United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013 No. 138

House of Representatives

The House met at noon 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 7, 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 1:50 p.m.

WHY WE FIGHT

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the ''Band of Brothers'' episode, ''Why We Fight,'' reminds me of an experience my father, Jack Brooks, shared with me. At age 23, dad was a combat engineer in General Patton's army. Near war's end, dad was ordered to help at a German concentration camp. Dad and his fellow soldiers saw human bodies decomposing and stacked like cordwood, 5- and 6-feet high, with lime sprinkled on them to retard the spread of disease. Those concentration camps helped my dad, and America, understand why we fought in Europe.

Today, Washington is in an epic political battle that will affect America's future for decades and centuries to come. Some see a fight between Republicans and Democrats. I see a fight between those who are financially responsible and those who are not, between those who have the understanding and backbone needed to prevent an American bankruptcy and those who do not.

Why do I fight? I fight for America's children and grandchildren. I fight for America's future.

President Obama's five deficits have averaged $1 trillion per year, the worst in history. America soon will blow through the $17 trillion debt mark, the worst in history.

Mr. Speaker, it is challenging to grasp trillion-dollar deficits and a $17 trillion debt. Let me simplify. In each of the last 5 years, the Federal Government borrowed 20 to 30 percent of its operational costs. How many American families or businesses could avoid bankruptcy if, year after year, 20 to 30 percent of what they spent was borrowed money? Not many, and not for long.

Economic principles don't care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more than you can pay back, you go bankrupt. America has been warned of the consequences of financial irresponsibility. Greece is further down the debt path than America. Greece's unemployment rate is 27 percent, worse than any year in America's Great Depression.

Earlier this year, Cyprus confiscated as much as 60 percent of their citizens' savings and checking accounts. The Detroit and Stockton municipal bankruptcies risk retirees losing their pensions.

President Obama's former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, warned Congress that America's greatest national security threat is not Iran, not al Qaeda, not China, not Russia; it is our debt. Admiral Mullen is prophetic. In recent history, no enemy has done as much damage to America's military and national security as have debt and sequestration.

President Obama's Comptroller General, Gene Dodaro, warned Congress and the White House earlier this year that America's deficits and debt are unsustainable, which brings us to today's fight involving a government shutdown, debt ceilings, and socialized medicine. No question, a government shutdown hampers the economy. Between 1976 and 1995, there were 17 government shutdowns. Yet, America's economy boomed in the 1980s and 1990s. Shutdowns can be overcome.

No question, not raising the debt ceiling poses economic risk. No one knows for sure how much risk, because America has never crossed this threshold before. Whatever it is, it can be overcome.

Knowing these risks, why do I fight over funding bills, the debt ceiling, and socialized medicine? Because too many Washington politicians pander to the next election's voters without caring one whit about America's future—because appropriations bills, continuing resolutions, the debt ceiling, and the like are the only leverage I have to cajole financially irresponsible Washington politicians into doing what must be done to prevent an American bankruptcy.

It is because, as bad as government shutdown and debt ceiling risks may be, they are relatively inconsequential compared to the economic devastation resulting from an American bankruptcy. Think about the chaos and hardship that will ensue if America has no national defense, no FBI, CIA, or DEA, no Social Security, Medicaid, or Medicare, no NASA, no justice system

Printed on recycled paper.

because an American bankruptcy has deprived us of the money needed to pay for them.

Why do I fight? I fight to minimize the risk of America suffering a debilitating bankruptcy that can destroy the America it took our ancestors centuries to build.

Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to use any tools I can to win that fight, because this is one fight America cannot afford to lose. That is why I fight.

LET US VOTE

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this will be a short 5-minute, indeed a short 1-minute, because it all can be said in a very few words.

Yesterday, the Speaker said ''there are not enough votes in the House to pass'' a clean bill to fund the government and end the shutdown.

There is one clear way to find out, Mr. Speaker: let us vote on the floor of the House.

On Saturday, 195 of us Democrats sent a letter to the Speaker, saying we are willing to vote ''yes.'' And the reports are also 22 Republicans at least are ready to vote ''yes.'' That's a majority. There are enough votes to end the shutdown.

And Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe it, let us vote.

HEALTH CARE EXCHANGES WORKING

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks day 7 since the rollout of the health care exchanges under the Affordable Care Act. Listening to the hysterical rhetoric from the majority party in the House, you would think that America's basic freedoms and economy would be in ruins after day 7. And in fact, there have been some problems in terms of some of the accessing through the database that was set up.

Part of the problem was the fact that millions of Americans, far more than anyone expected, even the most ardent supporters of the law, have swamped the system, which, if you think about it, I think speaks volumes about the fact that there is a tremendous need out there for this affordable care—which, again, the law I think made an historic step in terms of advancing it.

I am proud of the fact that coming from the State of Connecticut, which, again, is one of the States that did not stonewall the legislation, Governor Malloy moved forward as quickly as possible and set up a system that was actually ready last week to deal with the onslaught of emails and calls into the call centers. As of Friday, they tallied over 100,000 contacts that came into the system. Again, they enrolled actually over a thousand people even though, again, coverage doesn't even begin until January.

So for a lot of people, again, the need to enroll right away doesn't exist right now because you have to actually write a check if you are going to enroll this early. But nonetheless, still, a thousand people have already signed up. And as I said, 100,000 were able to contact the system and interacted with it with little or no problem.

First of all, I would just like to again congratulate Lieutenant Governor Nancy Wyman, who has been sort of shepherding and quarterbacking this process over the last few months or so, again, to make sure that Connecticut's system was ready.

And I wanted to share, again, a couple of the stories of individuals who contacted the Connecticut Health Exchange over the last week or so to describe their experiences. There was 48-year-old Elly Baros, who said that she was pleased to be one step closer to enrolling in health insurance. The New Britain woman, who spent the entire afternoon at the health center going through her options, has been without coverage for a year and a half due to a layoff.

She said that she has been holding her breath, thanking God every day ''I don't get sick or get into a car accident.'' She was excited to learn that she could get good individual coverage for about $70 to $200 a month or possibly even qualify for expanded Medicaid coverage.

I had a conversation and an email with a woman from Norwich, who is a 50-year-old, self-employed individual, who said to me:

> I currently pay $980 a month for coverage for myself. I have a rare preexisting condition known as trigeminal neuralgia, which is treated by medication in four annual visits to my doctor. For this, I am considered a ''heavy utilizer.'' My condition interferes with my ability to earn.

Right now, what she is paying is on par with her mortgage payment.

> After speaking with my insurance agent, I found out that my premiums under the Affordable Care Act will be cut to $440 a month.

When I spoke to her on the phone the other day, she said when her agent called her and gave her this news she did a happy dance in her office, knowing that her health insurance premiums were going to be cut in half. Again, a 50-year-old, working individual who is now paying $980 a month is seeing her health insurance bill cut in half because of the health care exchange.

She is one of these people who has contacted the system, but she hasn't enrolled yet, but she will. Believe me. She cannot believe that we are at a point right now where there is a concerted, intentional effort to shut the government down in an effort to deny her—somebody who, again, has a preexisting condition—access to a smarter, more rational marketplace than the one that exists today.

The stories go on and on.

I have a letter from an individual who actually wrote to The New York Times, talking about the fact that on day 1 there were reports about how terrible the system is. She said:

> I tried to sign up. I had absolutely no difficulty getting all the answers I needed and all the forms to fill out on the very first try. The entire process was simple, direct, and easy to follow. Please don't forget all of us who, while maybe not newsworthy, are a large part of the equation.

Her name is Hu Lindsay from Norwalk, Connecticut.

So, again, the folks at the health care exchange who have been planning and preparing for months have demonstrated that that demand can be met if you have the right planning in place and that, when people actually have a chance to get past all the nonsense that is thrown around out there about the end of American freedom and actually see that they can buy private health insurance plans—again, Connecticut offers three private health insurance plans, Anthem Blue Cross, ConnectiCare, and Healthy Connecticut—the system will work. That's why we must keep this government open and not buckle to the folks who want to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act.

SHUTDOWN'S IMPACT IN MY DISTRICT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Good morning. I thought it was important to come as soon as I arrived after 24 hours in my district. After voting to restore the payment compensation to our Federal employees—some 800,000-plus who are now laid off, which means that Americans are not receiving vital services—I wanted to go home for a moment to be able to interact with my constituents.

In that period of time, I met doctors; I met carpenters and millwrights; I spoke to those in the arts community. I commemorated the 70th anniversary of Catholic Charities at a mass at Sacred Heart Cathedral. I listened to our cardinal talk with great faith, the cardinal of our community in the Houston-Galveston Diocese, and the cardinal that is named by the previous Pope, who now resides in our community, who gave us the words the just live by faith.

I indicated that I would come back to let this body know that the people who are being affected are not Republicans or Democrats or Green Party or Independents, or any other definition other than Americans. And I was overwhelmed by those who came up to me and indicated—from airline pilots—that negotiation and interaction is important, but don't break on the issue of the Affordable Care Act and getting this government open.

They understand it. These are people who are being impacted, like the workers today of an aircraft company in

Connecticut that is laying off 2,000 people, the Pentagon contractor that will soon be laying off thousands of people, the tax deadline for those who haven't filed coming up on October 15, needing IRS workers to help them with issues that they have in terms of filing their tax forms, or even the Federal courts, which will be assessing on October 15 whether or not they can keep their doors open for the moving of justice in this Nation.

So I think it is extremely important that whatever is tying you up, whatever is keeping you from looking at the common good—and I would offer to say to the American people everyone knows that we are not Greece. We wish the best for the people of Greece. But America is the richest country in the world, $4 trillion in economy, and a country that is looked to from all around the world.

Our economy is bigger than the European Union. That means countries like Spain, Germany, France, England, all those members who as well are our allies, but look to America—how shameful it is for someone to be held, and if you will, tied up by their own individual personal interests.

One would ask if the Founding Fathers, as imperfect as America was as she began, had come from the 13 Colonies and various districts, and probably interests, and had held to those specialized interests, would we have created a Nation that started out by saying we organize to create a more perfect Union? Albeit that there were groups of populations that did not have dignity and justice and citizenship at that time, something that I could look back at in bitterness, but I do not, because this is the greatest Nation in the world. But we are not showing ourselves that way.

It is not the truth to suggest that there are not enough voters, Members of Congress, that would vote right now today to open this government. It is something called a continuing resolution, but it's a bill that you put on the floor that has been passed already by Republicans and Democrats in the United States Senate.

This is not an idea of anyone over another person. Republican and Democratic Senators have already voted for this clean bill that we could vote on today. We have martial law. What that means—and my colleagues know what it means—is that you can put a bill on in just minutes.

So, rather than deciding amongst your children which ones to feed, which is the approach that my Republican friends in leadership are doing—squeezing out one little skinny bill versus another, squeezing out bills that leave out the FAA inspectors, leaving out ICE that deals with immigration, leaving out those who are dealing with young people who are undocumented, leaving out those who are helping young couples who want to get a home with mortgage processing. Who knows whose homes are going to be impacted by the heavy rains that are up and down the east coast who may need Federal assistance? All of that is being dumbed down—lost—because we have not opened the government.

I come today, Mr. Speaker, to ask all of us to turn to our American card, and hold up the American card—I am an American—and vote to open this government right now.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of light and life, our prayer today is simple.

May the eternal Spirit that embraces all good deliver us from fear.

May the hearts, minds, and souls of the women and men of this House of Representatives elected to serve the people be released from fear into freedom.

In freedom, may they discover and rediscover what is already deep within themselves as humans created in divine image.

May every conversation and deliberation of this day and days to follow be filled with compassion for the millions of people whose lives and livelihoods are affected by these decisions, courage to compromise when necessary to sustain and provide for the well-being of all people, humility to let go of the ideological convictions when those convictions hinder the common good, and clear vision to see beyond narrow agendas toward a Nation filled with promise to be a beacon of light for all people.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BURGESS 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.

TWO WEEKS, NO NEGOTIATIONS

(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, 2 weeks ago Friday, the President called Speaker BOEHNER out of the blue to announce he would not negotiate to avoid a shutdown. Since then, the President has made no plans to negotiate and has hosted one White House meeting to restate his position to not negotiate.

Clearly, this confirms the American people should look at the actions of all officials, not just words. Sadly, the President says he ''has bent over backwards to work with the Republicans,'' but this is not accurate. This continues his actions different from his words. In February 2009, the President announced the deficit was unsustainable, but then he tripled it.

House Republicans voted four times to avoid a shutdown. House Republicans were sincere in their actions and now vote repeatedly to save jobs and help families.

It is my hope there will be good-faith negotiations and we can come together to avoid the upcoming unsustainable fiscal crisis by ending the shutdown and addressing the debt limit.

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

IT IS NOT TIME TO FIGHT

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today is day 7 of an unnecessary and harmful government shutdown that is hurting millions of Americans. Speaker BOEHNER called it an ''epic battle.''

Hundreds of thousands are out of work, Federal contractors aren't getting paid, small businesses aren't getting loans, home purchases are on hold, nutrition programs are at risk, and Speaker BOEHNER has said, ''It is time for us to stand and fight.''

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this is the U.S. House of Representatives; it is not a battlefield. It is not time for us to fight; it is time for us to vote. Our constituents sent us here to get things done, to work together.

It is not time to fight; it is time to reopen the Federal Government. It is not time to fight; it is time to raise the debt ceiling and pay our bills. It is not time to fight; it is time to get the budget conference committee to work, something we have been asking for for months.

We can do it today, Mr. Speaker. It is not time to fight; it is time to vote. It

is not a surrender; it is a solution. It is not time to fight; it is time to vote.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE IS HURTING OUR ECONOMY AND PUTTING OUR COUNTRY AT RISK

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues over the last 10 days have been through quite a bit. We sent four bills to the United States Senate to keep our government open and to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare. Each of these requests was denied by the United States Senate.

After the fourth effort, we asked to go to conference and sit down and resolve our differences to keep the government open and to provide fairness to the American people under ObamaCare. The Senate Democrats once again said no.

The President had us all down to the White House last week, only to remind me that he was not going to negotiate over keeping the government open or over the looming need to increase the debt limit.

The President's refusal to negotiate is hurting our economy and putting our country at risk.

This morning, a senior White House official said that the President would rather default than to sit down and negotiate. Really? I am going to say this again: a senior White House staffer this morning said that the President would rather default on our debt than sit down and negotiate.

Now, the American people expect when their leaders have differences and we are in a time of crisis that we will sit down and at least have a conversation. Really, Mr. President, it is time to have that conversation before our economy is put further at risk.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, as Congress focuses on the government shutdown, our Nation quietly marks the close of our 12th year at war in Afghanistan.

While the country talks about a Federal Government shutdown and the divisive partisan politics that are standing in the way of progress, the harsh reality and hell that is war seem a distant memory for most. Meanwhile, we have over 54,000 troops serving in Afghanistan today. To all of our troops, thank you for your service and the sacrifices that you and your families have endured.

Two thousand one hundred and forty-three U.S. servicemembers have been killed in Afghanistan to date, leaving behind families who will never again feel their warm embrace. Let us honor those who have served and who continue to put their lives on the line and do our best to bring them home. Let us remember their great sacrifices and set aside the pettiness in our own lives that divides us, and let us remember their great service and ask ourselves constantly how best can we be of service.

A PREVENTABLE TRAIN WRECK: WHITE HOUSE BUILT SLOPPY IT ARCHITECTURE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the administration finally began to acknowledge what many have been saying for some time: healthcare.gov is having major problems.

The administration spent most of last week boasting about the high number of visitors to the Federal site, but it conveniently left out a very important statistic: how many people actually were able to purchase insurance.

Unlike the initial claims that the sites were crashing because demand was so high, it is clear now that the exchanges were failing because they appear to have major structural flaws. According to technicians and people at The Wall Street Journal, the site appears to be built on a ''sloppy software foundation.''

To make matters worse, even the information the Web site collected may be useless thanks to a security problem that corrupted a lot of the data. According to one estimate, 99 percent of the applications submitted may be facing data problems that will stop these applications.

Members of the administration need to come to the Energy and Commerce Committee and start telling us the truth about this information architecture. Taxpayers have spent money, a lot of money, to build these sites. If they have been sold a pig in a poke, they need to know.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, my office continues to be flooded with calls from North Carolinians who are frustrated with the government shutdown. The House and Senate clearly disagree on how to proceed, but one thing we can all agree on is supporting our men and women in the military.

Last Monday, Congress passed, and President Obama signed, the Pay Our Military Act. This bill ensures that our servicemen and -women and their civilian counterparts are paid during the shutdown.

Unfortunately, the administration delayed using this authority to pay all members of the military and DOD civilians, meaning many civilian workers who should be working were furloughed.

Our servicemen and -women deserve our deepest respect and gratitude. These men and women bravely serve their country and their paychecks should not be jeopardized. After pressure from the House, the administration quit delaying the implementation of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to also adopt the other commonsense funding bills passed by the House last week. Americans want to get back to work and don't want to see the government play politics with their paycheck.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration 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.

H.J. RES. 77

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 Food and Drug Administration 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 Health and Human Services—Food and Drug Administration''.

(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 ''Food and Drug Safety Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Food and Drug Administration 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. 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. 77, 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 77, which would continue the funding for the Food and Drug Administration. I think everyone here in the House agrees that funding for the FDA is necessary to this critical operation in order to support our Nation's public health and the millions of jobs associated with FDA activities. Most Members of this body may not realize it, but FDA-regulated industries account for almost 25 percent of the consumer spending in the United States of America.

Fiscal year 2013 ag appropriation included total funding of $4.2 billion; $2.5 billion came from discretionary funds and $1.7 billion from user fees. Of greatest importance is the need to ensure that our constituents continue to consume safe foods and use safe and effective drugs and medical devices. Despite reduced funding levels overall for FY 2013, we were able to provide a strategic increase of $12.5 million for food safety activities and $10 million for food and drug safety inspections in China. These funding increases will continue under a CR.

In addition to the funds appropriated for the FDA, this resolution that we are debating this afternoon would allow FDA to collect and spend drug and medical product user fees. Of course, the fees are charged to the industry to support such lifesaving activities for the review and approval of new and generic drugs as well as medical devices.

This House has already passed a resolution to fund the public health activities at the NIH, and it awaits the Senate's approval. Also, USDA meat and poultry inspectors were deemed critical to our Nation's food supply and have stayed on duty during this temporary delay in funding. It is now time for this body to continue funding one more critical component of our public health infrastructure.

The Food and Drug Administration touches every Member of this House, either directly or indirectly, and we need the entire Agency back at work. We need to also limit any damage to the millions of jobs impacted by FDA's work in the food and bioscience industries.

Now is the chance for my colleagues here in the House to join me in keeping this important program fully operational. I would ask that my colleagues support this resolution that we're debating this afternoon. It will ensure that all critical elements of our Nation's food and drug supply will be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleague and chair, Mr. ADERHOLT, just said that this bill is necessary because funding for the FDA is necessary. He's absolutely right, but this bill doesn't do all that. You cannot just fund one component of government and not have the rest of government. FDA is the Food and Drug Administration. It relies heavily on the Centers for Disease Control. You do nothing to fund the Centers for Disease Control. So as just one critical component of the Federal Government, it isn't the Federal Government, and that's what has been shut down, and so I adamantly oppose this legislation.

We have been here a number of days now with the government shut down because people are trying to use the appropriations process, which is, as every schoolchild knows, the process where the President asks and then the Congress disposes, and we use the Appropriations Committee to dispose; that is, we make the decisions on how much is going to be spent by each agency.

The President came to Congress asking for $1.2 trillion in expenditures. The Republicans rejected that in their budget and came up with a much less budgeted number of $967 billion. This bill on the floor, the big bill, has the Democrats agreeing to $986 billion. That's a $200 billion reduction. That's just amazing. I don't think this has ever been done before where that big of a cut has been made to the Federal Government, and yet we can't pass it.

The Senate has passed it because, as everyone knows, it's a bicameral process, and whatever the President signs has to be passed by both Houses. The Senate has passed over here a clean bill, as we say, which means without all kinds of conditionality. That would go to the President if this House had voted for it. It could go forward tonight. This whole thing—this charade of shutting down government—could be over tonight. All we would have to do is pass what the Senate sent over.

But no, here we go again. Now we're going to take it in piecemeal fashion. Tonight, we bring up the FDA; it's a wonderful organization. I want to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that, since I've been here, in 20 years, we've passed 111 CRs—enacted. In fact, under President Bush, we passed 56. And I'm sure every one of the Republicans passed those; 56, without conditionality. Democrats didn't try to bring down the House. And even under President Obama, so far, we've passed 19 CRs. So why can't we do that now? Why can't we do what we've been doing, this House has been doing for decades, passing a CR to keep government open?

It's certainly not the responsible thing for our committee, and we're very proud of our committee, but a CR is giving up because we haven't passed the appropriation bills that are really the mechanics of how we ought to be spending money. In fact, my distinguished colleague, Mr. ADERHOLT, has, 94 times, voted for a CR. So I cannot support this piecemeal specialty of the day, just voting for one segment of the Federal Government and ignoring all the rest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes sure that, even during this shutdown, the Food and Drug Administration's critical safeguards remain in place to protect our food and drug supply. The health of our people should not be jeopardized. This legislation provides funding for the FDA at the current post-sequestration annual rate of $2.3 billion. This will provide funding to maintain protections for food, drugs, and medical devices, and allow the FDA to collect and spend user fees.

The length of this authority will last until December 15 or until we enact year-long appropriations that address the funding of the Federal Government in full.

As with each of the other individual bills we have considered this week, the language in H.J. Res. 77 is nearly identical to what was included in my clean continuing resolution filed back in September. This bill moves us a step closer to the finish line, but we've got to remember that we can get there much faster if we find a way to fund the entire Federal Government. This will require cooperation and conversation from both the Senate and the House.

This will be the ninth bill the House has sent to the Senate to reopen the Federal Government. The ninth bill, Mr. Speaker. The House has voted to provide nearly one-third of the funding to reopen the government; but, unfortunately, the Senate won't even consider these bills, and so the government is still shut down. Our colleagues in the Senate say they want a clean CR, but when we've sent them these bills—pieces of a clean CR with clean funding mechanisms, nonetheless—they won't even bring them up for a vote.

This is not my first choice of how to fund the Federal Government. My preference would be to have passed full-year appropriations bills for all the government before September 30. The House made great strides toward that goal with our committee approving nearly all of our annual bills and with the full House passing four of them, yet the Senate would not even pass a single bill off the floor of the Senate. But I still hope and believe that we can find a path forward. It will require both parties, both bodies, to find ways we can work together to end this shutdown.

As we work toward that end, we can pass this bill to ensure that nearly all of the Federal Government's food safety activities are funded during the shutdown. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown. I wish my colleagues had shown this same level of concern for the Food and Drug Administration over the last 3 years. Since Democrats passed the landmark Food Safety and Modernization Act, Republicans have done nothing but stand in the way of its implementation by underfunding the critical needs in the FDA bill.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy, and the claim that Democrats are not negotiating is absolutely false. House Republicans wrote a bill and sent it to the Senate. The Senate adopted the most important part of it, the funding level, and the President agreed to sign it even though the Democrats want greater investment to support economic growth. The only thing Democrats say ''no'' to are irresponsible efforts to put health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies, which has nothing to do with keeping the government open. That is democracy. That is negotiation. We have done more than meet in the middle, but the Republicans now say ''no'' to their own bill. We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only support a reasonable solution to allow a vote on the Republican-written, Senate-passed bill.

Vote ''no,'' and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

□ 1800

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), who chairs the full committee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

As we try to work out our fiscal differences, it is imperative that the Food and Drug Administration does have the resources that it needs to ensure the safety and quality of our Nation's food and drug supplies and medical devices. This bill will help ensure that the FDA can focus on that very important mission.

Over the past week, the House has acted to reopen major parts of other government. The legislation before us is yet another piece of that important effort to continue critical programs for the American people.

From food inspections to approvals of breakthrough new drugs and devices, Members on both sides of the aisle indeed understand and appreciate the important role of the FDA. This essential work should continue as we wait at the negotiating table for the President to join in a conversation to resolve our differences.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to ensure that the FDA has the resources to get the job done. Let's stand together in support of food safety and drug approvals.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman LEVIN, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we should not be debating a bill that's going nowhere. We should be debating a bill that will end this shutdown.

Yesterday, the Speaker said this: There are not enough votes in the House to pass a clean bill to fund the government and end the shutdown. The truth of the matter is, if the bill will come up, it will pass.

On Saturday, 195 Democrats wrote to the Speaker and said, Bring up the bill. Informed reports say there are 22 Republicans who will also vote ''yes.'' That is a majority of the House.

I say to the Speaker: Let all of us speak.

The President today said this:

> The truth of the matter is there are enough Republican and Democratic votes in the House of Representatives right now to end this shutdown immediately, with no partisan strings attached. The House should hold that vote today. If Republicans and Speaker Boehner are saying there are not enough votes, then they should prove it. Let the bill go to the floor, and let's see what happens. Just vote.

Then he continued:

> There's no reason that there has to be a shutdown in order for the kind of negotiations Speaker Boehner says he wants to proceed. Hold a vote. Call a vote right now, and let's see what happens.

We say to the Speaker: Let democracy prevail. Bring the Senate bill up for a vote now.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

Since the Senate will not negotiate with us about opening up the entire government, we will continue proposing commonsense bills to reopen critical functions as soon as possible.

This bill funds the FDA and ensures that it performs important duties, including inspections of food, medical devices, and pharmaceutical facilities. It makes sure that reviews of lifesaving new devices and drugs continue and that the government doesn't stand in the way of innovation.

We have the most dynamic and productive medical research firms in the world. American companies and universities are paving the way to incredible new cures. In fact, three American scientists were just honored with this year's Nobel Prize in medicine for their research into how our cells function. Americans can continue leading the world in this field, but we have to make sure that the FDA conducts reviews promptly.

Let's get the FDA back open and performing their important work. Patients, young and old, are counting on it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the former

ranking member of the Agriculture Committee and now the ranking member of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are almost a full week into this self-inflicted government shutdown because the Speaker refuses to stand up to a vocal minority in his own party. There is no end in sight. Instead, we sit here watching the Republican majority talk out of both sides of their mouths and pretend to hold positions they have been voting against from the first day that they took power.

This bill is today's daily exercise in cynicism. I served as chairwoman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the body that oversees funding for the Food and Drug Administration. We worked hard to increase the resources at FDA so that more food could be inspected, more outbreaks prevented.

We also passed the Food Safety Modernization Act in 2010 to improve FDA's ability to respond quickly and efficiently in a proactive, science-based fashion to contaminated food outbreaks.

Since taking office in 2011, this Republican majority has tried to undercut and hamstring the FDA at every step. In 2011, the first bill this majority passed included a $241 million cut to the FDA. In 2012, they tried to slash salaries by 21 percent, hampering the agency's ability to implement the Food Safety Modernization Act. In 2013, they tried to cut FDA by another $16 million. They rejected an amendment that I offered to increase funding by $50 million for monitoring foodborne pathogens and implementing the new food safety law.

For years, we've been trying to get the Republican majority to be serious about the FDA and food safety funding. Food illnesses account for 48 million illnesses, 128,000 hospitalizations, and 3,000 deaths each year, and particularly affect children, pregnant women, and older adults.

Meanwhile, over 80 percent of the seafood and 30 percent of the fruit and nuts consumed in the United States are produced elsewhere, yet less than 1 percent of imported food is inspected by the FDA.

The Republican majority has refused to fund these food safety initiatives. Now they are bringing up this disingenuous bill for political show. The health of American families is not a game. These are people's lives.

Over 13 Federal agencies have important food safety responsibilities. The Centers for Disease Control identifies food safety pathogens in sources, and they are not funded in this bill. The Department of Justice prosecutes food contaminators, but they are not funded in this bill. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration carries out seafood inspections for the FDA, but they are not funded in this bill. USDA is responsible for a whole host of critical safety measures, but they are not funded in this bill.

Now, if you think there should be only one food safety agency, that's something that we can talk about.

This bill does not protect our families from contaminated food. It doesn't adequately fund the FDA. It's another in a series of purely political bills put forward by the Republican majority.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), who sits on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

Right now, moms and dads across this country have too many worries. They worry about whether or not they'll have enough money to pay their rent, their mortgage, and even fill up their gas tanks. They worry about whether or not their hours are going to be cut at work next month. Why should we add to their worry the list of the safety of the food that they're feeding their children at dinner tonight?

One of my constituents from Fishers, Indiana, Elizabeth Armstrong, has experienced firsthand a child becoming ill due to contaminated food. Several years ago, Elizabeth's young daughter fell very ill after eating spinach contaminated with E. coli. This brave little girl luckily survived, but she now lives with kidney disease.

Isn't food safety a core function of our government? Is it responsible to stop routine inspections of food processors and place our constituents at risk of developing foodborne illness.

Mr. Speaker, our parents are worried, but this is one worry they should not have. FDA needs to keep food inspectors on the job. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. FARR. Mr Speaker, how much time do both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who currently chairs the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act. The bill we are debating this afternoon would provide immediate funding for the Food and Drug Administration, which is, of course, the agency in charge of the safety and stability of our Nation's food supply and our medicine supply as well.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve an answer to a couple of simple questions. First of all, will Congress actually take action now to secure and to inspect our Nation's food supply? Secondly, will Congress take action now to secure our Nation's medicine supply?

I know that many on the other side of the aisle will once again oppose this legislation because they say they need to have an entire government funding bill or else nothing will be funded. Yet, they call Republicans ''absolutists.'' However, many on the other side of the aisle will recognize these legitimate concerns and will help us pass this important funding. It's time for the Senate to act on this and the other important funding bills that have passed with broad bipartisan majorities.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate majority leader and the President cannot continue to say that they will not negotiate on ending this government shutdown. They must stop holding so many important issues hostage to their absolutist demands. I say let's go to a conference committee now, let's negotiate in a bipartisan way, and let's stop this government shutdown.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Congresswoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the ranking member on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, what baffles me is that our Republican friends are seemingly acting like there's business as usual, that we are quietly on the floor of the House, just passing a food safety initiative.

Our House is on fire, and there's nobody here to put the fire out. We're in the middle of a government shutdown. Of course I'm committed to the principles of this legislation, as my colleagues, as the ranking member, as the ranking member of the full committee, as Ms. DELAURO and Mr. WAXMAN are. We are all committed to this.

May I remind my friends that 45 percent of the FDA employees, they are on furlough. Just today, four people in Texas were arrested because of FDA criminal investigators. They were trying to sell stem cell packages to sick people, devastated people, that were fraudulent and diseased and inappropriate to terminally ill people. It was the FDA criminal investigators that were able to make this case and the U.S. Attorney in my district said ''thank you.'' But right now there are U.S. Attorneys across the Nation getting ready to lay off their attorneys.

The House is on fire, and my friends don't seem to understand.

□ 1815

Let me just share with you that there are usually 80 inspections on food facilities a day. They're not going on right now. Up to October 17, there will be some 960 facilities not inspected, and the only reason is that we will not come to the floor, put the clean CR on the floor, and have 195 plus 21 people vote in the majority to open the doors of this government.

But more importantly, have you heard the stories of families whose husbands or wives are laid off, struggling to make ends meet, calling on relatives to be able to help them? You've heard

of the young woman who came to my attention who had to be carried away to a shelter because she was suffering domestic abuse because of the financial crisis; or maybe you haven't heard that 70 percent of Americans and 51 percent of Republicans are saying, We don't like what you're doing, Republicans. We want this government to open.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Or maybe you haven't heard from the Democratic Governor of Kentucky, Governor Beshear, who says that right now 7,000 are already enrolled in the Affordable Care Act. He is saying that he has a report that says that if this Affordable Care Act works, he'll have 17,000 more jobs, $15 billion in the economy.

