we would pay a whole lot more money than folks are going to pay on these exchanges, these large purchasing pools. For one thing, the administrative costs are so high when you buy for yourself or a small business; however, when you are buying health insurance for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands or millions of people, administrative costs are much lower. Competitive forces bring down the prices as well.

Our friends in the other party want to pull the plug on the efforts of 40 million people to find health care coverage for themselves. I think that is wrong. It is the law of the land. It is a done deal. It has been litigated. It is going to be with us. And I think some of our Republican friends are not afraid that it is not going to work; I think maybe they are concerned that it is going to work and it is going to actually meet the needs of people.

Abraham Lincoln, when talking about the role of government, would say: The role of government is to do for people what they cannot do for themselves.

The chamber of commerce in Sussex County in southern Delaware—a rural area—tried to set up a purchasing pool and couldn't do it. They tried it 10 years ago.

Another guy, David Osborne, in the book ''Reinventing Government,'' described the role of government and said the role of government is to steer the boat, not row the boat. And the exchanges are really that. The idea is to create large purchasing pools, a partnership between the State and the Federal Government in many States, Delaware and others, but to then let the private sector do its job. These are great examples of government steering the boat and the private sector and other providers rowing the boat.

I would like to close with this: People say we ought to change ObamaCare, we ought to change the Affordable Care Act, make significant changes to it. I agree. And the President already made one big change 1 month or so ago when he announced that the employer mandate was going to be delayed for a whole year to give us a chance to stand up the exchanges, make sure they are working, and then to revisit this issue of the employer mandate. The coverage, if you have more than 50 employees—a year from now it will be more than 100 employees they have to cover, I think, but at least more than 50.

Some people say we have to change it right now. I want to go back in time 6, 8 years. We debated on this floor the issue of prescription drugs. Should we have a prescription drug program for Medicare? Most people said we should have had it when we created Medicare in 1965. If we could have done as much then with pharmaceuticals as we can do now, it would have been a no-brainer. Prescription drug coverage would have been part of Medicare since its inception. But it wasn't until about 2005 that we actually got to a place where we had some agreement that this is what we ought to do. Ted Kennedy and the Democrats had one idea how to do it, and some of our Republican friends—certainly President Bush—had another one. We ended up with sort of a hybrid—a little more like President George W. Bush's idea—and a lot of our Democrats objected. They didn't say: We are going to shut down the government because we didn't get our way or because we didn't get our specific prescription drug program. They said: Why don't we figure out how to make it better?

Almost everybody has heard of the doughnut hole with respect to the Medicare prescription drug program. The way the original program worked is the first $2,000 of pharmaceuticals for a person in Medicare Part D—Medicare paid about 75 percent of the cost. If they used over $6,000 of prescription medicine a year, Medicare paid about 95 percent of the cost, everything over $6,000. But roughly between $3,000 and $6,000—when the program was introduced and for its first half dozen or so years, if you were between $3,000 and $6,000 roughly in prescription medicine purchases, you got nothing from Medicare. It was all on you.

When we did the Affordable Care Act, as our friends from Rhode Island and North Dakota know, we started filling the doughnut hole. Now, if you happen to be in that gap between $3,000 and $6,000, Medicare pays over half and will eventually pay 75 percent. That is the way we took a good program—Medicare Part D—and we made it better, and we can do that with the Affordable Care Act, and we will.

For our Republican friends, our friend Winston Churchill once had a great quote. He used to say: You can always count on Americans to do the right thing in the end, after they have tried everything else.

This is a tough time. I feel especially bad for those Federal employees across the country who have been furloughed. We are going to bring you back, I hope, this month. My hope and belief is that we will bring you back and make sure you are made financially whole.

I say to my Republican colleagues, the next time, whether it is JOHN MCCAIN or PATTY MURRAY or somebody else who asks unanimous consent to go to conference and work out a real budget agreement, don't object. Let's accept that and get on with the work that lies ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, yesterday was a scary day on Capitol Hill. I was sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair and saw the bells ring, saw all the Capitol Police hustle our great pages in to protect them. Senator MCCAIN was speaking, and like the veteran he is he continued to make his impassioned plea for help for the Syrian opposition as things swirled around. For members of our staff and Members of the Senate and the House and all the tourists and the visitors, I think the only thing that stood at that moment between them and potential harm was the Capitol Police and the Secret Service. I was struck by that.

As a former attorney general who actually ran a law enforcement agency, I have a lot of great relationships with law enforcement people. In fact, I lost two officers in the line of duty during my tenure as attorney general, and I know the sacrifices, I know the fears of the families, and I know that every day, regardless of what is going on, some average, ordinary beautiful day can turn into a catastrophe where an officer loses their life.

As we were standing there, I was visiting with one of the officers who was protecting the pages, and she told me a story. She told me a story about a uniformed Capitol Police officer who told her that morning that he has a stay-at-home wife and she is raising their children, and he has $115 in his checking account and doesn't know how he is going to get through this time period to the next paycheck. Even though they are here and some of them are working overtime, they are here without a paycheck and potentially might not receive a paycheck.

So today we wear these buttons that say ''thank you.'' And I think about the hypocrisy of that. I think about the hypocrisy of buttons and galas and ribbons and all, and I want to say it is time for the Congress to not just pass out buttons that say ''thank you'' but pass out paychecks. That matters more. That is a real thank-you. That is real recognition of the value of those services.

So it was with great outrage that I left this body last night as we were working through the challenges, and I realized the great humor of the Capitol Police. I was leaving the building and visiting with my guys at the door. He was giving me a hard time, and I said: I want to thank you for being here every day. I want to thank you for your sacrifice. I want to thank you for the trauma your family goes through. And he said: Just think how good I would be if you actually paid me.

So I wish to say to all of my friends in the Capitol Police, who have been really truly friends—on some days I feel as if the only friendly face I see—that we care deeply. But it is not enough to wear a button. We have to start solving the problem of this impasse. We have to start recognizing that all of our people, all of our employees in the Federal Government—we have heard all day here this laundry list of let's do this and let's do this. I think we are up to 9, 10, and they are building, they are growing each one of

these lists. There should be some point when we get to the tipping point where we realize that all of the functions are important. Everybody who is out there working is important, is essential, and the best way forward is to fund government.

I want to build on what Senator CARPER has been talking about because I think it is so important. I probably was sitting in the chair the first time this happened. As most of you know, I am new to the Senate and new to these procedures. And Senator MURRAY, chair of the Budget Committee, came out and she asked to appoint a budget conference committee. I know this process fairly well. You get the big targets, and then they get passed down to the appropriators, who then build the budget within those guidelines. And the Senator from Texas stood and objected. I thought, why would you object to the appointment of a conference committee with the House and with Representative RYAN, who has been a staunch conservative and a staunch proponent of targets that I would think the Senator from Texas agreed to? There was this long back-and-forth, and then Senator MURRAY sat down and that was the end of it. I was perplexed. I thought, well, when do we get to vote on this conference committee? When do we get to kind of tell her it is OK because there are a whole lot of people in this place who agree that we should go to conference—only to find out there is something called unanimous consent.

The same people who have brought us to the brink of triggering a result of a slowdown in our economy with this behavior also have stopped the compromise. Now, adding to the hypocrisy of the day, we have the same claim for ''let's compromise.'' The easy compromise here is when Senator MURRAY comes to the floor and asks for a conference committee, we all agree to start doing it, we all agree to start doing our job.

There has been a lot of attention on the so-called tea party shutdown and the tea party faction and calling them out and saying: You are a minority. But I would like to take a different tactic this afternoon, and I want to challenge the good people in the House Republican caucus who have already recognized that the best thing to do would be to pass a clean CR. I want to say I know what it is like to take a tough vote that your party doesn't agree with. I know what it is like to feel as though you have let people down who are part of a group that is helping and moving things along and that represents, kind of, your team to some degree. I know what that is like. I have been there and I know it doesn't feel good. But I know at the end of the day doing the right thing for what you believe your State believes in is a better feeling.

I am suggesting maybe the minority, the minority of the majority that has an opportunity to step forward and take on this challenge and do the right thing, are those folks who know this is wrong, those folks who know over there that we could do better, that we have an opportunity to end this nonsense and move forward.

There is a procedure for doing this, as I understand it. I want to speak to those folks who I think are good-hearted, who understand the impact on families, on children, on our Native Americans. I could tell you horror stories right now, where we are looking at a snowstorm in North Dakota and many of our native families rely on fuel assistance. The people who do that are not on the job. How are they going to heat their houses in the middle of this snowstorm? This is life and death. I do not see a special provision coming across for those folks.

That is the problem when you piecemeal this. I think there are good people in the House Republican caucus who know that. If there is a way that they can in fact step forward, there will not be a lot of floor glory in their caucus. Trust me, I know. There won't be a lot of pats on the back and it might be pretty chilly for a long time. But you will have your conscience clear knowing that you did the right thing.

I am hopeful we can get good people to step forward, to stand up to behavior that can only be described in some ways—it has been talked about as hostage-taking here. It is really bullying behavior when the small minority does this.

Let's step forward. Let's do the right thing. I challenge you to do the right thing on behalf of the Native Americans, on behalf of my sheriff from Fargo, who was sent home from Quantico, the premier training facility. He waited years and years to be in the queue to get that training and now has been sent home. On behalf of law enforcement, on behalf of the Capitol Police, where we, yes, honor them today by wearing these buttons, let's honor them more by passing out paychecks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I join my former attorney general colleague, Senator HEITKAMP, in expressing all of our appreciation for what the Capitol Police did. We all know when that event transpired, our job was to go and hunker down, stay away from windows where we might be a target, and keep out of the way and not add to the difficulty or confusion. They had a much tougher job. Their job was to go to the danger and keep the United States Capitol safe. They did their duty and they did it well.

It is now incumbent upon us to do our duty and that is to get rid of the tea party shutdown. We are now in tea party shutdown day 4. I have been watching this debate as it transpired on the floor and I have been participating a little bit in it. I have heard some interesting comments that have been made out here.

The first one is the suggestion that this is not a tea party shutdown. They say it is not a tea party shutdown, but the tea party warned of it, the tea party wanted it, the tea party is cheering it, and the tea party says they are profiting from it, that it is a big success.

When did the tea party warn of it? One example is when LYNN WESTMORELAND, the Republican from Georgia, long before this all began, told the Faith and Freedom Coalition:

> This is what we are going to do. If the Government shuts down we want you with us.

The tea party wanted it.

JOE WALSH, Republican of Illinois:

> Most people in my district say shut it down.

Representative JACK KINGSTON told reporters that his Georgia constituents would rather have a shutdown than ObamaCare.

Representative TIM HUELSKAMP said:

> If you say government is going to shut down my constituents say, OK, which part can we shut down?

The tea party not only warned of it and wanted it, but they are cheering it.

MICHELE BACHMANN, Republican of Minnesota, said this:

> We are very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

She pointed out in another quote:

> This is about the happiest I have seen members in a long time.

How happy are the tea partyers about the tea party shutdown? Here is what Republican Representative DEVIN NUNES said: ''They are all giddy about it.''

The dictionary definitions of ''giddy'' say, ''feeling or showing great happiness and joy. Joyfully elated, euphoric.'' ''Giddy'' also means ''lightheartedly, silly'' or ''dizzy'' and ''disoriented,'' but that is another story.

Elated, giddy, exactly what we wanted—now they say they are profiting from it. Here is GOP cheerleader John Tamny, in Forbes magazine. I am quoting.

> Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government—

and get this—

> and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

I will say that again:

> Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

Echoing that sentiment we had our colleague Senator RAND PAUL the other day say, ''We're going to win this, I think.''

So the tea party warned of the tea party shutdown, the tea party wanted the tea party shutdown, the tea party is cheering the tea party shutdown. They are so happy that they are giddy. And they are claiming that their tea

party shutdown is a big success. It is a little late now to say, well, it is really not our tea party shutdown.

I have also heard colleagues come to the floor and say nothing they are doing is extremist. It is not extremist to shut down the government and make the demands they are making. One dictionary definition for extremist is ''one who advocates or resorts to measures beyond the norm, especially in politics.''

I would say that shutting down the U.S. Government is beyond the norm, even in politics. I would say refusing to ever allow a vote on a Senate-passed bill under the constitutional procedures that prevail between our Houses is beyond the norm. And I would say that deliberately putting hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country out of work is beyond the norm.

The norm would be for them to vote on our Senate bill over in the House. Over and over we in the Senate have voted on their House measures. We voted to strip out the extraneous measure and send back the continuing resolution. We voted to table. We followed the Constitution, we have done our duty, and we have voted. They in the House may not like that they do not win the Senate vote, but we did our duty in the Senate and have repeatedly voted on House measures.

Over in the House they have not yet once voted on the Senate measure. It is sitting on the Speaker's desk without ever a single vote. If the Speaker called up the Senate measure and allowed a vote over there in the House, it would pass and the tea party shutdown would be over. But, remember, who wants this shutdown in order to use it for bargaining leverage? The giddy folks, the folks who are so happy they have caused this, the folks who think this is good politics.

I think it is safe to say they are extremists, both by the dictionary definition and in their disregard of our traditional back and forth, one House voting on the other House's measure.

Last, and this one is particularly rich, they say we won't negotiate. Let's remember that this all began with a deal negotiated between the Speaker and the majority leader that we pass a clean continuing resolution funding the government. What did the Speaker get out of that deal? We agreed to fund the government at the Speaker's level. He actually won that negotiation. That was what was negotiated. But the Speaker did not honor the deal.

As I say, it is rich that we negotiate, we give the Speaker the funding level he wants, then he breaks the deal and now claims we won't negotiate.

One of my colleagues came to the floor a little while ago and he called to mind the radio commentator Paul Harvey. Paul Harvey used to have his catchphrase in his radio broadcast, ''and now for the rest of the story.'' And he talked about the rest of the story. The President has made his position very clear. It is: We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Open the government and we will negotiate about everything and anything. But we will not negotiate while you are holding hostages.

All the Republicans report in this Chamber is the first part: We will not negotiate. It is not a question of the rest of the story, how about the rest of the sentence? We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Remember that 19 times we have tried to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget between the Senate and the House and every time, the tea party extremists have stopped us. Let's remember that they do not want to negotiate. They want to negotiate with hostages. That is a very different thing. They want to negotiate with hostages, hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country whom they are using as hostages and will not let go back to work and earn their living. That is not just negotiation. There is something more than just negotiation going on when it involves hostages or other threats.

Every mom whose 4-year-old is having a tantrum over not getting what they want knows that is not just negotiation. Every 12-year-old picked on by the school bully in the school playground knows that is not just negotiation. And every businessman who is asked to pay protection money knows that is not just negotiation. There is something else going on. Ordinary Americans get the difference between negotiating in good faith, the way we have to if we had appointed conferees and went to have an actual conference between the House and the Senate about our budget, the way the rules in the Constitution propose, and negotiating with a threat or negotiating while holding hostages.

We are not going to negotiate while you are holding hostages. There are two parts to that sentence.

May I have 1 minute to conclude? I see Senator PORTMAN has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader said publicly he will negotiate on anything and everything as soon as the hostages are released and the tea party shutdown has ended. To now blame the majority leader for this tea party shutdown reminds me of when President Lincoln was put in such a position. When President Lincoln was accused of the very thing he was trying to prevent, he said:

> That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth: ''Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!''

That was Abraham Lincoln.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam chair, we find ourselves here in Washington with the government shutdown in place and a debt limit approaching, and I read this morning in the newspaper that a senior White House official has said with regard to the shutdown, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us'' how long it lasts.

That is not the right attitude. Today I call upon the White House to stop the political posturing, to come to the table so we can find common ground and end this government shutdown and negotiate something sensible on the debt limit. This notion that a senior White House official would say, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us'' how long it lasts, shows that it is politics, not substance that matters.

It may not matter to the White House how long it lasts, by the way, but it does matter to the American people because they expect us to fulfill our constitutional duties, to get our work done, and not to take America to the brink. They expect us to do the job that we were sent here to do.

It matters, by the way, to a lot of Americans because they are being affected by it. There are 8,700 civilian employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base outside of Dayton, OH, who are being affected. It matters to the roughly 1,800 Ohio National Guardsmen across the State of Ohio who have been furloughed.

We can stand here and point fingers at each other as to how we got here. The truth is that how we got here is we didn't do our work. The fact that we have a continuing resolution at all, which is a continuation of funding from last fiscal year, is a mark of failure. It is a mark of failure because it means that the Congress didn't do the appropriations bills that it was supposed to do. There are 12 of them, and the idea is that Congress sits down and has hearings about the departments and agencies to provide proper oversight to the Federal Government, and then they put together appropriations bills in 12 different areas. That hasn't happened. Congress did not pass these appropriations bills in an orderly way. If they did, there would not be a continuing resolution.

We can talk about the fact that over the last 4 years, under the leadership of the majority in the Senate, we have passed exactly 1 appropriations bill out of 48, on time—1 out of 48. That was the military construction bill. I think it was in about 2011. That should be a relatively easy one to pass.

The House has done better. They have passed more appropriations bills, and they passed a budget consistently every year. This year—in the fourth year after 3 years of no budget—the Senate did pass a budget, and I applaud the Senate for that. I do support going to conference with those budgets, but the fact is that Congress has not done its work, and that is why we are here. Only 1 appropriations bill out of 48 in the last 4 years has passed this Senate on time—one.

There is another way to get around this, and we can talk about that. There is legislation called the end government shutdown bill, which simply continues funding from year to year. If we

get to September 30, and any appropriations bill is not done, it says we will have the same level of funding as the previous year, except after 120 days there is a 1 percent reduction in funding, and after another 90 days, there is another 1 percent reduction in funding, and so on. The reason is to encourage the appropriators to meet and get their work done, so we put a little inducement in there.

That legislation is bipartisan. We voted on that legislation in the Chamber earlier this year. It was supported by 46 of the 100 members. It was supported by every Republican except for two, and it was supported by three Democrats. It is my legislation, and we tried to bring this up as an amendment last week on the continuing resolution. It would have made all the sense in the world. Instead of us having this discussion we are having now in the context of a government shutdown, if we had passed the end government shutdown amendment to the CR last week, we would continue funding from last year knowing it would be reduced by 1 percent in 120 days, which gives us plenty of time to get the appropriations together, and then another 1 percent after 90 days, and another 1 percent after the next 90 days.

We wouldn't be sitting here today in the situation of a government shutdown had we passed that. The majority refused to allow that amendment to even come up for a vote. I don't know if we could have passed it or not. Again, 46 of us supported it last time. My sense is, given the fact that we were heading toward a government shutdown, we could have gotten a majority of this body to support that. But we don't know because, as is the case so often, the leadership here blocks amendments, so we never had the opportunity to have our voices be heard as Senators.

Without a doubt, there is plenty of blame to go around, but whatever brought us to this point, it is where we are. I can promise this: As long as the White House and the majority in this Chamber continue to refuse to talk about it and negotiate, and as long as they refuse to attempt to find common ground—any common ground—we are not going to make progress. As long as they treat it as a political opportunity, one to score political points, then we are not going to be able to move forward. It is a failure of leadership because governing is about talking, negotiating, discussing, debating, and then finding common ground. It is hard, but it is what we are hired to do.

We talk a lot in this Chamber about this notion of finding common ground, and I support it strongly. We don't do it enough. But to find common ground, you have to step off your own territory and on to some territory in the middle, and that requires negotiations. It requires sitting down with both parties and talking. It is what the American people, by the way, want us to do. They do it in their lives every day. We do it in our marriages and in our businesses. Yet, there is this unbelievable quote from this morning that I talked about by some senior official at the White House saying, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't matter to us'' how long it lasts.

We have legislation coming over from the House to this Chamber that says: Let's have a conference. That is the conference between the House and the Senate. So there is a formal process where we have conferees over here—people to represent the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, and to represent the House, Republican and Democratic conferees. They come together and discuss, in this case, the continuing resolution and the debt limit, and that was tabled here. In other words, the majority here did not want to move to conference, so they blocked it. To me that seems to be the wrong approach. Let's have a conference and a discussion.

By the way, this is on top of a hardline position the President has taken, and I have talked about this over the last month because the President has been saying it for the last month. He has refused to talk about or negotiate on the debt limit. That is coming up in only a couple of weeks. As important as the government shutdown debate is, in my view, the debt limit discussion is even more important because it puts our country's economy at risk.

I don't think we should be taking a position on anything if we don't talk, but certainly not on the debt limit discussion. The irony, which has been pointed out by others, is that we have a President of the United States who says he will negotiate with President Putin of Russia, but he will not talk with the Speaker of the House who is in the other party. To me it is irresponsible. It is a failure of leadership, and I don't think it is sustainable. I hope it is not.

By the way, the President has said he refuses to talk about the debt limit because we should just extend the debt limit without any preconditions, without any reduction in spending, without even any discussion of what should go along with a debt limit extension. That, my friends, is not consistent with the historical precedent either. Every President, Republican and Democrat alike, has engaged in negotiations and discussions about the debt limit, in part, frankly, because the debt limit is a hard vote. The folks I represent back home get it. For them it is kind of like the credit card. Their deal is: OK, Congress has once again gone over their limit on their credit card.

I have to be careful which credit card I hold up. I am not advertising for any particular one. This happens to be a MasterCard.

They are saying: Before you guys extend the limit on the credit card, let's deal with the underlying problem. It's kind of like if your teenager puts you, as a parent, in a position of having gone over the line on the credit card. We have teenagers here who I am sure have never done that. Your parents would probably say, after they rip up the credit card, let's get at the underlying problem, which is the spending problem. Why are we spending more than we are taking in to the point we have to keep extending the limit on this credit card?

The American people get it. That is why every President—Republicans and Democrats alike—has had to come to Congress and say: OK, how are we going to work together to extend this debt limit while also dealing with the underlying problem, which is the fact that we are spending too much? But this President refuses to do it.

I have gone back and looked. For the last 3 decades the debt limit discussion is the only thing that has led to Congress doing anything substantial on spending. This is a period at which Congress has consistently spent more than it has taken in. Congress and the Presidents—Republican and Democrat alike—have led the country into deficits and debt. We are now at historic levels. This year the debt is just under $17 trillion. We are in uncharted territory. This year it is higher than ever. Yet this President is saying, unlike other Presidents, that he refuses to even talk about it.

I will tell you what has happened. Over the last 30 years, every substantial deficit reduction has come in the context of a debt limit debate. Some may remember Gramm-Rudman back in the 1980s. It was considered historic legislation at the time, when we had smaller deficits and a much smaller debt. But it provided rescissions—across-the-board spending cuts. It was bipartisan. It came out of a debt limit discussion.

In 1990, when President George H.W. Bush, the first President Bush, went out to Andrews Air Force Base, with Republicans and Democrats alike, to negotiate a budget agreement, it was in the context of a debt limit discussion. The pay-go rules that many Democrats now talk about favorably came out of the discussion about the debt limit.

The 1997 balanced budget agreement with Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton that ended up leading to the balanced budget we got a couple of years later came out of a discussion about the debt limit. Most recently, of course, the Budget Control Act came out of a discussion about the debt limit.

So this notion that Presidents never talk about or negotiate on the debt limit is just not accurate in terms of our history. In fact, just the opposite is true. It is the only time we have been able to reduce spending.

I see the distinguished majority leader is on the floor, so I will be short.

We need to figure out how to come together. The President needs to engage. It is time to govern. If the President refuses to talk, we will not be able to come to an agreement. If he does engage, as history has shown us, tough decisions can be made.

I have gone through a litany of times when we have done it. I have also talked about the fact that this year we have a bigger debt than ever, a bigger deficit than any of those historical examples I gave. Therefore, there is a greater need than ever for us to come together and find that common ground.

Mr. WICKER. If the Senator would yield for a moment. I think the distinguished majority leader is going to make a procedural motion which will take only a moment, and then I have a question for my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I will be happy to yield.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 5 p.m., and that all the provisions under the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate my two friends for yielding for this consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, as far as I am concerned, my distinguished friend from Ohio can still have the floor. I only wanted to take a moment to congratulate him on his remarks and to observe that when it comes to budget matters, he knows whereof he speaks. He not only has a distinguished record in the House of Representatives, but he is a leader in being a budget hawk and was an opponent of additional debt in the House of Representatives, and has had a distinguished career in the Office of Management and Budget. So I thank the distinguished Senator.

It may be that he has already asked for an opinion piece from today's Wall Street Journal to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PORTMAN. I have not.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time an opinion piece written by Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey on page 23 in today's Wall Street Journal entitled ''Obama Rewrites Debt-Limit History.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 2013]

OBAMA REWRITES DEBT-LIMIT HISTORY

(By Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey)

As the government shutdown continues, the nation gets closer and closer to the day—probably Oct. 17—when Washington hits the debt limit, and with it the specter of default. President Obama may be getting nervous about what will happen to his negotiating position as that day approaches.

He keeps asserting that the debt limit has never been used ''to extort a president or a government party.'' Treasury Secretary Jack Lew is selling the same story, saying ''until very recently, Congress typically raised the debt ceiling on a routine basis . . . the threat of default was not a bargaining chip in the negotiations.''

This is simply untrue. Consider the shenanigans of congressional Democrats in 1989 over Medicare's catastrophic health coverage provision.

In this case, the problem was political infighting within the Democratic Party between the House and the Senate. ''Weeks of political maneuvering brought the government to the brink of financial default,'' the New York Times wrote on Nov. 8 of that year. The debt limit was raised just hours before all extraordinary measures to avoid default were exhausted. The final bill dropped any action on Medicare but included a measure to repeal 1986 tax rules barring discrimination in employer-paid health insurance plans.

The Obama administration's campaign to make the debt limit appear non-negotiable might reflect concern that Republican congressional strategy might actually work. Six out of 10 Americans say ''it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised, even if it risks default,'' according to a Sept. 26 Bloomberg poll. (Only 28% say ''the debt ceiling should be raised when necessary, with no conditions.'')

One thing is certain: The debt limit has been a powerful negotiating tool in the last several decades. It has enabled the passage of important additional legislation.

According to the Congressional Research Service, Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about $16 trillion from $752 billion. Of these 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in a split Congress, and seven in a Republican-controlled Congress.

While large increases that give the U.S. Treasury a healthy amount of borrowing space happen occasionally, small short-term increases are common. In 1990 alone, while Republican George H.W. Bush was in the White House, a Democratic-controlled Congress voted to increase the debt limit seven times.

Congressional Republicans who want legislative conditions in exchange for a debt-limit increase are following a strategy that has been pursued by both parties the majority of the time. Of the 53 increases in the debt limit, 26 were ''clean''—that is, stand-alone, no strings-attached statutes. The remaining debt-limit increases were part of an omnibus package of other legislative bills or a continuing resolution. Other times, the limit was paired with reforms, only some of which were related to the budget.

In 1979, a Democratic Congress increased the debt limit but required Congress and the president to present balanced budgets for fiscal years 1981 and 1982. In 1980 the debt limit, again increased by a Democratic Congress, included repeal of an oil-import fee. In 1985, the debt limit that was raised by a divided Congress included a cigarette tax and a provision requiring Congress to pursue an alternative minimum corporate tax in the next year.

Most recently, a divided Congress that passed the 2011 debt-limit increase included the Budget Control Act which aimed to reduce the deficit by $2.4 trillion over 10 years and included the automatic budget sequester that kicked in on Jan. 1.

As the finger pointing begins, it is important to keep this history in mind. All told, congressional Democrats have been responsible for 60% of the ''dirty'' increases when the debt limit was raised alongside other legislative items. Republicans were responsible for 15%. The remaining 25% occurred during divided Congresses.

Of the Democratic dirties, six occurred when Democrats also controlled the White House, and 10 occurred when a Republican controlled the White House. For Republicans, all four occurred while a Democrat held the presidency.

Debt-limit votes often have been contentious, but on the whole they serve an important function. First, they force painful votes by legislators who would prefer to offer supporters free lunches through unfunded spending programs. Without these votes, politicians of both parties would have a significantly easier time ignoring fiscal discipline.

Second, debt-limit votes have provided a regular vehicle for legislation. Divided governments have a difficult time passing anything. Since the consequences of government default are so severe, debt-limit legislation has always passed in the end, and it has often included important additional legislative accomplishments.

Third, the debt limit has provided significant leverage to the minority party and has been a check on the power of the presidency.

Republicans today are playing a role that has been played many times. While the debt-limit kabuki inevitably roils markets as deadlines approach, the alternative absence of fiscal discipline would make government insolvency more probable in the fullness of time.

Trying to separate ObamaCare from the debt limit, President Obama has asserted that his health law has ''nothing to do with the budget.'' His argument is eagerly echoed by an at-best ignorant media. The Affordable Care Act was passed under ''reconciliation''—a legislative process that is used only for budget measures and which limits congressional debate.

The notion that legislation passed as part of a budget might be reconsidered as part of subsequent budget legislation should be uncontroversial. Perhaps that is why the administration has staked so much on its misrepresentation of history.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

This article points out in a very detailed and annotated way a number of times when this Congress has made policy changes, important, far-reaching policy changes, in connection with negotiations on the debt ceiling increase.

So I join my friend from Ohio in saying it is absolutely incumbent on this Senate—Republicans and our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle—as well as Members of the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, to, once again, negotiate in good faith.