Let's stop this foolishness with ObamaCare. It's working. Let's get back to work and pass a clean CR. Too many people are hurting. Enough is enough. We need to do what is right for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.J. Res. 77, a piece-meal "mini-CR," which woefully underfunds the Food and Drug Administration, FDA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would be unnecessary if only the House majority would allow a vote on the clean Continuing Resolution, passed by the Senate. The House would easily pass the measure and the President will sign it, as he reaffirmed today.

H.J. Res. 77 is the latest attempt by the House Republicans to extricate themselves from the mess they created by shutting down the government. But they should have learned by now that it would not work. It is inefficient, unfair, and costly. The shutdown needlessly disrupts the lives of Americans who provide benefits and services and those who depend upon them. These reckless mini-CRs will have the effect, intended or not, of sowing division when unity is needed. It is not surprising, therefore, that responsible leaders of organizations that would benefit from these mini-CRs are united in opposing this piece-meal approach to appropriating.

Veterans groups opposed the 'Republican mini-CR for veterans' affairs. Similarly, leading research and consumer protection organizations oppose the FDA mini-CR before us.

For example, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, CSPI, opposes H.J. Res. 77. Although the organization is a health advocacy nonprofit that promotes food safety, the CSPI does not support the piecemeal approach by government that would make funding the FDA a partisan issue because "the irresponsible shutting down of government and particularly public health agencies like FDA and Center for Disease Control places families at risk from food borne diseases. But opening FDA alone would not solve the problem. Food safety is a joint governmental effort involving 13 different agencies often working collaboratively?"

The FDA is an essential federal agency with the life-saving mission of protecting all Americans from unsafe drugs, devices, biologics, and food.

For example in Texas, three men were arrested and a fourth is being sought by the FBI in connection with what investigators say was a $1.5-million Texas-based scheme to illegally market and sell stem cell treatments to patients with terminal diseases. "Protecting the public from unproven and potentially dangerous drug and medical procedures is very important," said Kenneth Magidson, U.S. attorney for the Houston-based southern district of Texas. "This office will continue to prosecute violations involving threats to the public health."

"This indictment demonstrates the commitment of the FDA to protect the American public from the harms inherent in being exposed to unapproved new drugs," said Patrick J. Holland, special agent in charge of the FDA Office of Criminal Investigations, according to the statement. Due to the shutdown, the FDA is now unable to continue to aggressively pursue perpetrators of such acts and ensure that they are punished to the full extent of the law.

It is important that the FDA is funded as it plays a vital role in protecting consumers from contaminated and misbranded food.

But it is even more important that the entire government be reopened to serve all the needs of the American people.

Due to the shutdown, the FDA will have to cease most of its food-safety operations. That includes "routine establishment inspections, some compliance and enforcement activities, monitoring of imports, notification programs (e.g., food contact substances, infant formula), and the majority of the laboratory research necessary to inform public health decision-making."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Inspection Service will continue manning every meat facility with full-time inspectors, even as many government programs are halted. But the FDA also oversees the safety of the vast majority of the country's food industry. According to a memo released by the Department of Heath Human Services, the bulk of FDA food inspectors have been deemed non-essential, so few, if any, food facilities will be inspected until the shutdown is over.

This past December, the FDA shut down a nut processor in New Mexico after records showed that the facility was shipping products infected with salmonella. This sort of monitoring and enforcement could become much harder because of the shutdown.

In fiscal 2011, the FDA coordinated or conducted inspections of about 20,000 food facilities for compliance with safety regulations. The number of past inspections suggests FDA officials normally inspect about 8o facilities per business day. So, for every day the government doesn't work, approximately 80 food facilities will go without federal inspections. If the shutdown lasts until October 17, 960 facilities may go without U.S. inspections.

A spokesman from the FDA contacted The Huffington Post on Wednesday to note that a portion of these inspections would be conducted by the agency's partners in state agriculture and public health departments. But he couldn't say how big a portion, or whether the FDA would continue, during the shutdown, to pay state agencies their normal fee for inspections conducted on the FDA's behalf.

To get a sense of what this means, we must understand that the FDA sends letters to food facilities that failed inspections. They reveal gnarly conditions at major food manufacturing facilities, including cooking implements covered in mold and stored in brown, soiled water at a Detroit donut faculty; high levels of illegal drug residues in veal were found from a farm in upstate New York; and flies infesting a tortilla factory in Hagerstown, Maryland.

The warning letters give the facilities in question a chance to correct sanitation mistakes before they cause serious outbreaks of food borne illness. If the commands in a warning letter are not obeyed, the FDA has the authority to punish, or even shutdown, the facility in question.

These warning letters are sent to just a small fraction of all facilities that are inspected, and not all of these facilities have infractions that lead directly to illness. That means, it is impossible to say whether cancelled food safety inspections will directly lead to food consumers getting sick. However, fewer inspections can have a direct correlation to more contamination in the marketplace.

For these reasons, we must end the government shutdown as soon as possible, or, barring that, to fund food safety programs with a separate bill.

The following leading research and consumer groups have urged Congress to end the shutdown completely since they cannot support a legislative approach that shuts down some essential public health agencies while temporarily funding others: American Medical Student Association, Breast Cancer Action, Community Access National Network, Connecticut Center for Patient Safety, Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, National Consumers League, National Research Center for Women & Families, National Women's Health Network, Our Bodies Ourselves, The TMJ Association, WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease, WoodyMatters.

It is not responsible to fund the FDA at the same time that the Center for Disease Control and Prevention is unable to fully function to examine the cause of epidemics caused by unsafe food or defective medical products.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress fails to pass a "clean" continuing resolution before month's end, FDA inspections will continue to decrease across the nation and the likelihood of consumers becoming ill will increase.

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 safety of the food supply and the lives of real people—the lives of our families, our friends, and our constituents.

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 people who depend upon the FDA program.

OCTOBER 4, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: We are writing as public health, patient, consumer, and scientific nonprofit organizations to oppose H.J. Res 77 and any other efforts to single out the Food and Drug Administration for funding. Our organizations represent millions of patients, consumers, health professionals, and scientists who strongly support

the work of the FDA and urge Congress to provide the level of appropriations the agency needs throughout FY 2014.

We appreciate the recognition that the FDA is an essential federal agency with the life-saving mission of protecting all Americans from unsafe drugs, devices, biologics, and food. We are very concerned that the current shutdown is curtailing the agency's work, which will inevitably delay the approval of new medical products and the inspection of medical products and food. The shutdown also harms scientists and other employees who have dedicated their careers to public service, and will make it even more difficult for the agency to attract the scientific expertise it needs now and in the future. And, the shutdown will also have a devastating impact on some of the companies that rely on FDA reviews to get their new products to market, and their workers.

Nevertheless, we cannot support a legislative approach that shuts down some essential public health agencies while temporarily funding others. For example, it is not responsible to fund the FDA at the same time that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is unable to fully function to examine the cause of epidemics caused by unsafe food or defective medical products.

We strongly urge Congress to do its job: immediately open up all federal agencies and then quickly work together to get the FY 2014 appropriations bills enacted into law, based on the funding levels needed to do their jobs well. These appropriations bills should not include a sequester or arbitrary across the board cuts, but rather should give agencies the authority to cut ineffective programs and adequately fund those that are essential.

American Medical Student Association; Breast Cancer Action; Community Access National Network; Connecticut Center for Patient Safety; Jacobs Institute of Women's Health; National Consumers League; National Research Center for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; Our Bodies Ourselves; The TMJ Association; WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease; WoodyMatters.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), one of our physicians here in the House.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration historically has been one of the bipartisan efforts that this House has enjoyed. In fact, a little over a year ago, the Food and Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act passed both the House and the Senate, went to a conference committee, was signed by the President of the United States on July 9, 2012, in the middle of an election year when partisanship was at its fever pitch, and yet this House came together and passed that reauthorization bill.

You've heard the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee say that he hoped this bill would pass today to allow the Food and Drug Administration to utilize those user fees that have been remitted by the companies that are actually looking to have their products approved by the FDA. I support him in that, and I hope he's correct.

One of the most important missions of the government, one of the premier agencies of the Federal Government is the Food and Drug Administration. Its job is to ensure that medical drugs and medical devices are safe and effective. The FDA is also a gateway for patients who are suffering disease and disability with the hope of one day getting past that disease and disability. The FDA is the gateway for those patients.

We've taken legislative steps to fix some of the issues with the FDA. They aren't always functioning in a perfect manner, but I know one thing for sure: keeping FDA employees away from their jobs is not the way to accomplish those goals.

This is a good bill today, the Food and Drug Safety Act. I hope the Senate will take this up. The House is going to pass it in a bipartisan manner in just a very short period of time. We will send it over to the Senate, as we have many other bills last week, and we'll continue to send bills. This is the way the process should work. Appropriations shouldn't be done in one large lump. They should be done in the individual departments.

I support this bill today. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has voted for CRs 19 times since President Obama has been in office, with the whole enchilada, passing them without rancor, without asking the President to negotiate. So there's no reason we can't do that tonight.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, HENRY WAXMAN, the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we're on the seventh day of a government shutdown caused by the reckless actions of House Republicans; and we are now considering the sixth piecemeal bill that reopens a few government activities, but still continues the shutdown for everybody else.

Now, I support the FDA. Who doesn't support the FDA? It's very important that they do their job. But you know what's also important? What's also important is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which responds to disease outbreaks and works to prevent the spread of seasonal flu. They're not going to be reopened. There's no funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, which limits its ability to improve mental health across the country.

There are things this government does—and I'm pleased my Republican colleagues are starting to understand why government is so important. And that's why we shouldn't have this closing down of government and then reopening it piece by piece.

This is an effort to hold the government hostage until the unreasonable demand to deny health insurance for American families is met, and that is a demand that we will not give in to. Let the House vote on a clean bill to fund the whole government, not the piecemeal approach we're considering today. It's a gimmick, and it's also poor policy.

And you should understand something else, Mr. Speaker, they're not giving FDA the full funding. What they're doing is still continuing the draconian sequestration cut which took over $200 million out of FDA's budget. If they love FDA so much, fund it where it should be funded, not with $200 million less.

Mr. Speaker, there is no funding for hundreds of the Nation's tribes. There is no funding for meals for millions of seniors. There is no assistance to more than 1 million families in need.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WAXMAN. I think we're all supporters of the FDA; but if the Republicans were truly interested in FDA, they would work with Democrats. We would have a conversation about it to lift the sequester and restore funding for FDA and all other critical programs as well.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, our distinguished leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the congressional district that is home to the Food and Drug Administration. Those individuals do great work for our country; and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, nobody—and I mean nobody—is being fooled by this ridiculous stunt that the Republicans in this House are pulling, trying to cherry-pick little pieces of government to fund when they know they're not going anywhere, when the American people know that this House is in possession of a piece of legislation that, if we were allowed to vote on it, would go to the President's desk tonight; he would sign it; and we would open up all of government immediately—FDA, NIH, the VA, everything.

The position Republicans are taking is made even more ridiculous by what we did on Saturday. On Saturday, we said, We're going to pay all Federal employees—not just employees at FDA, not just at NIH—all Federal Government employees. That was the right thing to do.

Now you're saying you only want to keep some of those agencies open, not all of them open. So what our Republican colleagues are telling the American people is, we want to pay all the employees in the Federal Government; but we don't want to allow a lot of them to go to work. We want to pay for everybody in the Federal Government, but we don't want to allow everybody to go to work. What kind of policy is that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, just this weekend, the Speaker of this House admitted on

national television that he had reached an agreement with the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, Senator HARRY REID, where HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats said, We will agree on a temporary basis to the lower funding levels in the sequester in exchange for making sure we have a clean continuing resolution, that we keep the government open. That's what the Speaker agreed to.

But then he came back to this House, and he couldn't hold his caucus. Why? Because Senator CRUZ and a radical reckless faction said, No, we can't do that. We have to close the government unless we shut down the Affordable Care Act. And that position hasn't changed. That's why today we can't open the government, because our Republican colleagues want to continue to shut down the Affordable Care Act.

Let's vote today to open the whole government. Let's have a vote, Mr. Speaker, on the bill that's in our possession.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield to the distinguished Congressman from Arizona, RON BARBER, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, while Congress recessed this weekend, I stayed here in Washington to work with my colleagues to end this shutdown. I talked with southern Arizonans to hear from them about the shutdown and how it's impacting their families. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the people I talked with don't care who is to blame. They want us to reopen their government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BARBER. On behalf of my constituents in southern Arizona, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59. We must come together, and we must put the American people first. We cannot allow this stalemate to continue for one more day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is out of order for the gentleman to make a speech when seeking recognition for a unanimous consent request.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this piecemeal bill to nowhere that continues to delay and shut down government when we could be passing a bill right now that would keep government open, and it would open it up tomorrow morning; but the Speaker refuses to allow that legislation to come to the floor. He tells the press there aren't the votes.

Let's try it. I dare you. I dare you. Bring it to the floor. Let's see if there are enough votes. I think there are because I think the majority of this body wants to keep the government open and not play these games.

These are games. Never done before. Never done before. Congress has never shut down the government. Yes, it was shut down under Clinton, but it was by a veto. It wasn't for a failure to get them a bill. They're saying, Well, the President has to negotiate. He doesn't have to negotiate.

Under President Bush, we passed 56 CRs with no negotiation. Under President Obama, so far, 19. Almost every Member here voted for those. So you've been voting for CRs continuously for years and years without rancor. What's the difference now? You don't like a bill that passed 3 years ago, and you have to come and break the rules here by getting a waiver so you can bring up these issues on the appropriations bill because you don't want to do it in regular order? This is just insane.

This is insane. We've never done it like this. And the country is wondering what the heck is going on. Well, what's going on is we've just become children in this fight. This is nuts. This is not the way to run a government.

By God, let's get government open. We can do it tonight. Let's bring the bill to the floor and vote on it. Vote against this bill to nowhere.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all of my colleagues would join me tonight in supporting House Joint Resolution 77 that has been discussed here over the last hour.

I understand that many of my friends across the aisle would disagree with the majority's decision to immediately fund the most critical function of government during the delay that we have in current funding.

I recognize your preferences for a vote on all the government at one time; but you must recognize the truth of the matter is we don't have consensus in the House. Until the White House and the Senate are willing to sit down and negotiate a quick solution to this stalemate, I ask that my friends across the aisle join me in supporting the Food and Drug Administration, an agency that is on the front lines for our public health on a day-to-day basis.

There are a number of us who would question why nearly half of the FDA is furloughed when nearly all of their work impacts the safety and protection of human life. However, the administration has chosen to cease activities related to food, to medical devices, and to human drug establishment inspections, infant formula notifications, and to laboratory research that are tied to public health decision-making.

□ 1830

Most importantly, I would want to think that the administration is not playing politics with the safety of our Nation's food supply; but why is it that 87 percent of the Food Safety and Inspection Service is on the job while only about half of FDA's food safety staff are actually working, especially when FDA is responsible for 80 percent of the food supply?

As I noted in my opening remarks a few minutes ago, I would speculate that many of our colleagues don't realize how the FDA impacts every single one of our constituents in one way or the other. From formula fed to babies, to blood transfusions needed during emergencies and routine surgeries, to drugs that extend the lives of the sick, to the domestic or imported foods we feed to our families, on every occasion, the FDA is there.

Just 2 days ago, this body voted 407–0 to approve a measure that will provide backpay to furloughed Federal workers. This vote did not impact the critical needs of public health, yet an important vote, nonetheless. I would ask that each of the 407 Members who voted on Saturday for the backpay for Federal workers to now vote in favor of a bill that provides for urgent needs for our public safety and our welfare across the United States of America.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 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. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. FARR. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Farr moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 77 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. FARR (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth time we've made this motion to bring the clean CR to the floor. And what could be simpler than a clean appropriations bill? No riders, no earmarks, no policy changes. I know it's something that my friends on the other side of the aisle have done over and over and over again. In this case, it's even with no increase in spending. It's clean; it's simple; it's the right thing to do.

So why are we here today, day after day, tinkering at the margins? Today we fund one agency; tomorrow it's something else; last Friday it was several others. This isn't any way to run a government, and no one who votes for this bill should think that it is. All this bill does is play favorites, pitting one agency against another for meager government funding.

So I offer this motion to recommit with the hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join me in funding, not part of government, not piecemeal government, all of government. Why? Because all Americans deserve a complete government at their service, a full-time government, not a partial government or a sometimes government.

This motion will allow us to pass the Senate version, which is a clean, what we call, continuing resolution, and it would reopen government within 24 hours. Very simple. Just bring it to the floor. Let the vote be what it is.

We've had, as I said earlier, 111 CRs since President Clinton was elected to office. In fact, I have the breakdown right here. We had 36 CRs, continuing resolutions, passed without this kind of conditionality, without the government shutting down—36. Under President Bush, we had 56 CRs passed without shutting down the government. With President Obama, in the years that he has been here, we've already passed 19 CRs without shutting down the government, without rancor, without conditions.

So why are we doing it now? It doesn't make any sense. Nobody can explain this. All Americans want all of their government back, and we can do that. Voting on this motion to recommit, we can get government open.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to recommit. Support our ability to get government back, working for all the people for all the time, not part-time.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions that are contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration at the time.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, and 4 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.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard on the point of order.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, doesn't this bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open the entire Federal Government so that all the consumer protections that our Nation provides are guaranteed. We need to open up not just food safety, but we also need to open up the Centers for Disease Control. We need to open up consumer hotlines. Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open up all the Nation's consumer protections?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have argument confined to the point of order?

Mr. FARR. Last Saturday, we agreed to pay our workers furloughed during the shutdown. I supported that bill. But what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not be able to do their jobs? What kind of strange House is this that would force this situation on our fellow workers? You've got to sit at home, but don't worry, you'll get paid?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Alabama.

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

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Food and Drug Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

On October 2, October 3, and October 4, 2013, the Chair ruled that a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House was not germane to various measures on the basis that the motion failed the committee jurisdiction test of germaneness.

Here, the joint resolution falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The instructions in the motion fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

The instructions, therefore, propose a non-germane amendment. The point is of order is sustained.

Mr. FARR. 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. ADERHOLT. 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. FARR. 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 joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommittal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 182, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
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
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers

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

NAYS—182

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
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
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
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—32

Bass
Blackburn
Buchanan
Castro (TX)
Clay
Davis, Danny
DesJarlais
Ellison
Forbes
Gallego
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hoyer
King (NY)
Lipinski
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Meeks
Moore
Poe (TX)
Polis
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Simpson
Welch
Young (FL)

□ 1906

Messrs. CLYBURN and SIRES 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. FARR. 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 235, nays 162, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—235

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
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
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—162

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
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
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—34

Bass
Blackburn
Buchanan
Castro (TX)
Clay
Davis, Danny
DesJarlais
Ellison
Forbes
Gallego
Gosar
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hoyer
King (NY)
Lipinski
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Meeks
Moore
Poe (TX)
Polis
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Simpson
Welch
Young (FL)

□ 1914

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 FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 139

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 139, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting re-printings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

POLITICS: THE ''ART OF COMPROMISE''

(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, Senate leader HARRY REID has been the most ardent proponent of his party's no-compromise, no-negotiation stance. The leader has even been unwilling to discuss a compromise to prevent a prolonged government shutdown.

We are moving into the second week of this shutdown. In an effort to avoid being labeled as an ''obstructionist,'' the Senate leader has ordered a stance—at least rhetorically—and now claims there has already been compromise.

I would say to the Senate leader that there has been some compromise, but not in the Senate Chamber. The compromise has come from 57 Democrats who joined with the majority in the House to pass targeted appropriations bills that will fund key departments and programs.

Mr. Speaker, politics is often referred to as the ''art of compromise.'' It is essential to the legislative process and surely vital to a functioning democracy. I commend my 57 Democratic colleagues in the House who understand this, and I encourage more to join them as we continue to pass targeted appropriations this week.

Unfortunately, not until both Chambers start compromising will we be able to end this shutdown.

END THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN IMMEDIATELY

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call once again for this House to end this shutdown now by passing the Senate-passed bill that the President will sign to reopen the government.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER refuses to bring up this bill. This weekend, he claimed it doesn't have the votes to pass. While I am no mathematician, basic math shows that the Senate-passed bill to end the shutdown would pass the House; 217 votes are needed for a bill to pass.

Look at these numbers. With the votes of 198 Democrats and the 23 Republicans who have said publicly that they would support the bill, the bill would pass with 221 votes.

Mr. Speaker, bring up the bill to end the Republican shutdown immediately.

DEBT CEILING

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad truth that our jaw-dropping $16.7 trillion national debt pales in comparison to the totality of future spending obligations the Congressional Budget Office forecasts. A change in spending habits and a reform to mandatory spending obligations isn't just advisable in this moment; it is absolutely essential for America's long-term financial health.

But meaningful reform is impossible without leadership from the White House. Is President Obama willing to lead and enact reforms to make our country stronger? It appears not.

The President has made it no secret that he is loathe to engage in bipartisan negotiations regardless of what is at stake—whether it be reopening the Federal Government for the American people, or containing our debt crisis so our children and grandchildren aren't left to pay for previous generations' irresponsibility.

Refusing to negotiate on the debt ceiling is code for refusing to make any changes to reduce future debt.

Mr. Speaker, as this body knows, it is foolish to take aim at the symptom without also treating the disease.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I received an email from a woman who runs a small business in my district. I will read it to you now:

> Morgan, As you know, I'm a small business with 36 employees, have been paying 75 percent of my employees' health care for over 20 years.
>
> Get a call from health care provider agent that although my renewal date is March 1, the companies are offering to renew on December 1 this year with a 9.8 percent increase. This is to beat what is anticipated as a 30 to 60 percent increase after all the effects of ObamaCare.
>
> Needless to say, this has reignited my frustration with the so-called Affordable Health Care Act. Please stick to your principles, continue the fight. Let me know what, if anything, I can do.

Yes, ma'am, I will.

WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, this House has actually come together on two different measures here that would seek to ease a lot of the pain from the government slowdown. The sad thing is we can agree on everything the Republicans have been trying to pass out of here. The only thing we don't really agree on is what we are going to do with that portion of ObamaCare. We have even moved towards you in that we are going to limit it to simply giving the rest of the American people a 1-year delay in the mandate as the President has called for Big Business and has been given waivers to certain individuals.

We can agree on this. We can get this thing done on what we agree on right away. It is imperative what we do, because we've got three things going on that the American people don't like: they don't like this government slowdown; they don't like what they are seeing with ObamaCare; and they don't like the impending things we are going to have to do with the debt ceiling. All these things work together—the cost of ObamaCare, the government regulatory system that is killing jobs, and the inability for us to get things done around here.

The debt ceiling is a conversation we are going to hear a lot about in the very near future. If we are not doing the things to work on a truly balanced budget, then there is no reason the debt ceiling doesn't keep going up year after year after year.

We need to balance our budget, folks. We need to get the job done for fiscal responsibility. I am not seeing that plan come from the White House or from the Senate.

LET'S DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, tonight I had a wonderful tele-townhall meeting with my constituents from across the 10th District of western North Carolina.

We had a lot of discussions tonight about the government shutdown and about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. My constituents gave me great feedback. They said, Keep fighting because we want to see a repeal of ObamaCare. But they said, We want the President to come to the table and negotiate; we want Washington to work.

I also asked my constituents if they had seen their health insurance rates go up as a result of ObamaCare. Fifty-eight percent said they had seen rates go up; 9 percent said they had seen them go down; and the balance said they had seen no change.

Clearly, it is harming families with increased health insurance rates. My constituents want a repeal, but they want Washington to work. So I call on the President, and I ask our friends over in the Senate to come to the table with House Republicans and try to come to consensus so we can move our Nation forward and do what's right for the people.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, 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 Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus comes to the floor now entering the second week of the House Republican-led government shutdown. Instead of allowing a simple ''yes'' or ''no'' vote on a bill that funds the government, Republicans continue to play irresponsible games that are hurting our country. The shutdown's impact on our already fragile economy, as previously predicted, is already beginning to take shape and is negatively affecting millions of Americans.

There is a simple solution to this, however, and that is to bring a clean continuing resolution to the House floor for a vote. The Senate has passed it; and if Speaker BOEHNER scheduled a vote, it would pass the House as well. But the House GOP is more concerned with catering to a fringe group of their caucus than leading for the American people.

There are serious costs to that inaction for my constituents and constituents throughout our country. In Nevada, an estimated 11,000 Nevadans may be furloughed or directly impacted by the furloughs. At one of our Air Force bases in my congressional district, 1,100 Nevadans are affected by furloughs, processing of claims at the VA and Social Security have slowed for new applicants, and the Head Start program is feeling the pinch of the shutdown.

Tonight, we come to this floor to raise these issues and others to call on our colleagues on the other side and the Speaker to allow a clean continuing resolution to be brought to the floor.

At this time, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman FUDGE, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, a leader who has been fighting for equality and fairness for all Americans.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I thank you, as always, for continuing to lead this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could stand on this House floor today and say that Republicans are playing with fire when they refuse to fund the government, but I can't do that because what they are doing is much worse. They are playing with people's very lives. They have made it abundantly clear that they care more about scoring political points and embarrassing this administration than addressing the needs of the American people.

□ 1930

A government shutdown has had an immediate impact on many people across this Nation: furloughing more than 800,000 Federal workers; stopping nutritional and clinical support for women, infants and children; and delaying lifesaving research at NIH.

My office continues to receive calls from distressed constituents about the status of Medicaid, Social Security, and SNAP. While we can reassure them that such programs will continue to operate, their concern and anxiety demonstrates the price every day Americans must pay when Congress fails.

Over the past few years, no issue has consumed more of the public's attention than health care reform; but, unfortunately for the American people, much of what has been said bears no relation to reality.

Republicans have tried to make the case that health care reform will raise health care costs catastrophically and drive up the cost of Medicare or increase the deficit. These claims are simply not true. The truth is the Affordable Care Act will slow overall health care spending, decrease Medicare spending, and decrease our deficit. All this will be accomplished while expanding health care coverage, cutting costs for seniors, and eliminating health disparities for communities of color.

Unfortunately, Republicans are so focused on preventing the expansion of health care that they are willing to hurt individuals in communities that are still struggling to rebound from our economic downturn. Already, as many as 19,000 children in 11 States have been left out of Head Start programs because grant money ran out on September 30. Several large defense contractors have started placing workers on notice that they may be furloughed. The 9 million mothers and children who rely on the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC, are facing the possibility that they may lose their benefits. And our local Federal courts may be crippled by furloughs as soon as next week.

The growing economic impact of this shutdown is extremely difficult to measure. The human and social impacts like the loss of money for food, housing, or educational opportunities are impossible to quantify. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, passed by both Chambers of Congress, signed by the President, and confirmed as constitutional by the Supreme Court. Until Republicans accept this fact, the government will be shut down and the American people will have been let down by the majority party of this body.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the vice chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HORSFORD for yielding me this time, and I thank him for all the work he does here in the House of Representatives and say he represents his district well.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight, quite frankly, very frustrated. I am frustrated as I stand here right now. Our Federal Government is shut down. This is the seventh day of a shutdown that did not have to happen. This is political theater at its best—or at its worst. And who's paying the price? It's the American people who are feeling the pain.

This shutdown has been engineered and manufactured by House Republicans. Anyone paying close attention to what's happening here in the House will come to the quick conclusion that it is not the Democrats who have manufactured this crisis; it is the Republican majority that has done so.

There are votes on the floor tonight that could pass a continuing resolution to get this behind us. I can tell you that most, if not all, Democrats will vote for a clean CR, and many, many of my Republican friends would do the same. I dare not call my Republican friends by name, but there are many of them. I had two visit with me tonight on the House floor to say they are willing to do it.

Yet Republicans feel that somehow they can use the budget crisis as a means for defunding the Affordable Care Act. It will not happen. It is the law of the land. It is fully implemented. It has been approved by Congress, signed by the President, tested by the U.S. Supreme Court, and it is now fully operational as of October 1.

Open season for the health insurance marketplace began several days ago, and nearly 3 million people have visited healthcare.gov on the first day alone. Americans who before lived with the constant fear of financial ruin if they got sick because they never had health insurance flooded the Web site in huge numbers to sign up for coverage.

Right now, there are more than 600,000 Americans living in a household forced to file bankruptcy because of unpaid medical bills. More than 60 percent of all bankruptcies filed last year were because of medical bills that could not be paid. Many people forced to file for bankruptcy because of medical expenses actually had insurance but were hung out to dry by insurance companies that dropped them from coverage simply because they had that power. ObamaCare makes that a thing of the past.

Beginning on January 1 of next year, Americans can no longer be denied coverage or dropped from coverage for having a preexisting condition. All plans must include coverage for outpatient and emergency services and maternity and newborn care, mental health, and prescription drugs. I am very proud of this plan. There will no longer be a yearly or lifetime limit on how much insurance companies will pay out for care.

That the House Republicans would hold the Federal Government and its

more than 4 million employees hostage over a law that, on all counts, seems to provide a great benefit to Americans defies logic.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a game, though my Republican colleagues seem to think that it is. They are not working with any sense of urgency and don't seem to comprehend the seriousness of the Nation's fiscal crisis.

Just yesterday, on national television, the Secretary of the Treasury, Jack Lew, warned us of what the consequences could be. This isn't about who wins or loses. We aren't keeping score, but the American people are keeping score, and they can't figure out Republicans' outright obsession with ObamaCare while the Federal Government isn't open for business. It makes no sense.

Democrats have come to the floor for the past week asking and begging for House Republicans to permit a vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution. I will repeat for the last time: It would pass this House tonight if the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, will put it up for votes. The votes are here right now to pass the Senate version of the continuing resolution.

I urge the Speaker of the House, who is a decent individual whom I have gotten to know over the years since I've been here, I hope that he will finally say to the extreme right in his caucus that he has done all that he could to lift up the issues that they care about, but now it's the future of the country that we must all care about. Speaker BOEHNER, this week, sir, please bring the continuing resolution to the floor and see if the votes are here. They will be here, and we can reopen the government, and then we can sit down and reconcile our differences.

I thank all who are standing strong in this debate.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the vice chairman, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for his constructive remarks and calling once again for the Speaker to bring a clean resolution to the floor. We know that the votes are here to pass a clean continuing resolution, one that would reopen government, one that would be supported by Republicans and Democrats; and so the Congressional Black Caucus comes to this floor at this hour to ask the Speaker of this House to do the will of the people and the will of this body.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a civil rights icon, a man who speaks truth to power.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame and a disgrace. Furthermore, it is really, really sad that the government of the most powerful country in the world is closed. It is closed. It is unbelievable. It is unreal. It is downright embarrassing.

I wonder—I wonder what the rest of the world thinks of us. We go all around the world preaching democracy—one person, one vote—and we will not even give the Members, all of the Members of the House of Representatives, an opportunity to vote on a clean effort, a continuing resolution, to end the shutdown.

Give the Members—please, give the Members, all of the Members, Democrats and Republicans—an opportunity to cast a vote, a free and open vote. That's what our Founding Fathers struggled for. People died for the right to participate. And in the House of Representatives, in this House, the people's House, we will not be provided an opportunity for all of the people to vote.

We must end the shutdown and put our people back to work and keep our economy growing and moving. We don't want to go back, my friends, or stand still. We want to go forward. Let's come together, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, come together and end this shutdown for good. We can do it. We made hard and tough decisions before and we can do it again, and we must do it because it's the right thing to do.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments and for pricking the conscience of this body for doing what's right at a time when the country expects that of our elected leadership.