The President may feel we are entirely unreasonable in our position. Frankly, there have been times during my 19 years in the House and now in the Senate when I felt the Chief Executive was completely wrong in his viewpoint on how we should address our national debt. But at no time in my recollection have the parties been simply unwilling to sit down and talk at all or to have meetings in the White House and in those meetings to basically say we are not going to make counterproposals or to say publicly: Why should I offer them anything at all? I think the American people see that is an unworkable approach.

So I point out to my colleagues, and I thank the Senator from Ohio in

pointing out that very important fiscal decisions, very important debt-related decisions have absolutely been made in our Nation's history, and I am glad they have been made in connection with this debate on the national debt.

I yield back to my friend from Ohio and thank him for allowing me to intrude on his time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, if the Senator will hold for a moment, first, I thank the Senator for referring to the op-ed in the Wall Street Journal. I have not seen it yet so I look forward to reading it myself. It sounds as though it is consistent with what I was pointing out, which is it would only make sense that the American people would want us to reduce spending when we extend the debt limit yet again—again, at historic levels now. The American people get it. They know we can't keep spending more than we take in, so they expect us to do something about the underlying problem.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, the Senator from Ohio mentioned the Budget Control Act of 2011. It wasn't a particularly pretty way to do debt reduction, but it did give us the spending levels we are operating under now.

The authors of this opinion piece go on to point out that according to the Congressional Research Service—an independent arm of this government—Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about $16 trillion. In at least 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in split Congresses, and 7 in Republican-controlled Congresses. It goes on to point out time and again how important policy changes were made in connection with this debate.

So I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to ask my friend from Mississippi a question. He has been stalwart on budget debates and he is a guy who has always held the line, in the House and in the Senate. He voted for the Budget Control Act because he believes we need to get our spending under control. He also wants to ensure that we deal with the part of the budget that is not being talked about because the whole continuing resolution debate is about 35 percent of the budget. The other 65 percent, which is the faster growing part, based on the Congressional Budget Office, parts of that—the health care entitlements—will grow over 100 percent over the next 10 years. I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he is hearing back home what I am hearing from my constituents, which is they want us to do something on the spending before we extend the credit card limit again.

I wonder if he could tell us what he is hearing back home, given his background.

Mr. WICKER. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the American people are alarmed, actually, at the level of debt this government has run up, particularly in the last 4½ to 5 years. It has been astounding. We cannot continue to add debt upon debt for the next generation, many of whom are within the sound of our voices and some of whom are employed as our pages. The Senator has already referred to them today. We owe them a government that grows our debt at a much slower rate.

We have done it before. When the distinguished Senator and I were in the House of Representatives, we were told we could not balance the budget within 10 years. Actually, with the leadership of my friend from Ohio, we passed legislation. We had the cooperation of the President of the United States who negotiated with us, and that divided government balanced the budget not within 10 years but within 3 or 4 years, and we fulfilled that until the terrorist attacks of 2001.

So, yes, the American people are concerned. I think we would be doing a disservice to them, simply to go along with a debt increase without addressing the underlying problems. As my friend from Ohio knows, the President of the United States himself in this budget has proposed very significant changes in the growth rate of certain of our entitlement programs, which would go a long way toward getting us to a bipartisan resolution on this issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator raises an important point, which is that the larger part of the budget—the 65 percent of the budget that is not being debated as part of a continuing resolution, not subject to congressional appropriations and the faster growing part of the budget—is an issue the President actually did address in his own budget. In fact, he laid out a number of proposals called mandatory spending reforms that would help to reduce some of the debt by reducing some of the cost increases on that 65 percent of the budget.

By the way, 65 percent today, 10 years from now will be 76 percent of the budget. The departments and agencies that are appropriated every year are only 35 percent, soon to be reduced to 24 percent of the budget. So that is a very good point the Senator makes.

The President himself has pointed out that we need to make changes. Yet he refuses to negotiate, refuses to talk, refuses to consider any of these proposals. It doesn't seem to make sense, and it is certainly not in the interests of the American people, the people from Mississippi and the people from Ohio.

I thank my colleague from Mississippi for joining me. I look forward to reading the new material he has provided for the RECORD today. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as my colleagues have done on several occasions, I come to the floor also to speak on the shutdown and the pending effort to find a compromise we can finally get to the President of the United States. Today, specifically, I come to the floor to take issue with a remark made by the President on Tuesday this week regarding the health care reform bill that he also sometimes calls ObamaCare. He said:

> The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

While I understand the President's position on the law that now is referred to by his name, he also misses the point. On Monday night, the Senate had the opportunity to keep the government running. The Senate had a bill that funded the government and did so without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. As we all know, the Senate voted down that bill. So let me repeat: The government could have been kept open without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. Anyone who says anything different is simply not being accurate.

What did the bill Monday night seek to do? The bill sought to delay the implementation of the individual mandate for 1 year and require executive branch appointees to go to the exchanges. Those are changes to ObamaCare.

Apparently, the President doesn't believe we are allowed to make any changes whatsoever to ObamaCare. I would respect that position if the President actually enforced it over the last several years, as he had bills presented to him that he signed and that actually made some changes in the health care reform law. In fact, Congress has made numerous changes to ObamaCare since it was signed into law. I have a list here, but it is a list I will read in its entirety so people know the President has accepted changes to his prime piece of legislation and so I can refute that the President isn't consistent when I go back now to his quotation when he says:

> The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

By that, I think the President is signifying that we can't do anything to touch the issue whatsoever, even to the minimal extent that we tried to Monday night.

So this list was conveniently assembled not by this Senator but by the Congressional Research Service, and it was done on behalf of Senator COBURN.

In the 111th Congress, to start with the first change we made that the President accepted, H.R. 4887 clarified that health care provided under TRICARE, TRICARE for Life, and the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program constitutes ''minimal essential health care coverage.''

Then we had H.R. 5014, clarifying that the health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs constitutes, according to the health care reform bill, ''minimal essential health care coverage.''

H.R. 1586 modified the definition of average manufacturer price to include inhalation, infusion, implanted or injectable drugs that are not generally dispensed through a retail community pharmacy.

H.R. 4994 offset the costs of the Medicare and Medicaid Program extensions and the postponement of cuts in Medicare physician payments with a change in the Affordable Care Act, but the President signed it.

H.R. 4853 extended the nonrefundable adoption tax credit through tax year 2012.

H.R. 6523 extended TRICARE coverage to dependent adult children up to age 26, to conform with the private health insurance requirements under the Affordable Care Act. The President signed that.

In the 112th Congress, H.R. 4 repealed the requirement that businesses file an information report whenever they pay a vendor more than $600 for goods in a single year.

H.R. 674 modified the calculation of modified adjusted gross income to include Social Security benefits.

H.R. 3630 reduced the Prevention and Public Health Fund annual appropriations over the period from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2021 by a total of $6.25 billion to help offset the cost of extending the payroll tax cut. That is a monumental change in the bill. The President signed that.

H.R. 4348 modified the Medicaid disaster-recovery FMAP adjustment by changing the adjustment factor and the effective date.

H.R. 8 transferred 10 percent of the remaining unobligated Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan—and we call that the CO-OP—program funds to a new CO-OP contingency fund and rescinded the other 90 percent of those funds and repealed the CLASS Act.

H.R. 1473 was another bill that the President signed. It canceled $2.2 billion of the $6 billion appropriation for the CO-OP program.

H.R. 2055 rescinded $400 million of the remaining $3.8 billion for the CO-OP program, rescinded $10 million of the $15 million fiscal year 2012 appropriations for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, instructed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Web site with detailed information on the allocation of moneys in the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and prohibited use of those funds for lobbying, publicity or propaganda purposes. That bill was signed by the President.

H.R. 933 rescinded $200 million of the $500 million transfer from the Medicare Part A and Part B trust funds for the 5-year Community-Based Care Transition Program and rescinded $10 million of the Independent Payment Advisory Board's fiscal year 2013 appropriation.

These are changes made by Congress to the law the President refers to as settled law. When he talks about settled law, he talks to us that the Affordable Care Act cannot be changed now as we are debating things with a continuing resolution. Obviously, the act is not so settled that Congress cannot and has not amended it in the last several years.

But as we all know, the President, through his own actions, has, in addition, considered ObamaCare not to be settled law either. The President has, through administrative action himself, made numerous changes to ObamaCare.

In February, the President delayed application of the out-of-pocket limits. In March, the President delayed implementation of the Basic Health Plan Option. Also, in March, the President delayed a requirement that small business exchanges offer a choice of plans. In July, the President delayed the exchange applicant eligibility and verification. In July, in perhaps the most famous example, the President delayed implementation of the employer mandate. In regard to that, there were even Members of the President's party in the Senate—that said the President did not have the legal authority to do that.

So on Monday night, House Republicans sent the Senate a bill that did not defund or delay ObamaCare. It continued funding our government. It simply sought to amend ObamaCare in the same way—dozens of times—as I have just illustrated it has been amended. There was not even any debate of the proposals on their merits. It was simply handled in the most simple way you can here, tabled by the Democratic leadership. Now we hear about the farcical issue of settled law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, could I have 2 more minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do not know where this settled law legal theory comes from. I would note that some of my colleagues have ignored this theory during previous health care debates.

In 2003, Congress passed a law, a bipartisan law, called the Medicare Modernization Act. This law passed with Members of both parties supporting it. It was signed into law by the President. It survived any court challenges that were made against it. It was, by the same token, settled law. That did not stop my colleagues from proposing legislation to amend Part D, called the Medicare Modernization Act. In fact, Democrats, including Members still currently in the Senate, proposed and voted to alter the Medicare Modernization Act by striking the noninterference clause. We considered that proposal and debated it on its merits, as we should have the amendments to the Affordable Care Act recently offered. We did not dismiss it as offensive because it sought to amend a settled law.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the Democrats' unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over the proposals to amend ObamaCare, not defund it or delay it.

We are where we are because the majority refuses to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans are by going to the exchange.

In the wash of words that we will hear on the floor, I hope this simple truth can be heard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, recently there was a disturbing poll in the Washington Post. It said that most Americans fear that the American dream is passing them by. Almost 65 percent worry that they cannot make ends meet with their current incomes. That is up from 48 percent in 1971.

We are not talking about luxuries—just basic living expenses: food and clothing for their kids, a roof over their family's head, just getting by day-to-day. So many of our fellow citizens are working harder than ever and still feel as though they are falling behind. They wonder: Where is the country headed?

This week, they are wondering more than ever, watching the spectacle here in Washington, watching the government shut down, grinding to a halt. I am hearing from my constituents, from people in New Mexico, and they are frustrated and worried. They are concerned about the U.S. Department of Agriculture crop payments, as we head into the harvest, when they need financing the most. They are concerned about being able to close on mortgages with Federal backing, with their loans on hold.

Many New Mexicans are going to be furloughed without pay. This hurts their families and all the businesses that rely on them in our economy—restaurants, retailers, car washes, landscapers, any type of business one can imagine.

This shutdown did not have to happen. We are not debating the amount of the budget. The fact is, House Republicans are demanding concessions just for keeping the lights on at the Federal Government.

I think most Americans have two questions. How did we get into this mess and how do we get out of it?

We are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression, but recovery is underway. We have seen 42

months of private sector job growth. That is 7.5 million jobs. That is hope for millions of families. We have had nine consecutive quarters of economic growth—the longest stretch since the recession hit in 2008. So we are slowly making our way back—not fast enough, with too many folks still struggling, and with great challenges for the future.

This is a time for leadership, for working together. Americans expect their leaders to act as grownups. But they feel they are watching a schoolyard spat. Is it any wonder they hold Congress in such contempt or that they worry about the kind of country they will leave their children?

Here is what we should be doing. We should have a farm bill by now. We should have comprehensive immigration reform, and we should have a serious budget—one that would get rid of sequestration's meat-cleaver cuts with targeted spending reductions, tackling the deficit, reforming the Tax Code, helping the middle class and small businesses, helping families and seniors who are struggling, moving ahead with smart investments in infrastructure, creating jobs, investing in our future.

The Senate passed that budget 6 months ago. But the House went in a completely different direction. Their budget put tax cuts for the richest Americans above funding for education and ensuring the safety of our roads and bridges.

Democrats and Republicans have differences. That is no surprise. But we still have a job to do. We still need to sit down and work it out. But a minority in the House has blocked our way forward—not once, not twice but time and time again.

American families and businesses need a long-term budget. Businesses do not hire on a monthly basis. They need certainty and the confidence that their government is working to create an environment for growth. We are giving them neither; instead, we lurch from crisis to crisis.

The worst thing about it is it does not have to be this way. This is a manufactured crisis, a series of self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The American people do not want this. They want a strong economy. They want jobs and a government that can actually get something done for the middle class, not just for Wall Street billionaires. The American people want a government that works, not a government shutdown.

There is no logic behind this crisis. Why are we here? Because the other side wants to kill the Affordable Care Act. I respect the diversity of views in America and in Congress. But the Affordable Care Act passed Congress like every other bill. It passed the House, it passed the Senate, and the President signed it. If Republicans want to repeal this law, they should make their case to the American people and work to pass their own health care law. What is happening is unprecedented, disruptive, and undemocratic behavior.

We heard a lot of indignation—hour after hour of it. But here is the thing: It does not stop the Affordable Care Act. This whole stunt has been a colossal waste of time, and wasting time is something we cannot afford. The real problems facing our Nation are still waiting.

Everyone outside of a radical group of obstructionists knows this is silly, knows this is misguided and dangerous to our economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, business leaders from coast to coast—there is a loud chorus of: Stop. This is enough. But, so far, it is not loud enough.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I am not going to come here to the floor and say the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What law is? But it is the law of the land. It is being implemented. Shutting down the government does not change that. Here is what a shutdown does do: 27,000 Federal employees in my State could be furloughed and lose their income. Nearly half of the civilian workers for the Department of Defense will be sent home. In New Mexico, that is over 6,500 people who help defend this country, and they may not be paid.

Social Security applications could be jeopardized. Calls to SSA for help could go unanswered. Federal loans would be delayed for tens of thousands of folks trying to buy a home or applying for a small business loan. Those doors may be locked. National parks will close. So will museums and monuments.

This hurts the tourist economy in my State and hurts small businesses. During the last shutdown, 7 million tourists were turned away. Our veterans, who already face too many delays in their claims for benefits, could face even more. During the last shutdown, more than 400,000 veterans saw their disability and pension claims delayed.

Students will also be hurt. Work-study and Perkins loan payments would stop. Pregnant women and mothers who need nutrition assistance for their children may not get it. All of this is because the other side wants to send a message on ObamaCare? Well, it has a very high price, costing our Nation billions of dollars every day and hurting Federal agencies, including our critical national labs such as Los Alamos and Sandia, in their important national security mission.