I would like to yield, at this time, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this shutdown. The absurdity of it begins with the fact that we are now going to pay people for not working. We need to bring them back to work to provide the services and do the work that they are being paid to do.

Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is really not based on reality. Some have said, some apparently believe, if they just stay the course and keep the government shut down, they will be able to repeal or substantially undermine ObamaCare. That's not going to happen, and so we are not based in reality.

Now they are blaming Democrats for not negotiating, but there's nothing to negotiate. We are talking about the budget. The Republicans came in with one number; the Democrats had a higher number. The Senate decided not to negotiate but, rather, accept the Republican number, so we're in agreement. There's nothing to negotiate.

Now, in the 1990s when they had a disagreement on the budget, there were profound differences on spending levels and tax and revenue levels. They couldn't agree on the budget. But we, at this point, at least for a short-term, 6-week continuing resolution, to keep the government open for at least 6 more weeks while we can negotiate, we have already agreed on the number.

Now, the problem we're in right now is we just cannot reward people who have a tantrum and say we voted 40 times to repeal ObamaCare and we haven't done it, so we're just going to shut the government down. You cannot reward that behavior because it will become an expectation that every time it's the end of the fiscal year and you need a continuing resolution or the debt ceiling, there will be an expectation of reward. No, this is not the end of the process. This is just the beginning. We are just talking about a 6-week continuing resolution. Two weeks from now, we'll have the debt ceiling. Four weeks after that, we'll be at the end of the 6-week period if we can reopen the government. They will be asking for things.

Now, the fact is, the problem that we have, as stated in a recent article in Nation magazine, they revealed the strategy of the Republicans. They made a list of the kinds of things they will be looking for in the continuing resolution, the debt ceiling, every time there's an opportunity to shut down the government, and here's the list:

They want to undermine ObamaCare, Keystone pipeline, offshore drilling, corporate tax cuts, business-oriented tort reform, sabotage Social Security and Medicare, undermine clean air EPA regulations, cut back on consumer protections, and end net neutrality on the Internet.

Now, I suppose that after they've gotten their list, they'll say: We'll be reasonable. We'll negotiate. We will only take half of the things that we don't have the votes to pass. We'll just take half.

No. If you get to the point where there is an expectation of reward, then we will be in that. Suppose Democrats had thrown in maybe gun safety, marriage equality, immigration reform, and a jobs bill, and we're sitting up here trying to do the budget and have to do all of that and all of those and think we're ever going to come to a resolution. We have to have a clean CR so we can reopen the government without all those complications.

□ 1945

Back to ObamaCare, which seems to be provoking this problem. The fact is our health care system was in trouble. The rates were skyrocketing year after year after year. The problems with our health care system were not caused by ObamaCare; ObamaCare is trying to cure the problems.

We had a gentleman earlier today who said people have looked at the rates and some are paying a little more, some are paying a little less, and some about the same. If that's the case, that is a miracle, because after the last 50 years, rates have been skyrocketing and going up much faster than inflation. If they had been anywhere close to even, that would have been a lot less than it would have been had we not had ObamaCare.

Now we have the situation where it's affordable, it treats those with preexisting conditions, people under 26 can stay on their parents' policies, insurance reforms, preventive care provided

without copays and deductibles, the doughnut hole. It goes on and on. This is a good deal. It will be better than before.

Another gentleman earlier today said just eliminate the individual mandate. The individual mandate is in every policy because if you're going to cover preexisting conditions, you cannot allow people to wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. If that's the case, everybody will wait until they get sick to buy insurance. Everybody with insurance would be sick, and the average rates would go through the roof. If you look at what happened in New York and the rates there, you can reasonably estimate that if you provided that exemption, the cost of insurance would double on the spot. We can't have that. So we need to just proceed.

If you want to improve ObamaCare, let's talk about improving it. In the meanwhile, it is not going to be repealed. It's not going to be undermined. This idea that you can keep the government open piecemeal by funding one agency at a time is absolutely absurd. Passing those bills would only serve one purpose, and that is to perpetuate and extend the shutdown.

The fact is that they don't have the votes to repeal ObamaCare. They don't even have the votes to keep the government shut. If they called a vote, we'd reopen the government. We just want an up-or-down vote on reopening government. We've had several procedural votes so far where we could have reopened the government. At least have an up-or-down vote on reopening government. And as the gentlelady from New York pointed out, there are enough Republicans who are on public record saying they would vote ''yes'' to give a clear indication that more than a majority of the House would be voting in favor.

I want to thank the gentleman from Nevada for bringing us together. ObamaCare is a very important advance in health care. It will cure all of the problems they're talking about. We don't need to reward anyone for shutting down the government or threatening the debt ceiling or shutting down the government in 4 weeks. We need to just reopen the government, and then we can have intelligent discussions about what to do about the budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments and for bringing up a number of key points. The main one that, I think, gets lost is the fact that the President and Democrats in both the House and the Senate have compromised. They've compromised on the lower budget number to get to a 6-week agreement on funding the budget in order for us to have a longer term negotiation for the budget in subsequent years. That is a major point that I think the Speaker and those on the other side tend to forget. That was a number that the Speaker himself offered up in July and said that he would bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor in July at the very number that Democrats are prepared to say ''yes'' to.

What we're here to say, Mr. Speaker, and Members on the other side, is take ''yes'' for an answer. We're ready. There are 195 Democrats who are ready in this House, some 20 Republicans who publicly said that they're ready to support a clean continuing resolution, and there are probably more that would vote for it once it's brought to the floor.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what my colleagues have said: it is time for us to bring a clean funding resolution to the floor of the House that would get a majority of Democratic support, and it would get strong Republican support to reopen the government. Not to reopen it in pieces, but to reopen all of government for all Americans. It's time for us to do that now.

We've had several funding bills that have come to the floor to fund bits and snippets of the Federal Government, but that's really not the way to do it. In fact, as the gentleman knows, the government was shut down by Republicans, and it wasn't shut down piecemeal. So it should not be reopened piecemeal; it should be opened in full.

I represent a district in Maryland that has a lot of Federal workers, workers who work at virtually every agency of the Federal Government. And I would note that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have brought forward piecemeal funding bills that fund a handful of agencies. There are 486 Federal agencies, and we haven't brought 486 funding bills to this floor. So it's rather silly to propose funding the government in these little snippets.

These three workers were in my office. One of them works for the Environmental Protection Agency. The other works for the Department of Health and Human Services and, in fact, at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services, and the other one works at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. As I talked to the workers, I cannot even begin to explain to you how devastated they felt being tagged nonessential, knowing that their work is vital, but not really feeling validated as workers. That was kind of one thing.

The other thing is that they're doing their jobs because they believe in their jobs. They believe in the work that they're doing for the government. They believe in the work that they're doing for taxpayers.

Lastly, they're worried about all of the work that goes undone. They're worried at EPA about letting the public know that inspections about conditions of water and other things in the environment in communities across this country are not happening because the EPA is not in business.

The worker who was in my office, Julia, who works at the Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Speaker, is worried because in the work that she does, her specific job is to train Medicare providers so that they indicate the right codes when they submit for payment so that there's not fraud. The other part of her job is that she's supposed to look through those claims and make sure that if there is any indication of a problem or fraud, that it gets referred to the inspector general and gets referred to the Department of Justice. At a time when we're both implementing health care, but also when Medicare is being used, it's really important that Julia's job actually saves taxpayers money, and yet she's at home.

The worker who came to my office today, Emma, from NASA, is very concerned because part of her job is working on systems that would help deliver us our next generation of weather satellites because we have a gap in our satellite coverage. The farther we get behind in developing that new weather satellite, it means that it puts all of us in jeopardy in terms of receiving the information that we need. Mr. Speaker, as Americans know, we don't get our weather from The Weather Channel; we get our weather from the National Weather Service, from the folks at NOAA, from the people at NASA, and yet they are at home.

The other thing that these workers explained to me is the great personal cost to them. Seconda, who works at the Environmental Protection Agency, told me today that she takes care of her mother, in addition to herself and other family members, on her salary, and that she has been worried and up nights and unable to sleep because she's not really clear how she's going to be able to meet those expenses.

Julia, who works at CMS and HHS, has an 11-year-old child who had brain damage when he was born, and he's a special-needs child. Aiden has a wonderful smile and a beautiful face and voice, and he needs his mom, but they've also been able to take care of services for him with the salary that she makes at HHS.

Emma at NASA said to me that her 12-year-old and 14-year-old really don't understand why she's at home instead of going to work.

These workers aren't just a faceless bureaucracy. They have lives and they have responsibilities. With the Federal Government shut down, we're not enabling them to meet those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that they said to me is if you open up the government piecemeal, it doesn't really help them out. Take the example of Julia at HHS. If her job is to make referrals to the Department of Justice and to the Office of the Inspector General, and she's at her job, if by some fortuitous chance our Republican colleagues decide to restart HHS, what that means is that she doesn't have

anybody to refer that fraud to because they're not on the job at the Department of Justice. If NASA is working and NOAA is not, then that joint work that takes place between agencies can't.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we do know is that every week that the Federal Government is shut down, it costs taxpayers $10 billion. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been shut down now for a week. Chalk up $10 billion to the taxpayers. So you can see that the entire purpose of the strategy to shut down government is, in fact, costing taxpayers money.

Finally, I will share with you what I read in the paper today, Mr. Speaker. Three scientists and researchers won the Nobel Prize for medicine. They won the prize for developing a way to track cell traffic so that it could make determinations about when appropriate packages of cells in the body are being delivered for certain purposes. In doing that, it would help us make discoveries for immunological diseases, for neurological diseases, for things like diabetes. Some of these scientists had been working under a grant from the National Institutes of Health for about the last 30 years. It made me think that if we are not funding the National Institutes of Health and other government agencies that do research right now, that the work that they've been doing for the last 30 years is work, if you think forward 30 years, we're going to be missing because we've failed to fund the kind of research that we need. So there are ripple effects to the cost of shutting down the Federal Government.

Finally, in my district, I plan every year to have a college fair for the students in my district. Usually about 2,500 to 3,000 students show up. Our college fair is supposed to come up this weekend. We usually get assistance from NASA. They bring all kinds of projects and experiments to the science fair to get young people engaged in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields so that we can get them invested in tackling these jobs for the 21st century. We usually get assistance from the Department of Education to educate young people about loan and grant opportunities that might be available to them as they decide to make their college selections.

I just got an email, even as I was sitting here on the floor, that none of these agencies will be able to participate in a college fair for our young people who are preparing to go to college next year, and they're going to miss out on those opportunities about learning of what's available to them and the challenges that they face because the Federal Government has shut down.

This is a really sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the impact of the shutdown and the ripple effect that that has both throughout our economy and in our local communities. So I will close by urging Speaker BOEHNER, Mr. Speaker, to please bring a clean funding bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, let it come up for a vote. You know what? If it fails, it does. But I know that in this body Republicans and Democrats like me will support that bill, and we'll do it, even though I don't agree with the number, I never supported the number. But I know that even though it is a Republican number, I'm going to agree with it because it will restart government. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to open up all of the Federal Government for all Americans.

□ 2000

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks and for bringing the real-life names and stories about who this furlough impacts and how government shutdown is really affecting them. Those are the individuals, the public servants who provide critical services each and every day, who deserve to go back to work.

Again, we're asking that the Speaker bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor so the government can be reopened; and like the gentlewoman from Maryland, I, myself, have heard from my constituents who are affected by this. Many have sent emails and called my office. There is one by the name of Alex, a Department of Defense employee, who got married a week before the shutdown and was furloughed a week ago today. Now, is that the Republican Party's idea of a honeymoon gift? This has to end, and it has to end now.

I got some letters today from a fifth grade class of students from Sandy Miller Elementary School in Nevada. They wrote to me because they're planning a trip to the Grand Canyon, but now it looks like that trip may be in jeopardy because the government shutdown is threatening access to the Grand Canyon. They wrote to provide me with some advice on how to solve these problems and to suggest that if Congress could start acting a little more like fifth graders, maybe we could get something done around here.

I would like to share some of the remarks from the letters that they wrote. Stefany writes:

> You should be respectful of each other. Be communicators. But most of all, be balanced and open-minded.

Rossie said:

> You should be reflective about how you are affecting other people, not just yourselves. If my class can compromise and get along, you and your colleagues in Congress should too.

George wrote:

> Congress should start cooperating and working as a team, like we do here in school.

''The message is pretty clear,'' as one of the writers, Bailen, put it, ''if fifth graders can get along, you can too.''

Well, I sure hope that's the case, Mr. Speaker. Because if we can't work together to do the people's business, then we shouldn't be here; and maybe we should turn the gavel over to them.

I yield the floor to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Nevada for chairing this hour tonight.

And just as I reflect, Mr. Speaker, on the comments made by those fifth graders, well, I'm glad I'm in tune with them because, you see, through this whole ordeal, I have spoken about people who have narrow agendas, where they're only thinking of themselves and not the totality of the common good in the United States. Because, you see, it's disingenuous and hypocritical to one day vote for a shutdown of the government and the next day show up at the World War II Memorial and stand with the veterans saying this is horrendous what has happened. You can't have it both ways.

I did not vote for a shutdown of the government, so maybe I should have been there at the World War II Memorial, saying the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been saying as they voted to shut down the memorial.

I want to share a story with you from a young lady in my district just a day or two ago. She's a young mother in Newark, New Jersey. I represent the people of that town. She went to the young fathers program at Rutgers University with her 2-year-old daughter. Due to the government shutdown, this young mother no longer is receiving her WIC benefits. And in desperation, she is reaching out to anyone and everyone for help, as her child literally starves from lack of nutrition assistance. She doesn't know where to go or who to turn to. She feels totally alone. She doesn't know how she'll feed her child or how she'll make ends meet.

This story breaks my heart, and, unfortunately, she is not alone. There are millions of pregnant women and new mothers just like her across the country who don't know how they'll feed their child. And what breaks my heart even more is knowing that Congress has the power to open this government tonight. The votes are here, Mr. Speaker. Let's pass a clean CR.

Make no mistake, this is a Republican government shutdown. The extreme faction got exactly what they wanted. Well, I ask you, did the American people get exactly what they wanted? The people I represent didn't. Families across New Jersey's Tenth Congressional District who won't get the Hurricane Sandy relief that they were counting on didn't. Veterans who put their lives on the line for this country didn't. Low-income children kicked off of Head Start didn't. The 31,000 furloughed Federal workers in New Jersey didn't. The 9 million women, infants, and youngsters who rely on the WIC program certainly didn't.

So I ask, Who are my Republican colleagues listening to? Whose interests are they representing? Instead of reopening the entire government for everyone, House Republicans hold the country hostage with their piecemeal approach, picking winners and losers,

choosing which parts of the government are worthy of opening. We must open the entire government and do what we can to do it today.

Mr. Speaker, 200 Democrats have signed a petition to bring a bill to the floor that would open the government today, and more than 20 Republicans have said they would also vote for the bill. So we have the votes. The question is, why won't Speaker BOEHNER bring the bill to the floor, one that he knows will pass, one that would reopen the government today? Because it's not too much to ask Members of Congress to do their job. It's not too much to ask to reopen the government and pay our bills on time. The people I represent have to do their jobs and pay their bills on time every single day. Why can't the leaders of this Nation do the same?

With every day that goes by, the more we drive up the costs for the American people, the more we threaten the stability of our Nation's economy. We cannot keep the government closed, and we cannot default on our debt. So I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to stand up for the American people, bring a bill to the floor that would reopen the government today, and let's start doing the job expected of us and continue to move our country forward, not punish the American people by moving it backwards.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman.

May I inquire as to the time I have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I yield to my good friend from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for recognizing me to talk about something that is very important, and that is what is going on with America's future as it relates to this Republican government shutdown, the Affordable Care Act, and jobs.

While Republicans refuse to bring a clean CR to a vote on the House floor to end this Republican shutdown, our Nation, our cities, our States continue to suffer. Every single day, we are losing millions of dollars, wasting time and resources by furloughing government workers and limiting the public's access to government. And as we approach day eight of this reprehensible Republican shutdown, Republicans continue to bring bills to the House floor that will only fund pieces of the Federal Government.

This cynical effort to make headlines and cover themselves for causing such shameful dysfunction is resulting in a historical loss of confidence in Congress and causing undue economic uncertainty for families and businesses all across our country.

To my Republican friends, please understand this is not a game. These political gimmicks are not a responsible approach to governing. Each problem resulting from the Republican government shutdown can be taken care of if we simply pass the Senate's clean continuing resolution.

In north Texas, in the area that I represent, the 33rd Congressional District, families may miss out on over 300,000 meals because the USDA may have to cancel food truck shipments to the North Texas Food Bank. It's ridiculous. And millions of Americans may be affected by the flu this year due to the closing of the CDC's flu tracking program. These are only two examples of the widespread direct effects of the Republican shutdown.

And here's what Republicans need to know: they should go in their districts and talk to people, talk to workers who work in the defense industry, that work at our military bases, that are government employees. Talk to people that have been furloughed. Talk to the people that, because of the sequester problems that we've been unable to solve here because of the lack of Republican leadership, have already been laid off, including the over 400 at Bell Helicopter in Tarrant County in Fort Worth.

And if they talk to people and they go into their districts and speak with everyday common people that are out there working hard every day, what they'll find out is that it hurts to lose your job. And when you lose that job—particularly at this time of the year, as we get closer and closer to the Christmas season—and when you lose that job, then something happens to your car, some medical emergency pops up that ends up costing you a lot of money, then you really start to struggle as a family, and it really starts to hurt. That is what is so shameful about this Republican government shutdown. It doesn't take into consideration the real people that are out there struggling every day.

Speaker BOEHNER claims there aren't enough votes to reopen the government, but we know that's not true: 200 Democrats, including myself, have signed a letter to Speaker BOEHNER, making it clear that there are enough votes to pass the bill and reopen our government now.

Republicans claim they started this shutdown to defund, delay, and deny health care insurance to millions of Americans. Such a move would work to deny health care coverage in my home State of Texas to 6 million uninsured residents. We have the highest uninsured rate in the Union. In the district that I represent, alone, over 265,000 are uninsured. That's over a third in the 33rd Congressional District, in Dallas and in Fort Worth.

To Members wishing to deny health coverage through the Affordable Care Act, I want them to explain to those constituents in the district that I represent and in their own districts. It's a myth that it is only happening in our districts. They have people in their districts that are uninsured also, and they need to start representing them.

The most ridiculous reality of this political stunt is that the ACA is the law of the land, which means that this shutdown will be fruitless in repealing the law. And in the end, Republicans will have to behave like adults and stop simply saying ''no'' and come to the table with solutions for matters we can address in good faith.

□ 2015

Until then, House Democrats have a clear message: We demand a vote to reopen our government so Americans can move on with their lives, get back to work, provide for their families.

I ask my Republican colleagues to let reason overtake ideology, and let's get our government open again. Let's get it running. Enough is enough. Let's do the right thing. Let's stop with these games, stop the obstruction, and let's get back to work. These families are depending on us.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for his very constructive remarks. And as he said, the fact that some on the other side want to close down government and keep it closed and now potentially threaten our ability to meet our obligations on October 17 with the debt ceiling over the Affordable Care Act, something that is now the law of the land that's been passed by this Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and that's simply not going to happen, it's time for them to come to the table to negotiate without holding the Affordable Care Act as a precondition. And that is what we are here to say, to ask the Speaker to bring to the floor a clean funding bill that's supported by an overwhelming number of Democrats and Republicans, to reopen government and to allow our American workers to go back to work.

I'd like to now yield to the cochair of this Special Order hour, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my good friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, my good friend, Representative HORSFORD, for his tremendous leadership for anchoring this CBC Special Order. And it's my honor and my privilege to join him today, during this Congressional Black Caucus Hour of Power, where, for 60 minutes we have the opportunity to speak directly to the American people. It's always an honor and a privilege to do so, but it's tragic and sad that we're here today under such circumstances. This is a manufactured crisis, a government shutdown engineered as a result of mean-spirited, reckless, and unreasonable behavior by our friends from the other side of the aisle.

And in order to mask the obstructionism and the behavior that has resulted in more than 800,000 hardworking civil servants being kicked out of their jobs temporarily—we hope—there's been a series of myths, of factual misrepresentations that have

been brought to the American people from our good friends on the other side of the aisle. I just want to spend a minute or two exploring some of the most significant ones courtesy of the House GOP.

The first thing that led us down this road is this idea that the Affordable Care Act is a train wreck, repeated over and over and over again. The Affordable Care Act is a train wreck.

It's not a train wreck. The train hasn't even left the station. Enrollment just began a few days ago on October 1. The coverage period for the American people doesn't even begin until January 1 of 2014. How can it be a train wreck when the train hasn't even left the station?

This is behavior that is designed to create an accident because of some obsession that folks have on the other side of the aisle with providing tens of millions of Americans who are otherwise uninsured with health care coverage. It's an obsession that, quite frankly, I can't understand.

What are you so angry about? Are you upset about the fact that the Affordable Care Act prohibits preexisting conditions from denying health care coverage to Americans, including children?

Do you dislike the fact that young people going out into a very difficult job market can now stay on the insurance of their parents until the age of 26?

Does it really bother you that small businesses will be eligible for a tax credit up to 35 percent to help provide health insurance coverage for their employees in a manner that will allow these small businesses to grow and prosper?

Enough with this myth the Affordable Care Act is a train wreck. But that was the basis of the shutdown and the ransom notes that were sent over to the Senate majority that courageously stamped each one: Rejected; return to sender.

Defund, delay, destroy the Affordable Care Act, that was the genesis of this conflict. And then we shifted, once it was clear that that strategy was not going to work, into the second great myth of this debacle that we find ourselves in. The second myth: Democrats refuse to negotiate.

Negotiate over what? Negotiate over a law that my colleagues have clearly indicated is the law of the land, passed by a duly-elected Congress in 2010, signed by the President, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States of America in a decision issued by Chief Justice John Roberts, a Bush appointee, and then affirmed by the reelection of President Barack Obama in the electoral college landslide? Why do you want us to negotiate over settled law?

There are three ways in the American democratic system for you to change law, Mr. Speaker:

The first is through the legislative process. In 2010, you lost. Forty-three or 44 additional times subsequent to that, you've lost, unable to do it legislatively.

You can try and change the law in America through our democratic system jurisprudentially, through the court system. In 2012, the Supreme Court rejected that. You lost.

Then you can try and change things as a result of an election, and you lost with the reelection of the President by more than 5 million votes in 2012.

Those are the three legitimate ways—legislative, jurisprudential, electoral—that you change laws in American democracy. You do not extort concessions and threaten to shut down the government.

So this notion that we've refused to compromise is a great myth, particularly when, as my good friend from Nevada pointed out, the fact is that we've already compromised as it relates to the underlying number connected to funding the government.

The Democrats believe the appropriate number is $1.058 trillion. That number is right here. The Republicans believe the appropriate number is $986 billion. That number is right here. We've agreed to drop our number all the way down to $986 billion, representing a $70 billion compromise, yet you continue to put forth this myth, as if we're the ones behaving unreasonably. The American people see through this factual misrepresentation.

Lastly, let me just say, we had another great myth put forth this weekend by none other than the Speaker of the House of Representatives. No, not the junior Senator from Texas; the other one from Ohio. He said there are not the votes in the House to pass a clean CR. Not the votes? I'm no mathematician, Mr. Speaker, but it's clear, 198 Democrats have indicated they're willing to reopen the government if you put the bill on the floor. And if you add that to the 23 Republicans who have gone on record back at home in their districts, that gets us to 221, the magic number being 217 to reopen the government.

Stop peddling factual misrepresentations to the American people to cover your legislative malpractice. Let's get back to doing the business of the American people.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I know we are coming down to the end of our time. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. Let me first thank you both for continuing to sound the alarm and to really conduct these Special Orders so the American people can know the truth about what's really going on here in Washington, D.C. So thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES, for your remarkable leadership and for what you're doing tonight once again.

As I'm listening to what we've been talking about, there are two things that I want to drive home.

One is many of us did not want to and will continue to oppose sequester. What sequester has done is really gutted many of our safety net programs, such as Head Start, where 21,000 young people cannot have access now to Head Start in many of our districts. Senior citizens, Meals on Wheels, they won't be able to really get their Meals on Wheels, which is what they need to have a nutritious diet.

We see over and over again the impacts of sequester in people's daily lives, and it's wrong; and, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the subcommittee that really works on all of our domestic programs, we've been fighting so hard to end the sequester so that people do not have to live through this pain, given what they're going through now as a result of sequester. So for us to support a bill that would open the government up at that level causes us a lot of pain and grief.

And what we're hoping is that, by our support of that $986 billion bill to open the government up, we can open the government up so that people can get back to work, so that we have a functioning government, and so that we can begin to negotiate what makes sense for the American people in terms of the type of programs and the type of resources and services they need until we can get the Republican Tea Party Members of this House to understand that we need to create jobs and support a jobs bill. But until we do that, we have to minimally ensure that the Federal Government provides for the basics for the American people, and so many of us would support that level of funding just to get the government open.

I think, and as you said, the Speaker, I think they know that they have enough votes to put up with our Democratic votes to open the government up; and so, for the life of me, I don't know why they don't just bring that bill to the floor. Let's see. Let's have an up-or-down vote. I think the American people deserve that.

A government shutdown is wrong. People deserve to have health care. Millions of people now are accessing the Affordable Care Act. They didn't have health insurance before. Now they'll be covered.

So, once again, we have to see why in the world, or ask the question: Why in the world would people who need health care, why would they be held hostage to people who want to work in a government shutdown?

So I hope that more people are listening, more people understand that we know how to open the government up and we know how to begin to negotiate on a real budget that makes sense for not only our domestic programs, but for the Pentagon and for our foreign assistance, State Department, all of those necessary programs that make for a functioning government.

So thank you again for your leadership, and thank you for giving me the time tonight to speak.

Mr. Speaker, here we are day seven of the hurtful devastating Republican government shutdown.

We all know that Tea Party extremists came to Congress—not to govern—but to achieve the goal of shutting down the government.

Well, congratulations to them for achieving a dream come true.

Now, millions of families, children, seniors, federal employees and our economy are paying the price.

In my congressional district, and throughout the state of California, families are already feeling the impact of the Republican government shutdown.

The California Women Infant and Children program is on the brink of turning away low-income pregnant women and new moms if this shutdown continues.

And schools throughout the state of California are cancelling field trips to national parks and monuments which are closed to visitors due to this Republican shutdown.

Across the country our vital national interests are also taking the hit.

The shutdown threatens to derail the already unacceptable Veterans Administration disability backlog.

There are no new business loans or assistance for small businesses or for our farmers.

Without the CDC conducting disease surveillance and taking calls about infectious diseases—our public health is at serious risk.

If the Republican shutdown continues—13 million children will lose access to school breakfast and 31 million will lose access to school lunches.

8.7 million women and their young children will not receive nutrition assistance through the WIC program.

And 47.5 million people who rely on SNAP will go hungry.

Yes, the Tea Party is getting exactly what they wanted—and millions of children and families will go hungry because of it.

To add insult to injury, Republicans have shut down the government because they are obsessed—obsessed mind you—with destroying the Affordable Care Act.

The vast majority of Americans—who, by the way, continue to blame Republicans for the shutdown—see how senseless it is to shutdown the government because you want to deny health care to millions of Americans.

Despite the Republican government shutdown, health care exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act have successfully opened for enrollment.

Now millions of uninsured Americans are less than just three months away from having the health care coverage they so desperately need.

For the nearly 7 million uninsured African Americans, October 1st marked the opportunity to have fewer health inequities, and increased access to quality and affordable health care and preventive medicine.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, 500,000 young, African American adults have already gained coverage from a parent's health care plan.

And for the 7.3 million African Americans who have private insurance and the 4.5 million who have Medicare coverage, the Affordable Care Act now means access to key preventive health services, including vital screenings, at no extra cost.

With health disparities continuing to have a huge financial burden on the health care system, these key changes as provided through the Affordable Care Act will not only save money—but they will save lives.

California—the first state to commit to establishing its own exchange—launched the Covered California exchange.

In my Congressional District alone there are nearly 100,000 uninsured constituents and the opening of the exchanges means they are one step closer to health care coverage that can literally mean the difference between life and death.

"MAKING GOOD HEALTH MY REALITY" TOUR

Mr. Speaker, this summer I, and many of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, co-hosted the "Making Good Health MY Reality" tour health care town halls to help educate our constituents about the Affordable Care Act.

Two hundred constituents attended my town hall, and while there were many many questions, people were undeniably excited and looked forward to the open enrollment period.

There were many who already had private insurance, but attended in order to learn more so that they could tell their friends and family members about the Affordable Care Act.

Some attended just to speak about the good health care reform has already done in their lives, like the mother whose daughter became very ill while away at college and had to rely on her health insurance to seek treatment.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, her daughter was able to stay in college, graduate, and now has her own health care insurance.

But that isn't enough for Tea Party Republicans.

It isn't enough that websites across the country are crashing because of the interest millions of Americans have in getting affordable health care coverage.

As one constituent, after working for 3 hours to successfully enroll in a health care plan, put it: "Do I now have doubts about the Affordable Care Act? Absolutely not."

I would go through much more to get affordable health insurance. I experience more stress every day worrying about getting . . . a disease like cancer and having to face a hospital bill I can't afford on my own." (Janice Worthen wrote of her experience in The Alamedan)

That is what is driving Americans to the health care exchanges. That is what the Tea Party Republicans are holding this country hostage for.

Mr. Speaker, while all of us believe it is important to keep the government functioning, hostage taking is no way to run federal departments and agencies.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions.

Yet, instead of working together to do our jobs, Republicans continue to double down on the tea-party plan to destroy and decimate our government.

Instead of working on a serious option to reopen the government, Republicans latest strategy is to exploit our veterans, cancer patients, pregnant women, and young children, by voting on piecemeal bills that will not end impacts of a shut down that extend across our country.

WIC

It is simply outrageous to sit here and play politics with pregnant mothers, their babies, and their young children.

In the past year alone the WIC program has been cut by $500 million—simply unacceptable to the more than 21,000 WIC participants in my congressional district alone.

As a Member of the Appropriations Committee, I witnessed Republicans vote over and over and over again to cut funding to this vital program.

Despite committee Democrats' best efforts to stand against these ridiculous attacks and to convince them of the importance of this program, they have refused to listen to reason and insisted on massive cuts.

HEAD START

And that's not all.

Because of the Tea Party imposed sequestration, more than 57,000 at-risk students have lost their Head Start slots, and my district alone lost $1.5 million in federal contributions to the Head Start program.

Yet there is now a Republican proposal circulating to restore funding to Head Start.

The hypocrisy is truly appalling.

VA

We saw them do the same for the Veterans Affairs department.

Even if we do fund the VA, their employees still need to work with their counterparts at the Department of Defense and the Social Security Administration in order to process claims.

Mr. Speaker, of course we support our veterans, of course we support our national parks, and of course we support full funding for the NIH, the WIC program, and the Head Start program.

Yet, some people in this chamber who have been leading the charge to cut these very same programs are taking their fundamental responsibility and holding it hostage, hoping that by doing so they will get their way.

If my colleagues would really like to help our nation's most vulnerable, the people who will suffer the most due to their intransigence—rather than trying to score political points—they need to not only fund the entire federal government, they also need to roll back sequestration and other cuts to vital programs that they've made over the last three years.

But they aren't going to do that.

Instead they will continue to posture, to attempt to score political points, and in the end push to achieve the goal they set years ago: to dismantle this government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what the American people deserve.

This anarchy must end.

We must bring a clean CR to the Floor, and we must pass it.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentlelady from California.