Wall Street is on edge. Main Street is on edge. Families are worried. Communities suffer. There is another cost. The paralysis of government sends a terrible message, a terrible message of failure and dysfunction.

What is next? The debt ceiling. Holding the credit of the United States of America hostage for political gain. Instead of serious debate, we have ultimatums. Instead of regular order, we have midnight shutdowns. Instead of compromise, we have all or nothing, take it or leave it.

My friend from New Mexico, MSG Jessey Baca, summed it up well in an interview with KOB-TV back home. He said:

> I'm not angry. I'm frustrated because of the way we've always been taught to work together to get things done, you work together—and that just doesn't seem to be happening. Settle your differences.

Jessey is right. We need to start working together. We have not done that. So here we are on the wrong train, on the wrong track going nowhere. It is hurting families, hurting communities, could derail our economy with the recovery still under way.

The hard-working families of this country want a government that works, not one that shuts down just to send a message. Meanwhile, those families wait—wait for us to meet the real challenges that face our Nation and that make a real difference in their lives and the lives of their children.

Before I finish, I want to discuss the subcommittee I chair on Appropriations, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee. We work with agencies that are critical to keeping the economy running smoothly. I have to speak up and make sure that those who are causing this shutdown know exactly how badly the country needs the government to reopen. This shutdown is jeopardizing consumer safety. It is adding to the uncertainty facing our financial markets. It is doing real damage on our economy.

Our subcommittee funds the Small Business Administration. Small business owners are really going to take a hit in this shutdown. The SBA, Small Business Administration, is closed. I do not know about my colleagues, but the top concern I hear from small business owners in New Mexico is how hard it is to get a loan to expand. The SBA approves an average of $86 million in loans to small businesses each day. But while the government is shut down, our Nation's job creators are not getting those resources. If the shutdown continues, 28 million small businesses will no longer be able to get capital from the SBA to expand.

There are other impacts too. Each day the government is closed our economy grinds down a little further. The shutdown is affecting the services that keep our capital markets safe. The CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, will have just 4 percent of its normal staff during the shutdown. That means markets will be without effective oversight.

We are about to hit the debt ceiling, our Nation's borrowing limit. It is a potentially dangerous financial situation. The shutdown has put our watchdog at the CFTC and the SEC to sleep. Global markets are open, Wall Street is open, but investor protection agencies are closed. It is an open invitation to financial abuse.

The shutdown is also putting the safety of our children at risk. Christmas may seem far away, but companies are already working to get ready for the holiday season. They are shipping

goods in from overseas, including millions of toys. During this shutdown, only 22 employees at the Consumer Product Safety Commission will be available nationwide. That is 22 people to inspect millions of imported toys and gifts, gifts that American families will be putting under the Christmas tree. These agencies were created by Congress to protect American investors and consumers, to help small businesses. It is a travesty that tea party Republicans in the House have been allowed to hold the country hostage. That is unconscionable. Real people are being hurt, the people who are going without pay, without veterans' benefits or survivor benefits, without important financial and consumer protections.

You know the one that is the most devastating to me? People who are going without food. Here we are talking about millions of women and children in this country in poverty.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it has been 7 days since we passed a piece of legislation to fund the government. I wonder how many days it will be that the Speaker makes the American people wait to open the government. How long is he going to make them wait before the government is open? It is a real hardship not only to the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees but the people who depend on the Federal employees for their own jobs. So it is very unfortunate.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have not had a harder working Senator in the past 9 months than the Presiding Officer.

You have worked so hard doing so many different things, not the least of which is presiding over the Senate. You have presided over the Senate in the early morning hours, late-night hours. It is remarkable. I so appreciate your doing this. The entire Senate, Democrats and Republicans, has expressed their appreciation through me to the Presiding Officer for the good work you do in trying to make this place better. Not only do you preside, but you do a good job. You are dignified, and you do it with authority.

The people of Wisconsin are so fortunate to have the distinguished Presiding Officer as a Senator. I have had the good fortune to serve with a number of other Senators from Wisconsin. Russ Feingold was such a good friend. I miss him very much. Herb Kohl is a unique individual who added a great deal to the Senate with the many things he did as a long-term member of the Appropriations Committee. However, none of the Senators I have served with from Wisconsin will outshine the distinguished Presiding Officer. You have been remarkably good. You have only been here a short period of time, but in the short period of time you have been here, you have had admirable dedication to this institution.

Senator BALDWIN is a native of Wisconsin—the first woman ever to represent that great State.

As frequently as you have presided, you have enjoyed a front-row seat. History is being made during this congressional session. Some of the sessions you have watched haven't been too much fun, but it has been good, and you have done such a remarkably good job.

On behalf of all of the Senators, I congratulate you and thank you for your service to the Senate. This is the first Golden Gavel Award. There will be a presentation made at our caucus this Tuesday to recognize your distinction. This is something that is traditional, the Golden Gavel. It is a beautiful memento we will present to you on Tuesday.

MARSHALL LEGACY INSTITUTE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to recognize the work of the Marshall Legacy Institute, MLI, and extend my congratulations on its 16th anniversary. While serving as Secretary of State, GEN George C. Marshall devised a plan to rebuild Europe after the devastation of World War II. Founded in 1997 on the 50th anniversary of the plan that bears General Marshall's name, the MLI's goal is to extend the plan's legacy by helping rebuild today's war torn countries.

Over the past 16 years, the MLI has focused on assisting severely mine-contaminated countries, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, and Afghanistan, by clearing mines, offering survivors' assistance programs, and providing educational outreach to children. This work is vital to civilians who, when they are finally able to return to their homelands after war, often face the unpredictable threat of landmines. It is also critical to protecting the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, who risk their lives every day to defend our country and often serve where landmines pose a significant threat to their safety.

One such servicemember is PFC Barrett Austin, a combat engineer in the 4th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division who bravely served our country in Afghanistan, and who died on April 21, 2013, after his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Austin's dedicated service, selflessness, and sacrifice were the qualities that General Marshall exemplified and valued. It is therefore fitting that the MLI pay tribute to this soldier through its Mine Detection Dog Partnership Program by naming a mine detection dog in his honor.

I thank MLI for its 16 years of service, and for its continued efforts to make our world a safer place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr.

SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 265. A resolution expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 266. A resolution designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

S. RES. 227

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 227, a resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 265—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, AND COMMENDING AND THANKING MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, FIRST RESPONDERS, AND CIVIL SERVANTS FOR THEIR COURAGE AND PROFESSIONALISM

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSINOS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 265

Whereas, on September 16, 2013, a tragic mass shooting took place at the Washington Navy Yard in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the people of the United States mourn the loss of the 12 innocent victims who were killed as a result of the mass shooting;

Whereas the Washington Navy Yard serves as headquarters of Naval District Washington and is the workplace of 18,000 military, civilian, and contractor personnel who serve the United States; and

Whereas military officials, law enforcement officers, and other first responders reacted swiftly and courageously to prevent additional loss of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims killed or wounded during the horrific violence that took place at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013;

(2) offers support and hope for all the individuals who were wounded and discomforted by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(3) recognizes the difficult healing and recovery process that lies ahead for communities affected by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(4) honors the courageous and professional service of —

(A) the uniformed men and women of the Navy and other members of the United States Armed Forces;

(B) all civilian employees who provide support for the United States Armed Forces; and

(C) the law enforcement personnel, emergency responders, and medical professionals who responded to and assisted victims of the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(5) thanks those individuals for their selfless and dedicated service; and

(6) remains committed to preventing the occurrence of tragedies similar to the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard.

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH 13, 2013. AS ''NATIONAL CHESS WEEK'' TO ENHANCE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE STUDENTS AND ADULTS TO ENGAGE IN A GAME KNOWN TO ENHANCE CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN) submitting the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 266

Whereas there are more than 80,000 members of the United States Chess Federation (referred to in this preamble as the ''Federation''), and unknown numbers of additional people in the United States who play chess without joining an official organization;

Whereas approximately ½ of the members of the Federation are members of scholastic chess programs;

Whereas many studies have linked scholastic chess programs to the improvement of students' scores in reading and math, as well as improved self-esteem;

Whereas the Federation offers guidance to educators to help incorporate chess into the school curriculum;

Whereas chess is a powerful cognitive learning tool that can be used to successfully enhance students' reading skills and understanding of math concepts, as well as to improve memory function for people of all ages;

Whereas chess also offers educational and social activity benefits to adults and is used in programs to help stroke victims and people suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder; and

Whereas the Federation offers programs for adults including senior citizens, members of the Armed Forces, and veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to play chess, a game known to enhance critical-thinking and problem-solving skills for students of all ages, learning abilities, and strengths; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chess Week with appropriate programs and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the

Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''consensus standards'' means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term ''part 23'' means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee'' means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term ''small airplane'' means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

SMALL AIRPLANE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further action on H.R. 1848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1848) to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the substitute amendment, which is at the desk and is the text of S. 1072, as reported by the Commerce Committee, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1999) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''consensus standards'' means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term ''part 23'' means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee'' means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term ''small airplane'' means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1848), as amended, was passed.

TRUCKER SLEEP APNEA RULES

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3095, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3095) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the bill be read three times and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3095) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESCUE OF DANISH JEWS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 200, S. Res. 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 227) to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 17, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORT FOR FREE AND PEACEFUL DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 201, S. Res. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 213) expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title, as follows:

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 213

Whereas the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela guarantees its citizens full political rights, including the right to freely associate for democratic political purposes, and the right to a secret ballot through regular free, universal, direct elections and referenda;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that ''representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region,'' and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that ''the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it'';

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolas Maduro to have been elected in Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, with 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the Supreme Court of Venezuela refused to hear legal cases presented by the political opposition regarding alleged violations of electoral law, and the CNE denied the opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas Venezuela's Unified Democratic Platform (MUD) has formally requested the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to conduct an impartial review of alleged violations of Venezuelans' civic rights through electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses in the April 2013 elections, and the Government of Venezuela subsequently announced its withdrawal from the Inter-American Court on Human Rights;

Whereas, in response to the political opposition's decision not to recognize Nicolas Maduro as President, legislators from opposition parties in Venezuela were denied the right to speak and removed from key committees by the President of the National Assembly, were violently assaulted by members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV), and increasingly face the prospect of politically-motivated criminal charges;

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013, and the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that ''violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly'';

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) repudiated the incident by stating that it ''reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country''; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy as guaranteed by the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela;

(2) deplores the undemocratic denial of the legitimate rights of opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela, the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside chambers of the National Assembly, and the growing efforts to use politically-motivated criminal charges to intimidate the country's political opposition;

(3) commends legislators from other countries in the Americas who have declared their opposition to alleged electoral irregularities and condemned the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Department of State to work in concert with other countries in the Americas to take meaningful steps to ensure the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter and to strengthen the ability of the Organization of American States to respond to the erosion of democratic norms and institutions in member states; and

(5) calls for the United States to work with other countries in the hemisphere to actively encourage a process of dialogue between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition through the good offices of the Organization of American States so that the voices of all Venezuelans can be taken into account through their country's constitutional institutions and free and fair elections.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela, condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, and calling for dialogue between all political actors in the country.''.

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 213), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the title was agreed to.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 265) expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 265) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3230 AND H.J. Res. 72

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

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

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading, but object to my own request for both of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

NATIONAL CHESS WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 266) designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am proud today to speak in support of my resolution to designate October 7 through October 13, 2013 as National Chess Week. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues Senator ALEXANDER and Senator LEVIN.

National Chess Week is designed to increase awareness about the many benefits of chess, and to encourage both children and adults to enjoy this game. Chess has a wide range of educational and cognitive benefits, including improving problem-solving skills and developing critical thinking skills. It helps increase memory function and hone reading and math skills. For these reasons, chess is used by some educators as part of their curriculum, and is even used to help patients who are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or the effects of a stroke.

Over 80,000 children and adults nationwide are members of the U.S. Chess Federation, and ½ of them are students. Engaging students in chess can help make learning fun, and give them a lifelong pastime that they can enjoy while using and developing their skills. I am proud to support and endorse National Chess Week, which I hope will result in engaging even more citizens of all ages in this important activity.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 p.m., on Saturday, October 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 NOON TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:53 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING A HOMETOWN HERO: SERGEANT JAMES CASEY JOYCE, COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK HAWK DOWN

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my fellow Americans to remember, remember a day of exceptional valor, bravery, and comradery in our nation's history. Today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of Black Hawk Down, also known as the Day of the Rangers.

On October 3, 1993, approximately 120 U.S. Army Rangers and Delta Force Operators launched a raid to capture Mohamed Farrah Aidid, a warlord wreaking havoc on the city of Mogadishu and starving innocent civilians in Somalia. What began as an attempt to seize an oppressor and bring peace and aid to this developing country turned into an extensive rescue mission after two U.S. Black Hawk helicopters were shot down. Tragically, many American lives were lost, including one of our very own, Sergeant James Casey Joyce, a graduate of Plano Senior High School.

After attending the University of Texas and the University of North Texas at Denton, Sergeant Joyce enlisted in the Army in November 1990 where he completed Airborne Training and earned the esteemed title, U.S. Army Ranger. Twenty years ago, Sergeant Joyce was one of the brave Rangers who put their lives on the line to bring these American pilots safely home. In the midst of the vicious battle, a fellow Ranger who fell from one of the helicopters was in critical condition—without immediate medical attention he would clearly die. Fulfilling the Ranger Creed, Sergeant Joyce took it upon himself to "never leave a fallen comrade" behind. He proceeded into the danger of enemy fire in search of a medevac vehicle and was tragically killed in action.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Joyce's actions that day, along with the other brave men and women who fought alongside him must always be remembered. His commitment to his comrades, unwavering courage, and extraordinary sacrifice embodies the highest form of the American spirit, to place service over self.

Words cannot sufficiently express the debt of gratitude we owe Sergeant Joyce and others like him who have bravely fought and lost their lives in service to our great country. I'd also like to thank his family—his wife, DeAnna, his mother, Gail, and his brother and sister, Steven and Sancy. When one member of a family serves, the entire family serves, and you all deserve our utmost appreciation and respect. Because of their sacrifices, America remains the land of the free and the world is a better place for it.

God Bless all who serve, past, present, and future. I salute each and every one of you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 2013, and September 28, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 491 through 500.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 491, on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate Amendments to H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act, I would have voted "yes."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 492, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3096, to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center," I would have voted "yes."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 493, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 361, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform of agricultural programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 494, on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 495, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have noted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 496, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2251, to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse," I would have voted "yes."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 497, on concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1 to H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 498, on concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #2 to H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 499, on passage of H.R. 3210, making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown, I would have voted "yes."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 500, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 2848, the Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014, I would have voted "yes."

COMMEMORATING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an important day, the National Day of the Republic of China, commemorating the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising of 1911 that led to the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912. This is a significant day for the Taiwanese people and the United States.

For decades, Taiwan has been a vital ally to the United States, and we share common security, economic, and political interests.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy strong cultural, security, economic, and political ties and an even stronger friendship. Taiwan is a model democracy in the Pacific region where the people of Taiwan value freedom and liberty. Taiwan is a top United States trading partner as well as a champion of human rights. With a robust trading relationship between our two countries already in place, I urge the Administration to finalize the Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan in order to protect private investment, develop market-oriented policies, and to promote U.S. exports.

Given Taiwan's establishment as a major trading leader in the Asia Pacific region, I urge the facilitation of Taiwan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Taiwan has already proven itself as a leader on the global stage.

HONORING GABRIEL HARRISON BIGGS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Gabriel Harrison Biggs. Gabriel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Gabriel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Gabriel has been involved with

scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Gabriel has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Gabriel removed and replaced stones from the prayer garden at St. James Catholic Church in Liberty, Missouri, enhancing the overall beauty and quality of the prayer garden.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Gabriel Harrison Biggs for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CELEBRATING WORLD WAR II VETERAN LESLIE MAST'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in celebration of World War II Veteran Leslie Mast's 100th birthday on Saturday, October 5, 2013. Mr. Mast, a Machinist Mate First Class, is an extraordinary individual from Elkhart, Indiana. Throughout his life, Mr. Mast has demonstrated a deep-rooted courage and commitment to his family and our country.

At the age of 29, Mr. Mast enlisted in the United States Navy as a machinist. After training, Mr. Mast sailed to New York where he received his overseas assignment. He was sent to Arzew, Algeria where his crew spent three weeks training and preparing before they received orders to Bizerte, Tunisia. Mr. Mast spent one year in Bizerte maintaining and repairing a variety of different vessels. During his time in the Navy, Mr. Mast learned how to appreciate the little things in life. Thanks to the brave fighting spirit of servicemembers like Mr. Mast, freedom triumphed over the empires of tyranny.

Our country owes a great deal of respect and gratitude to incredible individuals like Mr. Mast who have devoted their lives to protect the United States of America at home and abroad. Thanks to the service and sacrifice of Hoosier war heroes, our country remains strong and free. Mr. Mast's commitment to defend liberty truly symbolizes the essence of American patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in celebration of Leslie Mast's 100th birthday and admirable service to this great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2013 BLACK ACHIEVERS, INC. AWARDS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding recipients of the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. Awards.

Black Achievers, Inc. is an impressive organization dedicated to promoting qualities such as leadership, service, and making a positive impact in our community. This years' awardees embody these noble values.

The recipients of this the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. awards are Jorge Albarran, Leslie Allison, Kimberly Beaty, Larry Bonds, Harold S. Cardwell, Jr., Shemika Charles, Phillip Dabney, Jr., Vincent J. Grooms, Lloyd James Hargrave, Dwight Douglas Hicks, James Jones Jr., Leonard E. Lane, Kyle L. Mann, Willie A. Price, Dolly Michelle Randle, Kaamalal Robinson, George E. Stokes, Mark Worthy, and Keith M. Young.

Each of these impressive individuals has made significant contributions in various career and community endeavors. I am proud to see such dedicated, hard-working individuals be recognized tonight, and applaud their efforts to better our community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to recognize the recipients of the 2013 Black Achievers, Inc. Awards, and those who work tirelessly for this valuable organization. Their achievements are commendable and their devotion to our community is inspiring. I wish each and every one of them the best in all their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 512 on H.J. Res. 70—On the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 513 on passage of H.J. Res. 70, Making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 514 on passage of H.J. Res. 73, Making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

SWISS FLOWER AND GIFT COTTAGE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Business of the Year Award.

This award recognizes a business that exemplifies the ''Best in Business'' that represents the values of our community.

Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage owner Heidi Haas-Sheard has been conducting business in her building since she was a small child, and in 2012 she decided to educate the community on the multitude of businesses on 44th Avenue from Ward Road to Harlan in Wheat Ridge. She wanted to encourage people to shop local for those things they need and want. It started with a simple idea of pointing out 44 reasons to shop 44th Avenue, including a list of established businesses and a map to reference their locations. She then designed a postcard listing all the businesses on 44th that she provided to each business, thus creating a shared advertising idea. With the assistance of the City of Wheat Ridge and local partners, the vision now includes a website, signage on the bus shelters along the corridor, and a raised awareness of the businesses along 44th Avenue in Wheat Ridge.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Swiss Flower and Gift Cottage for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

DR. WILLIAM H. FARLAND

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary public service career of Dr. William H. Farland as he concludes his tenure as Vice President for Research at Colorado State University (CSU), one of the nation's top research universities.

Dr. Farland received his undergraduate degree from Loyola University; a master's degree in Zoology from the University of California, Los Angeles; and a doctor of philosophy degree in cell biology and biochemistry from the University of California, Los Angeles.

At the Environmental Protection Agency, Dr. Farland rose to become the highest-ranking career scientist, appointed Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science in the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and also directing the EPA's Office of the Science Advisor. His 27-year federal career was characterized by a commitment to the development of national and international approaches to the testing and assessment of environmental agents.

Numerous executive-level committees and advisory boards within the federal government sought his expertise. Examples of his service include: Chairing the Executive Committee of the National Toxicology Program (NTP); serving as a Public Member of the American Chemistry Council's Strategic Science Team for its Long Term Research Initiative (ACC/LRI); and as a Member of the Programme Advisory Committee for the WHO's International Programme on Chemical Safety.

Dr. Farland received numerous accolades for his public service including recognition in 2002 by the Society for Risk Analysis with the ''Outstanding Risk Practitioner Award'' and appointment in 2005 as a Fellow of the Society. In 2006, he received a Presidential Rank Award for his service as a federal senior executive.

Dr. Farland's outstanding public service continued at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, CO, where he oversaw record-breaking annual research expenditures in excess of $300 million, representing a third of the University's overall budget. Dr. Farland was also named to two prestigious National Academies of Science committees that address environmental issues' impact on human health and named an Academy of Toxicological Sciences Fellow.

Dr. Farland has performed outstanding federal service, showing an unwavering commitment to promoting science in service of the public, and he has earned the trust and utmost respect of his colleagues and the citizens of Colorado as a member of the community of dedicated public servants at CSU.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor William H. Farland's distinguished service and want to express a deep appreciation for his dedication, sacrifice, and outstanding service to his country in the name of science and education.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT ''BOB'' WILLIAMS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor my dear friend, Mr. Robert "Bob" Williams on the occasion of his 95th birthday. It may be hard to believe this, but neither I—nor my intrepid staff—can seem to find a good cause in The Woodlands that Bob has not been instrumental in or supported.

How many 95 year olds do you know that are using their birthday to raise funds and food for the needy? But, that's Bob. He is spending his birthday morning this Saturday at the Panther Creek Randalls store collecting non-perishable food and much needed money for InterFaith's Food Pantry. But, that's our Bob.

Almost as soon as he moved to The Woodlands, Bob was busy helping to establish our first YMCA. From being a charter member of the Woodlands Community Presbyterian Church and a Hometown Hero, Bob Williams knows a lot about service. An Eagle Scout, World War II veteran and lifelong Kiwanis Club member, Bob founded The Woodlands first Kiwanis Club. Nearly 60 years later, he is still a distinguished member and his hard work is evident in the Kiwanis Breakfast and Key Clubs in four Woodlands High Schools that teach our young students community service.

Bob walks the walk he talks every day. Whether it be in Kiwanis, the Special Olympics, his church, the YMCA or InterFaith, he leads by example with humor and caring.

An amazing tennis player also known for his beautiful singing voice and for—get this—driving himself all over the United States; it's not unusual to hear how he just road-tripped the Midwest or Florida. That's Bob.

Between his 90th and 95th birthday, he tried to go home again to Chicago, but it didn't take him long to realize Texas was home now. We are grateful for that epithany because we are better for his service.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize my friend Bob Williams for his countless—and ongoing—contributions to The Woodlands. I urge you to join me in recognizing Bob Williams for his many years of service, which I know will continue long after the candles are blown out on his 95 birthday cake.

RECOGNIZING TIMOTHY Z. JENNINGS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor former New Mexico State Senator Timothy Z. Jennings, who is being recognized with the prestigious Heritage Award by the Historical Society of Southeast New Mexico. A lifelong resident of Roswell, few have done more for their community and the entire state than Timothy Z. Jennings.

The Society is holding its 32nd Anniversary Heritage Dinner on October 8 in Roswell to celebrate the rich history of Southeast New Mexico. Each year, the Society, which dates back to 1907, honors a member of the community with the Heritage Award. This year's award will be presented to Timothy Z. Jennings in recognition of his many years of dedicated service to the community and the State of New Mexico.

Timothy Z. Jennings, the son of James T. and Francis Jennings, was born, raised and still lives in Roswell. His father, James, was a prominent local attorney and his mother, Francis, is a longtime member of the Historical Society of Southeast New Mexico. He graduated from New Mexico Military Institute, earned a bachelor's degree in business administration from Creighton University in Nebraska and took courses in agriculture at New Mexico State University. He continues to operate a sheep ranch outside of Roswell.

Timothy Z. Jennings was first elected to the Chaves County Commission in 1975. After serving for four years, he was elected to the New Mexico Senate, where he represented his constituents with distinction for 33 years, becoming the second-longest-serving member in history. He served in several leadership posts, including Majority and Minority Whip, Majority Floor Leader and Senate President Pro Tempore. He was respected as a bipartisan leader and a champion for persons with developmental disabilities.

Timothy Z. Jennings and his late wife, Patty, were passionate supporters of cancer research and strong advocates for cancer patients and their families. He continues that passion in memory of Patty.

For his efforts on behalf of New Mexicans, Timothy Z. Jennings received the Outstanding Leadership Award from New Mexico State University, the Friend of the Profession award from the New Mexico Society of Certified Public Accountants, the Soaring Eagle Award from the New Mexico Association of Counties, honorary membership from the New Mexico Medical Society, and was honored for his commitment and support in the battle against cancer from the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, in addition to numerous other awards.

After leaving the Legislature, Timothy Z. Jennings was appointed to a prestigious position on the New Mexico State Investment Council. He has also kept busy on the ranch, serving as fire chief for the volunteer fire department near his home and spending time with his children: Katherine and husband Josh Stewart, Elliot Ikard and wife Melanie, Courtney Ikard, Zeph Jennings, Zach Jennings and grandson Keegan Ikard.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER DAVID JOHNSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christopher David Johnson. Christopher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christopher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christopher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Christopher has earned the rank of Runner in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say while serving as his troop's Senior Patrol Leader. Christopher has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Christopher built eight movable walls for the Kansas City Pet Project to be used for training stray dogs in order to prepare them to be adopted by loving families.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christopher David Johnson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

DANIEL ''TINY'' CROSS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Daniel "Tiny" Cross of Bolivar, Missouri, whose hand-carved hobo nickels have been included in the National Numismatic Collection of the Smithsonian National Museum of American History.

Tiny became interested in numismatics quite some years ago, collecting hobo coins, specifically, about a decade ago, and carving his own about two years ago. In 2003, he joined the American Numismatic Association and, became the district representative for the State of Missouri. While attending a numismatic seminar in Colorado, he met the collection manager for the Smithsonian Institution National Numismatic Collection, and she found his coins very interesting.

Unlike many numismatic artists, Tiny does all of his work by hand. A unique staple of Tiny's work includes golf hats carved on the bearded men on his coins. His work has captured the attention of many and will be a fantastic addition to the Smithsonian collection.

RECOGNIZING PAUL HERZOG

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor New

Mexico resident Paul Herzog and thank him for his service as he prepares to retire as the Chief Executive Officer at Memorial Medical Center in Las Cruces.

I want to acknowledge the innovation and hard work of a true professional who successfully guided Memorial Medical Center during the past decade. I understand and appreciate the challenges of running a hospital, particularly during an era of drastic changes in the health care industry. Paul Herzog not only overcame those challenges, he also positioned Memorial Medical Center to succeed and provide the best possible care to the community—a standard that should be set for all hospitals.

Paul Herzog has 40 years of experience in the health care industry. He previously led the Albuquerque Regional Medical Center in Albuquerque before taking over as Chief Executive Officer at Memorial Medical Center in Las Cruces.

During his tenure, Paul Herzog led several successful efforts to improve Memorial Medical Center, including:

Overseeing a $5.7 million renovation of the hospital.

Making cardiology, oncology, women's services and emergency services top priorities.

Developing the Memorial Medical Cancer Center, a medical oncology center, as a department of the hospital contracted with the University of New Mexico for physician services, a research nurse and a nurse practitioner.

Overseeing Memorial Ikard Cancer Treatment Center during its accreditation by the American College of Radiology.

Creating an additional 20 Critical Care Unit beds, with a total of 43 Intensive Care Unit/CCU beds.

Creating a new urgent care clinic.

Overseeing the accreditation of the medical residency program.

Creating a neonatal program.

Creating a hospitality program.

Under Paul Herzog's leadership, Memorial Medical Center was named the ''Best Practice'' in 2011 by the U.S.-Mexico Border Centers of Excellence Consortium for its ability to retain physicians; and named ''Best Hospital'' by Readers' Choice Awards for 2003–2012.

Paul Herzog has played a pivotal role in ensuring that rural hospitals can provide exceptional care and services to their communities, and his leadership will be greatly missed. On behalf of all New Mexicans, I wish Paul Herzog the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA LIONS EYE BANK FOR 55 YEARS OF RESTORING SIGHT

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank, whose mission for 55 years has been restoring the gift of sight to those with visual impairments. The Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank serves 37 counties and patients at over 60 hospitals, but their work benefits people across the globe. If no suitable cornea transplant recipient is found locally, they conduct searches nationally and internationally to ensure that all transplantable tissue reaches someone in need.

The Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank has helped over 30,000 people worldwide who were in need of corneal donation and transplantation. Specializing in obtaining, evaluating, and distributing corneal tissue, they use state-of-the-art technology and the highest medical standards to certify that all donated eye tissue is completely safe for sight-restoring surgery.

In addition to facilitating tissue donation, the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank provides services for donors, their families, hospitals, and transplant surgeons. The Eye Bank helps transplant recipients connect with support groups and provides an array of educational and informational programs for the public and the medical community. They coordinate with other organ and tissue donor agencies in Pennsylvania and across the country to provide these services.

Each year over 50,000 Americans and hundreds of thousands more around the world suffer from corneal blindness. Since there is no substitute for human corneal tissue, all of the Eye Bank's efforts depend upon the generosity of voluntary corneal tissue donors. Today I salute the Northeast Pennsylvania Lions Eye Bank's efforts to help those selfless donors turn their generosity into the gift of sight for thousands of visually impaired individuals.