I will just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we demand a vote. We demand a vote on a clean funding resolution, one that's supported by 198 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 221 Members. A majority of the Members of this body are prepared to vote on a clean resolution, and we're asking—demanding—the Speaker bring that clean resolution to the floor so that we can reopen government and allow all of our American workers, those in government and those in the private sector, to get back to work and to meet our obligations as a country.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Patient Protection and Affordable

Care Act which has already significantly improved health care for Americans. The six month enrollment period for Americans to sign up for affordable health care coverage in the state-based Health Insurance Marketplaces has begun. Important decisions on government finding and the debt ceiling await votes while politics take center stage and the soundness of our economy remains in question.

House Republicans have caused a government shutdown in order to advance a delusional political agenda spearheaded by disdain for the Affordable Care Act. In a demonstration of hollow leadership, politics are being placed before people. Instead of approving the Senate-passed funding bill, House Republicans have cast yet another vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act for the forty-third time since its passage.

However, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and many have already benefited from its implementation. In Texas, families have saved $46.3 million in insurance company refunds. Medicare beneficiaries in the "donut hole" have saved $420.7 million in prescription drugs. More than 40,000 Americans and 17 million American children with pre-existing conditions gained insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act. The Congressional Budget Office released a study showing that the Affordable Care Act will provide coverage for an additional 32 million people while reducing overall health care costs.

The new health care law will only grow stronger and expand access to quality coverage with the state-based Health Insurance Marketplaces for those who cannot receive coverage through an employer. The Affordable Care Act not only provides increased access to quality care but it marks the beginning of fewer health disparities across the nation and more investment in preventative health care. I am proud to stand with the President and my colleagues in support of the Affordable Care Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and October 8 on account of a family illness.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3241. A letter from the Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Implementing the Byrd Amendments to the Black Lung Benefits Act: Determining Coal Miners' and Survivors' Entitlement to Benefits (RIN: 1240-AA04) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3242. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0028; A-1-FRL-9797-3] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3243. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Fort Collins [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0708; FRL-9900-86-Region 8] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3244. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation for the Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0386; FRL-9900-71-Region 3] received September 57, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3245. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Procedures for Stringency Determinations and Minor Permit Revisions for Federal Operating Permits [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0355; FRL-9900-82-Region 6] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3246. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment for the Chico Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0800; FRL-9900-69-Region 9] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3247. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2013-0055] (RIN: 1018-AY76) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3248. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wagner, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0004; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3249. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Walker, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0266; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-11] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3250. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Brigham City, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0414; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Supplemental report on H.R. 1804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress semiannual reports on the cost of foreign travel made by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs (Rept. 113–227, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3271. A bill making continuing appropriations for the compensation of Federal employee and certain military personnel in the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. NORTON:

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax incentives for investment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United

States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 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. 7: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 15: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 233: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 350: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 565: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 685: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 688: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 721: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 830: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 855: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 940: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 997: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1070: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1094: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1318: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1339: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1462: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1507: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1518: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1633: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1726: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1731: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1796: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1915: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2029: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2064: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2459: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2663: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2760: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2766: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 2797: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2887: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3005: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3040: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3061: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3111: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3121: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3143: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3179: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 3232: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3236: Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. HONDA.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 61: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 131: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 153: Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 254: Mr. HOLT.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013 No. 138

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our stronghold and defense, Your judgments and will are perfect, so we place our trust in You.

Thank You for the privilege of speaking to You in daily prayer. Forgive us when our prayers are so other worldly they are no earthly good. Forgive us also when we put politics ahead of progress.

Lord, strengthen our Senators today, helping them to not throw away their confidence in You. Inspire them to persevere in seeking to do Your will, knowing that Your promises are sure and that the harvest is certain.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

At 5 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Bruce and Ellis nominations, both to be U.S. district court judges in the State of Illinois.

At 5:30 p.m. there will be at least one roll call vote on confirmation of the nominations.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, on national TV claimed there are not enough votes to pass the bill and bring an end to the dangerous government shutdown. I believe he is mistaken.

Two hundred Democratic Members of the House of Representatives said they would vote for the bill to reopen the government, and 22 Republicans in the House have said publicly they would vote for the bill. We have heard there are as many as 100 who wish to vote for it. No matter how we do the math, it adds up to a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

If there were only a mechanism for polling all Members of the House of Representatives to find out whether they support the Senate-passed bill, one surefire way to find out whether the bill would pass is to have a vote on it; that is, to vote on the legislation that has already been passed in the Senate.

There is a way; have a vote. That would settle the question for a long, long, time, wouldn't it.

What I say to the Speaker: Allow a vote on the resolution that would end the shutdown, legislation that you, JOHN BOEHNER, proposed in the first place. The entire Federal Government could reopen for business by tomorrow morning.

I ask the Speaker, why are you afraid? Are you afraid this measure will pass, the government will reopen and America will realize you took the country hostage for no apparent reason?

Why is the Speaker opposed to these reasonable solutions.

Across the Nation people are suffering—not only Federal employees—because of his irresponsible action, the irresponsible tea party driven action. But it is not, I say, only Federal employees. US Air had a delivery last Friday of a $180 million aircraft. They couldn't take delivery. Why? Because there weren't inspectors to do that for those aircraft.

We know that Lockheed has already announced today they are laying off 3,000 people, and there is more to come in the defense industry. It is happening all through the government.

There is an easy way out of this; the same escape hatch has been available as long as we have been a country. It is called a vote. But for the 7 days the Federal Government has been closed for business, the Speaker has refused to use that escape hatch.

It is so important when people wish to buy a home. One can't buy a home with an FHA loan today. Even if it is not FHA, they can't get them done because to confirm the amount of money that is on the application they need an IRS person to check it. They are not available.

The Senate-passed bill to reopen the government, while we work out our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

budget differences, wasn't my idea. It was his idea. The Speaker of the House of Representatives said: You do this CR at this number, and I will get it done.

We negotiated for a while. I agreed to his number. It was very hard to do for us in the Democratic Caucus. But it was his idea, not my idea. All this talk about not negotiating, that is what that was all about. He admits it was his intention all along to pass a clean resolution. But then he ran into the tea party, a minority within a majority that runs the majority in the House of Representatives.

The bill before the House of Representatives is a compromise by us, a compromise that was difficult, I repeat, to get my caucus to accept. Now that we have compromised, the Speaker won't take yes for an answer. He has moved the goal line again.

Last week he said he wanted to go to conference to work out some differences. As we heard on national TV yesterday, he is not only concerned about ObamaCare, he is concerned about the budget deficit, as we all are. He keeps changing. He said he wanted to talk about that. Fine. We are happy to do that. If he wants to talk about ObamaCare, if he wants to talk about anything else, we will do it. I put that in writing and had it hand delivered to him. We said that we would talk about agriculture, we would talk about health care, we would talk about domestic discretionary spending, military spending, and anything he wishes to talk about. We have been asking to go to conference on a responsible budget for more than 6 months.

On national TV, the Speaker said Chairman RYAN and Chairman MURRAY have been working together for a long time. As I have indicated here previously, he said that in a meeting we had in the White House in the last few days. I said in front of everybody there: It is simply not factual.

Senator MURRAY issued a statement yesterday after she heard him saying this on national TV saying that is not true. They have had a couple of meetings but they haven't discussed anything substantive. I guess the meetings were only to say to the Speaker they met, but they talked about nothing in her budget or his budget.

We are saying simply, reopen the government. We have said we will go to your budget number. We don't like it. We have said we will go to conference and talk about anything you want.

He can't take yes for an answer.

Simply reopen the government. We will talk, I repeat, about anything you wish to talk about. We are not afraid to negotiate. We are not afraid to make reasonable compromises. Once again the football was moved, just like Lucy in the ''Peanuts'' cartoon.

As Judd Legum, editor-in-chief of ThinkProgress pointed out, Republicans have a strange definition of compromise. This is how he explains it:

Republicans ask: ''Can I burn down your house?'' We say: ''No.'' Republicans ask: ''Just the second floor?'' We say: ''No.'' Republicans ask: ''[Just the] garage?'' We say: ''No.'' Republicans say: ''Let's talk about what I can burn down.'' We say: ''No.'' Then Republicans say: ''You're not compromising!''

Republicans insist we must negotiate while the Federal Government remains closed. As The New York Times editorial reported on Saturday, when 800,000 Federal employees are furloughed, government services are shut down and the economy is flagging, it is hardly time for talking.

Then they come up with all this: We will do an NIH bill. We will open NIH.

The problem is, it is really hard to pick and choose between that and the Park Service, especially when we consider they have cut spending this year for NIH by $1.6 billion; the second year of their famous sequestration, $2 billion. This is all a charade.

This is what the Times wrote after the brief introduction:

> This is a moment for immediate action to reopen the government's doors, not the beginning of a conversation Republicans spurned when they lacked the leverage of a shutdown.
>
> [Republicans] have refused to negotiate over the Senate's budget, they have refused to negotiate over the President's budget, and they have refused to negotiate to make the health law more efficient. . . . The two sides will eventually have to reach a reckoning on long-term economic issues, but the time to do so is not while dangling over an abyss.

Democrats are willing to negotiate but won't negotiate with a gun to our heads. We say to our Republican colleagues: End this irresponsible government shutdown. Stop your reckless threats of a default on the Nation's obligations. Then Democrats will negotiate over anything, anything our Republican colleagues wish to negotiate.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader in recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. We are now in the second week of a government shutdown that nobody claims to want.

Democrats say it is unreasonable to ask for any changes or delays to ObamaCare. Republicans, we think the ObamaCare rollout has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt just how reasonable a delay is. If anybody had any doubts about the need to delay this thing, those doubts should have been allayed this weekend when the administration admitted its Web site wasn't working and took it offline for repairs.

Delay and basic fairness are what Republicans are asking for at this point, not exactly the Sun and the Moon.

Another thing Republicans have been saying is that if we can't agree on a bill to fund the entire government, let's at least pass the most urgent pieces of it. Let's at least pass the parts we can all agree on. That is exactly what the House has begun to do.

Over the past several days, the two parties in the House have responsibly come together and passed no fewer than eight bills to fund things such as the Coast Guard, the Guard and Reserve, and programs for veterans. In other words, the House has quietly shown the two parties aren't completely at odds in this debate and that there is, in fact, some common ground here. Slowly but surely the House has approved funding for folks who shouldn't get caught in the middle of a political impasse such as this. They have done it on a bipartisan basis.

Over the weekend the House passed a bill that said a government shutdown doesn't affect the free exercise of religion on military bases, and 184 Democrats agreed. Another bill said government workers shouldn't have to wonder how they are going to pay their bills during a shutdown, and 189 Democrats agreed with that.

The bill to fund FEMA drew 23 Democrats. The one to fund NIH drew 25; national parks, 23.

Let's be clear here that the problem isn't the House. There is actually a fair amount of agreement among Republicans and Democrats over in the House, that Republicans and lawmakers have a duty and a responsibility that rises above the politics of the moment to fund things such as veterans, cancer trials, the National Guard, and reservists in every State.

The problem is the Senate.

I know Democrats don't like it, but the American people have given us divided government for two elections in a row. They gave us a Republican House, and they gave us a Democratic Senate.

This means negotiation isn't a luxury; it is a necessity. Until Senate Democrats accept reality, these crises will only be harder to resolve. So I would suggest they start thinking about how they might start playing a constructive role in the crisis and in the challenges that lie ahead. There is a time for politics, and there is a time for sitting down like adults and working things out. Republicans are ready and willing to negotiate. We invite Senate Democrats to join us.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me start off by acknowledging an article which appeared in today's New York Times attributed to the Senate Chaplain, Dr. Barry Black, who led us in prayer to open the Senate's session. It is entitled ''Give Us This Day, Our Daily Senate Scolding,'' and it goes on to talk about the prayers which Dr. Black, our Senate Chaplain, has offered during the course of the last week during the government shutdown. They say in the article the morning invocation has turned into a daily conscience check for the 100 men and women of the Senate.

The article points out that in the course of one of his prayers Dr. Black said:

Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism. Forgive them the blunders they have committed.

I can't match his baritone voice and delivery when it comes to these prayers, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article as a tribute to our Senate Chaplain who has been given the awesome responsibility to prove the power of prayer during the midst of a government shutdown.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 2013]

GIVE US THIS DAY, OUR DAILY SENATE SCOLDING

(By Jeremy W. Peters)

WASHINGTON.—The disapproval comes from angry constituents, baffled party elders and colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. But nowhere have senators found criticism more personal or immediate than right inside their own chamber every morning when the chaplain delivers the opening prayer.

''Save us from the madness,'' the chaplain, a Seventh-day Adventist, former Navy rear admiral and collector of brightly colored bow ties named Barry C. Black, said one day late last week as he warmed up into what became an epic ministerial scolding.

''We acknowledge our transgressions, our shortcomings, our smugness, our selfishness and our pride,'' he went on, his baritone voice filling the room. ''Deliver us from the hypocrisy of attempting to sound reasonable while being unreasonable.''

So it has gone every day for the last week when Mr. Black, who has been the Senate's official man of the cloth for 10 years, has taken one of the more rote rituals on Capitol Hill—the morning invocation—and turned it into a daily conscience check for the 100 men and women of the United States Senate.

Inside the tempestuous Senate chamber, where debate has degenerated into daily name-calling—the Tea Party as a band of nihilists and extortionists, and Democrats as socialists who want to force their will on the American people—Mr. Black's words manage to cut through as powerful and persuasive.

During his prayer on Friday, the day after officers from the United States Capitol Police shot and killed a woman who had used her car as a battering ram, Mr. Black noted that the officers were not being paid because of the government shutdown.

Then he turned his attention back to the senators. ''Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism,'' he said. ''Forgive them the blunders they have committed.''

Senator Harry Reid, the pugnacious majority leader who has called his Republican adversaries anarchists, rumps and hostage takers, took note. As Mr. Black spoke, Mr. Reid, whose head was bowed low in prayer, broke his concentration and looked straight up at the chaplain.

''Following the suggestion in the prayer of Admiral Black,'' the majority leader said after the invocation, seeming genuinely contrite, ''I think we've all here in the Senate kind of lost the aura of Robert Byrd,'' one of the historical giants of the Senate, who prized gentility and compromise.

In many ways, Mr. Black, 65, is like any other employee of the federal government who is fed up with lawmakers' inability to resolve the political crisis that has kept the government closed for almost a week. He is not being paid. His Bible study classes, which he holds for senators and their staff members four times a week, have been canceled until further notice.

His is a nonpartisan position, one of just a few in the Senate, and he prefers to leave his political leanings vague. He was chosen in 2003 by Senator Bill Frist, a Tennessee Republican who was the majority leader at the time, from a group of finalists selected by a bipartisan committee. Before that he ministered in the Navy for nearly 30 years.

''I use a biblical perspective to decide my beliefs about various issues,'' Mr. Black said in an interview in his office suite on the third floor of the Capitol. ''Let's just say I'm liberal on some and conservative on others. But it's obvious the Bible condemns some things in a very forceful and overt way, and I would go along with that condemnation.''

Last year, he participated in the Hoodies on the Hill rally to draw attention to the shooting death of Trayvon Martin. In 2007, after objections from groups that did not like the idea of a Senate chaplain appearing alongside political figures, he canceled a speech he was scheduled to give at an evangelical event featuring, among others, Tony Perkins of the conservative Focus on the Family and the columnist and author Ann Coulter.

Mr. Black, who is the first black Senate chaplain as well as its first Seventh-day Adventist, grew up in public housing in Baltimore, an experience he draws on in his sermons and writings, including a 2006 autobiography, ''From the Hood to the Hill.''

In his role as chaplain, a position that has existed since 1789, he acts as a sounding board, spiritual adviser and ethical counselor to members of the Senate. When he prays each day, he said, he recites the names of all 100 senators and their spouses, reading them from a laminated index card.

It is not uncommon for him to have 125 people at his Bible study gatherings or 20 to 30 senators at his weekly prayer breakfast. He officiates weddings for Senate staff members. He performs hospital visitations. And he has been at the side of senators when they have died, most recently Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii in December.

He tries to use his proximity to the senators—and the fact that for at least one minute every morning, his is the only voice they hear—to break through on issues that he feels are especially urgent. Lately, he said, they seem to be paying attention.

''I remember once talking about self-inflicted wounds—that captured the imagination of some of our lawmakers,'' he said. ''Remember, my prayer is the first thing they hear every day. I have the opportunity, really, to frame the day in a special way.''

His words lately may be pointed, but his tone is always steady and calm.

''May they remember that all that is necessary for unintended catastrophic consequences is for good people to do nothing,'' he said the day of the shutdown deadline.

''Unless you empower our lawmakers,'' he prayed another day, ''they can comprehend their duty but not perform it.''

The House, which has its own chaplain, liked what it heard from Mr. Black so much that it invited him to give the invocation on Friday.

''I see us playing a very dangerous game,'' Mr. Black said as he sat in his office the other day. ''It's like the showdown at the O.K. Corral. Who's going to blink first? So I can't help but have some of this spill over into my prayer. Because you're hoping that something will get through and that cooler heads will prevail.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I picked up the newspaper, at least went online to look at the newspapers from Illinois this morning, and two stories jumped right off the page. One was in the Bloomington Pantagraph. What a great story it is and makes me so proud to be from the Midwest and to represent people who are, by their very nature, pretty darned extraordinary. It is a story that comes out of Lexington, IL, about an event that happened yesterday, and I will quote just a bit of it.

More than 60 area farmers, truckers and their families gathered north of Lexington on Sunday morning to pay back a friend who had helped them out at one time or another during his 71-year lifetime. Some 16 combines harvested more than 300 acres of corn as friends of Dave Thomas brought in Thomas' last harvest. Thomas died of a heart attack on July 22 and his wife Sharon and four sons, decided to end the family's farm operations.

The article went on to say how it broke the family's heart to give up this family farm, but these neighbors pitched in. They wanted to harvest David Thomas' land and to make sure that last crop was brought in for his family. It is the kind of compassion and caring and family and community which we see in many States, but I see over and over in my home State of Illinois.

This is not unique. It happens often, and every time it does it is worthy of note because it is such a special comment on the people of this great Nation and their caring for their neighbors.

The area farmers in Chenoa, not too far from Lexington, are planning a similar harvest operation for another neighbor, David Harrison, this morning. Dave passed away last week.

Time and again these farm families put aside their own physical comfort, their own daily schedules, their own lives to help one another. It is such a wonderful comment on this great Nation that we call home and the area I am so proud to represent.

The second article that jumped off the page after I read this came out of Kansas—Wichita, KS—and it quotes Tim Peterson. He is a wheat farmer. I am not as familiar with wheat as I am corn and soybeans, but he started talking about the problems he is running into. His problems are created by us because Tim doesn't have access to vital agricultural reports. They are casualties of the Federal Government shutdown. We stopped publishing this information, and farmers such as Tim

Peterson and others are forced to make some very important family decisions, some important financial decisions without the necessary information.

These reports can alert them to shortfalls in overseas markets or if there is a wide swing in acres planted, both of which might prompt U.S. growers to plant extra crops to meet demand or hang on to a harvest a little longer to get a better price.

Here are these farmers across the Midwest who have worked hard to reach this point in the harvest where they can make enough money to live and to plant another year, to sustain their families and communities around them, and they have a problem. The problem is the politicians in Washington who want to shut down the government.

What a contrast: farmers who rallied in Lexington, IL, for the family of a fallen farmer, to show they would stand by him through thick and thin and help him out—at least his family out through this adversity—and then this article and story in Kansas, where the Congressmen and Senators sent to Washington to do their job and to provide the basic information for these farmers have failed and in failing have made it much more difficult for these farmers.

Two articles in the morning papers from the central part of the United States of America, which brings home to me the graphic human side of this government shutdown. Something else brought it home personally. When HARRY REID, our majority leader, announced we weren't going to have votes on Saturday or Sunday, I took the opportunity to get out of town and I raced off to be with my grandkids.

I have two twin grandchildren, 22 months old, and I just love them to pieces. I thought getting away with them is exactly what I need, to get out of this town and to get my mind straight after a tough political week. We had a ball. We did the normal things one would expect: going to the park and reading ''Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear?'' and all the things that are fun for a grandfather.

There were a couple moments, though—you see, they are almost 2 years old, and there were a couple moments during the weekend where one of them would lose it for just a little while and start crying and screaming uncontrollably and saying the word ''no'' over and over again and unable to express themselves because they just don't have the vocabulary to tell us what is on their minds. In those moments I felt as though I was back in Washington again.

The terrible twos temper tantrums sounded like Congress—people shouting no, screaming uncontrollably, and unable to express what they are doing and why they are doing it, and that is where we find ourselves today.

On the morning talk shows yesterday, on Sunday, a number of leaders came to speak, and of course everybody was focused on Speaker BOEHNER because he is the captain of the ship when it comes to the government shutdown, but it was interesting to me that what guided this government shutdown last week—ObamaCare, the health care reform bill—they were not talking about so much anymore. It has been launched, and 9 million people across America have visited the Web site because they are interested in finding health insurance maybe for the first time in their lives or health insurance they can afford—9 million.

Because so many have come to these Web sites, the Republican leader is right, we have had trouble getting them moving forward. It will take a few days to adjust to this volume of people coming on board to find out whether this insurance exchange can help them, their family or the business. The good news for my colleague Senator MCCONNELL, from Kentucky, is that his State has been a real success story, with 8,000 people having already signed up in Kentucky for health insurance on the insurance exchange of ObamaCare.

I hope Senator MCCONNELL and Senator RAND PAUL take some pride in the fact that now 8,000—at least 8,000—Kentuckians have health insurance they can afford and they can trust, some of them for the first time in their lives. When I hear this news, I wonder how these Senators from Kentucky and some other States can say we want to repeal this, we want to get rid of this.

What are they going to tell those 8,000 families who finally have health insurance for the first time? Big mistake. Sorry. Go back to the marketplace where you have no health insurance protection. That is hardly the response Americans want to hear in Kentucky, Illinois, in Maine or any other State.

What we are trying to do with ObamaCare, the health care reform act, is to open up an opportunity for 40 to 50 million Americans to have health insurance they can afford for the first time in their lives. What we have heard from the other side of the aisle is: Repeal it. Defund it. Delay it. Do anything you can to stop it. Stop it.

You know why they want to stop it? Because they understand that once people's appetites are whetted for health care insurance they can afford and insurance where they can protect their families, there is no turning back. We are at a point in history, much as we were with the creation of Social Security and Medicare, where we are offering to families across America something they could not do by themselves and something they will value very much as part of their families and their future, and that is what is driving this fear on the other side of the aisle. That is what is driving the government shutdown.

What is worse is October 17, the next deadline, and it is not that far away. In another 9 or 10 days we are going to face a debt ceiling expiration. The debt ceiling is basically America's mortgage. We have to extend our mortgage. We borrow money to manage our government, to fight wars, to pay our military, to do the most basic things. When we borrow that money, we have to have authorization from the government. That is the debt ceiling.

Many of the same Senators and Congressmen who voted for this spending now will not vote to pay the bill. That is akin to eating the big meal at the restaurant and, when the waiter brings the check, saying: I ain't paying. How long would that last? That is what many are suggesting when they say we are not going to extend the debt ceiling. They have eaten the meal. They just don't want to pay the bill.

It would be the first time in the history of the United States we would default on our national debt. The first time we would basically violate the full faith and credit of the United States of America. It has its consequences. The last time the tea party did this, America's credit rating suffered. What happens when our credit rating suffers? The interest rates we pay go up. Taxpayers are paying more to China and countries that loan us money than they are paying to educate children, to build roads or do medical research.

Here we go again. Another threat by the Speaker that we are going to default on our national debt again. They threatened it 2 years ago, and they have come back again—the tea party. This is totally irresponsible.

I read the newspapers from different countries and they look at the United States and shake their head and they wonder how this country, which many say—and I can certainly see the reason for it—is one of the leaders in the world, can find itself in this manufactured political crisis again and again and again. It is like the temper tantrums of the terrible twos when we hear this. We think it is totally unnecessary. We have to help these kids grow up and get through it. America has to grow up and stand and say to Congress: It is time for you to grow up and stand and do the right thing for the future of this country.

I hope we can do this, and I hope we can do it together in a bipartisan fashion. This shutdown of the Federal Government should end today. The Speaker has before him a continuing resolution which he could pass, could pass in a heartbeat, and the government would be extended. The farmer out in Kansas would have the information he needs, the medical researcher would be back to work at the National Institutes of Health, and all of the agencies of the government would be functioning for the good of the American people. That is what we were sent to do. There are no excuses and no political reasons not to.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator

from Illinois, the distinguished majority whip, for bringing up Chaplain Barry Black's name and the article that appeared in the New York Times. I know Senator DURBIN and I do a lot of things together. One of those things is just about every Wednesday morning we attend the Senate Prayer Breakfast. Replete through all of Barry's prayers at that breakfast is always one word, and that is ''humility.'' I think the message in that article in the New York Times and the message in the prayers in the last 7 or 8 days in the Senate and the message to all of us right now is that we need to grasp a little humility and find common ground among consternation and move this country forward.

To that end, I want to make my suggestion, for what it is worth, and I want to make mine as an inspiration with Senator COLLINS, the other Senator from the State of Maine who last week made her proposal. If we can't find common ground with the arguments we have today, let's proffer a new proposal to give us a chance to solve our problem.

SUSAN COLLINS made a great suggestion, to replace the medical device tax with other revenue so it doesn't cut the revenue and to get back to sequestration but only by cutting defense agencies, not by cutting across the board. That made a lot of sense. It provides a way to absorb those cuts but does so in a professional way.

So I come to the floor in a Robert Frost moment. You know the poem:

> ''Two roads diverged in a yellow wood. . . . I took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference.''

We have been traveling down the wrong road for far too long. We are here today, in large measure, arguing over a CR we shouldn't have to be arguing over. Had we been doing our appropriations and doing our budgets over the last 4 years, the money would have been spent, the regular order would have been in place, the fiscal year moneys would have been appropriated, and there would be no need for a CR.

There is bipartisan responsibility for not having done a budget or an appropriations act. The leadership, obviously, controls the floor, so they can bring the appropriations act forward and that is their responsibility. But we have also cried out on our side for a budget. Year after year, let's have a budget. Now we have a budget, one approved by the House and one approved by the Senate, but an inability to go to conference because we can't get agreement on preconditions. Once again, this is another situation of not negotiating over something that is important to the American people.

So I have a suggestion, a suggestion that two-thirds of this Senate agreed to in the budget debate we had in March, a decision that 20 States have exercised in our country that has made them better, a decision the State of Israel made 2 or 3 years ago when they got into such dire financial conditions and went to the World Bank for suggestions; that is, let's force our CR and add to it a simple resolution that changes our way of doing business to a biennial budget and appropriations act, where we force ourselves to appropriate over 2 years and not 1, and make those appropriations in the odd-numbered years so that in the even-numbered years we do only oversight.

It would make a lot of difference for the American people if we were arguing over not how much bacon we were bringing home but how much money we were saving through oversight, savings, and fiscal accountability. I have introduced that legislation, along with Senator SHAHEEN—a Democrat from New Hampshire and a Governor who ran a State under a biennial budget. It makes sense, it is humble, it is the right way to do business, and it ends this necessity of having continuing resolutions at the last minute because we didn't do our job.

Let's face it. We are here today in the conundrum we are in because we did not do our job. We did not pass a budget and go to a conference committee, we didn't have appropriations acts, so we are doing a continuing resolution into a new fiscal year. That is no way to run the greatest country on the face of this Earth. Four years and running we have shirked our responsibility. It is time for a new day in the Senate. It is time for a biennial budget. It worked for Israel. If it worked for 20 States, it will work for us. It establishes priorities, it ends waste, fraud, and abuse, and it brings about good decisions.

Last night on ''60 Minutes,'' Senator TOM COBURN from Oklahoma was featured, and the feature was about SSI disability and the fact that we now pay $135 billion a year in SSI disability payments—a trebling of those costs in just a few years—and fully 25 to 40 percent we know is fraudulent. Twenty-five to forty percent is $40 to $60 billion. You can do a lot with $40 to $60 billion. That is where transparency and oversight works.

There is nobody better than the Senator from Oklahoma in terms of oversight and nobody more humble than the Senator from Oklahoma, but when he knows he is right, he is going to work hard to do what is right, and that is what all of us should be doing.

Referring to the Senator from Oklahoma, I go back to the Workforce Investment Act, which Senator MURRAY and I are working very hard to bring to the floor. In that, Senator COBURN found forty-four duplicative job training programs in nine different agencies—over and over again. We are appropriating money forty-four different times to nine different agencies to do workforce training when we really only ought to be doing one. If we were budgeting on a 2-year basis and doing other oversight in even-numbered years, there would be no limit to the successes we could have, the transparency we could enforce, the agreements we could come to, and the lack of cliff management we are in today.

The debt ceiling we face in about 10 days is a debt ceiling we face because we are having to borrow more money to run our government. We are having to borrow more money to run our government because we are not doing fiscal accountability, we are not doing appropriating, and we are going to continue for that to grow and grow.

As a businessman and a saver, I know what the time value of money is. The time value of money means that if you put away a little bit of money every year and save for your kids' education, for your health care, or whatever it might be, when the time comes and you need it, you will have it. But I also know what the time cost of money is: when you are borrowing money to pay off borrowed money—and that is where we are in the United States of America today. So that is why this debt ceiling crisis is such a big issue.

I would submit, and humbly, that the Shaheen-Isakson legislation that forces us to do our regular order of business of appropriating, forces us to budget, and forces us to do it every year puts us back to the kind of discipline and job responsibility we really need around this place. Instead of arguing about what we can't agree upon, we ought to find common ground and run our country's household the way American families run their households. If we had to do here in Washington what every American family has to do year in and year out, this place would be a whole lot different.

It is time that we find humility, find common ground, do what 20 of the 50 States do, do what the State of Israel has done, and do what 67 Senators said we ought to do in the budget debate back in March; that is, pass a biennial and appropriations act, end this foolishness, and gain back some of the humility we richly deserve.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 2 extra minutes to pay tribute to a physician in my county.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The further remarks of Mr. ISAKSON are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his call on this place to get back to regular order and to bridge our differences. I think it is an important one and a noble and hopefully easy request for us to ultimately follow.

I came down here this weekend to talk about a young woman in Bridgeport, CT, who is at the epicenter of the fallout of this shutdown, and I wanted to come back down on Monday to tell her story very briefly once again because the way a lot of trade papers

cover this shutdown makes it seem as if this is just about politics. If you listen to some commentators and some members of the tea party crowd in the House of Representatives, they will tell you that what we are going to find in this shutdown is that everybody is going to learn that the government really doesn't do that much and it is not that big a deal if it goes away for a couple of months, a couple of weeks, a couple of days.

What we are finding as we enter week 2 of this shutdown is we have now moved past the point where the collapse of the government is just an inconvenience. It is now ruining lives. I wish Melanie Rhodes was the exception, but she is increasingly becoming the rule across the country. The Presiding Officer heard me tell her story this weekend, but I am going to do it again.

Melanie was homeless a couple years ago. She lives in the southwestern portion of Connecticut. She had hit really hard times, but she decided to pull her life together—not the least of the reasons being that she has a little boy. She has a son Malachi. Malachi was born about 2 months premature, so he was born with some developmental disabilities that luckily, because of a government program, were caught early on. The program is called Birth to Three. In Connecticut, it is our early intervention program. Most States have it. It is one of the programs that are going to run out of funds pretty soon if we don't start turning back on the faucet to State governments.

But even more important to Melanie was that through that early intervention screening program that figured out Malachi needed a little bit of extra help, they got him into a Head Start Program. He wasn't even 1 year old when he started the Head Start Program. Today he is 3, and he is making incredible progress. He has some serious issues. He is just now learning how to communicate with some signs he has been taught. But he is doing better and doing better every single day.