HONORING GRANT ALVIN BERGMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Grant Alvin Bergman. Grant is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Grant has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Grant has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Grant has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Grant has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Grant constructed two animal–accessible benches for the Kansas City Pet Project, to be used by staff and volunteers as well as a meet-and-greet area for potential adopting families.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Grant Alvin Bergman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

COLORADO PLUS AND WEST 29TH RESTAURANT AND BAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Colorado Plus and West 29th Restaurant and Bar for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Reinvestment Award.

This award recognizes businesses that have made a significant investment in their property, improving the overall appearance of the site.

Both Colorado Plus owner Eugene Khang, and West 29th Restaurant and Bar owners Bud and Mary Starker, made huge contributions to the esthetic look of Wheat Ridge over the past few months through the renovation and construction on their two respective businesses.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Colorado Plus and West 29th Restaurant and Bar for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF JULIENNE SAUER

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Julienne Sauer, of San Ramon, California. Fourteen-year-old Julienne recently was awarded second place in the science category of the Broadcom MASTERS 2013 National Science Fair.

The Broadcom MASTERS National Science Fair challenges sixth, seventh, and eighth grade scientists to explore STEM experiments and projects. Julienne was selected as one of thirty finalists from thousands of nominees by a panel of distinguished scientists and engineers.

Julienne's project was titled Quantum Locking: The Future of Frictionless Motion. She tested two different types of superconductors to explore which produced a magnetic field that would support the most weight. Scientists today are using this type of research to determine how to use frictionless motion to propel high speed rail and other projects. It is important that young scientists like Julienne have opportunities to pursue their passions.

I applaud Julienne's success. Her achievement, especially at such a young age, is remarkable. She is an inspiration and should serve as a role model for other young students looking to pursue a STEM education around the country. I offer Julienne my heartfelt congratulations, and I wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

HONOR VETERANS BY FULLY FUNDING GOVERNMENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this statement for the RECORD to show the sentiments of two of the greatest generation war heroes that breaking up the veterans funding does not serve veterans.

Today, Congressman John D. Dingell, Democrat of Michigan, and Former Senator Robert Dole, Republican of Kansas, issued the following statement urging Congress to take immediate action to re-open the entire federal government:

''As two proud World War II veterans blessed also to serve this great nation in Congress, we consider our bipartisan work together in helping to create a National World War II Memorial to be among our greatest accomplishments and a true honor to our brothers-in-arms. If this Congress truly wishes to recognize the sacrifice and bravery of our World War II veterans and all who've come after, it will end this shutdown and re-open our government now. The current shutdown has slowed the rate at which the government can process veterans' disability claims and, as the VA has stated, it is negatively impacting other services to our nation's veterans. Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans—and indeed all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them.''

SILVER DOLLAR CITY'S ''OUTLAW RUN'' GOLDEN TICKET AWARD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Branson, Missouri theme park, Silver Dollar City, for winning the Golden Ticket Award for ''Best New Ride'' in the theme park industry for their new wooden roller coaster, Outlaw Run.

This prestigious $10 million wooden roller coaster was also ranked seventh among the Top 50 Wooden Coasters Worldwide by Amusement Today magazine's awards on September 7, 2013, at Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk in California. Silver Dollar City was also voted as one of the Top 10 Best Theme Parks in the world—a first for Missouri.

As an economic driver to the famous entertainment town of Branson, Missouri, Outlaw Run created an additional 100,000 visitors during summer 2013.

These awards are a huge honor to Silver Dollar City. Silver Dollar City wanted to leave a worldwide footprint when it comes to family friendly destinations, and through hard work and determination was beyond successful.

HONORING FLETCHER GRANT HOKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Fletcher Grant Hoke. Fletcher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Fletcher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Fletcher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Fletcher has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say while serving as his troop's Patrol Leader. Fletcher has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Fletcher extended a path towards the Butterfly Garden at Hodge Park Living History Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, making it more easily accessible.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Fletcher Grant Hoke for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TELLER STREET GALLERY AND STUDIOS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Teller Street Gallery and Studios for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Cultural Commission Award.

This award recognizes a business which has made an impact on our community by promoting culture and the arts, and supporting opportunities in art education for all ages.

Teller Street Gallery and Studios has been in business for a little over one year and is a member of the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Being in the business of fun and creativity, they love participating in local events, such as hosting kids' art activities at the 2012 Carnation Festival, Ridge at 38 Event, and Wheat Fest. Teller Street made the backdrop for the photo booth for the August 15th Cruiser Crawl, and the trophies for the 2013 Carnation Festival Chili Cook-Off. They also have the privilege of providing after-school art programs for kids from the Wheat Ridge 5–8 School, and judging the Everett Middle School art show last spring.

In addition to encouraging art in the community, they enjoy supporting local charities and organizations such as the Wheat Ridge Feed the Future Backpack Program and hosting fundraisers like the painting party for Saints Peter and Paul School's silent auction kick-off.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Teller Street Gallery and Studios for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE ''GENE'' B. GLICK

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Eugene ''Gene'' B. Glick, who passed away on October 2, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our community, state, and country.

Mr. Glick was born in Indianapolis and had an early foray into business as both advertising salesman for the Daily Echo at Shortridge High School and as the operator of a charter bus service at Indiana University. He went on to earn his bachelor's degree in business from Indiana University.

Mr. Glick served his country in the Army during World War II. After returning to Indianapolis, his Gene B. Glick Co. became one of the largest privately held real-estate development firms in the country. He also went on to launch many philanthropic efforts in our community. To many in Indianapolis, Mr. Glick was a smart businessman and generous philanthropist. To his peers, he was a thorough boss who taught them about responsibility and accountability.

Mr. Glick, and his late wife Marilyn, were deeply committed to the greater Indianapolis community. Signs of their extensive philanthropy efforts are spread generously throughout Central Indiana. Among them, the Glick Eye Institute at the Indiana University School of Medicine, the Indianapolis Cultural Trail, the Arthur M. Glick Jewish Community Center, the Eugene and Marilyn Glick Indiana History Center, the Indianapolis Museum of Art, and more. The couple also supported several charitable organizations such as the Indiana Authors Award, Eugene & Marilyn Glick Family Foundation, Gene B. Glick Family Housing Foundations, the Glick Fund of the Central Indiana Community Foundation, and more.

Mr. Glick was devout in the Jewish faith, a wonderful family man, leaving four daughters and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. His legacy is more than I am able to fit into this memorial. Indianapolis, Indiana, and our nation is a better place because of the imprint of Mr. Glick.

RECOGNIZING DR. ARVID C. JOHNSON

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Dr. Arvid C. Johnson as the ninth president of the University of St. Francis, located in Joliet, Illinois.

Dr. Johnson earned a doctorate in management science from the Stuart School of Business at the Illinois Institute of Technology. Before joining the University of St. Francis, Dr.

Johnson served as the Dean of the Brennan School of Business and as a Professor of Management at Dominican University. He is also the recipient of many prestigious awards and grants, including the International Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines Research Award and the Business Ledger's Entrepreneurial Excellence Award.

In addition to his impressive academic record, Dr. Johnson has over 15 years of experience in engineering, manufacturing, and senior management in a variety of business environments ranging from start-ups to Fortune 500 companies.

As a scientist, engineer, businessman and educator, Dr. Johnson brings an immense amount of knowledge and experience to the St. Francis community. I am sure that under his direction, St. Francis will continue to thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Johnson on his outstanding achievements and I look forward to working with him and all of the faculty, students, and alumni to build upon the University's proud tradition of excellence.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Manufacturing Day to recognize the importance of manufacturing in the great Commonwealth of Kentucky, and specifically in the Sixth Congressional District.

With over 212,000 manufacturing jobs, manufacturing employs 12 percent of Kentucky's workers.

Manufacturers are drawn to Kentucky because of the highly educated workforce, diverse economy, and relatively low energy costs. These factors contribute to the Bluegrass Region consistently ranking in the Top Ten by Forbes Magazine as one of "Best places to Start a Business."

My district is home to great manufacturers such as Toyota, Lexmark, Double Star, Big Ass Fans, 3M, and Hitachi. These employers make important contributions to both the local and national economies, while creating thousands of jobs for my constituents back home.

To promote policies that help American manufacturers, I have joined the Congressional Manufacturing Caucus. In Congress, I remain focused on advancing an agenda that promotes economic growth, and increasing the competitiveness of our manufacturers will always be central to that goal.

LORETTA DiTIRRO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Loretta DiTirro for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge City Council Partnership Award.

This award recognizes a company or individual for their overall contributions to the City. It incorporates business achievements as well as contributions in volunteerism, leadership, and community investment and involvement.

Loretta DiTirro has been an active part of Wheat Ridge for many years. She currently is the President of the Wheat Ridge Business Association where she guides the mission of the organization and is the leading force behind its success. She is also a member of the Wheat Ridge Business District and sits on the Board of Directors, assisting businesses through a grant and loan program.

Additionally, Loretta DiTirro is a key figure in the Wheat Ridge Foundations "Feed the Future" program providing books, backpacks, food and assistance to the less fortunate children of Wheat Ridge. She can be seen volunteering at almost every event in Wheat Ridge and truly is a beacon of goodwill for the community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Loretta DiTirro for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on October 10th our good friends in Southeast Asia, Taiwan, will celebrate their 102nd year. Known to the people of Taiwan as Double Ten day since it falls on the tenth day of the tenth month. This is Taiwan's National day and is revered and celebrated with as much excitement and fanfare as we celebrate the Fourth of July here in the United States.

Taiwan has been a strong ally and economic partner for many years; and remains as such today. The two way trade between Taiwan and the United States is around $63 billion per year. Taiwan was the United States' 11th largest trading partner and the 7th largest purchaser of agricultural exports from America in 2012.

Due to this high volume of trade between our two countries, it is in our best interest to see Taiwan remain competitive in the global arena. There are two areas that would help Taiwan in this regard.

It would be beneficial to both the United States and Taiwan if both countries would sign a Bilateral Investment Agreement (BIA). With this agreement in place, there would be greater protections for investors from both countries allowing these investors have greater confidence.

Additionally, Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The TPP is a multi-nation trade agreement which is currently being discussed by countries such as Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico and the United States (among others) to "enhance trade and investment". Since Taiwan is a vital part of the Asian economy and an APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) member, they should be able to join the TPP as well.

Please join me in wishing Taiwan a successful National Day with the hopes that they can remain competitive on the world stage by moving forward with these agreements.

IN HONOR OF EDWARD O. DuBOSE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader, Edward O. DuBose, State President of the Georgia State Conference National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Mr. DuBose will be stepping down as State President at the NAACP 71st Annual Georgia State Convention and Civil Rights Conference on Saturday, October 5, 2013 in Columbus, Georgia.

Mr. DuBose was born in Atlanta, Georgia, the third of ten children to Carnell and Margie DuBose. After graduating from Harper High School in 1976, he joined the United States Army. Mr. DuBose served his country proudly and honorably for 21 years.

Mr. DuBose has an Associate Degree in General Education, a Bachelor's in Business Administration and a Master's in Clinical Mental Health Counseling.

The Owner of Everlasting Peace Counseling and Consulting Services, Mr. DuBose is a Licensed Professional Counselor, National Certified Counselor, and Certified Anger Management Specialist. Mr. DuBose is also registered as a Neutral with the Georgia Office of Dispute Resolution and has received certificates in Civil as well as Family and Domestic Relations Mediation.

A man of many hats, Mr. DuBose served as President of the Columbus, Georgia Branch of the NAACP from 1997 to 2005. From 2000 through 2005, he also served as 2nd Vice President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP. He has also served as Georgia State NAACP Veterans Affairs Chairman and as District Coordinator for District 21 of the Georgia State Conference NAACP.

On October 11, 2005, Mr. DuBose made history in Columbus, Georgia when he became the only resident and NAACP member from Columbus to be elected to the office of State President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP. He made history again on February 21, 2009 when he became the first Georgia State Conference NAACP President in its 69-year history to be elected to the NAACP National Board of Directors.

Under Mr. DuBose's leadership, the Georgia State Conference NAACP has achieved a higher level of influence and a more prominent presence. He negotiated the only NAACP radio show in Georgia, helped to start the first Black History Month Parade in Columbus, Georgia, and coordinated the largest protest march in Columbus history by rallying over 15,000 people to call for justice for the 2003 shooting death of Kenneth Walker. He also assisted the Douglas County, Georgia branch of the NAACP in conducting the first protest march in the county in its history, rallying over 5,000 people seeking justice in the case of the "Douglasville Six."

Mr. DuBose had been steadfast and committed to leading the State of Georgia "By Any Means Necessary" to raise awareness, promote justice, and establish equality and respect in all aspects of life.

Mr. DuBose has been honored with many awards and has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have

been possible without the grace of God and his loving wife, Cynthia, and their three daughters, Cynthia, Casonya, and Kimberly.

On a personal note, I would like to thank Mr. DuBose for his outstanding leadership in the Columbus, Georgia community and throughout the entire State of Georgia. Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." Mr. DuBose embodies this statement thoroughly in his profession as a counselor and mediator, as well as in his leadership of the Georgia NAACP. We certainly could use more people like him in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Edward O. DuBose for his outstanding leadership as the State President of the Georgia State Conference NAACP.

JOHN MATT HUTCHINSON

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Matt Hutchinson for receiving the Boy Scouts' top award, the Honor Medal with Crossed Palms.

The Honor Medal with Crossed Palms is described as the Scouting equivalent of the Medal of Honor. Since 1938, only 277 other Scouts nationwide have received the award.

Matt earned the honor after the May 22, 2011, Joplin tornado when he exemplified outstanding leadership and bravery. Matt was ending his shift as a cook at St. John's Regional Medical Center when the storm hit. He sheltered six other people in a doorway during the storm. When the storm calmed down, the entire hospital was left in shambles and there were many people with serious injuries. Matt stepped up as a leader, getting help for people who needed first aid and making sure everyone was safe until help got there.

Matt would like to recognize the following leaders that had an impact on his Scouting career that began in the first grade: Richard Sapp, Jon Mikrut, Dan and Mary McKenzie, Tom and Jeannette Rouse, Sean Simmons, Kurt Garner, Curtis Ware, Michael Mueller, Glenn Weibel, Dr. Raymond Grote, Bruce Turner, Jeff Hole, Dan Webber, Dan and Dolly Johnson, Kathy Bal, and Byron Haverstick.

I am honored to recognize John Matt Hutchison for his courage and leadership.

WHEAT RIDGE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE WHEAT RIDGE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION'S FEED THE FUTURE PROGRAM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the Wheat Ridge Police Department and the Wheat Ridge Business Association's Feed the Future Program for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Mayor's Business & Community Partnership Award.

This award incorporates overall achievements as well as contributions in volunteerism, leadership, and community investment, but must also include involvement with the mentoring, training, and partnering with the youth.

The Feed the Future Program is a great collaborative initiative, working locally to transform lives toward a world where people no longer face under nutrition and hunger.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Wheat Ridge Police Department and Wheat Ridge Business Association's Feed the Future Program for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF HERMAN WALLACE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we rise to commemorate and celebrate the life and contributions of Herman Wallace, one of the bravest champions for justice and human rights whom we have ever met. Nicknamed, "The Muhammad Ali of Justice", Mr. Wallace was a member of Louisiana's "Angola 3" who spent 41 years in solitary confinement. Mr. RICHMOND and I had the opportunity to visit Mr. Wallace at the Louisiana State Penitentiary in Angola, justifiably called "the Alcatraz of the South" several years ago. I was impressed by his courage, determination, and dignity. We received word that Mr. Wallace passed away earlier this morning, only three days after he was freed pursuant to a federal judge's ruling that he had not received a fair trial in 1974.

Mr. Wallace began his struggle for justice back in the 1970s, when he, along with Robert King and Albert Woodfox, organized a prison chapter of the Black Panther Party at the Angola prison. He worked to desegregate the prison, to end systematic rape and violence, and for better living conditions for the inmates.

Mr. Wallace, Albert Woodfox, and Robert King spent decades in solitary confinement—confined in cells no bigger than a parking space for 23 hours a day—for murders they say they did not commit. No physical evidence links them to these crimes. Potentially exculpatory DNA evidence has been lost, and the testimony of the main eyewitness has been discredited.

Mr. Wallace showed relentless courage and perseverance in fighting the injustice and inhumane treatment that he and his fellow Angola 3 inmates were subjected to. Even from the confines of solitary confinement, he filed lawsuit after lawsuit in an effort to bring attention to the difficult conditions under which he and the others were being held.

The courts finally heard him this week, and some measure of justice was granted with his release. Mr. Wallace's conviction has now been overturned. Mr. King's conviction has been overturned. State and federal judges have overturned Mr. Woodfox's conviction three times, yet Mr. Woodfox remains in prison—in solitary confinement—because of the State's appeals.

On behalf of all who believe in fundamental fairness and justice, we commend Mr. Wallace's courage and determination to keep fighting through 41 long years of solitary confinement. He is an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. Wallace had recently been diagnosed with terminal liver cancer. With his release from prison, it was hoped that he would be able to receive the medical care that his advanced liver cancer required. Prior to his passing, Mr. Wallace's legal team said, however, that his greatest hope was that his case would help ensure that others, especially his fellow Angola 3 member Albert Woodfox, would not continue to suffer the cruel and unusual confinement that he had suffered. Because of Mr. Wallace's work, those of us in Congress who have called for his freedom will dedicate our future efforts to ensuring that no one anywhere in the United States is subjected to the unjust and inhumane treatment that he has endured.

Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that we learned of Mr. Wallace's passing earlier this morning, nine days shy of his 72nd birthday. Mr. Wallace's personal fight against injustice and the inhuman plight that is long term solitary confinement has ended for him. The larger fight against that injustice must go on, however, and his legacy will endure through a civil lawsuit that he filed jointly with his fellow Angola 3 members, Albert Woodfox and Robert King. That lawsuit seeks to define and abolish long term solitary confinement as cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr. Speaker, we ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Wallace for his many-decades-long fight for the humane treatment of prisoners. We, and all of us, owe Mr. Wallace a debt of gratitude.

RECOGNIZING RETIRED UNITED STATES NAVY COMMANDER KERWIN E. MILLER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing retired United States Navy Commander Kerwin E. Miller on the occasion of his 60th birthday and in honoring him for his service to his country in multiple ways throughout his adult life.

Cdr. Miller has made public service a lifelong pursuit. Since his induction to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1971, Kerwin has served under seven presidents, two Members of Congress, Walter Fauntroy and myself, and two mayors of the District of Columbia, Anthony Williams and Adrian Fenty, and has had a special commitment to the 40,000 veterans and the more than 600,000 residents in the District of Columbia. Kerwin graduated from the Naval Academy in 1975, and his heart has never left The Yard, where he continues to serve his alma mater as a member of the Admissions Committee.

In 1986, Kerwin joined Congressman Fauntroy's Service Academy Selection Board, and since 1991, he has served the people of the Nation's capital as first Vice-Chairman and

now as Chairman of the Board. He indefatigably guides students through their applications and promotes the benefits of a Service Academy education in general and of the Naval Academy in particular. Kerwin always has a plan, a program, or an athletic event (usually all three at once), sometimes with musical accompaniment by the U.S. Naval Academy Gospel Choir, to encourage DC students to investigate their possibilities at the Academies.

Along with his outstanding service to the Academies, Kerwin played a strong role in saving the District of Columbia's War Memorial, was an attorney in the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and served as director of the Mayor's Office of Veterans Affairs. He has always been a staunch advocate for the District's right to govern itself, and, above all, a devoted, thoughtful, and a fearsome friend of the city and a friend who has my personal respect and admiration.

I particularly remember Kerwin's attention to his mentor, the late Lt. Cdr. Wesley Brown, USNA 1949, the first African American graduate of the Naval Academy. Kerwin helped plan the dedication of the field house that bears Lt. Cdr. Brown's name, organized Wesley's affairs, his care, and his memorial service. Kerwin continues to serve as his executor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me recognizing Cdr. Miller not only with a "Happy Birthday" on his 60th birthday, but particularly for his service to the country and city, and always as with "Go Navy! Beat Army!"

MANDY FULTON AND SUZANNE SMITH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mandy Fulton of Teller Street Gallery and Studio, and Suzanne Smith of Food for Thought for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Business Association Member of the Year Award.

This award is given to the member or members who exemplify the Best in the Organization by promoting best business practices and for their contribution to the organization and the community. Both are successful business owners and are receiving this award for their volunteer activities to support Feed the Future and other local organizations that support our children.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mandy Fulton and Suzanne Smith for this well deserved recognition by the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

WEATHERLY, PA 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the borough of Weatherly, Pennsylvania, which is celebrating its 150th anniversary on October 6, 2013.

Weatherly is located in Carbon County and lies between the Broad and Spring mountains on the banks of Hazle Creek. Originally called Black Creek, the town's name was changed to Weatherly in 1848 when a local clock-maker, David Weatherly, made an agreement with town officials that he would build a clock for the town if the area adopted his last name. While the name change was made, the town never received the clock they were promised. In 1863, Weatherly split from Lausanne Township to become its own borough. Today, Weatherly boasts over 2,500 residents.

Mr. Speaker, for 150 years the borough of Weatherly has been an integral part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and our great nation. Therefore, I commend all those citizens who have lived and worked in this beautiful and historic area.

HONORING DR. KEVIN B. BREWER

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Kevin B. Brewer of the Faith in the Word Christian Center in Twentynine Palms. It is an honor to serve the people of the Eighth Congressional District, particularly when so many people in the district are dedicated to serving others.

Dr. Brewer began his service in 1972 when he joined the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in 1976 after graduating from Ashland University in Ohio. Between 1976 and 1997, Dr. Brewer wore the ranks of Second Lieutenant and Lieutenant Colonel in the Marine Corps, and it was during his overseas tour in Okinawa, Japan in 1979 that he rededicated himself to God and his calling to minister the gospel.

In March of 1985, Dr. Brewer began working part time as a pastor at Faith in the Word, and became the full-time pastor in 1989. Even as he was serving members of the Mojave Desert community, Dr. Brewer answered the call of duty once again in 1990, reporting for active military duty in Operation Desert Shield, before finally retiring from the USMCR in 1997.

After his retirement, Dr. Brewer has continued to serve members of his community as president of the local Ministerial Association and Rotary Club, in addition to his vital work as pastor.

Dr. Brewer is just one example of the many community members in the Eighth District who have chosen to serve in many ways, and I want to thank all of them for their service and for honoring me with the chance to represent them in Washington, D.C.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMOGENE THEATER IN MILTON, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Imogene Theater in Milton, Florida.

Built by banker Stephen Harvey for $25,000, the Imogene is a Renaissance Revival style hall that was slated primarily to serve as a community center for the performing arts. Originally called the Milton Auditorium, the facility also hosted movies beginning with the silent film, "The Passion Play." During this time, the Imogene remained a central part of the Milton community and served as a meeting place for Milton residents, even hosting speeches by presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan in 1916 and again in 1924 when he made campaign stops in Santa Rosa County.

In 1921 the Milton Auditorium was sold to Clyde Gooch. To honor his daughter, he renamed the facility the Imogene Theater after her. In the 1930's and 40's, the theater was a first-rate movie house, running the era's most popular films. In 1946, however, a new theater opened in town, and Imogene's prominent presence in the community began to fade.

Other businesses occupied the theater until 1980, but in 1985, the Imogene was purchased for $30,000 by the Santa Rosa Historical Society, which dedicated great effort and time restoring the theater to her old glory. The facility reopened and began a new tenure as a hub for local arts and community events.

Tragedy struck the historic landmark the evening of January 6, 2009 when a fire broke out on the same block as the theater. The beloved facility was severely damaged by fires, smoke, and water. With the aid of determined community support, the Imogene was once again restored and continues to be an integral part of the Milton community today.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Imogene Theater. May she have many more years serving Northwest Florida.

ABLE PLANET

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Able Planet for receiving the 2013 Wheat Ridge Special Recognition Award.

Able Planet, a Wheat Ridge business that designs and manufactures innovative audio and communication devices for individuals with all levels of hearing was honored by the State as one of the growing "Colorado Companies to Watch" at a recent gala in Denver. The award recognizes second-stage companies that are developing valuable products and services, creating quality jobs, enriching communities, and creating new industries throughout the state. Second-stage companies fuel the economic fire of Colorado by accounting for much of the economic growth and economic independence of individuals throughout the state.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Able Planet for this well deserved recognition by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Wheat Ridge Business Association.

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. This month is devoted to raising awareness and educating individuals about breast cancer and honor the thousands of women across our nation who have been diagnosed, fighting or have survived breast cancer.

Breast cancer is the most common cancer among women in the United States. 1 in 8 women will develop breast cancer over the course of her lifetime, and it is estimated that this year more than 230,000 cases of breast cancer. In the great state of Texas, 13,856 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in 2010.

In the Second District of Texas, I am proud of our local hospitals, school districts, and non-profits who promote breast cancer awareness and prevention during this month. My own staffer and casework manager, Whitney Rahim, has been affected personally by this disease. Whitney's mother, Cynthia Bryant, is a 5 year breast cancer survivor and a community volunteer for the Houston Avon Walk for Breast Cancer and the Houston Susan G. Komen for the Cure. Whitney and her mother, along with friends and family, walk in both races to raise funds for breast cancer research, education, screening and treatment. Almost everyone we know has been touched by this disease.

Last year, my friend John Garza with the Houston Police Department, received news that his wife, Virginia had stage 2 breast cancer. Virginia, like her husband, is a lifetime member of what is referred to in my part of Texas as the Poe-leece. It is an informal organization made up of my longtime friends in the Texas law enforcement community. I first met Virginia in 1993 at the North Harris County Criminal Justice Association breakfast meeting in Humble; she was then an agent with the DEA (United States Drug Enforcement Administration). I knew then that Virginia was a fighter and survivor. Virginia is a highly trained federal and state narcotics investigator; she has worked for the DEA, Harris County, Texas Department of Public Safety, and Humble Police Department. When Virginia was first diagnosed, she had just started working as a Senior Investigator at the Harris County Attorney's Office and had very little sick time accumulated. While receiving chemo treatments for a course of six months, she never missed a day of work! Virginia and John have five children and four grandchildren. One of Virginia's biggest fears was not being present or helpful for the birth of their third grandchild, I am happy to report that Virginia courageously battled cancer and she is cancer free and she recently saw the birth of her fourth grandchild.

Unfortunately, this disease has hit home for another one of our very own from the Houston Police Department. Senior Police Officer Linda Reichert was diagnosed with breast cancer in December of 2011. Every year, she made her routine mammogram appointment and on that day in December, she never thought she would receive the news that she did. Stage 0 breast cancer. Zero was a small number in her mind but it wasn't until doctors discovered stage 2 cancer in her lymph nodes that she realized she couldn't take the small number for granted. It was an arduous road to recovery for her. However, after a double mastectomy, intense chemotherapy, and lymph nodes removal, she was able to return to a job that she is immeasurably passionate about. It was more than the medicine and surgeries that led her to becoming a breast cancer survivor. Officer Reichert exuded positive energy and happiness, even during her lowest moments. Hair loss and skin deterioration were part of her recovery, but with her support team of family, friends, coworkers and doctors at her side, she beat the odds that come along with this disease. Today, she feels top-notch with lots of energy and is back at work pushing her goal each and every day: making a difference in someone's life, even if it is just one person.

As a husband and father of three girls, I support funding for breast cancer research, screening, and treatment programs. I am an advocate for organizations that are dedicated to educating women about early detection by practicing regular self-breast exams and scheduling regular mammograms.

I would like to express my sincere admiration to the 2.8 million breast cancer survivors in our country, like Cynthia and Virginia, who have demonstrated courage in their personal fight against this disease. Their tireless work is an inspiration and a reminder that we must keep up the fight until there is a cure.

And that's just the way it is.

GREENE COUNTY COURTHOUSE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 100th anniversary of the Historic Greene County Courthouse in Springfield, Missouri. The centennial will be celebrated on October 26, 2013.

The Greene County Courthouse was the fourth courthouse built for county use. It was moved to the geographical center of the city in order to unite the cities of what had been North Springfield and Springfield. After many political and financial battles, construction began in 1909.

The Historic Greene County Courthouse has proved important to economic growth, development, and prosperity for the city of Springfield and Greene County. The courthouse was a key part of the county's history and will be celebrated with displays, demonstrations, stories of numerous trials, as well as recognizing the elected officials who served in this grand building over the past 100 years.

On a personal note, the Greene County Courthouse is very special to my family and me. My Great Grandfather, Judge Benjamin Jacob Diemer, was the presiding judge of the county court and helped lead the drive for the new courthouse. He was a key figure in getting the courthouse built on its current location.

I am proud to honor the Greene County Courthouse's Centennial Anniversary.

CHUCK BAROCH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Chuck Baroch for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Chuck Baroch for his long service leading the Golden Civic Foundation, which supports economic development and nonprofit organizations in Golden, and for his 13 years on Golden City Council, the last six as mayor. He enhanced relationships with the Colorado School of Mines and represented Golden well in the disputes over the "Northwest Parkway," as well as contributed to the city's sustainability efforts. He brought an inclusive and gentlemanly manner to his interactions.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Chuck Baroch for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF "NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Manufacturing Day, and to encourage our young people to seriously think about what manufacturing entails.