On Monday night of last week Melanie stayed up all night watching to see whether the government was still going to be operating because she knew the Bridgeport Head Start Program works on a fiscal year that matches ours. So if the government shut down on October 1, the check wouldn't come to Bridgeport Head Start and they would have to send 1,000 kids home.

But she also knew her life was starting to get brighter in other ways as well. She had been looking for a job for a long time and she had done everything we asked of her. She had applied to everybody she could think of, from Walmart to Walgreens to McDonald's, and hadn't found anything until a bus company decided to hire her as a driver. She had gone through her training; she was just waiting for her background check to come back. It was going to be OK and she was going to start work. But, of course, the only way she could start work was if she had care for her child. As she has said so eloquently over the past week, she can't just leave Malachi with anybody because he is a kid with substantial difficulties and his caregivers need to know how to take care of him. So if there is no Head Start, there is no school for Malachi, he regresses in terms of the progress he has made, and she can't start her job. Her family essentially collapses around her simply because this place can't pass a budget. That is what is happening to Melanie, and she says simply this: We need our government and our businesses open. Why should we suffer and be held hostage while government can't do what they need to do?

Her story can be repeated thousands of times across Connecticut. I think I saw today that about 18,000 Head Start slots are going to be closed by the end of this week. Unfortunately, her story is not the exception; it is becoming the rule. This is what this shutdown means. It is not playacting. It is real.

As I watched some of the shows over the weekend, I heard a familiar refrain from our Republican colleagues. They said: Yeah, we have this demand that we want the health care law delayed or repealed or defunded in order to get the government up and operating, but really it is the Democrats. It is HARRY REID, it is President Obama who won't sit down and negotiate. If they would just sit down and negotiate, then we could end this whole thing.

I understand how some people might watch and think to themselves, why won't the Democrats just sit down and talk about this? So I would like to address this claim that the only thing stopping us from reopening the government is Democrats won't talk to Republicans. I want to address that in five simple ways.

First, I would make the point that every single one of my colleagues has made: We have already talked. What we thought we were talking about was a continuing resolution, a temporary budget that would keep the government operating for about 6 weeks. A lot of Democratic critics actually would argue that we didn't really negotiate that well over that particular issue because in the end the Senate passed a budget with a particular number for the continuing resolution, the House passed a budget with a particular number for the continuing resolution, and the difference was pretty substantial, but in the end the Senate just decided to go with the House number. We didn't settle in between. We didn't settle closer to ours or closer to theirs. We just took the House number. So we kind of feel, on the subject at hand, which is the continuing resolution, that the negotiation has already happened and we gave the House everything they wanted. There is not much more to negotiate after you give them everything when it comes to the bottom-line number in the continuing resolution.

Second, it is kind of hard to have a negotiation when only one side is making demands. We don't have any demands in this negotiation. All we want is for the things that normally happen to continue to happen—i.e., we want the government to stay open on the exact same terms the government was open last week and the week before. We want the country to pay our bills just as we have paid our bills for a generation. It is only Republicans—and, frankly, not all Republicans. Most Republicans in the Senate are not making these demands. It is mainly a small handful in the House and the Senate who say: In order to keep the government open, we want the health care law defunded or repealed or delayed.

It is difficult to have a negotiation when all we want is the status quo.

It is kind of like if two people lived in a house and one of them said: I am going to take the roof off the house if you don't do what I want. You wouldn't really negotiate that. That is an unreasonable demand. The roof just needs to be there. It is something that, for good reason, is normally not the subject of debate or negotiation. And you wouldn't settle for half. You wouldn't allow your roommate to take half the roof off. The roof just needs to be there, and if you are angry with me about something or you want to talk about something, let's do it while the roof is still on.

We can't negotiate over the government just operating. We can't negotiate over whether or not we are going to pay our bills. We don't want anything. We just want things to happen as they have happened in the past.

Third, this place just can't operate if in order to keep the government open for 6 weeks we have to satisfy everybody's personal political agenda.

I also said this weekend I have things I believe in very strongly. I represent Sandy Hook, CT. I submit I feel just as strongly about background checks as the Senator from Texas does about the repeal of the health care bill. But it would be unreasonable for me to say I am not going to vote for a budget because I don't get my way on background checks or immigration reform or tax fairness or whatever it may be that I care about outside the confines of the continuing resolution. If all 100 Senators had to get their particular nonbudgetary political points settled as a requirement of passing a continuing resolution, this place would absolutely collapse.

Maybe that is what some people want. Maybe some people want government to collapse and the government to shut down. But when I hear people talk on this floor, I take them at face value, that that is not what they want. Ultimately we all cannot get what we need all the time.

Fourth, you normally need to compromise when you do not have consensus, when you do not have agreement, when both the Senate and the House do not have the majority of

their Members agreeing to the exact same thing. In that case you need to negotiate because clearly we do not have consensus, and so we have to get two sides together to find consensus.

We have consensus. We have a bill the majority of Senators supports, the majority of House Members supports, the President is ready to sign the minute it gets to his desk. That is what is referred to as a clean continuing resolution, a bill that would keep the government operating for the next 6 weeks on the same terms it was operating beforehand. The only reason why that is not law today is because Speaker BOEHNER will not bring that up for a vote in the House of Representatives. But it reportedly enjoys the support of more than 216 Members of the House, which is what you need today to get that bill passed. It has already passed the Senate.

Last, as Senator DURBIN talked about, what Republicans are demanding as their condition to keep the government up and operating is no less than the repeal of the signature achievement of President Obama's first term, the most important bill I have ever worked on, the most important vote I have ever cast. That is the health care law which is today saving millions of dollars for senior citizens in their Medicare benefits and right now is providing a lifeline to millions of Americans who need cheaper insurance.

It is why poll after poll tells you that although people are still split on whether they agree with the exact prescription for our health care economy laid out in the bill we passed, they sure as heck do not want us to repeal the law. By about a 2-to-1 margin people say don't repeal the law, let it go into effect, give it a shot. It is also why by a 3-to-1 margin people do not agree with shutting down the government over the repeal of the health care law. It is why 9 million people have gone onto the Federal health care reform Web site to see what their options are. It is why, as Senator DURBIN said, even in States such as Kentucky, people are signing up by the thousands. In the first day of Connecticut's exchange we had more visits to the Web site than we had in the entire month previous. People are desperate for lower cost health care out there. Sick people and families with sick children have been waiting lifetimes to finally be able to get insurance for their loved ones.

People need this health care reform law to go into effect. It is simply not true, as the Senator from Texas and others have said, that people do not want this law. They have shown us how badly and desperately they need it by the flood of interest in the exchanges over the first week, and in poll after poll the American people say loudly they do not want this repealed.

It is hard to get major social change passed in this town. The Founding Fathers intentionally set up a process by which something such as health care reform seems nearly impossible. That is why it took 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed that we guarantee access to our health care system for all Americans for it to happen.

You have a lot of chances for that idea to crater. You need both Chambers to pass the exact same bill, you need a President willing to sign it, you need the courts to uphold it, and then you need the electorate to confirm it when everybody who voted for it stands for reelection again.

The reason why we are implementing the health care law today and the reason why most Americans want it to go forward is we passed every single one of those tests. For the first time in a hundred years the exact same proposal to reform our health care system passed with a majority of both the House and the Senate and was signed by our President. The Supreme Court reviewed the law and stamped that it was constitutional. Then this President and every Member of the Senate who voted for the health care bill went out to stand for reelection in 2012, based on the promise they would continue to implement the law. The President was reelected by a resounding margin and every Senator in this Chamber who voted for the health care law won reelection. The bill passed, the courts upheld it, voters confirmed their original choices. People want this law.

We already compromised on the amount in the continuing resolution. It cannot be much of a negotiation when all we want is for the government to stay up and operating and for us to pay our bills. This place cannot work if, every time you negotiate a budget, everybody has to have their own political priorities taken care of.

We do not need to negotiate because we already have a bill that enjoys the support of both Chambers and will be signed by the President if only the House of Representatives will call it for a vote. The idea that people do not want the health care law simply is not borne out either by the polls or by people's conduct on the exchanges over the last 2 weeks.

Melanie Rhodes is waiting for an answer from us. Malachi needs to get back into preschool, ASAP. He is a little autistic boy who, every single day he sits home by himself, is marching a little bit more quickly backward off the progress gained through this program, funded not by government but by all of us, because we thought it was important that little boys with autism growing up in poor families with moms who used to be homeless should have a chance at success in life. Every day we continue to reverse our collective decision as a society that Malachi should get some help, he goes backward and backward. His mom, to whom we said: You know what. Pick yourself up by your bootstraps, do the right thing for yourself and your child—she did it. She got him into Head Start, she found a job, and now because that program is shut down, she likely will not be able to start her job. He moves backward. She moves backward.

It is not because Democrats will not negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for those eloquent and very powerful remarks, and I will take advantage of his presence here to perhaps engage in a colloquy, if he agrees to doing so, asking him, because he spoke so wonderfully about that one family, whether he has seen, as I have seen, that story of deprivation and setback duplicated on a bigger scale throughout our State?

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for the question. As he knows, there are a thousand different children in that one Head Start Program alone who have essentially lost access to childcare. This week I think the number is, as the Senator knows, about 18,000 kids across the country who will lose access to health care. As we have seen, it has already had a big effect in our State because we have so many defense manufacturers. Some of the initial furloughs to civilians have caused a loss of work among families who could not afford it. We are seeing over and over how this shutdown trickles down.

Frankly, it is affecting the very families who cannot afford to miss a paycheck, the very families who cannot make quick arrangements to find somebody else to take care of their autistic child. As the Senator has seen and knows, this is affecting, in our small State, thousands and thousands of residents who did not have a lot of wiggle room when it came to the support that was standing around them due to programs run by the Federal Government.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. In fact, I think statistics show more than a thousand children and their families are directly affected by this shutdown in Head Start alone. Seniors, in terms of nutritional assistance—I do not know whether my good friend and very distinguished colleague from Connecticut has seen that phenomenon as well in Bridgeport and throughout our State of Connecticut and would care to remark on it?

Mr. MURPHY. I would say to the Senator, we have had this effort on behalf of Republicans to kind of pick and choose which parts of the government they are going to reopen. As I noted here on the floor in objecting to one of these piecemeal requests, that exact program my colleague referred to, the senior nutrition program which provides meals to very low-income and often very frail seniors who are getting them either at a senior center or delivered to them through the Meals On Wheels Program, was not initially one of the programs that Republicans chose to reopen.

That is why we object to this piecemeal approach. It is bad policy to allow

for a wing of this House or the other House to pick and choose which people they help, leaving on the outside, as the Senator mentioned, some who are very deserving, such as very frail and often very hungry senior citizens.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. What is needed, I think my colleague would agree, is an end to the shutdown, reopening government—not for the sake of reopening the government but to provide these vital services and assurance that the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the history of the world, is going to continue paying its debts. Then and only then have a conference and a compromise and collaboration on what our overall budget should be with smart spending cuts and increases in revenue that close some loopholes and subsidies. I think that was the thrust, was it not, of what my colleague from Connecticut had to say?

Mr. MURPHY. I think the majority leader made it very clear he is willing to sit down to talk about everything and anything the Republicans want to discuss but not with a gun to our heads. Let's reopen the government. Then, as we as a Chamber have been willing to do over and over, let's sit down in a budget conference with everything part of that budget on the table.

But this just cannot happen every time that one faction of one House does not get their way, they shut down the government until their particular demands are remediated.

As I was saying, Senator BLUMENTHAL and I care deeply about the issue of background checks. He worked his entire life on this issue. But given his life's work, he is still not coming to this Chamber and demanding until he gets his way on that issue, which is of such vital importance to his constituents and mine, that he will shut down the government.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. In fact, what is happening is a small fraction of one House of the Congress—in fact, in the House of Representatives, one small group of rightwing extremists, whatever they may characterize themselves as—is holding hostage the entire House of Representatives, the entire Congress, the entire government, even though it is only one branch and one part of a branch. I think Senator MURPHY has explained well our view—and our constituents in Connecticut need to know it—we are willing to compromise and collaborate but not with hostage-taking tactics that in effect say to everyone else in the country: It is our way or the highway.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut for speaking so clearly and persuasively on his topic, and for giving the impact of this government shutdown a human face and a human voice. The story he told from Bridgeport has indeed thousands of others just like it across the State of Connecticut, across the country, who are suffering the real hardship and harm of this shutdown.

We can talk in the abstract here. Our rhetoric may carry a little bit beyond these four walls. But the real-life consequences belong to them. Both Senator MURPHY and I have seen them in real life and that is why we are here to advocate and fight for those people of Connecticut, in Bridgeport, those families who depend on Head Start, those seniors who depend on nutritional assistance—he has told their story, and that of Sikorsky, so well today in this Chamber. These men and women, and their families, do great work for our Nation on their assembly lines.

Black Hawk helicopters are the best-made helicopters in the Nation. They perform rescue operations for our troops in Afghanistan. They medevac our Nation's warriors to places where they can be saved. They provide resupply and provisions. They are literally lifesaving vehicles in our war to keep America safe.

Those workers in Sikorsky were told late last week: You are done. You are furloughed. Do not report to work next week because 45 inspectors—civilian employees of the U.S. Department of Defense—are going to be furloughed. The 45 inspectors and 1,500 or 2,000 or more workers at Sikorsky who work on the Black Hawk helicopter assembly line, and other product assembly as well, were told they were going to be furloughed.

Senator MURPHY and I, and other members of our delegation, spoke with officials of the Department of Defense. We made our interpretation of the recently passed law clear to them and told them that it applies to employees of the Defense Contract Management Agency whose services were vital to certify and inspect those helicopters. We needed to keep the assembly lines at Sikorsky open in order to make sure that Black Hawk helicopters were continuing to be available to our military men and women who depend on them so vitally.

Those conversations—and I am sure others had them as well—with officials at the Department of Defense, along with the action of the House over the weekend, will make sure that all of the furloughed employees who work for the U.S. Government will eventually be paid.

Secretary Hagel was persuaded to do the right thing. I commend and thank Secretary Hagel for bringing back those employees, such as the 45 DCMA inspectors, who have to be there for the Department of Defense in order to take delivery of those helicopters, which, in turn, is necessary to keep the assembly line open and keep Sikorsky workers employed and on the job with the countless other hard-working men and women defense contractors across the United States.

I thank Secretary Hagel, but at the same time we need to recognize that for every Sikorsky helicopter situation, for every Fortune 500 corporation, and for every one of those big defense contractors, there are literally thousands of suppliers and small businesses that are continuing in uncertainty, and sometimes confusion, about what is happening here in Washington.

There are thousands of other businesses that depend on those suppliers because they provide the raw materials for the parts for the Sikorsky helicopters. The ripple effect and the ramifications pervade our economy and our society. The uncertainty creates harm and hardship that is immeasurable and perhaps irreparable.

The harm is not only to those workers who rightly have whiplash from being furloughed one day and being called back another and then being uncertain as to what impact this shutdown will ultimately have; there are suppliers and the countless other small businesses that cannot plan, cannot look ahead, cannot hire for the future, and sometimes they have to tell their workers: You are going to be furloughed. You cannot plan to buy a car or a new home or even the most minor things such as school supplies—or make other plans, for that matter.

Lives hang in the balance; lives are at stake. The real-life consequences are real and perhaps lasting for many Americans—not only the family who depends on Head Start or the senior nutrition assistance or the jobs in Sikorsky, but there are countless others whose lives also hang in the balance.

There is a solution to this impasse. Calmer minds, cooler heads, and common sense are beginning to reach a consensus that the House should be given a chance to vote, and that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, should enable that vote. He should very simply provide an opportunity to Republicans and Democrats—not singling out one side or the other—to come together on a bipartisan basis.

Who cares who is in the minority of that vote as long as it reopens the government and provides Head Start, nutritional assistance, and enables some certainty that permits our economy to move forward rationally and sensibly so we can recover from the great recession? We need to grow jobs and enable the economy to reach some measure of prosperity. We all have an interest in that outcome. We should all be pulling for America. We should all be assured that the greatest nation in the history of the world will leave no doubt that it will pay its bills on time and that it will fulfill its obligations on time, just as we have for every year in the history of this great Nation.

There is a way to come together. I have heard from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the time has come to end this impasse. Simply let the House vote.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, all over this country the American people are outraged by what is going on here in Washington. They have a hard time understanding why rightwing extremists in the Republican Party in the House are able to shut down the U.S. Government, while paychecks are being denied to millions of Federal employees and, at the same time, services—in some cases desperately needed services—are being threatened for tens of millions of Americans. People are hurting and they wonder what is going on.

Let me say a few words regarding what, in my view, has, in fact, happened. From the beginning, some of my Republican colleagues are saying: We just need to talk. Let's compromise. A key point they neglect to make is that a major compromise has already taken place. The Democrats in the Senate—and I am an independent, as is the Presiding Officer, affiliated with the Democratic Caucus—decided to send a budget for a continuing resolution to the House, which, in my view, was a very, very weak budget, one that I am totally dissatisfied with, and I think most Members of the caucus are. It continues the budget at sequestration levels which will have a devastating impact on this country. It is a bad budget. But the reason the majority leader sent it over to the House was that he was of the understanding that the Speaker of the House had requested that type of budget, and that once that budget came over—once that CR came over—the House would agree to it. In fact, let me read from an article in the Washington Post today commenting on an ABC interview that Speaker BOEHNER did. The Washington Post says:

> In the ABC interview, Boehner tacitly acknowledged making a deal with Senate Democrats to avoid using the threat of a shutdown to attack ObamaCare in exchange for an agreement to maintain the deep cuts known as the sequester through the fall. He conceded that his rank and file forced him onto the path to shutdown by insisting on waging the fight over ObamaCare.

That was the Washington Post today.

What does that mean? It means that an agreement had been reached by the Speaker and the majority leader that if the Democrats accepted the very low budget number the Republicans wanted, there would be a clean continuing resolution. What this article points out—and what I think the Speaker has virtually acknowledged—is that despite his agreement with the majority leader here in the Senate, he couldn't carry it out because his extreme rightwing said: Thanks. You got us the budget we wanted, the CR we wanted. That is not enough. Now we want to end ObamaCare.

That is where we are today.

So anyone who comes forward and says: Why don't you talk? Why don't you compromise? The fact is—and I think the majority leader has made this point—he compromised far more than many of us felt comfortable with.

A compromise has already been reached. The Democrats accepted, in my view, a very bad and weak Republican budget. But it was done with the hope and the understanding that there would be a clean continuing resolution and that the U.S. Government would not be shut down. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 is that the other day the Speaker said on TV that there are not the votes to pass a clean CR. What I have been hearing here on the floor of the Senate and in the House is that we have Republicans who are not sympathetic to ObamaCare, they don't like ObamaCare, and they would like to defund ObamaCare. But they understand we don't shut down the U.S. Government. We don't threaten that for the first time in the history of the United States we may not pay our bills, be a deadbeat Nation, and drive our economy and our financial system, and perhaps the entire world's financial system, into a catastrophic area by not paying our bills. We believe that there are enough Republicans in the House to join with Democrats and pass a clean CR.

The President and the majority leader have both made this point: Have the vote. Have the vote, Mr. Speaker. Maybe you are right or maybe you are not. But we don't know until you have the vote. I urge, as I have before, that the Speaker of the House function as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and not as the speaker of the Republican Party.

The last point I wish to make touches on an article that appeared in yesterday's New York Times. It is a very important article because it really tells us who is behind this shutdown and what their motives are. If anybody thinks this government shutdown or the threats about not paying our bills and driving the world's economy into catastrophic areas are ideas that just occurred the other day, that a Senator just had this bright idea, they would be very mistaken. The fact is we have a growing rightwing movement in this country funded by some of the wealthiest people in America, including the Koch brothers, a family that has made their money in fossil fuels and are worth over $70 billion—$70 billion is their worth. They are worth $70 billion, and they have access to the best health care in the world. They have access to the best housing in the world. Their family members can go to the best colleges and universities in the world. Yet they are obsessed with, among other things, making sure 25 million Americans have no health insurance at all.

I am a strong supporter of a Medicare for all, a single-payer program. I don't think the Affordable Care Act went far enough. But to say the least, 20 million or 25 million Americans can finally have access to health insurance. They can go to the doctor when they need to go to the doctor. There are now no regulations that prevent them from getting care because of a preexisting condition. Can we imagine billionaires—billionaires—going to war against working people so they and their kids cannot get health insurance? I think that is just obscene. That is just obscene.

Let me quote from The New York Times article of yesterday. It is important that people understand that the fight against the Affordable Care Act is just the tip of the iceberg. We have families and billionaires such as the Koch brothers who not only want to see that we don't expand health insurance in this country, but they have a long list of issues they are going after. In fact, they want to repeal virtually every major piece of legislation passed in the last 80 years that protects the middle class, working families, women, children, the elderly, the sick, and the poor. That is their agenda. So it is not a question of opposing the extension of health insurance through ObamaCare; that is not enough for them. What they want to do is end Medicare as we know it right now, and transform it into a voucher system, that gives an elderly person who is dealing with cancer $8,000 and says: Good luck to you.

They want to make massive cuts in Medicaid. They don't want to expand Medicaid. They want massive cuts. They are very clear about wanting to end Social Security. They don't believe the Federal Government should be involved in retirement issues and Social Security.

One of the more amazing things these guys want to do—and many of our Republican colleagues apparently drank the lemonade on this issue—is to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. The Federal minimum wage now is $7.25 an hour. People can't live on that. But their idea is to get the Federal Government out of the minimum wage issue—no floor—so that if an employer in a hard-pressed area in Maine or in Vermont or in Michigan can pay people $4 an hour, they think that is freedom: People have the freedom to work for $4 an hour. We don't want a minimum wage.

So, in other words, these rightwing extremists and the big money behind them have a major agenda, of which repealing ObamaCare is just one small part.

Let me just quote, if I might, the New York Times article. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire New York Times article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 2013]

A FEDERAL BUDGET CRISIS MONTHS IN THE PLANNING

(By Sheryl Gay Stolberg and Mike McIntire)

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after President Obama started his second term, a loose-knit coalition of conservative activists led by former Attorney General Edwin Meese III

gathered in the capital to plot strategy. Their push to repeal Mr. Obama's health care law was going nowhere, and they desperately needed a new plan.

Out of that session, held one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed ''blueprint to defunding Obamacare,'' signed by Mr. Meese and leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups.

It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that had long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire federal government.

''We felt very strongly at the start of this year that the House needed to use the power of the purse,'' said one coalition member, Michael A. Needham, who runs Heritage Action for America, the political arm of the Heritage Foundation. ''At least at Heritage Action, we felt very strongly from the start that this was a fight that we were going to pick.''

Last week the country witnessed the fallout from that strategy: a standoff that has shuttered much of the federal bureaucracy and unsettled the nation.

To many Americans, the shutdown came out of nowhere. But interviews with a wide array of conservatives show that the confrontation that precipitated the crisis was the outgrowth of a long-running effort to undo the law, the Affordable Care Act, since its passage in 2010—waged by a galaxy of conservative groups with more money, organized tactics and interconnections than is commonly known.

With polls showing Americans deeply divided over the law, conservatives believe that the public is behind them. Although the law's opponents say that shutting down the government was not their objective, the activists anticipated that a shutdown could occur—and worked with members of the Tea Party caucus in Congress who were excited about drawing a red line against a law they despise.

A defunding ''tool kit'' created in early September included talking points for the question, ''What happens when you shut down the government and you are blamed for it?'' The suggested answer was the one House Republicans give today: ''We are simply calling to fund the entire government except for the Affordable Care Act/Obamacare.''

The current budget brinkmanship is just the latest development in a well-financed, broad-based assault on the health law, Mr. Obama's signature legislative initiative. Groups like Tea Party Patriots, Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks are all immersed in the fight, as is Club for Growth, a business-backed nonprofit organization. Some, like Generation Opportunity and Young Americans for Liberty, both aimed at young adults, are upstarts. Heritage Action is new, too, founded in 2010 to advance the policy prescriptions of its sister group, the Heritage Foundation.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort. A group linked to the Kochs, Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce, disbursed more than $200 million last year to nonprofit organizations involved in the fight. Included was $5 million to Generation Opportunity, which created a buzz last month with an Internet advertisement showing a menacing Uncle Sam figure popping up between a woman's legs during a gynecological exam.

The groups have also sought to pressure vulnerable Republican members of Congress with scorecards keeping track of their health care votes; have burned faux ''Obamacare cards'' on college campuses; and have distributed scripts for phone calls to Congressional offices, sample letters to editors and Twitter and Facebook offerings for followers to present as their own.

One sample Twitter offering—''Obamacare is a train wreck''—is a common refrain for Speaker John A. Boehner.

As the defunding movement picked up steam among outside advocates, Republicans who sounded tepid became targets. The Senate Conservatives Fund, a political action committee dedicated to ''electing true conservatives,'' ran radio advertisements against three Republican incumbents.

Heritage Action ran critical Internet advertisements in the districts of 100 Republican lawmakers who had failed to sign a letter by a North Carolina freshman, Representative Mark Meadows, urging Mr. Boehner to take up the defunding cause.

''They've been hugely influential,'' said David Wasserman, who tracks House races for the nonpartisan Cook Political Report. ''When else in our history has a freshman member of Congress from North Carolina been able to round up a gang of 80 that's essentially ground the government to a halt?''

On Capitol Hill, the advocates found willing partners in Tea Party conservatives, who have repeatedly threatened to shut down the government if they do not get their way on spending issues. This time they said they were so alarmed by the health law that they were willing to risk a shutdown over it. (''This is exactly what the public wants,'' Representative Michele Bachmann of Minnesota, founder of the House Tea Party Caucus, said on the eve of the shutdown.)

Despite Mrs. Bachmann's comments, not all of the groups have been on board with the defunding campaign. Some, like the Koch-financed Americans for Prosperity, which spent $5.5 million on health care television advertisements over the past three months, are more focused on sowing public doubts about the law. But all have a common goal, which is to cripple a measure that Senator Ted Cruz, a Texas Republican and leader of the defunding effort, has likened to a horror movie.

''We view this as a long-term effort,'' said Tim Phillips, the president of Americans for Prosperity. He said his group expected to spend ''tens of millions'' of dollars on a ''multifront effort'' that includes working to prevent states from expanding Medicaid under the law. The group's goal is not to defund the law.

''We want to see this law repealed,'' Mr. Phillips said.

A FAMILIAR TACTIC

The crowd was raucous at the Hilton Anatole, just north of downtown Dallas, when Mr. Needham's group, Heritage Action, arrived on a Tuesday in August for the second stop on a nine-city ''Defund Obamacare Town Hall Tour.'' Nearly 1,000 people turned out to hear two stars of the Tea Party movement: Mr. Cruz, and Jim DeMint, a former South Carolina senator who runs the Heritage Foundation.

''You're here because now is the single best time we have to defund Obamacare,'' declared Mr. Cruz, who would go on to rail against the law on the Senate floor in September with a monologue that ran for 21 hours. ''This is a fight we can win.''

Although Mr. Cruz is new to the Senate, the tactic of defunding in Washington is not. For years, Congress has banned the use of certain federal money to pay for abortions, except in the case of incest and rape, by attaching the so-called Hyde Amendment to spending bills.

After the health law passed in 2010, Todd Tiahrt, then a Republican congressman from Kansas, proposed defunding bits and pieces of it. He said he spoke to Mr. Boehner's staff about the idea while the Supreme Court, which upheld the central provision, was weighing the law's constitutionality.

''There just wasn't the appetite for it at the time,'' Mr. Tiahrt said in an interview. ''They thought, we don't need to worry about it because the Supreme Court will strike it down.''

But the idea of using the appropriations process to defund an entire federal program, particularly one as far-reaching as the health care overhaul, raised the stakes considerably. In an interview, Mr. DeMint, who left the Senate to join the Heritage Foundation in January, said he had been thinking about it since the law's passage, in part because Republican leaders were not more aggressive.

''They've been through a series of C.R.s and debt limits,'' Mr. DeMint said, referring to continuing resolutions on spending, ''and all the time there was discussion of 'O.K., we're not going to fight the Obamacare fight, we'll do it next time.' The conservatives who ran in 2010 promising to repeal it kept hearing, 'This is not the right time to fight this battle.' ''

Mr. DeMint is hardly alone in his distaste for the health law, or his willingness to do something about it. In the three years since Mr. Obama signed the health measure, Tea Party-inspired groups have mobilized, aided by a financing network that continues to grow, both in its complexity and the sheer amount of money that flows through it.

A review of tax records, campaign finance reports and corporate filings shows that hundreds of millions of dollars have been raised and spent since 2012 by organizations, many of them loosely connected, leading opposition to the measure.

One of the biggest sources of conservative money is Freedom Partners, a tax-exempt ''business league'' that claims more than 200 members, each of whom pays at least $100,000 in dues. The group's board is headed by a longtime executive of Koch Industries, the conglomerate run by the Koch brothers, who were among the original financiers of the Tea Party movement. The Kochs declined to comment.

While Freedom Partners has financed organizations that are pushing to defund the law, like Heritage Action and Tea Party Patriots, Freedom Partners has not advocated that. A spokesman for the group, James Davis, said it was more focused on ''educating Americans around the country on the negative impacts of Obamacare.''

The largest recipient of Freedom Partners cash—about $115 million—was the Center to Protect Patient Rights, according to the groups' latest tax filings. Run by a political consultant with ties to the Kochs and listing an Arizona post office box for its address, the center appears to be little more than a clearinghouse for donations to still more groups, including American Commitment and the 60 Plus Association, both ardent foes of the health care law.

American Commitment and 60 Plus were among a handful of groups calling themselves the ''Repeal Coalition'' that sent a letter in August urging Republican leaders in the House and the Senate to insist ''at a minimum'' in a one-year delay of carrying out the health care law as part of any budget deal. Another group, the Conservative 50 Plus Alliance, delivered a defunding petition with 68,700 signatures to the Senate.

In the fight to shape public opinion, conservatives face well-organized liberal foes. Enroll America, a nonprofit group allied with the Obama White House, is waging a campaign to persuade millions of the uninsured to buy coverage. The law's supporters

are also getting huge assistance from the insurance industry, which is expected to spend $1 billion on advertising to help sell its plans on the exchanges.

''It is David versus Goliath,'' said Mr. Phillips of Americans for Prosperity.

But conservatives are finding that with relatively small advertising buys, they can make a splash. Generation Opportunity, the youth-oriented outfit behind the ''Creepy Uncle Sam'' ads, is spending $750,000 on that effort, aimed at dissuading young people—a cohort critical to the success of the health care overhaul—from signing up for insurance under the new law.

The group receives substantial backing from Freedom Partners and appears ready to expand. Recently, Generation Opportunity moved into spacious new offices in Arlington, Va., where exposed ductwork, Ikea chairs and a Ping-Pong table give off the feel of a Silicon Valley start-up.

Its executive director, Evan Feinberg, a 29-year-old former Capitol Hill aide and one-time instructor for a leadership institute founded by Charles Koch, said there would be more Uncle Sam ads, coupled with college campus visits, this fall. Two other groups, FreedomWorks, with its ''Burn Your Obamacare Card'' protests, and Young Americans for Liberty, are also running campus events.

''A lot of folks have asked us, 'Are we trying to sabotage the law?' '' Mr. Feinberg said in an interview last week. His answer echoes the Freedom Partners philosophy: ''Our goal is to educate and empower young people.''

CRITICAL TIMING

But many on the Republican right wanted to do more.

Mr. Meese's low-profile coalition, the Conservative Action Project, which seeks to find common ground among leaders of an array of fiscally and socially conservative groups, was looking ahead to last Tuesday, when the new online health insurance marketplaces, called exchanges, were set to open. If the law took full effect as planned, many conservatives feared, it would be nearly impossible to repeal—even if a Republican president were elected in 2016.

''I think people realized that with the imminent beginning of Obamacare, that this was a critical time to make every effort to stop something,'' Mr. Meese said in an interview. (He has since stepped down as the coalition's chairman and has been succeeded by David McIntosh, a former congressman from Indiana.)

The defunding idea, Mr. Meese said, was ''a logical strategy.'' The idea drew broad support. Fiscal conservatives like Chris Chocola, the president of the Club for Growth, signed on to the blueprint. So did social and religious conservatives, like the Rev. Lou Sheldon of the Traditional Values Coalition.

The document set a target date: March 27, when a continuing resolution allowing the government to function was to expire. Its message was direct: ''Conservatives should not approve a C.R. unless it defunds Obamacare.''

But the March date came and went without a defunding struggle. In the Senate, Mr. Cruz and Senator Mike Lee, a Utah Republican, talked up the defunding idea, but it went nowhere in the Democratic-controlled chamber. In the House, Mr. Boehner wanted to concentrate instead on locking in the across-the-board budget cuts known as sequestration, and Tea Party lawmakers followed his lead. Outside advocates were unhappy but held their fire.

''We didn't cause any trouble,'' Mr. Chocola said.

Yet by summer, with an August recess looming and another temporary spending bill expiring at the end of September, the groups were done waiting.

''I remember talking to reporters at the end of July, and they said, 'This didn't go anywhere,' '' Mr. Needham recalled. ''What all of us felt at the time was, this was never going to be a strategy that was going to win inside the Beltway. It was going to be a strategy where, during August, people would go home and hear from their constituents, saying: 'You pledged to do everything you could to stop Obamacare. Will you defund it?' ''

Heritage Action, which has trained 6,000 people it calls sentinels around the country, sent them to open meetings and other events to confront their elected representatives. Its ''Defund Obamacare Town Hall Tour,'' which began in Fayetteville, Ark., on Aug. 19 and ended 10 days later in Wilmington, Del., drew hundreds at every stop.

The Senate Conservatives Fund, led by Mr. DeMint when he was in the Senate, put up a Web site in July called dontfundobamacare.com and ran television ads featuring Mr. Cruz and Mr. Lee urging people to tell their representatives not to fund the law.

When Senator Richard M. Burr, a North Carolina Republican, told a reporter that defunding the law was ''the dumbest idea I've ever heard,'' the fund bought a radio ad to attack him. Two other Republican senators up for re-election in 2014, Lamar Alexander of Tennessee and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, were also targeted. Both face Tea Party challengers.

In Washington, Tea Party Patriots, which created the defunding tool kit, set up a Web site, exemptamerica.com, to promote a rally last month showcasing many of the Republicans in Congress whom Democrats—and a number of fellow Republicans—say are most responsible for the shutdown.

While conservatives believe that the public will back them on defunding, a recent poll by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that a majority—57 percent—disapproves of cutting off funding as a way to stop the law.

Last week, with the health care exchanges open for business and a number of prominent Republicans complaining that the ''Defund Obamacare'' strategy was politically damaging and pointless, Mr. Needham of Heritage Action said he felt good about what the groups had accomplished.

''It really was a groundswell,'' he said, ''that changed Washington from the outside in.''

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Let me quote from the yesterday's New York Times:

The current budget brinkmanship is just the latest development in a well-financed, broadbased assault on the health law, Mr. Obama's signature legislative initiative. Groups like Tea Party Patriots, Americans for Prosperity, and FreedomWorks are all immersed in the fight, as is Club for Growth, a business-backed nonprofit organization. Some, like Generation Opportunity and Young Americans for Liberty, both aimed at young adults, are upstarts. Heritage Action is new, too, founded in 2010 to advance the policy prescriptions of its sister group, the Heritage Foundation.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort.

Let me repeat that.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort.

Remember, these are the guys who are worth $70 billion, who want to essentially repeal every major piece of legislation protecting working families over the last 80 years.

Let me go back to the article:

A group linked to the Kochs, Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce, disbursed more than $200 million last year—

$200 million last year.

to nonprofit organizations involved in the fight.

Et cetera, et cetera.

Now I will go to another paragraph, which is really interesting and really important:

The groups have also sought to pressure vulnerable Republican members of Congress with scorecards keeping track of their health care votes; have burned faux ''Obamacare cards'' on college campuses; and have distributed scripts for phone calls to Congressional offices, sample letters to editors and Twitter and Facebook offerings for followers to present as their own.

What is going on here? What does that mean? This is what it means. As a result of the disastrous Supreme Court ruling called Citizens United, what billionaires such as the Koch brothers and others can do—and what they are doing today—is to say to Republicans in the House of Representatives: If you vote for a clean continuing resolution, if you vote to keep the government open, if you make it very clear that you will oppose any effort to see the U.S. default on its debts—if you do that, let me tell you what is going to happen to you, because we have the Koch brothers and people worth billions of dollars who are prepared to jump into your campaign, perhaps get a primary opponent to run against you, and to fund that opponent with as much money as he or she needs.

So now, what democracy in the House—as a result of Citizens United—is about is that a handful of billionaires can threaten any Member of the House with defeat by pouring in unlimited sums of money if they vote in a way that the Koch brothers do not like.

If that is how people think American democracy is supposed to function, it would surprise me very much. But that is not what American democracy is supposed to be about. That tells me again why we have to do everything we can to overturn this disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision so that a handful of billionaires cannot dictate public policy here in the United States of America and in the Congress.

Let me just conclude by saying this: The American people are angry and they are frustrated, and I think what they are seeing is that the middle class of this country is disappearing. In fact, in the last 24 years median family income today is lower than it was. It has gone down. You have millions of people who are out there working for wages they just cannot raise a family on. You are seeing right now a growth in poverty among elderly people. In the midst of a disappearing middle class and the increase of poverty, you are seeing more income and wealth inequality in this country than we have seen since

the 1920s. The gap between the very rich and everybody else grows wider. And now, as I mentioned a moment ago, what billionaires are doing with their money is continuing their war against the middle class by trying to repeal important pieces of legislation.

What the American people are saying is: What about us? What about us? Who is worried that my kid who graduated from high school cannot find a job? Who is worried that my other kid who graduated college is leaving school deeply in debt? Who is worried that in our country we are not being aggressive in dealing with the issue of global warming?

There are enormous issues facing the middle class in this country: the need to create millions of jobs, the need to raise the minimum wage, the need to make college affordable, the need to significantly improve childcare in this country and education in general.

There is an enormous amount of work to be done. What this Congress should not be doing is telling 2 million workers that you are not getting paid, furloughing what was then 800,000, now 400,000 workers. That is not what we should be doing.

I hope the American people stand and make it clear to our Republican friends that they cannot shut down the government because they are not getting their way. I hope the American people would do everything they can to demand that this Congress start doing its job, which is to represent working families.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today with a pretty simple message for House leadership: You can end this Republican shutdown today. Just simply let the House vote.

On issue after issue after issue, when the House has acted, the Senate has responded with a vote, either with a vote for or against a tabling motion or a vote for or against legislation, but we have taken a vote. We simply ask the House to do the same.

By scheduling a vote on the Senate-passed plan—the continuing resolution—Speaker BOEHNER can ensure that more than 800,000 workers, including tens of thousands in my home State of Ohio, can get back to work.

By scheduling a vote on the Senate-passed bill, he can reopen the government without rehashing old political fights; then get down to business—deal with the debt limit—then get down to business and make decisions about immigration, make decisions about jobs, make decisions about what we are going to do with the budget.

I do not think we have ever, Mr. Speaker, seen one faction of one party of one chamber of one branch of government hold the entire country and economic recovery of our Nation hostage—a faction of one party of one house of one branch of government hold the country hostage.

Do not take my word for it. A Cleveland Plain Dealer headline said: ''Republicans need to quit the attack on Obamacare and agree to a clean continuing resolution.'' They called the actions of the far right attack on the 3-year-old health care law—the health care law that was passed overwhelmingly in both Houses, with 60 votes in the Senate and well over a majority in the House, affirmed in part by the Supreme Court—the Plain Dealer called the actions attacking the health care law ''bordering on the un-American.''

The Toledo Blade called the actions of the far right in the House ''GOP extortion,'' challenging Speaker BOEHNER to put America's economy over his own job, reminding him of his election night saying the 2012 election ''changes that,'' making the health law ''the law of the land.''

Finally, the Washington Post—no stranger to criticizing Democrats—called out the ''House of Embarrassment'' and its ''heedlessness'' on the impact of its actions on ordinary Americans.

I was home this weekend, and I spoke with all kinds of people. I spoke with Federal employees, some of whom have been furloughed, some of whom have not. I spoke with others in Avon Lake, OH, other places. I listened to what they had to say. People are frustrated. They cannot believe that, again, one group of radicals in one House of one branch of government can, for all intents and purposes, shut the country down and move us towards the precipice of what happens if the Congress does not pay the bills that we as a Congress ran up. These are real people facing a real and devastating impact.

I did something else that I know the Acting President pro tempore, as a Senator from Maine, a former Governor, does also: get on the phone and just talk to people in your State about the impact this will have.

I spoke to one of the leaders of an institution in Ohio that has a large R&D presence in the State. He talked about the irreparable damage to our infrastructure, similar to what happens in Senator NELSON's State—who just joined me on the floor—what could happen at NASA in South Florida, what happens at NASA in Cleveland, what happens at Batelle in Columbus, what happens at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton.

This leader at one of these institutions—I do not want to call him out by name—he talked about the irreparable damage to our infrastructure as a nation. This is not just highways and bridges. This is scientific researchers, this is engineers, this is people working on some of the most top secret issues in our country and our government.

He went on to say it is asymmetric: building and killing a scientific endeavor. Think about that. Killing a scientific endeavor you can do in a week or you can do in a month simply by stopping the research by an interruption like this, where many of the top scientists, the top engineers, at some point just say: I do not want to go through this again. I am not going to continue to do this important work for my country and then see it shut down because somebody has a political ax to grind, because somebody, on a continuing resolution, or one political party, as we approach the debt ceiling, wants to attach their political platform to one of these important pieces of legislation just to make the government run.

What is happening in places like that is some of these engineers say: I am not sure I want to work for NASA anymore. I am not sure I want to stay in the military. I am not sure I want to be at a major research institution like Batelle. I can go elsewhere where my work will not get interrupted and people will show their appreciation simply by continuing to fund my research.

When you think about this building and killing a scientific endeavor, it is a little bit like one old politician said, that it takes a carpenter a long time to build a barn, but any—I am not sure he used the word ''mule''—but any mule can knock down that barn in a day or so.

I remember I was in a car accident years ago. I broke my back. I was in the hospital for a week. For 3 days I stayed in bed. I remember the first time I tried to walk how my muscles had atrophied. It took several weeks before I was back to full strength and could rebuild that muscle.

That is really the way it is with these research institutions in our country, which we have so many of, that are so important, whether it is NASA, whether it is Batelle, whether it is Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, whether it is the National Institutes of Health. We have assembled some of the greatest scientists and engineers and technicians in the world at these institutions, but building a scientific endeavor takes days and weeks and months and years; killing one is a matter of an interruption of 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 weeks.

That is why this is so dangerous, this shut down. That is why going up against the debt ceiling is potentially catastrophic for our country. It makes no sense. It is not good for our economy. It is not good for our people. It is not good for our Federal workforce that really can do the right kinds of things for our country.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. What the Senator said about NASA is so true. Would the Senator believe that 97 percent of the

workforce at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is on furlough? A few of us had to intercede. The Mars mission that is supposed to go in a narrow window between mid-November and early December—if they miss that window, it would be another 2 years before they could launch that Mars mission and, therefore, you would have all the expense of keeping the scientists on, and so forth. We finally got them to bring them back so they could continue processing the mission so it can launch in that narrow 3-week window. But the rest of the people are gone.

Does that sound very intelligent to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BROWN. I would add, it is interesting: Three of the great NASA facilities are represented on the floor now by Senator CORNYN from Texas, Senator NELSON, and me. It is not just NASA employees at NASA Glenn in Cleveland.

Mr. NELSON. Correct.

Mr. BROWN. It is another 1,300 contractors who are doing work paid by taxpayers. They are actually private companies, as the Senator knows. It is the same in Florida, the same in Texas. And their work is important too.

I just think these kinds of interruptions are so senseless. What I heard more than anything from people when I was home was how senseless this is, how ludicrous this is.

I spoke to hospital administrators all over my State today. I was on the phone with a number of them from Williams County in the northwest corner of the State, to Columbus, to Cleveland, to all over, and it is senseless to them that they are in the midst of maybe a hospital expansion or maybe just doing the day-to-day work of the hospital, and they do not know what to think.

I have heard many of my colleagues here for years talk about the unpredictability of this economy and that it is partly because of Washington and ObamaCare or maybe Dodd-Frank: We do not know what is happening next.

The worst kind of unpredictability is shutting the government down or leading us right up to the debt ceiling. That is why it is so important that the House vote and then we get serious about doing the debt ceiling vote and then we move on to issues such as immigration and others that matter for our country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I agree with our colleagues that a government shutdown is not the best way to do business around here. We should get together—the President, the House, and the Senate—and we should work this out, both the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling, of which Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew has said he will basically run out of all of the extraordinary measures he can use to avoid us reaching the debt ceiling—which, colloquially speaking, I would say is the equivalent of maxing out your credit card, the Federal Government's credit card.

But it is worth remembering that as James Baker, former Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of State, with a distinguished record of public service going back many years—he recently noted in an article in the Wall Street Journal that since 1976 we have had 17 government shutdowns temporarily until differences between the parties, between the branches could be worked out. I hope we can do that sooner rather than later.

The truth is that there was a way out with regard to the shutdown, particularly when the House passed a piece of legislation that would maintain the spending limits at $988 billion, which was the same level the Senate majority had chosen, but it also attached two other provisions to it, one of which would have eliminated the carve-out for Congress for ObamaCare—in other words, the carve-out that treats Congress differently than the rest of the country. Our Democratic friends unfortunately voted against that provision. All Republicans voted to eliminate that carve-out.

The second was the delay in the penalties that would be applied to individuals who do not buy government-approved health insurance under ObamaCare. The President has unilaterally delayed for 1 year the penalties for employers who do not meet the requirements of ObamaCare. All we were asking is that the same consideration be given to hard-working Americans. If our friends across the aisle—or at least enough of them—had joined with us to vote for both of those provisions that came over with the House bill, the government would not be shut down, it would be operating. But that was the decision they made. I think they made a mistake.

But we know the government shutdown debate is now quickly becoming a debate over the broader subject of what we do about spending and debt, particularly what we do with regard to the debt ceiling I mentioned earlier. We have reached almost the top of our credit limit on the Nation's credit card, and President Obama is asking for another trillion dollars in spending, in debt limit. But the President differs from many of us in that he thinks this debt ceiling cap ought to be lifted by another trillion dollars without anything else attached to it. He thinks it ought to be automatic, even though we believe it is entirely appropriate—and the majority of times in the past, the debt ceiling increase has been accompanied by other long-term policy reforms. The President himself has agreed to these kinds of reforms in the past. But apparently this time he has drawn a line in the sand.

So now he believes, unlike the past, that Congress should act like a rubberstamp when it comes to raising the limit on America's credit card, our debt limit. Meanwhile, it seems our friends across the aisle also feel the House should be a rubberstamp for the Senate. All of this leads me to conclude that James Madison, the father of the Constitution, must be rolling over in his grave because he and others of the Founders were the geniuses who decided that it was the checks and balances from separated government—the executive and the legislative, the House and the Senate—that would best protect our freedoms and best prevent overreach by other branches.

But in a way I can understand why the President and the majority leader are refusing to negotiate and are saying ''it is my way or the highway.'' After all, the last time we had these kinds of major fiscal talks in advance of a debt ceiling deadline, the result was the Budget Control Act. That was 2011. That law produced, by default, real spending cuts and real deficit reduction. If you recall, that was where the supercommittee was created to try to negotiate a grand bargain. The supercommittee was unsuccessful, and the default was the Budget Control Act and the sequester, which automatically cut discretionary spending. Our friends across the aisle clearly think that was a big mistake. The President and the majority leader now are refusing to negotiate at all on the debt ceiling. They believe it ought to be rubberstamped.

Well, amidst all of the rhetoric and the finger-pointing, now Washington has erupted into something it does best, which is the blame game. I am afraid we have lost sight of our underlying debt problem.

Despite the short-term deficit reduction we have witnessed since 2011 due to the default position of the Budget Control Act, our long-term fiscal trajectory remains unsustainable. Last month the Congressional Budget Office projected that publicly held Federal debt is on course to exceed the size of our entire economy. By that point, again, under current law, the interest we have to pay to China and other foreign creditors that hold more than half of our debt will be 2½ times greater than the 40-year average. We know interest rates are extraordinarily and abnormally low because of the policies of the Federal Reserve. But can you imagine, for that $17 trillion in debt on which the U.S. Government would have to pay historic averages of interest to our creditors in order to get them to buy our debt, what impact that would have? Well, I will talk about that more in a moment.

If we continue down this road without adopting real reforms for our long-term fiscal challenges, we will condemn our children and our grandchildren to fewer jobs, slower economic growth, worse opportunity, and a much greater risk of a full-blown fiscal crisis.

In the event of a crisis, our safety net programs that we all care about for the most vulnerable in our country would be cut harshly and abruptly, as would

our ability to fund national security and other priorities.

Nobody wants that kind of a future. Nobody has to accept that kind of a future if we just do our job—not the President trying to go it alone again, not the Senate saying ''it is my way or the highway'' to the House, but by the House and the Senate and the White House working together to try to work our way through it.

But if we continue to rack up debt—another trillion is what the President wants to raise the debt limit—and if we continue to postpone the hard choices and leave it to others, we will move closer and closer to an eventual disaster. By contrast, if we were to take the responsibility now to reform our safety net programs, we could reform them gradually so that people would barely feel it. That will make it much easier to protect the Americans who need these programs the most—our seniors and the most vulnerable in our society.

Of course, we cannot make any real progress as long as the President and the majority leader in the Senate refuse to negotiate. As I said earlier, Congress is not a rubberstamp. That is not the Constitution written by our Founders. The House of Representatives is not a rubberstamp for the Senate. We have been willing to compromise and negotiate. As a matter of fact, the House has sent over multiple bills. Every time a Member of the opposing party comes to the floor and talks about the National Institutes of Health's funding being cut off for children's cancer research, we have come down here and said: Well, let's pass the bill. Let's pass that appropriation.

When someone has said: Well, what about the veterans' disability claims that are stacking up and are not being processed as a result of the shutdown, the House has passed legislation. We have come to the floor and offered legislation that would allow us to address that problem, but we have been told no time and time again.

I ask unanimous consent for 4 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we need to work together. That is the only way this is going to happen. We know it will happen. It is going to happen. The President cannot take the unsustainable position that ''it is my way or the highway and I will not negotiate,'' especially since he has done it before, especially since that is the only way our constitutional framework allows the resolution of problems. If we were to do—which we are not going to do—what the President and the majority leader have asked us to do, which is to raise the debt limit automatically without dealing with any of our long-term fiscal problems, we would simply be encouraging Congress and our policymakers to delay the tough choices and hard votes. We would be encouraging—indeed, we would be enabling—this type of fiscal profligacy that has left us with a gross national debt of $17 trillion, which is about $53,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

More than $6 trillion of debt has been added since President Obama became President of the United States. Yet the President seems to show absolutely no sense of urgency in dealing with it. That is despite his own fiscal commission, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, coming back in December 2010—that was a bipartisan commission he himself appointed—they came back with their own policy prescription to deal with this problem. Republicans, some of our most conservative Members, and some of the most liberal Members on the other side of the aisle came together and they voted for the Simpson-Bowles Commission report in December 2010, but the President simply walked away from it.

Back in March, he told ABC News:

> We do not have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it is going to be in a sustainable place.

That is what the President of the United States said last March. But that is not what his own bipartisan fiscal commission said in December 2010. That is not what the Congressional Budget Office says. As everybody around here knows, the Congressional Budget Office is the final authority on these matters. In their 2013 long-term budget outlook, on page 13, they have a couple of pages that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

It is entitled ''Consequences of Large and Growing Federal Debt.'' They did not say: We do not have an immediate crisis in terms of debt, and we are pretty much in a sustainable place for 10 years.

They said:

> The high and rising amounts of Federal debt held by the public that CBO projects for the coming decades under the extended baseline would have significant negative consequences for both the economy and the federal budget.

What were those? They said there would be less national savings and less future income. They said there would be pressure for larger tax increases and spending cuts to deal with this, particularly the phenomena of high interest payments that I mentioned a moment ago.

Again, because of the Federal Reserve's policies, it costs next to nothing for the Federal Government in terms of interest on our national debt, but when that goes back up to historic averages, to 4, 5 percent, it is going to cost trillions of dollars more for us to service the existing debt, not to mention the additional trillion the President wants to borrow.

What is that going to do? Well, that is going to crowd out other priorities such as NASA, which my colleague from Florida and I both think is an important national priority. I heard the Senator from Ohio say the same. But higher interest payments as a result of not dealing with this high debt are going to crowd out other important national priorities.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office said there is a ''greater chance of a fiscal crisis.'' Specifically, what they are talking about is that as we pay more and more for interest on our national debt, we lose more and more control over our fiscal future. As we all know on a bipartisan basis, we have been told time and time again by the experts that when our creditors lose confidence in our ability to repay debt, there can come a breaking moment when all of a sudden we lose control and all of these things happen, which we can avoid if we deal responsibly today.

In other words, the President seems content to let one of his successors deal with the problem of our rising national debt—that is only, I would add, if we get lucky enough to postpone the kinds of crises and problems CBO and Simpson-Bowles project that long. The President obviously has other priorities, but I want to remind him what his own former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, said when he was asked about the Nation's biggest threat to our national security.

He said it was the national debt. The President himself has echoed those comments, but the President is still sitting on the sidelines and still takes the untenable position that he is unwilling to negotiate. At a time when the country needs genuine leadership, he is nowhere to be found.

Until that changes, we are not going to get any closer to where we need to be sooner, rather than later, and that is a true bipartisan compromise.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article: ''Consequences of Large and Growing Federal Debt.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, Sept. 2013]

CONSEQUENCES OF LARGE AND GROWING FEDERAL DEBT

The high and rising amounts of federal debt held by the public that CBO projects for coming decades under the extended baseline would have significant negative consequences for both the economy and the federal budget. Those consequences include reducing the total amounts of national saving and income; increasing the government's interest payments, thereby putting more pressure on the rest of the budget; limiting lawmakers' flexibility to respond to unexpected events; and increasing the likelihood of a fiscal crisis.

LESS NATIONAL SAVING AND FUTURE INCOME

Large federal budget deficits over the long term would reduce investment, resulting in lower national income and higher interest rates than would otherwise occur. The reason is that increased government borrowing would cause a larger share of the savings potentially available for investment to be used for purchasing government securities, such as Treasury bonds. Those purchases would ''crowd out'' investment in capital goods,

such as factories and computers, which make workers more productive. Because wages are determined mainly by workers' productivity, the reduction in investment would also reduce wages, lessening people's incentive to work. In addition, both private borrowers and the government would have to pay higher interest rates to compete for savings, and those higher rates would strengthen people's incentive to save. However, the rise in private saving would be a good deal smaller than the increase in federal borrowing represented by the change in the deficit, so national saving would decline, as would private investment. (For a detailed analysis of those economic effects, see Chapter 6.)

In the short run, though, large federal budget deficits would tend to boost demand, thus increasing output and employment relative to what they would be with smaller deficits. That is especially the case under conditions like those now prevailing in the United States—with substantial unemployment and underused factories, offices, and equipment—which have led the Federal Reserve to push short-term interest rates down almost to zero. The effects of the higher demand would be temporary because stabilizing forces in the economy tend to move output back toward its potential level. Those forces include the response of prices and interest rates to higher demand, as well as (in normal times) actions by the Federal Reserve.

PRESSURE FOR LARGER TAX INCREASES OR SPENDING CUTS IN THE FUTURE

Large amounts of federal debt ordinarily require the government to make large interest payments to its lenders, and growth in the debt causes those interest payments to increase. (Net interest payments are currently fairly small relative to the size of the federal budget because interest rates are exceptionally low, but CBO projects that those payments will increase considerably as rates return to more normal levels.)

Higher interest payments would consume a larger portion of federal revenues, resulting in a larger gap between the remaining revenues and the amount that would be spent on federal programs under current law. Hence, if lawmakers wanted to maintain the benefits and services that the government is scheduled to provide under current law, while not allowing deficits to increase as interest payments grew, revenues would have to rise as well. Additional revenues could be raised in many different ways, but to the extent that they were generated by boosting marginal tax rates (the rates on an additional dollar of income), the higher tax rates would discourage people from working and saving, further reducing output and income. Alternatively, lawmakers could choose to offset rising interest costs, at least in part, by reducing benefits and services. Those reductions could be made in many ways, but to the extent that they came from cutting federal investments, future output and income would also be reduced. As another option, lawmakers could respond to higher interest payments by allowing deficits to increase for some time, but that approach would require greater deficit reduction later if lawmakers wanted to avoid a long-term increase in debt relative to GDP.

REDUCED ABILITY TO RESPOND TO DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Having a relatively small amount of outstanding debt gives a government the ability to borrow funds to address significant unexpected events, such as recessions, financial crises, and wars. In contrast, having a large amount of debt leaves a government with less flexibility to address financial and economic crises, which in many countries have been very costly. A large amount of debt could also harm a country's national security by constraining military spending in times of crisis or limiting the country's ability to prepare for such a crisis.

A few years ago, the size of the U.S. federal debt gave the government the flexibility to respond to the financial crisis and severe recession by increasing spending and cutting taxes to stimulate economic activity, providing public funding to stabilize the financial sector, and continuing to pay for other programs even as tax revenues dropped sharply because of the decline in output and income. If federal debt stayed at its current percentage of GDP or grew further, the government would find it more difficult to undertake similar policies in the future. As a result, future recessions and financial crises could have larger negative effects on the economy and on people's well-being. Moreover, the reduced financial flexibility and increased dependence on foreign investors that would accompany a rise in debt could weaken the United States' international leadership.

GREATER CHANCE OF A FISCAL CRISIS

A large and continually growing federal debt would have another significant negative consequence: It would increase the probability of a fiscal crisis for the United States. In such a crisis, investors become unwilling to finance all of a government's borrowing needs unless they are compensated with very high interest rates; as a result, the interest rates on government debt rise suddenly and sharply relative to rates of return on other assets. That increase in interest rates reduces the market value of outstanding government bonds, causing losses for investors who hold them. Such a decline can precipitate a broader financial crisis by creating losses for mutual funds, pension funds, insurance companies, banks, and other holders of government debt—losses that may be large enough to cause some financial institutions to fail.

Unfortunately, there is no way to predict with any confidence whether or when such a fiscal crisis might occur in the United States. In particular, there is no identifiable tipping point of debt relative to GDP that indicates that a crisis is likely or imminent. All else being equal, however, the larger a government's debt, the greater the risk of a fiscal crisis.

The likelihood of such a crisis also depends on the economic environment, both domestic and international. If investors expect continued economic growth, they are generally less concerned about debt burdens; conversely, high debt can reinforce more general concern about an economy. In many cases around the world, fiscal crises have begun during recessions and, in turn, have exacerbated them. In some instances, a crisis has been triggered by news that a government would, for any number of reasons, need to borrow an unexpectedly large amount of money. Then, as investors lost confidence and interest rates spiked, borrowing became more difficult and expensive for the government. That development forced policymakers to either cut spending and increase taxes immediately and substantially to reassure investors, or renege on the terms of the country's existing debt, or increase the supply of money and boost inflation. In some cases, a fiscal crisis also made borrowing more expensive for private-sector borrowers because uncertainty about the government's response to the crisis reduced confidence in the viability of private-sector enterprises. Higher private-sector interest rates, combined with reductions in government spending and increases in taxes, have tended to worsen economic conditions in the short term.

If a fiscal crisis occurred in the United States, policymakers would have only limited—and unattractive—options for responding to it. In particular, the government would need to undertake some combination of three approaches: restructuring its debt (that is, seeking to modify the contractual terms of its existing obligations), pursuing inflationary monetary policy, and adopting an austerity program of spending cuts and tax increases. Thus, such a crisis would confront policymakers with extremely difficult choices and probably have a very significant negative impact on the country.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the Chair is yielded, I wish to say it is almost like deja vu all over again. The great Senator from Maine was sitting in the chair only a few days ago when this Senator had a chance to make comments. Here we are again.

I wish to say to the Senator from Texas, as he is leaving the Chamber, that I think the Senator is a good Senator who believes strongly in what he is saying, but if there is a will, there is a way. Reasonable people can come together and work through to a reasonable conclusion.

I was going to say, with the Senator from Texas on the floor, the Senator had a chance to express his opinion. Indeed, the Senator did with his vote when we passed the appropriations bill, now called the continuing resolution, because we have not brought each of the appropriations bills to the floor.

We accepted it at the House number. The senior Senator from Texas expressed his opinion by means of his ''no'' vote, but ''yes'' votes won, and we sent it to the other body to keep the government open. Indeed, the government is not open.

I go back to 2 days ago when the Senator from Maine was the Presiding Officer and here we are again. If we would remember the Golden Rule put in the old English: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you or put into modern street language: Treat others as you want to be treated—in other words, recognize that the other fellow has a point of view and you have to respect his point of view—even though his point of view may be different from yours—the genius of American democracy is hammering out those differences and building consensus in a civil way and achieving a workable solution. What we have here is brinkmanship.

We hammered it out, we passed appropriations, a continuing resolution. We sent it to the House of Representatives, and they will not put it up for a vote because they are only—and this is operative—going to pass this with Republican votes.

What does that do? This takes an outsized minority of the Republican caucus being the tail that is wagging the Republican dog in the House of Representatives. If they only pass it with Republican votes instead of the will of the whole House then, in fact, we will have what we have now, a small out-of-the-mainstream political philosophy extremist group dictating what

they want and only what they want. It is their way or no way. That is not treating others as they wish to be treated. This is an attitude of saying: I know better than you and my way is going to be the only way. That is not how we govern this country. That is not how we honor and respect other people's points of view that may be different from ours.

I do not wish to hold up the Senator from Maine, but I wanted to follow up on the conversation I had through the Chair 2 days ago. All of these high-minded, highfalutin ideas of all of us getting together and treating each other as we wish to be treated and hammering out this policy—lo and behold, maybe everything I am saying doesn't have a thing to do with this by virtue of an investigative piece having been done by the New York Times over the weekend. I wish to read the first three paragraphs of this investigative piece. It is entitled: ''A Federal Budget Crisis Months in the Planning'' by Sheryl Gay Stolberg and Mike McIntire.

Shortly after President Obama started his second term, a loose-knit coalition of conservative activists led by former Attorney General Edwin Meese III gathered in the capital to plot strategy. Their push to repeal Mr. Obama's health care law was going nowhere, and they desperately needed a new plan.

Out of that session, held one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed ''blueprint to defunding Obamacare,'' signed by Mr. Meese and leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups.

It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that has long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire federal government.

This is only the first three paragraphs. If that is true, then all of these high-minded ideas of the Golden Rule and treating each other with respect and working out your differences is all out the window.