According to recent reports, 55 percent of manufacturers reported business growth in 2012 and 63 percent anticipate growth this year. Meanwhile, most of their employees are at least 45 years old, with retirement on the horizon. Within the next decade, three-quarters of the workforce in this sector will need to come from Generation Y if the industry is to keep growing and evolving at its current rate.

With statistics like these, companies across the nation recognize the need to recruit younger generations. For this reason they are opening their doors and welcoming our young people to tour factories and consider a career in manufacturing. By opening their doors, they want to educate young people on the skills necessary to find manufacturing work, and advise them that this work still pays better than many jobs.

Take Detroit's historic rise in automotive manufacturing and production as an example. Thousands of families found quality good-paying jobs, with benefits secured through collective bargaining at the auto plants. Although many of the manufacturing jobs that built our middle class over the 20th Century were shipped overseas, there is a new focus on bringing them back by recreating what manufacturing in American looks like today.

Right now, manufacturers are adding jobs at the fastest pace it has seen in the last few years, ramping up production of "Made in America" products. But while the manufacturing community is currently in the midst of resurgence, they are struggling to find qualified employees to fill these job openings.

Since much of the industry has modernized over the last few decades, these job positions are high tech, working with robots and cutting-edge technologies that require strong math and computer skills. Manufacturing is no longer dangerous, dirty, or backbreaking work—it is a modem, technologically advanced profession. In order to continue the current manufacturing resurgence, we need to focus on preparing our youth with STEM educations to help them garner the skills that will allow them to transition into modern plants that require smart, high-tech employees.

I applaud American manufacturing companies pulling together to highlight the advances across the industry, and I strongly encourage these sorts of educational opportunities for our youth. Manufacturing has long been a source of good-paying jobs that provide economic security for American's middle class and I fully support efforts to ensure it holds this position into the future.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,747,468,275,799.27. We've added $6,120,591,226,886.21 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

ED DORSEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ed Dorsey for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Ed Dorsey for his long-term efforts as the exemplary volunteer contributing to the success of a variety of activities in the City of Golden. He has served as an active member and chair of several key organizations including Leadership Golden Board, Visitors Center Board, the Citizens Budget Advisory Committee, GURA and the Buffalo Bills Days Committee, just to name a few. Most recently he has been a lead advocate to inform the community about the Downtown Development Authority. His singular distinctive contributions set a superlative example of volunteerism in Golden as detailed in Vision 2030.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ed Dorsey for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

CELEBRATING PAT AND JERRY EPSTEIN

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friends Pat and Jerry Epstein on the October 12 celebration marking both their wedding anniversary and Jerry's 90th birthday.

Jerry was born on August 29, 1923, in New York, and this year he turned 90 years young. Pat and Jerry were married in her native home town of Atlanta, Georgia, in December 1948, and this year marks their 65th year of marriage. The October celebration is halfway between Jerry's birthday on August 29 and their wedding anniversary on December 26.

Pat is an active sculptor. For many years she worked with alabaster, but her latest works are composed of paper mache. Her work is on display at St. John's Hospital in Santa Monica and the Jewish Home for the aging in Los Angeles. She also participates in a number of charitable activities, most notably for Hadassah and the Irene Dunne Women's Guild for St. John's Hospital.

Jerry is a true patriot. From his participation in three Pacific island invasions as a soldier in World War II, through his Reserve career after the war, and continuing through his active civic involvement on local city, county and state commissions for the past forty or more years, Jerry Epstein is a ''Horatio Alger'' who has always believed in giving back to his country and community.

Jerry has been involved with Marina del Rey since its inception in 1955. He participated in the Master Planning process even before dredging began to create the Marina del Rey Harbor in 1958. He was among the original developers to bid on County of Los Angeles ground leases when the new community was developed through a then-unique public private partnership in the mid-1960s. Today Marina del Rey is the largest single income-producing asset owned by the County of Los Angeles, and Jerry is currently co-General Partner of Marina Harbor Apartments and Anchorage as well as Managing Partner of Shores.

Jerry's vision and tenacity extends beyond the creation of the community of Marina del Rey to his leadership on transportation and other public infrastructure issues in Los Angeles County and throughout the state of California. He has served as President of the Board of Airport Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles; Chair of the California Transportation Commission; Vice Chair of the California High-Speed Rail Authority, and President of the Los Angeles State Building Authority. Jerry has also served as President of the St. John's Hospital Foundation and was honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Boys and Girls Club of Venice, among other charitable activities and honors.

Together Pat and Jerry have an interest in American historical documents. Jerry's interest in American historical documents reflects his patriotism. They have donated a collection of these documents to Colonial Williamsburg, including a rare stone imprint of the Declaration of Independence. The Colonial Williamsburg web site includes information on the Pat and Jerry Epstein Collection of American Historical Documents.

Mr. Speaker, I admire and am proud of Pat and Jerry's involvement and commitment to our community and our nation. Their generosity and civic engagement is an example we can all emulate and is one from which we all benefit.

I am honored to call Pat and Jerry my dear friends and I wish them my sincerest congratulations on sixty-five years of marriage, my best wishes for many more happy years together and a very happy 90th birthday to Jerry.

HONORING SUSAN WOODS AND MISTY FURGENSON

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Golden Living Center of McDonald County's Executive Director, Susan Woods, and Director of Nursing, Misty Furgenson, as recipients of the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living 2013 Silver National Quality Award.

Susan joined the facility in 1995 as a Certified Nursing Assistant. After holding just about every position in the living center, she became the Executive Director in 2005. Misty joined the Living Center as the Director of Nursing eight years ago.

The Golden Living Center provides patients with quality health care in a comfortable living environment during their recoveries. Susan and Misty have led the McDonald County facility as a model of excellence in providing that care.

The National Quality Award Program highlights facilities across the nation that serve as models in providing high-quality long-term care. Recipients of the Silver-Achievement award have demonstrated systematic advancement in quality, plans for continual improvement, and sustainable organizational goals.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Susan Woods and Misty Furgenson.

PRESTON DRIGGERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Preston Driggers for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Preston Driggers for his decades of citizen service to our community. Golden has been shaped by the contributions of many, and Preston is an example of one who has made a big difference. From working towards the open space purchases of both table mountains and the Bachman property, serving on the GURA board, to even commenting on the transit oriented development on Golden Ridge Road, Preston has always made sincere, important, and unselfish contributions. The Golden community knows Preston as someone

who is altruistic, balanced, calm, and a thoughtful role model for citizen involvement.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Preston Driggers for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

RECOGNIZING LEWIS UNIVERSITY'S AVIATION PROGRAM

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Aviation Department at Lewis University and Department Chair Bill Brogan for receiving the Loening Trophy, an award presented to the top collegiate aviation program in the country.

I am happy to see this outstanding program recognized nationally. Lewis University, which is located in my district, has seen significant growth in their aviation department over the past few years, and emerged as one of our nation's preeminent programs. On September 26, in a ceremony held on campus in Romeoville, Illinois, members of Lewis' Flight Team along with students and faculty from the Aviation and Transportation Department were on hand to receive the Loening Trophy.

I have visited Lewis University and the Aviation Department a number of times over the past year. I have been very impressed with the various aviation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Aviation is a growing field and the program at Lewis provides students with an education and skills that will serve them very well.

Every year, the National Intercollegiate Flying Association considers aviation programs across the country and selects a recipient for the award based on intense evaluations. Since 1929, the recipient has represented the current benchmark for an overall outstanding aviation program. The hard work and dedication that Lewis University puts into its academics, community involvement, comprehensive safety programs, and a proactive enhancement of the future of aviation earned them the honor this year, setting their program apart as truly top-tier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lewis University's Aviation and Transportation Department and congratulating them on this award. The Loening Trophy proves that Lewis continues to be a collegiate aviation leader not only in Illinois, but nationwide. May the students and faculty at Lewis enjoy this prestigious award and continue their work in the field of aviation.

REOPEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution, along with Representatives GEORGE MILLER and NITA LOWEY, which is designed to reopen the Federal Government.

House Republicans have shut down the government in an effort to push their reckless agenda, allowing a small group of Tea Party Republicans to hold the entire Federal Government hostage. And they think they can distract from that by cherry-picking pieces of government to re-open, and leave the rest of it to die on the vine. They are playing games with peoples' lives, leaving families, small businesses, veterans, and our economy to pay the price.

The fastest way to proceed is to vote on the clean Senate-passed bill to immediately reopen the government. The President has indicated he is willing to sign it tonight. Unfortunately, House Republicans have manipulated the rules to block democracy in the House, and will not allow an up-or-down vote on the bill.

So today, House Democrats are offering an alternate way to end this irresponsible shutdown and allow our public servants to return to the work of the American taxpayers. We are introducing a petition that will compel consideration of legislation to open the government. By signing this discharge petition, both Democrats and Republicans can finally stand up and demand a vote as early as October 14 on a short-term extension of government funding consistent with what the Senate has passed. This would allow Congress to finally get back to the work of boosting job growth and reducing our long-term deficit in a balanced way. And it would allow government to get back to the work of helping to keep our nation safe, fight and cure diseases, help veterans, and provide vital services that touch virtually every family in our country.

Speaker BOEHNER has made it very clear that he is afraid of democracy. But that is why we were all elected to the peoples' House. It's time to stop playing partisan games and stop this damaging shutdown.

HONORING MARIST HIGH SCHOOL IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marist High School in Chicago, Illinois. This September the high school celebrated its 50th Anniversary. Hundreds of students, alumni, and family members joined Cardinal Francis George in Red and White Stadium to celebrate an anniversary Mass, honoring Marist High School's past and future.

In 1963 this Roman Catholic high school opened its doors with the mission of granting students quality schooling, preparing them for higher education, and instilling in them the values of faith, family, and service. Achieving and maintaining a level of performance as high as Marist is not easy. The school has established an educational culture that creates structures, norms, and organizational support to sustain their improving trend toward excellence.

For half a century Marist High School has provided an innovative and demanding college preparatory curriculum, serving thousands of Chicago-area and suburban students. Today, the school continues to enhance its surrounding community. The hard work and dedication of all the staff at Marist High School has not gone unnoticed. Praise is due not only to the outstanding teachers, who work tirelessly for the benefit of their students, but to the administrative staff who also work relentlessly to provide the professional atmosphere and the materials necessary to let teachers do what they do best.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding faculty and students, both past and present, at Marist High School, and congratulating them on this special 50th Anniversary. May Marist High School continue to exhibit excellence and create an outstanding learning environment for our future leaders.

HONORING ST. FRANCIS XAVIER PARISH SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 4, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Francis Xavier Parish School, an exemplary Catholic school in La Grange, Illinois, for receiving the prestigious 2013 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award. Established in 1890, St. Francis Xavier Parish has been serving the entire community of La Grange through religious and academic education as well as community service.

In 1982, the Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order to replicate their success. I am proud that one of the exceptional schools being honored is not only located in my district, but sits only a couple of miles from my home. I enjoy participating in the annual Falcon 5k run and other events for the school.

The mission of St. Francis Xavier Parish School is to provide students with academic excellence centered in the Catholic values of prayer, learning, and service. Each student pledges to uphold these principles and be a citizen of the world and ''represent the mission of my school with dignity and grace.'' Since 1917 when the school opened its doors, the faculty and staff have been providing an excellent education to students based on these founding values.

Today, St. Francis Xavier School offers programs from preschool through eighth grade and attracts students from La Grange, La Grange Park, and surrounding communities, currently enrolling more than 600 students. As

a proud graduate of Catholic and Jesuit schools, I understand the rigorous and engaging curriculum that emphasizes Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Technology, Language Arts, and Religion. The St. Francis Xavier School offers challenging educational experiences that foster success, promote unity, and respect the individuality of each student.

Please join me in celebrating the accomplishments of St. Francis Xavier Parish School and all the National Blue Ribbon award winners. Their pursuit of academic excellence is inspiring, and I hope that their success can serve as an inspiration for schools across the nation.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7171–S7214

Measures Introduced: Two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. Res. 265–266. **Pages S7210–11**

Measures Passed:

Small Airplane Revitalization Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1848, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7212–13**

Reid (for Klobuchar) Amendment No. 1999, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7212–13**

Sleep Disorder Rules for Commercial Drivers: Senate passed H.R. 3095, to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding. **Page S7213**

70th Anniversary of the Rescue of Danish Jews: Senate agreed to S. Res. 227, to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people. **Page S7213**

Representative Democracy in Venezuela: Senate agreed to S. Res. 213, expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela, condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, and calling for dialogue between all political actors in the country, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the committee amendment to the title. **Pages S7213–14**

Washington Navy Yard Attack: Senate agreed to S. Res. 265, expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism. **Page S7214**

National Chess Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 266, designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as "National Chess Week" to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills. **Page S7214**

Messages from the House: **Page S7210**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S7210**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7211**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S7211**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7211–12**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 4:53 p.m., until 12 p.m. on Saturday, October 5, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7214.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 4 public bills, H.R. 3243–3246; and 2 resolutions, H.J. Res. 88 and H. Res. 372, were introduced. **Page H6289**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6289–90**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Holding to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6227**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:49 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6238**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C. **Pages H6238–39**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H6239, H6253**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:47 p.m. and reconvened at 2:30 p.m. **Page H6252**

Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 164 nays, Roll No. 522. **Pages H6254–62**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Bishop (NY) motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 521. **Pages H6261–62**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 520, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 519. **Pages H6244–52, H6252–53**

Agreed by unanimous consent to modify H. Res. 371 with the technical correction placed at the desk. **Pages H6253–54**

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 75, making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 164 nays, Roll No. 524. **Pages H6262–72**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Kirkpatrick motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 523. **Pages H6270–71**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 520, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 519. **Pages H6244–52, H6252–53**

Agreed by unanimous consent to modify H. Res. 371 with the technical correction placed at the desk. **Pages H6253–54**

Supplemental Report: Agreed that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to file a supplemental report on H.R. 1804, Veterans Accountability Act of 2013. **Page H6272**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6252–53, H6253, H6261–62, H6262, H6271, and H6272. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 p.m., Saturday, October 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m.

Next Meetings of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Saturday, October 5

House Chamber

Program for Saturday: Consideration of H.R. 3223—Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1440
Barr, Andy, Ky., E1438
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1438
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1435
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1436
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1442
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1439, E1441
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1440
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1433
Foster, Bill, Ill., E1437
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1433, E1435, E1436, E1437
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1434
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E1434
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1437
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E1433
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1443, E1443, E1443
Long, Billy, Mo., E1435, E1437, E1439, E1441, E1442
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E1435, E1435
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1440
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1439
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1434, E1436, E1437, E1438, E1439, E1440, E1440, E1441, E1442, E1442
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1441
Polis, Jared, Colo., E1434
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1438
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1437
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1442
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1436
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1443
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1433
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1434

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.