If that is true—and it looks as if it is by virtue of what we see going on down in the other end of this Capitol Building, a small group of people are not going to do anything to open the government unless they get their way to defund the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform act—I would suggest that if that is the case, then the people who are suffering should sit up and take notice of what is happening to their government.

We have heard examples over and over. Senator BROWN and I were just talking about the 97 percent of people who are laid off in NASA. Then what do we do with all of the civilian workforce in NASA? Think of what this is doing to all of the contractors who work for NASA.

We have heard also the statistic out here that over 70 percent of the intelligence community has been furloughed. We have heard that Head Start, the federally funded program to get children ready to start the public schools, kindergarten and first grade, is shutting down.

We know last week, when we were in the middle of this shutdown, there was a storm brewing in the Gulf of Mexico. Thank the good Lord it fizzled out, but at one point it was expected to turn into a Category 1 hurricane hitting the gulf coast. Had that happened, FEMA had been laid off—although they reached back and started the National Guard, et cetera. Thank you to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel for finding an unintended consequence in the law that was passed to pay the U.S. military while the government is shut down because he found a little hook in there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. He found a hook in there so he could then extend that to most of the civilian workforce, including some of the National Guard, but we didn't know that.

In my State of Florida, 156 employees were getting the notices just in the National Guard on Friday. There were already 1,000 military technicians that had been furloughed in the National Guard, and we had an inbound storm.

What about the programs in our State to help veterans find jobs? If we are not done with this shutdown at the end of October, that is gone. What about the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, a part of the State government. Ten percent of their funds are Federal funds. What about the Florida Department of Agriculture? Over 6 percent of their workforce is federally funded.

What about—and we have heard this in the Senate—Women, Infants, and Children? A society is supposed to take care of its very old and its very young. This is why we have programs for Women, Infants, and Children. Yet the supplemental nutrition program for women, for nursing mothers, for children up to the age of 5, for breast-feeding support, for nutrition education, and for health checkups is gone.

I could go on and on. Others have said it more articulately than I. This is ridiculous. This shouldn't go on. As the drumbeat of the crescendo continues, it will grow louder as we march toward October 17, when the debt ceiling has to be raised so we don't go into default.

It is a sad day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The assistant majority leader.

STIRLING AND ELLIS NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. I rise to speak in support of two individuals whose nominations will be voted on at 5 p.m. We haven't set any records in the Senate in the last 5 weeks for productivity. We passed one major piece of legislation, which the Senator from Oregon brought before us relative to the issue of our helium reserve. It was great work. It is one of the few bipartisan actions we have accomplished in 5 weeks, maybe the only bipartisan one. At 5 p.m. we have a chance to improve our record.

These are two nominees for Federal district court judges in Illinois that I commend to the Members of the Senate.

I wish to say at the outset it isn't only this Senator on this side of the aisle making this recommendation, Senator MARK KIRK and I worked on a bipartisan basis to come up with these nominees and get them approved by our nomination committees. They are then approved by us, by the White House, by the Judiciary Committee, and brought to the floor.

Since Senator KIRK has been elected, we have done this in lockstep, together every step of the way. By tradition, the President's party Senator, in this case myself, has three appointments. Senator KIRK has the fourth, but each of us has the veto power over the other's choices.

We have a working relationship and a good one. Senator KIRK has endorsed these two nominees: Colin Bruce, who has been nominated to serve in the Central District of Illinois, and Sara Ellis, nominated to serve in the Northern District of Illinois. They have the experience, qualifications, and integrity to be excellent Federal judges. Both appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee for a hearing on June 19, and both were reported out of the committee by a unanimous voice vote.

I would like briefly to discuss their backgrounds and qualifications.

Colin Bruce has been nominated to fill the judicial vacancy that opened in Urbana when Judge Michael McCuskey took senior status. Michael McCuskey is also one of my appointments, an outstanding Federal judge. I am sorry he is going into senior status, but he felt, and I did too, that Colin Bruce would be an excellent replacement to succeed him in that position.

Mr. Bruce has worked in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois since 1989. He currently serves as the first assistant U.S. attorney, a position he has held since 2010.

Colin Bruce applied for the position of U.S. attorney. He didn't get it. But the man who did, the man I selected, Jim Lewis, hired him as his first assistant. So it was a few months ago that Jim Lewis, the U.S. District Attorney, came by my office with Colin Bruce. We talked about a number of things, and he said: Incidentally, I don't know what I would do without Colin Bruce. He is such an extraordinary first assistant. When he finished his presentation, I said: Jim, would you stick around for a minute; Colin, go outside, if you would. I said: Jim, I have an opening for a judgeship, and I know Colin is a person who would fill that

bill. He has already gone through all the vetting. He would be an extraordinary judge, but you would lose him as your first assistant. He said: I can't stand in his way. I couldn't think of a better choice to be a judge in this district.

Colin Bruce was born in Urbana, IL. He got his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Illinois and went straight to the U.S. Attorney's Office out of law school. He has handled criminal, civil cases, and bankruptcy and tort claims filed against the government. He then shifted to prosecuting complex criminal matters, drug fraud and cyber crime cases. In 2007, he was appointed branch chief of the Urbana division of the U.S. Attorney's Office, and in 2010 he was named first assistant U.S. attorney, which is the No. 2 position, as I mentioned.

In his current capacity, he oversees the day-to-day operations of the U.S. Attorney's Office, supervises all the Federal criminal investigations, prosecutions, and appeals in the district, as well as civil defensive and affirmative litigation in the district in which the United States is a party.

He has received numerous recognitions, including certifications of appreciation from the Justice Department, the FBI, and the DEA, as well as awards from the Illinois State Police and the Metropolitan Enforcement Group and Task Force.

He has a record of giving back to the Urbana community through his association with charities, such as the Central Illinois Chapter of the American Red Cross and Imagine No Malaria, a charity that purchases mosquito nets for families in Africa.

He is an outstanding nominee for the Federal bench, and has a great family whom he brought to the hearing. I certainly urge my colleagues to join Senator KIRK and me in supporting his nomination.

The second nominee is Sara Ellis. She has been nominated for a Chicago-based judgeship that was formerly occupied by the distinguished Judge Joan Gottschall. Ms. Ellis currently works at the prestigious law firm of Schiff Hardin in Chicago, where her practice involves white-collar criminal matters, complex civil litigation, and corporate counseling.

She was born in Ontario, Canada, to parents who had emigrated from Jamaica. She moved to the United States and became a citizen at the age of 15. Her undergraduate degree is from Indiana University and her law degree is from the Loyola University Chicago School of Law.

After law school, Ms. Ellis joined the Federal Defender Program in Chicago, where she served for 6 years as a staff attorney. In this capacity she represented indigent criminal defendants in all aspects of criminal litigation, preliminary hearings, trials, sentencing hearings, and appeals. She then worked in private practice for several years before joining the City of Chicago Department of Law in 2004, where she served as assistant corporation counsel for 4 years, primarily handling section 1983 cases.

In 2008, Ms. Ellis joined Schiff Hardin, where she handles criminal and civil matters. She has served as an adjunct professor at Loyola University Chicago School of Law, teaching Federal criminal practice and legal writing.

She has a distinguished record of pro bono work and community service. Among her endeavors she has taught reading and legal skills to children living in juvenile detention and she has provided legal advice and guidance to the Warren Park Youth Baseball League.

She is also actively involved with St. Gertrude Catholic Parish in Chicago and is on the board of the parish school, Northside Catholic Academy.

Ms. Ellis is an excellent nominee for a Federal judge. She too is a person with great family and children backing her up, and I am happy Senator KIRK and I can commend her as well to the Senate for this nomination.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to confirm these two nominees who have bipartisan support and will be outstanding Federal judges.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind words, and I certainly support the appointments, and I am glad we were able to get that legislation passed on a bipartisan basis to help American industry.

On Friday last, it was thrilling to read the United States is now No. 1 in the world when it comes to energy production—not Saudi Arabia, not Russia, but our country. It was a particular source of such satisfaction because, after all these years of the American people hearing about how we are dependent on foreign sources of energy, at the top of our papers Friday last the energy experts said the red, white, and blue was at the top in terms of energy production.

This good news story about the energy boom is, obviously, as the Presiding Officer knows, absolutely essential to creating more high-skilled, high-wage jobs. I saw it, along with my colleague, when I was in his State, and we see it all across the country. This energy boom, for example, has been key to triggering a manufacturing renaissance—the lower cost of natural gas in particular being a magnet to bringing companies that had gone overseas back to the United States again and employing our workers with good-paying jobs. It has been key to the falling imports of foreign oil. Of course, wind and solar farms are adding tremendously to the power mix. In our part of the country, Shepherds Flat in eastern Oregon is our country's biggest wind farm, and we are especially proud of it.

The current senseless government shutdown is putting this good news story at risk. When it comes to causing problems, unfortunately, this shutdown has something for everybody. If you care about oil and natural gas development, Federal agencies now cannot approve drilling permits either on Federal land or offshore. If you care about renewable energy, wind and wave energy permitting is now at a standstill. It is at a standstill because of the shutdown. Environmental reviews for solar farms on Federal land have stopped. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has canceled a meeting about implementing two hydropower bills that passed this Congress on overwhelming votes.

In my part of the country we are especially proud of this legislation. Hydropower is responsible. It is actually the biggest source of clean power in the United States. Industry estimates it could generate perhaps as much as 60,000 megawatts of additional clean power. These hydropower bills—there were two of them—were the first standalone energy bills to become law since 2009. Now they languish because of the shutdown.

All of these developments—the developments I have described with respect to natural gas development, solar and wind energy, the hydropower laws that passed overwhelmingly in both the Senate and the House—are now, in effect, languishing. What it means is less new energy, fewer new jobs, and less revenue—less revenue that we are going to need in both the public and the private sector.

I might also add this shutdown harms the important safety work that needs to be done by blocking work that is going to speed up the response to oil-spills and accidents offshore. Of particular concern to me, and I know to so many others in the Senate—I see my colleague from Alaska is here—are the people who get hammered, who get hit hardest by these consequences who live in our rural communities, the ones who depend upon producing energy, timber, and recreation. They are the ones who feel the biggest hit from the shutdown.

I am going to talk about what this means in terms of recreation and hunting and fishing. The hunting season starts at different times in different parts of the country, but between recreation and hunting and fishing we are talking about something in the vicinity of $646 billion a year which goes just to the recreation sector, and another $140-billion-plus in terms of hunting. I am going to describe the consequences there, but we are talking about policies with enormous impact for our rural communities.

I mentioned the thrilling news of last Friday, about how we were tops in terms of energy production, but I got some additional news that wasn't exactly thrilling last Friday when I was

called by the Chief of the Forest Service, Tom Tidwell, who called to report the Forest Service had canceled 450 timber sales on 120 national forests across the country. What that means is loggers, such as the hardworking folks I represent in Oregon, who want to do a hard day's work, are being benched because of this shutdown.

The shutdown comes at a particularly ominous time because winter is at hand, in effect putting an end to logging operations for the year in many parts of our country. That means workers won't be able to make up for this lost time and money this year. Those loggers will simply have to get by with less. So again, rural communities are the face of what this means. They are the ones that are going to get walloped because of a handful of Members of Congress—a handful of Members of Congress—who won't fund the government.

So logging, energy, recreation, I mentioned the hunting season, the sort of flip side of the coin with respect to recreation. While the hunting season for ducks and geese is starting in my home State and across the country, the government shutdown here is closing hundreds of wildlife refuges where those waterfowl are normally fair game. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, hunting, fishing and wildlife-related activities generate about $144 billion per year. Hunters contribute $5.4 billion in State and local taxes each year. Because the waterfowl season is only 3 months long in Oregon, if you lose 1 week, every lost week is a huge bite out of the benefits that hunting brings to our local economy.

What Senators may also not be aware of is the shutdown also means our government is less prepared to respond to these fires, these rapidly developing dangerous infernos in our national forests. The fires have lessened in some parts of the West, but there are areas of high to extreme danger in California, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Dakota, and other States. While many firefighters are considered essential, others, such as our off-duty firefighters, have been furloughed. Public safety on Federal lands is also impacted by these furloughs. Although law enforcement continues, without rangers and other agency employees on hand, the conditions are ripe for visitors to find their way into severely understaffed forests and pose a safety risk. And, of course, thousands of hardworking employees at these key natural resource agencies are now out of work.

As we speak, there are 24,000 furloughed at the Forest Service, more than 10,000 furloughed at the Bureau of Land Management. If they are not working, Bureau of Land Management employees can't issue permits for grazing on Federal lands. Energy Department workers and contractors can't clean up nuclear waste sites, such as that at the Hanford Reservation that threatens the Columbia River and the million people who live downstream.

Our committee, recognizing the situation, recently had to cancel a hearing on the Columbia River Treaty, which is vital to the energy and environment of the Pacific Northwest. It is vital to our relations with Canada. This treaty is about managing a river that is the lifeblood for the Pacific Northwest. It is our lifeblood for transportation, for electricity, for fish, and there isn't much time for our two nations to come together to decide the treaty's future.

I have tried to describe what the shutdown means in terms of our status as No. 1 in energy production, what it means with respect to logging and forest fires, hunting and recreation, and it is all happening because a small group of Members in the other Chamber is demanding negotiations with the American economy tied to the train tracks. It is especially ironic that in many cases the districts of those Members are the ones that are going to bear the brunt of the impasse, those rural communities. They are the ones that are going to bear the consequences of stalled energy production and stalled logging.

I hope we can quickly come together and pass this budget without all the various additions that have made it impossible for Congress to go forward. It is time to reopen the government. I have spent a lot of time working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle on these other issues, and I will continue to do so, and I know a lot of Senators will. Right now it is time to reopen the government and end the shutdown.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, if the Senator will stay on the floor for a moment, one of the bills mentioned by the Senator from Illinois was the helium bill. Within that there is an important Alaska priority. I know my colleagues worked with the Senator—important to my State—on cleaning up those legacy wells that have been on Federal land for years with oil literally seeping out of those wells. And now there is money for the first time in I don't know how many years to actually clean up these wells. But from what I just heard, and correct me if I am wrong, what the Senator just indicated is that the Bureau of Land Management doesn't have the capacity to do permitting and other staffing. So there is no work to be done even though we finally passed a bipartisan bill in both Houses, signed by the President—something that has been waiting for decades to be cleaned. Am I correct on this, that BLM now can't do the work we want them to do? And Alaskans have been desperately waiting for decades.

Mr. WYDEN. I say to the Senator, we know for certain that 10,000 individuals have been furloughed at the Bureau of Land Management. And I tried to describe particularly getting these new permits. I guess if we are already out there with something—and I talked to Chief Tidwell about how we would try to stabilize operations that have, in effect, been put in place now. But we are not going to be able to go forward with new operations like the Senator from Alaska is describing.

Mr. BEGICH. I know the Senator came to Alaska a few months ago and had an opportunity to see some of the great ability of our energy companies and what we are trying to do. Today I got an important announcement from Exxon and ConocoPhillips about building an LNG plant in an area the Senator had a chance to see. I didn't want to tell them yet, but I wanted to say thank you for the announcement, the multibillion-dollar investment in our State, something we have been doing already for 40 years—exporting to Japan. But now if there are any Federal Government permits they will need, the odds of them getting them in a timely manner are now delayed. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. WYDEN. Again, the Senator is right, because in Alaska, like Oregon, there is an extraordinary level of Federal ownership. In my State the Federal Government owns more than half of the land. The Senator is absolutely correct. With the shutdown, Federal agencies cannot approve drilling permits either on Federal land or offshore, and I saw both when I was in Alaska.

The point is that these are issues we can work on in a bipartisan way. As soon as the government gets reopened, we will go about the task of getting those permits out and coming together on a bipartisan basis, as we have done on so many issues. But we can't do it if the government is shut down. We can't do it if we can't pay our bills. That is what we are going to have to deal with.

Mr. BEGICH. I think this is more of a question/comment. One of the statements at the end talked about how this was held up. We passed a bill out of here—a continuing resolution—in which we cut, on an annualized basis, $70 billion. We didn't compromise. We took their number. Let's make sure we are clear. We negotiated starting back in July, reduced and reduced, and then we went with their number, a $70 billion annualized reduction. The body passed it, and nothing passes out of this body unless we get a motion to proceed with some sort of unanimous consent or bipartisan, and that was 99 to 0—people forget that—to move us to the bill. Then we moved it and sent it over to the House, where it has sat since the day we sent it over there. That would have kept this budget operating. Again, it had a $70 billion annualized reduction.

I think that was the point toward the end of the Senator's comment, that a simple vote over there would put everyone back to work—these permits we just talked about, cleaning up the legacy wells.

The timber we have in southeastern Alaska is now in jeopardy because our Federal lands are now at risk. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. WYDEN. It is. And I am sure the Senator was involved in this as well,

where, after all these years about hearing that the Senate hadn't passed a budget, we stayed up one night until the wee hours and passed a budget. We had scores of votes. Then a lot of us simply wanted to have a conference with the other body. After hearing that there hadn't been a budget, we thought we would be able to get that conference going, and we haven't been able to do that either.

Mr. BEGICH. And they have passed their budget too. So we have two budgets ready to go to conference; is that fair?

Mr. WYDEN. It was there for the doing. I remember coming to the floor and asking unanimous consent to go to conference. I knew there had been some conferencing. But there was an immediate objection. At that time I pointed out that Republican and Democratic economists were saying look to the long term. I talked about it that day, saying that Senator ISAKSON of Georgia—a very able Member of the Finance Committee—and I have some new ideas on Medicare that we think can protect the Medicare guarantee and hold costs down. But we can't get at those kinds of issues unless, as the Senator says, we first reopen the government with that simple vote.

Mr. BEGICH. I appreciate the comments, and I thank the Senator for answering these questions. I think it is important again to point out that budget was passed back in April-May. We did ours, and they did theirs. We have tried 18 times to bring the two parties together. We have tried unanimous consent, as the Senator noted, here on the floor 18 times.

Then we went to this continuing resolution. That debate and negotiation started in July. The House had one number, and we had one number. As time progressed, we took their number—a $70 billion annualized reduction. Some would not call that a compromise, but we will call it a negotiated compromise because we wanted to get it done. We again sent it over there. It has sat idle. One person—the Speaker—could put it on the floor. I heard him on the radio or TV this weekend explaining how the votes aren't there. Well, if the votes aren't there, put it on the floor and it will fail. But the reality is that the votes are there.

Just as we have taken every one of their items, brought it to the floor—we have voted on every single item over here. They haven't prevailed, but we voted because that is the process. But for whatever reason, it has gone over there and sat idle.

So if the Speaker doesn't think the votes are there, put it up. His side will win then. But there are clearly Republicans and Democrats over on the House side who want to put the government back in operation so we can get on to these bigger issues.

Is that a fair chronology of events?

Mr. WYDEN. It is. And what I was struck by over the weekend with respect to those comments is, why not at least try that? If we add up all the Members on both sides of the aisle who said they would vote, for whatever——

Mr. BEGICH. House Members.

Mr. WYDEN. Yes, the House Members who said they would vote for it, it sure looks as though the votes are there. And if they are trying to break the gridlock, why not try?

So I hope that kind of thinking will set in here in the next few hours because that would be the fastest way, as the Senator from Alaska has made clear, to get the government open.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Senator for allowing me to ask some questions.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we are in day number 7 of this government shutdown. As was pointed out by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon, we started with a continuing resolution of $1.058 billion. That was compromised down, with the expectation that there would be a clean CR, to $986 billion—over a $70 billion reduction. That wasn't good enough because there were some who wanted to add different amendments to deal with the affordable health care act. The bottom line is that we are in the throes of a governmental shutdown.

It is interesting that since the government was shut down—midnight tonight will be a solid week—we have seen bills come over from the House that would fund the VA and the National Park Service. The Senator from Alaska is on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We both work very hard for rural veterans in this country, but we both know the VA can't do their job unless the IRS has funding and CMS has funding. So it is great to put that political gesture out there, but the truth is that they can't do their job until we have more than just the VA funded.

Then there was a story of childhood cancer, so the House came across and said: Maybe we ought to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Then there was the terrible scene last week where Capitol police officers—who are actually working without pay—had to address a lady who drove up here by the Hart Building. Since those officers responded, maybe we should pay them. So they came across with a bill for them. They should be paid all the time, I might add.

Then there is the issue of Hurricane Karen, so we need to fund FEMA. So they came across to fund FEMA.

Then they thought, all these furloughed Federal employees, we should pay them. And I agree, we should. The fact is that they do a great job and they should be back here working, and every one of them wants to be back here working to get that backpay.

Then they decided to fund things such as food inspectors because they understand our food security is at risk.

These guys can't see past their political noses. The bottom line is, as the previous speakers talked about, if the Speaker of the House put the clean resolution up with $986 billion, it would pass the House. He said it wouldn't this weekend. OK. So if it doesn't, put it up anyway. Prove us wrong. The bottom line is that it would pass and this senseless shutdown would be over.

There are plenty of things out there that continue to hamper this country's moving forward economically due to this economic shutdown. We have talked about Head Start. We have talked about the Forest Service suspending logging contracts. The Senator from Alaska talked about drilling permits. Montana is an outdoor State, and people live for this time of year. It is called hunting season. Access to a lot of the hunting, camping, and fishing sites has been severely restricted. This weekend the National Guard furloughed its drill for 3,500 guardsmen. Communities around our national parks are being severely impacted, losing literally millions of dollars, which is real money.

So how do we get out of this? It is pretty simple: If the Speaker would put the bill on the floor, it would pass. He refuses to do that. I think he refuses to do it for another reason, and that reason is that I think a lot of his Members want to cater to the tea party movement but go back home and want to appear as if they are moderates. If they had that vote, it would certainly point out who stands for what in that body. That is why he needs to have the vote.

As was said by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska, we have had votes on everything they sent over here, just about. The fact is they need to do the same. We sent a clean CR to them. Unless they want this shutdown to go and on and on for some unknown reason, they would vote on that clean CR.

Then we are rapidly approaching the debt ceiling, which puts the full faith and credit of this country at risk if we do not increase it. I might add this is not money that is yet to be spent, this is money that has been spent. It is not unlike the mortgage on your house or your credit card bill. If you do not pay them, interest rates will go up. If we do not increase the debt limit, interest rates and our national debt will go up. Those who are concerned about the debt and the deficit, as I am, and others on both sides of the aisle, we will see our national debt increase, not decrease, by doing something as silly as not increasing the debt ceiling.

I know there are some in this body who would love to put issues on the debt ceiling, and they are playing with fire. We saw what happened in 2011 when our credit rating was downgraded because some were just talking about not increasing the debt ceiling.

The truth is I will be the first to work with anybody in this body to try

to reduce the debt and deficit by reducing spending, by removing tax loopholes in the code. We need to do that at the front end, not the back end. The debt limit is dealing with the issue at the back end. If we do not do it, if we do not increase the debt ceiling, we will see the economy spiral down out of control, potentially even putting us into a depression.

I don't say that to scare people. I say that to make the point that we should not be fooling around with this issue. We are adults here. We need to get together and realize that the debt ceiling is too important to play politics with. I know since I have been here—and this government shutdown issue is a prime example—politics has trumped policy nearly every time. It is time to endorse the right policy and get a long-term comprehensive deal that is not a patch, that doesn't add to the uncertainty, yet gets us by the continuing resolution, gets us out on the debt ceiling so we do not have to deal with this every 45 or 90 days and do not have to deal with the debt ceiling just about every year.

I think if we were to do that and cooler minds prevailed, we could see this country start to grow economically. We would see unemployment drop even more than we have seen previously. We would see this country go on to have an opportunity to pay down our debt and deficit in a way that makes sense for our kids and grandkids.

I do not know where this is going to end. I can tell you the folks back home see it for what it is, and they are tired of foolishness and they want to see it stopped. I can tell you what makes it particularly frustrating for me is that as I see businesses start to expand, as I see entrepreneurs ready to take chances, they look at what goes on in Washington, DC, and: Whoa, this is not worth it. We don't know what the future is to bring because of the uncertainty of not only the continuing resolution, keeping the government open, but also the talk that has been revolving now around the debt ceiling talks.

I hope this body will do the right thing, and that it would push the House to do the right thing; that is, put the clean resolution on the floor in the House. Let's get the debt ceiling behind us. Let's talk about debt and deficit reduction in a meaningful way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Could the Senator from Montana stay for a second so I can ask for a clarification of one of his beginning statements?

Mr. TESTER. Yes.

MR. BEGICH. The Senator had at the beginning some good numbers there. If I do the math right, when the Senator from Oregon was here and from what I saw, we hear over and over there are not negotiations or compromise going on. But if I hear my colleague's numbers right, there were negotiations, there was compromise. As a matter of fact, there was so much compromise we went to the House number—not our number, we went to their number. We actually reduced the budget on an annualized basis $70 billion. Isn't that what the Senator's numbers are? He is on the Appropriations Committee, I am on the Appropriations Committee. There is one thing we do know a lot about and that is numbers.

Mr. TESTER. It is. It is a much lower number. I will tell the good Senator from Alaska this: That is what happened in the negotiations. The upshot of all that is that we would get a clean CR coming back if we would negotiate it back down to that figure; there would not be a bunch of games being played.

Mr. BEGICH. Not a lot of stuff added on later that wasn't necessary. We would debate that later but——

Mr. TESTER. Absolutely. And we should debate them later. But the bottom line is it is important that we keep our government open. Why? Because we are wasting a ton of money the way it is being done now, and this piecemeal funding, trying to get a political advantage, is crazy. People see it for what it is: Political gamesmanship.

Mr. BEGICH. Isn't it odd they pass ''let's pay everybody,'' 435 to 0, they pass it but they only want to have some of them come back to work? If you are a fiscal conservative—I think I am; we are from Montana, Alaska, you know, conservative States—I want them working if we are paying them. Doesn't that make sense?

Instead, it seems as though we are given a couple of agencies, but they still want to pay everybody. I don't know what the logic is there.

Mr. TESTER. Why don't we have them come back? We know the value of work to their self-esteem.

Mr. BEGICH. Absolutely.

Mr. TESTER. We know those folks are important to my office. If they were not important to my office, they would not be working for me. They tell folks what is going on, help constituents when they have problems with some of the agencies around.

But the bottom line is they are sitting at home. These are not rich folks. A lot of them are hand to mouth. They don't know how long this government shutdown is going to go on and they want to go back to work.

Mr. BEGICH. I guess I have one more. The Senator said something I thought was very interesting on the budget deficit. The Senator is older than I am. I came here 2 years after the Senator. When we came in, we dealt with the debt ceiling, which is about paying the bills. We have to pay the bills that were racked up for a period of time before we got here.

In 2009, I think the deficit per year was $1.4 trillion. This year—which just closed out because we are still not done—it was about $630 billion. That is almost a 60-percent reduction in the deficit. We are headed the right way. But this is not helping.

Mr. TESTER. My last point would be this. If we are going to get the debt and deficit under control, one of the things we have to do is grow the economy. By stopping government with this continuing resolution, by talking, simply talking about increasing the debt limit, it does not do good things for our economy. In fact, it takes it in the wrong direction. We see businesses contract when they see what is going on here in Washington.

It is time to start using some common sense. There are folks who claim to be business representatives out there. I talked to a bunch of businesses this afternoon.

Mr. BEGICH. The Senator runs a business. He is a farmer.

Mr. TESTER. I am. Every one of them said they ought to quit messing around, get to an agreement, have the debates on debt and deficit we need to have, because they are important, but don't hold up the debt limit and don't hold up the government funding in the process.

I thank my friend from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank my good friend for allowing me to take a few minutes and ask a couple of points.

Mr. President, I am here to say that is what this debate is about, a simple question, allowing a vote on the House side. If they do not have the votes, because obviously the Speaker there believes he doesn't have the votes and he doesn't support it being voted on, let it be on the floor, it will fail, and we will go back to the drawing board.

But the reality is he knows the votes are there. We would be out of this shutdown. The result would be people would be back to work, services will be provided, and businesses will not be losing the confidence they are losing every day or like the market once again. Since this debate started, the threats of shutdown, of actual shutdown, the stock market over the last 15, 16 days has lost almost 600 points. Most people do not pay a lot of attention to that. But if you have an education account, a 401(k) account, a retirement account, an IRA, or you have a little money set aside, it has a direct impact to your livelihood over the long haul.

I encourage the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker BOEHNER, to allow a simple vote. We have, on every bill that has come over here. They have not prevailed, but we allowed a vote. That is the process.

But over there they refuse to do it. They keep sending back gimmicks. It is hard for me to understand this logic. They want to pay every single Federal employee, but they are only going to have some of them come back to work. It makes no sense. If you are paying your employees, have them come back and work.

I run a small business, my wife runs a small business, I know the Senator from Montana, who just left here, runs a small business. You don't pay your people not to come to work. When you pay them to work, you pay them to work.

The Presiding Officer was a Governor. He would not say one day: Oh, by the way, I am going to pay everyone, stay home for a month. No, he would have them come to work when he is paying them unless they have leave or vacation time. This is crazy. It passes unanimously on the House side.

Then they say: But we don't want you to work.

The taxpayers should be outraged about that. I want to vote on that bill. I want to vote on that furlough bill here. I want to make sure everyone gets paid, and then I went to follow it up with the CR and put everyone back to work. That is what we should be doing here, not these games where they bring over political statements with the items they are bringing over.

Do we want to vote against veterans? I have a higher per capita number of veterans in my State than any other State. Veterans are important to our economy. They have served our country. They deserve every benefit. But to play this game of leveraging—the American people see right through this. These guys who keep bringing these little schemes over here are thinking they are one step ahead of the American people. They are absolutely wrong. The American people are two or three steps ahead of us. They see the show-and-tell that is going on and it doesn't make sense.

Again, if you are going to fund all the employees—again, 435 to 0 they voted to fund all the employees who get paid, but then they only want some of them to go to work. It makes no sense to me at all.

I appreciate the time of the Presiding Officer allowing me the opportunity to engage with a couple of my colleagues here, but every time they spoke I wanted to explain and show kind of the farce that is going on over there and what is happening over there with a small group of the tea party—very small, 30, 40 Members over there, who decided they are going to run the government here.

The government is not run by one group, it is run by compromise and negotiation. We have negotiated all the way down to their number, we have put every one of their bills on the floor and voted on them. Now all we ask is one simple vote, a clean CR that sits in the Speaker's office, ready to be put on the floor.

He even says it will fail. OK. Let's see. Let's see where his votes are. Let's see where it all is. If it fails, we will be right back to where we are today, no difference. What does he fear? He fears the fact it will pass.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Chair.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF COLIN STIRLING BRUCE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

NOMINATION OF SARA LEE ELLIS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois and Sara Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask consent the time be equally charged to both sides during the quorum call, and I suggest an absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering judicial nominations from a previous order.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we are going to vote on two of the district court nominations pending before the Senate. I am glad we are getting to these important nominations, as we should have weeks ago. They should have been done in a routine fashion in the normal course of events, but there has been this concerted effort to slow down President Obama's judges—something we have never seen with other Presidents, but we do with him. I am glad that these are at least going through.

In the same vein, we see a needless government shutdown. I hope it comes to an end so the Senate can tend to the business of the country, including, as I said on the floor the other day, ensuring that the courts have the judges they need. In fact, speaking of judges, they are both from Illinois and have the support of Senator DURBIN and Senator KIRK.

I ask that my full statement regarding the judges be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATIONS OF COLIN BRUCE AND SARA ELLIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we will vote on two of the district court nominations pending before the Senate. While I am glad we are considering these important nominations today, I hope that this needless government shutdown soon comes to an end so the Senate can tend to the business of the country, including ensuring that our courts have the judges they need.

Colin Bruce is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois. Mr. Bruce is a lifelong Federal prosecutor who has served in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois for nearly 25 years. He has served as the first assistant U.S. attorney since 2010. He has extensive experience in Federal court and has handled over 600 cases, including 60 jury trials, 3 bench trials, and 80 appeals involving a broad range of issues such as drugs, fraud, national security, and cyber crime.

Sara Ellis is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Ms. Ellis works in private practice in Chicago and also serves as an adjunct professor at Loyola University Chicago School of Law. She has substantial experience litigating in the civil and criminal context, having previously worked as a staff attorney for the Federal Defender Program and as an attorney for the city of Chicago Department of Law. Over her 18-year legal career, she has tried 11 cases to verdict.

Both of the nominees have the bipartisan support of their home State Senators, Mr. Durbin and Mr. Kirk. They were reported by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote more than 2 months ago. While I am pleased that we are finally getting to vote on these nominees, voting on just 2 of the 13 judicial nominees currently pending on the floor is not enough to make real progress in reducing the vacancies on our Federal courts. Our Federal judicial vacancies currently number more than 90, including 39 that have been designated as emergency vacancies due to high caseloads by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the Courts. There is no good reason for us to not get back to what used to be the regular order in the Senate of taking up and confirming consensus nominees within days of being reported out of committee. We need to get these talented men and women off the Senate calendar and into the courtroom so they can get to work on behalf of the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I think I have spoken on the floor every day since this happened. In what has become an all-too-familiar scene around

the Capitol over the past few years as we again find ourselves in a stalemate over providing funding to keep the Federal Government running. I share the frustration of most Americans—Republicans and Democrats—that what was once the regular business of Congress, funding the government, has been replaced by political theater and another artificial made-in-Congress crisis that might get a number of people on television, but while doing it, they imperil the economy, and in ways large and small, every single family in America. It makes no difference what their politics are, they are in peril.

Of course, there is an easy way to resolve this fabricated crisis. The House of Representatives could simply vote on the Senate bill. It is a clean continuing resolution. It has no partisan ideological riders on the right or the left. It would provide the funding necessary to keep the Federal Government open through November 15, and Speaker BOEHNER could accept the offer Leader REID made to get on with the business of negotiating and passing this year's appropriations bills that should have been passed by the end of last month.

Over the past week, the House has had ample opportunity to end this shutdown. They could have passed the Senate's legislation to fund all of the Federal agencies and provide Congress with the time it needs to find a path forward.

Yet a faction—not the whole House by any means—of extreme House members, supported by their leadership, have prevented the full body from voting on the Senate bill. Extreme Republican members—they certainly don't represent the kind of Republicans we have in Vermont—have prevented the full body from voting on the Senate bill.

Instead, what do they do? They are all collecting their salaries, but they closed the government all because they want to erode access to affordable, private health care options for millions of uninsured Americans. It is unconscionable, and they have not come up with an alternative.

They said: We will get rid of a family's option to keep their college-aged children on their health insurance, but we have no alternative. We are going to get rid of the ability of spouses who may have had a preexisting condition, such as cancer or diabetes or a heart condition, from having insurance. We are going to get rid of that, but we have nothing as an alternative. We are going to eliminate those options, for those—who might be low-income persons—to get insurance, but we have no alternative. We just want to get rid of it.

There is no question that this is a crisis driven by a handful of partisans on the other side of the aisle for whom there is no path to compromise on just about anything. Well, there is one exception. They do find every possible opportunity to get in front of a television camera and talk about what they have done. The American people ought to know what they are doing; they are hurting them terribly.

Their demands are both constantly shifting and breathtakingly unreasonable.

While the Senate has voted on one flawed House proposal after another, the House refuses to vote on anything from the Senate. Incredibly, these same extremists—and they are extremists—are now threatening to employ this same harmful tactic when the Federal Government reaches its statutory borrowing limit in a couple of weeks.

It is interesting that the Speaker says: We are not going to be able to do anything on the debt limit. We saw the stock market, which was projected to be up by 150-to-200 points suddenly go down 150 points. There was a 300-point swing. In other words, we will continue our sloganeering and our stalling no matter what that might do to people's savings for retirement, or their pension, or to their kids in college or to the small businesses that are trying to make money so they can stay in business. We don't care what happens to them because we have to be on the evening news and talk about how we are standing up for America.

No, they are not standing up for America.

In fact, the Treasury Department reported last week that a failure to raise the debt limit could cause credit markets to freeze, the dollar to plummet, and interest rates to rise precipitously. The report goes on to say a government default on its debts might prove so catastrophic that it could potentially result ''in a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse.'' They don't seem to care so long as they get on television.

We have all heard a lot of talk and seen a lot of crocodile tears about getting our fiscal House in order. Oh, what a great campaign slogan. But too many who got elected with such bumper sticker sloganeering are not following through on their constitutional responsibility to the government.

Look at their list of ransom demands for reopening the government: The first one blows a $100 billion hole in the national debt by repealing the Affordable Care Act. The second one adds $30 billion more to the debt without offering any suggestion for making up the revenue. The third still keeps important government functions closed, such as providing food assistance to young children, expectant mothers, seniors, continuing health trials that could cure cancer or childhood diseases; and the list goes on and on.

It is truly unfortunate that a relative few Republicans in Congress, who are obviously enjoying the limelight, are willing to play politics and brinkmanship at a time when the public demands statesmanship. Their reckless actions are hurting families all across America. I would remind them they are hurting Democratic families, Republican families, Independent families; they are hurting Americans. For this small, extreme faction, it seems ''compromise'' is a dirty word and ''distrust'' is a political tactic. That may explain why we have heard excuse after excuse for blocking the budget discipline they so desperately pled for just a short time ago. They said: Why don't we pass a budget? Why didn't the Senate pass a budget? I was in the chair at 5 o'clock in the morning on a Saturday morning when we were voting on that budget. We voted all day and all night and we finished it. That was back in March.

So what happens when we want to go to a conference on the budget and work out the differences with the House? In a conference, if we counted the number of people, there would be more Republicans than Democrats. It was a Republican Senator who stood on the floor and said: I object to going to conference—the same one who was giving speeches asking why we don't have a budget.

Then, when we pass a budget, we have to go to the next step to work it out with the House: Oh, no, I object to that. Probably because he was surprised we had actually done our work. The chairwoman of the committee, the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, who did such a brilliant job of getting together a budget that saves the taxpayers money—they then act terrified that it might actually pass.

They have objected 19 times to go to that budget conference. They have shut down the government. They are preparing to cause the government's first ever debt default in our Nation's history. That is right. The Speaker of the House is now holding the government's credit hostage, threatening this weekend to let the Nation default come October 17 when the debt limit is reached unless even more draconian spending cuts are made. Is there any reason markets all over the world are dropping? Is there any reason the rest of the world looks at America and says: What are you doing? Why are you letting the children in the sandbox take over?

We have caught just a preview of the chaos such a move could create. Stock futures, as I mentioned, dropped sharply and European stocks dropped dramatically in the wake of House Republicans' newest ultimatum. This is no way to govern.

It is also not an example to set for the rest of the world when we have to go to the rest of the world and say: Help us, work with us, to stop the terrorists who threaten the United States. Help us, work with us, so we can export our goods to your country. Help us, work with us to bring about stability around the world. They say: You will not do a thing to even help yourself. Why should we help you?

I talked to some of these countries. I talked to the people in those countries. They are shaking their heads and saying: What has happened to America?

So it is far past time for reason and sanity to return to Congress, on this

government shutdown, on setting our budget priorities, and a whole host of other issues. Let's let the grownups come back and start running things around here.

I remain ready to work with people on both sides of the aisle. I am proud of my record, as the senior-most Member of this body, that year after year after year legislation I have written with both Republicans and Democrats as cosponsors has passed. The distinguished Presiding Officer was Governor of one of the great Commonwealths of this country, the Commonwealth of Virginia. He brought Republicans and Democrats together. It was a model for the rest of the country. It can be done, but it takes grownups to do it. We are always going to have a few loud voices saying: Oh, we can't possibly do this.

The American public expects the people who truly lead to be leaders. So let's work with people on both sides of the aisle. Let's find a solution that ends this needless shutdown and gets us and hundreds of thousands of Federal employees back to doing our work on behalf of the American people. That starts with the House voting on the Senate bill to reopen the American people's government.

That bill is sitting over there right now. Bring it to a vote. Vote to put Americans back to work and to reopen those trials to find cures for childhood diseases, or vote no if some wish to continue to be children in the sandbox.

I am blessed with grandchildren. I like to think none of my grandchildren would act as childish as a small group of ultra-rightwing Republicans have in the House. They don't reflect the great tradition of the Republican Party in my State or in this country. They reflect an atmosphere of people who care only for themselves. No matter what they say, they care only for their own egos and their own political future. It is time they started caring for the United States of America.

I see nobody else seeking recognition. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and if time is being charged, I ask unanimous consent that it be charged on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with nobody else seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question occurs on the Bruce nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Heller	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Risch
Brown	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Isakson	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Chambliss	Kaine	Scott
Chiesa	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Levin	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Inhofe
Coburn	Rubio

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ELLIS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Sarah Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from California.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business for debate only be extended to 7:30 p.m. and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for such time as I might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think we are all in a state of shock that we are entering the fourth day of a government shutdown with no movement in sight.

I wanted to go home to California to see how the Affordable Care Act is going in California since that is the reason the Republicans have shut down the government. I want to report that people there cannot understand why on Earth the Republicans want to stop the Affordable Care Act. They can't believe that just as Californians are on the brink of getting millions of our citizens insured and small businesses are getting affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, Republicans not only have shut down the government, but they are threatening default. And they understand that default would lead to economic chaos. It has never happened before in American history. I tried to explain to my constituents exactly what has been going on here, and I did it in the best way I could, and I think I was fair.

The first thing: In order to keep the government open for 6 weeks, they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They tried 43 times. That never worked, so then they said they would defund it, which everybody understands that if you don't fund it, it is the same thing. But we told them they couldn't defund most of it because most of it is not appropriated funds. They didn't care. They put that forward. That went nowhere.

Then they said: We won't repeal it or defund it. We will delay the Affordable Care Act.

We all said: If you think we are going to delay further the chance for millions of Americans to get affordable insurance, we are not going to do it. This bill passed 3½ years ago and was upheld by the Supreme Court. It is not going to happen.

Then they said: We will just take part of it and stop part of it. We won't allow women to get preventive services.

That went over like a lead balloon, their war on women again. They were saying women won't be able to get tested for cervical cancer, for STDs, for pregnancy-related diabetes. They were just going to shut that part of the Affordable Care Act down. Women here in

the Senate held a press conference, and they dropped that.

Then they said: OK, we are going to repeal one of the revenue streams that is going to cost $30 billion, but we have no way to replace it.

So then they actually sent us a provision that would have added $30 billion to the deficit—from the Republican Party. They say they are so fiscally conservative, and they actually sent us a provision that would cost $30 billion with no way to pay for it. So that didn't go down to well.

This one is really beautiful. They say our staff and the staff of anyone working in the White House—all these people who believe so much in giving back to their great country will no longer get the employer contribution that all Americans get who work for large employers. That is their great ''thank you'' to their staff. That is their great show of appreciation—besides shutting down the government where their staff is working without pay.

So I explained this to my constituents who are trying to sign up for health care.

I went to a really good community health care center where people are lining up and getting information and they will be signing up for health care.

They said: Well, why would they do this?

I said: Well, there is more bad news. We thought they would extend the debt ceiling, which is the way you pay for the debts you have already incurred. It is already on the credit card. We need to pay for that, and now they are threatening not to pay the bills of the United States of America. They are threatening to take this country into default.

Now they are saying: Well, maybe we won't do it if we can cut Medicare and Medicaid.

So now they have put the Affordable Care Act on the line, they have put Medicare on the line, Medicaid on the line, Social Security is out there, and they may cause a default if we don't deal with these programs that are so critical to our people.

I have been around here a long time, and I know we have differences. But the President is right when he says we the Congress have two things we have to do. One of them is that we have to keep the doors open because we have passed laws and they need to be carried out. Keep the government open. And the second thing we have to do is pay our bills that we incurred. Raise the debt ceiling. So far, the Republicans refuse.

We sent a clean continuing resolution over there without all this cutting health care, Medicare, and Social Security that they are interested in. We said: Let's just keep the government open and going for 6 weeks, raise the debt ceiling, and then of course we will talk about all of this. That is what we do. We negotiate. We talk. And the President is more than willing. He offered the Republicans a $4 trillion deficit-reduction deal. They walked away. He is willing to talk about everything and anything. But you have to keep the government going and you have to pay your bills. That is the fundamental work we have to do. The irony, of course, is we get our checks. But our staff, they do not get their checks. The workers who come back because they are deemed essential, they are working without getting their pay.

This is an outrage. Speaker BOEHNER, all you have to do is put the continuing resolution on the floor for an up-or-down vote. Every Democrat will vote for it and, at last count, the newspapers say at least 21 Republicans. Open up the government. We are knocking on the door. Open it up. Guess what you will find behind the door? People who want to work, people who need a paycheck.

I have to tell you, they passed a bill that says they are going to pay Federal workers after the shutdown, and that is good. They should have done that. But right now we hear Republicans over here who say they don't really think that is a great idea. I have a better idea than even that: Open up the government and pay people for doing the jobs they were hired to do.

I have a ranking member who has asked for a big hearing on climate change, and he wants all the administration officials to show up. We were planning on that. But most of them have absolutely no staff, and they are responding to emergencies. If there is a chemical explosion, the chemical safety board has to respond. If there is a horrible coal ash spill, the EPA will have to respond. If there is a disastrous cancer hot spot, the EPA will have to respond. Open up the government. Don't just say to people you will get paid so you don't have to bother coming to work. Open up the government. Let people work for the pay they are supposed to get. This is an outrage.

I have to say when they passed over there ''pay the workers,'' we know why they did it. It was political. Because the heat in Virginia is so hot in this gubernatorial race, even the far right Republicans over there said to open up the government and fight about health care later.

I have to say when I went home and I saw people waiting to sign up for coveredCA.com, I learned that on the first day coveredCA.com had 5 million hits and 500,000 distinct users. Some 17,000 people called Covered California service centers and over 6,000 Californians began to sign up on the first day. On the second day they had 200,000 distinct users.

They are training thousands of enrollment counselors there. Many of them are already insurance agents. Many of them are going to work for big providers like Kaiser Permanente. Many of them are going to be in the community health care centers. Why do the Republicans want to shut down the government and threaten the default of this Nation when we are on the brink of getting millions of people the health insurance they need and deserve? The small business community is going to have an opportunity to get better rates and better tax breaks.

I want to talk a little bit about this threat of default because the threat of default is real. Let's start off and go through a couple of charts. First of all, we have a new thing going on. The junior Senator from Oklahoma today said: Oh, you don't default if you don't pay people what they are owed, only if you default on interest payments.

All of a sudden there is a new definition. But if you don't pay Social Security, he doesn't consider it a default. If you don't pay for Medicare, he doesn't consider it a default. If you don't pay contractors, he doesn't consider it a default.

Why don't we go to Black's Law Dictionary:

> Default: The failure to make a payment when due.

Let's be clear, there is not one bill that is coming due that Congress did not pass. Let's be clear. Congress makes the decisions on spending. We default when we fail to make a payment when due. They are playing, as Jack Lew, the Treasury Secretary, said, with fire—playing with fire.

Let's see what has been said about default. Default means you fail to raise the debt ceiling in order to accommodate the bills you have already incurred. Ronald Reagan, the hero of the Republican Party:

> The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

Ronald Reagan said that in 1983. Why don't the Republicans listen to their hero? He said even the thought of a default was dangerous for this Nation. The last time they played these games it cost billions of dollars because we were downgraded. Let's look at Douglas Holtz-Eakin, CBO Director under George W. Bush, talking about default:

> It's a bad idea, little defaults, big defaults; defaults, a bad idea, period, and there should be no one who believes otherwise.

If they don't listen to Ronald Reagan, why don't they listen to the CBO Director under George W. Bush? I tell you, these guys are in the fringes. They are in the fringe lane. They are in the far right, and they are going to go off the road, and if it were just them, it would be one thing, but they are taking America with them. We have to stand up and be counted around here and not let this go without comment.

Mark Zandi, he was JOHN MCCAIN's economic adviser. Here is what said:

> The dark scenario is so dark I can't imagine it.

He is talking about a default. Speaker BOEHNER is standing there saying: Well, despite the fact that you read that I didn't want a default, I can't

contemplate approving this without figuring out how to cut entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

I have to tell you, they are playing with fire. I think they have lit the match. Anyone who knows anything about economics—I happened to have majored in it in college, and I was a stockbroker for a period of time and know that uncertainty is the worst thing. The last time the Republicans tried this—and eventually they decided to back up and back off—it cost us, as I was saying, almost $19 billion over 10 years in taxpayer costs. America's credit rating was downgraded. Standard & Poor downgraded the U.S. credit rating for the first time in American history and the stock market sank. It dropped 2,000 points in July and August of 2011.

That is a wonderful policy, Republicans. Just keep it up. Who do you think you are helping? People who have 401(k)s? Everyone in America who is counting on the certainty of a government opening up every day in the greatest nation of the world? What are they accomplishing? The President had to cancel a trip to Asia that was so anticipated, giving China the upper hand there. You have to be kidding. Who are you helping?

Here is the deal. We have a health care program now called the Affordable Care Act. I will tell you the story of Leslie Foster, a 28-year-old freelance filmmaker in Hollywood. He told the Wall Street Journal—Leslie Foster—that he found a plan on Covered California that will cost him only $62 a month. Because Leslie earns $20,000 a year, federal assistance will pick up nearly three-quarters of the cost of his premium. Leslie says he hasn't had comprehensive health insurance since 2006.

I went home to be with the real people, to see the good that we can do. Is the Affordable Care Act perfect? No. Can we fix it? Yes. Let's talk about it. But don't try to scuttle a law that is so important for the people of my State and for this country—48 million people who are uninsured in America today. They have a shot at getting insurance for the first time. Don't take it away. Don't threaten default, and don't shut down this government—which you already did. Open it up.

The more I think about it, they pass a law to pay Federal employees who are sitting home. Tell me how that makes sense. They want to come to work and do their jobs. They are not happy sitting at home, whether they get a check or they don't. Open up the government. If you don't like certain functions, fight it out during the regular order. PATTY MURRAY, the chair of our Budget Committee, she has asked—I think it is now 18 times, I could be wrong and I'll correct the record if I am wrong—she has asked them to go to conference and strike a deal. Let's sit down and talk.

Senator CRUZ objected every time, and when he was not here Senator LEE objected. The far right wing does not want to solve this problem because they like the chaos. I don't know why. They ought to say it to Andrew Stryker. He is 34 years old. He lives in Los Angeles. He does freelance work. He pays a monthly premium of around $600 to stay on the plan from the job he left 4 years ago. He has high blood pressure and says he has been denied coverage in the past due to a preexisting condition. Last Tuesday Andrew told the Washington Post he picked out a silver plan on the Covered California exchange. It took him a while to sign up for coverage due to traffic and high demand on day 1. He said, '' . . . it will save me over $6,000. For that I would have waited all day.''

I think the Republicans should call up Mr. Stryker and say: Too bad. Too bad. You don't mind if we delay this another few years, do you?

And he would say: I sure would. I have a chance.

Last week San Franciscan Paul Cello told KQED that he selected a plan on the California exchange that will save him more than $300 a month compared to what he pays now in the high risk pool. ''It's like a whole 'nother world,'' he said. ''The coverage is better, no preexisting condition exclusions, I will get mental health coverage, so there's way more coverage than I had and I am going to be saving.''

Why doesn't JOHN BOEHNER, who is known to shed tears, call up Paul Cello and say: Gee, Mr. Cello, we are really sorry. We want to delay your insurance for a year or 2 or forever. Where is the emotion Speaker BOEHNER has shown in many other cases. Where is the emotion for workers here who cannot get a paycheck, who are just praying to God the Republicans will vote on that clean CR and open up this government?

We know we have disagreements. That is fine. We are proud of the values that we bring. But it is not right to shut down the government and cause so much pain. It is not right to threaten default and havoc in the markets, and havoc all across the nation. It is not right. They are trying to shut down the government, and they might default because they don't like Medicare, ObamaCare, Social Security, and Medicaid, and they are stamping their feet and they are throwing a tantrum. Why are they inflicting so much suffering on our workers and on our families, but none on themselves?

Note to the Republicans: You are protecting your pay. Give it up during the shutdown.

Here in the Capitol last week we had a very frightening incident. It happened right outside my office. We are so thankful to the Capitol Police for rushing to save the day. A vehicle was being used as a weapon. They ran right to the trouble. A couple of them wound up in the hospital. They are not getting paid. What do you think that does to the ego of people, to their feeling of self-worth? And these Republicans can get all the protection they want, and so do we. This is the way we value people: Shut down the government and don't give them their pay? And by the way, they tried to take away their employer contribution to their health care which is equivalent to a huge pay cut. Talk about values, Speaker BOEHNER, why don't you get a little bit of a dose of Tip O'Neill? Tip O'Neill knew the magic of 218. He didn't care whether it was Republicans or Democrats who voted. He got things done. They have done nothing. Just because they control one-half of one-third of the government doesn't mean they get to decide everything. It doesn't work that way. We have to work together.

They don't get to pick and choose what laws to enforce. If they don't like them, then repeal them. Try to repeal the Clean Air Act. Bring it on. Try to repeal the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Super Fund Act, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform law, and the Consumer Protection Agency. Be honest. They don't even like Social Security, they don't like Medicare, and they don't like Medicaid. If they want to battle that out, bring it on. We will battle it out. But don't hold this whole country hostage and don't hurt millions of workers.

They did pass these little mini bills. We stand on the floor and talk about the horror stories. Oh, they passed a mini bill. I guess eventually they will send enough bills over here to open the whole government. Why don't they just open the government?

We cry for those people who can't get into NIH trials. They have a mini bill, but they didn't open the CDC and people are not working to catch the next epidemic. They didn't do anything to restart food inspections, and Lord knows we lose thousands of people a year from eating poisoned food. They will not open the EPA, and we have kids in Los Angeles, as we speak, who are very sick and ill with bloody noses.

There is a picture in the paper I can show everyone. The red over here is the result of bloody noses from little children who are living near an oil and gas operation. The day I read about it, I called up the EPA. They said they would be on it in 5 minutes, and then the government shut down. They don't care over there. Even though 75 percent of the people strongly support the EPA, they want to get rid of it. Bring it on but don't hold this country hostage.

There are 110 FAA safety inspectors in southern California who were furloughed, 830 Bureau of Land Management employees were sent home, and small businesses are not getting paid. We don't even know what our unemployment rate is in the greatest country in the world because the Labor Department had to send home the people who calculate that number.

In Santa Monica a plane crashed on Sunday evening and four people were killed. The NTSB cannot investigate—that is the National Transportation Safety Board—because the investigators are off the job. They took what

they learned, put it in a vault, and when the government reopens, they will take it out. In the meantime, who knows why it happened. Maybe it is a defect in the plane that we could fix for all planes. Maybe it is something on the runway. We don't know. Maybe it was pilot error. All of this needs to be discussed and looked at.

What they are doing is disgraceful, and it is unprecedented. I have looked back, and there have been shutdowns, but most lasted 1 or 2 or 3 days, but none of them were about repealing a law, let alone a signature law of a President—Democratic or Republican.

The Republicans have to wake up and smell reality. They had an election and a lot of it was about the Affordable Care Act. They lost. Amazingly, the Affordable Care Act—they dubbed it ObamaCare—is based on a Republican idea of individual responsibility. We actually got the idea from Republicans and from a Republican Governor named Mitt Romney. They ran away from it because they don't care for this President. Get over it. You lost. There are people in this Senate who ran on saying they would make the Affordable Care Act better, but they weren't going to repeal it.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission furloughed 600 employees. The government can't regulate the markets for contracts in oil, corn, and metals. Commissioner Bart Chilton said:

> Taking our cops off the beat for even a few days could have disastrous impacts on these markets that consumers depend upon.

We talked about the CDC. They furloughed 9,000 workers who respond to outbreaks such as salmonella. This is happening at a time when an outbreak of hepatitis A has affected 79 people in California.

We are dealing with a self-inflicted wound upon this Nation, a government shutdown that is unnecessary. We cannot allow this to continue. So I say to Speaker BOEHNER, who is the architect of this shutdown, stop playing games with the lives of Americans—our workers, our families, and our children. Do your job. Open the government. Let the House vote. It is pretty simple.

We have sent a bill over there which funds the government. We have made a commitment to them that after they pass that and the debt ceiling, every single thing is on the table.

I was thinking the other day that if you are a teacher and you get hired in a school and the school opens for work at 9 a.m. every morning, you have to be in the classroom at 9 a.m. in the morning in order to keep your job. If you weren't in your classroom at 9 a.m. in the morning and decided that you wanted to do something different such as come in at 11 a.m., you would be fired.

Our job is to keep the government running and pay the bills we have incurred. We don't get to pick and choose or decide that all of a sudden in the middle of everything we are going to cancel out a law that passed 3½ years ago.

This is so bad that the Republican candidate for Governor in Virginia has said: Stop it. Open the government and then debate health care.

The good news is Speaker BOEHNER could change his mind, bring up our bill in a few minutes' time. I know how it works. I spent 10 years in the House. It is real easy. They take the bill, go to the rules committee, talk about how they are going to allow one or two amendments or none, and they could then actually take it up, pass it, and send it to the President. What would that do? It would reopen the government tomorrow. It would keep the government open for 6 weeks while we debate the bigger issues, and then we should raise the debt ceiling so we can pay the bills we have already incurred.

It is so good to go home to your State and talk to people who are looking at us and thinking: Why would anyone want to close down this country because they don't like the fact that our families can get health insurance? They don't understand it. They are pondering it, and they are coming up with a tilt.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, you are a man; obviously, you have deep emotions. Your policies and that of your party are hurting people, hurting children, hurting families, hurting the economy, hurting the country, and all you have to do is bring up a clean continuing resolution that we passed over here, thanks to Republicans who allowed us to bring it up and pass it, and pass it over there. Let's get through this. Let's restore some faith that this country can function once again.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield the floor.

RETIREMENT OF DR. CLEM DOXEY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, we had a discussion at the Prayer Breakfast 2 weeks ago about skin cancer, and we have shared a common experience in that we have confronted a melanoma at one time in our lives.

On this Friday night Dr. Clem Doxey of Marietta, GA, is retiring after 43 years as a leading dermatologist in the Southeast, chief of staff at Kennestone Hospital, and also a leading dermatologist around the United States of America. He is a real inspiration to me, a man who led me to help pass the TAN Act, along with Senator REID, JOHN MCCAIN, and others, who came together to bring about awareness for skin cancer, awareness for melanoma, and awareness for early detection; a citizen who contributed to us an idea that is now the law of the land in the United States of America and one I am sure will help save lives.

Clem is retiring after many years in Marietta, GA, and 43 years of practice. He has been a leader in Rotary, a leader in organizations in our community, a leader in our hospital, a friend to me, and my dermatologist.

He graduated from the Pensacola School of Medicine and went straight, as a flight surgeon, to Vietnam in the U.S. Marine Corps. He returned to be a physician and get his residency training at Tulane University Medical Center in New Orleans, LA, and then came to Marietta, GA, and founded Marietta Dermatology, now the leading dermatology practice in the State of Georgia. He will retire this Friday night.

I walk around on these two feet in part because Clem taught me early awareness, early identification, and the right practices to deal with skin cancer. I thank him for what he did for me and what he has done for countless patients over countless years in the great city of Marietta in the great county of Cobb.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on October 9, 1863, the Maine legislature signed a charter establishing the State's first public institution of higher education. I rise today to celebrate 150 years of remarkable accomplishments by the University of Maine at Farmington.

Also, 2013 marks another significant anniversary: this is the 16th consecutive year that the University of Maine at Farmington has been named to the U.S. News and World Report ''Best College'' list. That same publication has named UMF, as it is known throughout Maine, a ''Best Value'' school for its quality programs and affordable cost. In addition, the Institute of International Education and the U.S. State Department have recognized UMF as a ''Top Producer'' of Fulbright Scholars, with 11 faculty members having received that prestigious award.

Such recognition is but one measure of UMF's success. Another is the deep affection alumni and people throughout Maine have for this remarkable institution. In 2005, I had the privilege to serve as honorary chairman of UMF's campaign for a new Education Center to integrate technology with teaching and learning. The support from countless individuals, businesses, and organizations was overwhelming and enabled a small school of just 2,000 students to keep pace with the top colleges and universities in the country.

Responding to the needs of an ever-changing society is one of the richest traditions a college can have. The UMF tradition of service began in 1857, 6 years before the charter was granted, when a convention of teachers from Franklin County, in the mountains of western Maine, urged the establishment of an institution dedicated to educating educators for the benefit of their region and of the entire State. When the first class of 31 students matriculated at the new Farmington Normal School the summer after the charter, they did so in a setting that was described by a UMF historian as ''rough, crude, and plenty humble.''

Over the years, UMF has become known for its outstanding liberal arts programs, which attract students not only from Maine but also from all over the nation.

Through the years, UMF has established another noble tradition—that of contributing to the entire region by adding to its cultural life, teaching in local classrooms, coaching youth athletics, and helping youngsters learn everything from swimming to foreign languages. From the Health and Fitness Center to the Mantor Library, the doors of UMF are open to the community.

The combination of quality and value results in graduation and freshman retention rates that are significantly higher than the national averages for both public universities and private colleges. UMF's dedication to educating educators continues today, with graduates receiving the Maine Teacher of the Year Award in four of the last 6 years.

On that ''rough, crude, and plenty humble'' foundation laid 150 years ago, something magnificent has been built—an ongoing commitment to excellence and a spirit of service. On behalf of the people of Maine, I congratulate the University of Maine at Farmington for 150 years of outstanding contributions to our State.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ELIJAH EVANS

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an exemplary young man who has persevered through life's challenges and devoted himself to bettering the lives of children in foster care. As a young boy, Elijah Evans was abused by his family, forcing him to be removed from their care and placed into a foster care program. Quickly winning the love of the nurse assigned to attend to his wounds, Elijah was adopted by Lynore Harding when he was 4 years old. But after being adopted, Elijah did not forget what it was like to live in foster care, or about the more than 400,000 children who are in foster care today.

In 2011, when Elijah was 13 years old, he began raising money to give Christmas gifts to foster children, knowing that the Christmas season often leaves these children with the longing feeling of not being a part of a family. In that year, he was able to raise $5,000 and give Christmas gifts to 72 children. Since then, Elijah has established his own organization, No Use for Abuse, and has continued Christmas of Hope, which is going into its third year. He hopes that he will be able to expand his organization in the future to offer college scholarships to foster children after they graduate from high school.

As a father, I know that every life is incredibly precious. There is always more we can do to increase adoptions, but I'm deeply grateful for everything the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute and the Angels in Adoption do for children. Thankfully, with their help over 50,000 foster children were adopted into loving families last year and given a chance to make a positive difference like Elijah has. Elijah's actions are an extraordinary example of what can be achieved through love and respect for all mankind and a passionate desire to serve others.

Elijah's noble and thoughtful efforts have not gone unnoticed. Aside from positively affecting the lives of so many foster children, Elijah will be recognized for his service by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute at its annual Angels in Adoption awards gala on October 9, 2013. This award honors groups and individuals who have made extraordinary contributions on behalf of children still in need of families, and honorees include such individuals as First Lady Laura Bush, Sean and Leigh Anne Tuohy, and Muhammad Ali.

Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation to Lynore Harding for welcoming Elijah to be a part of her loving family and to offer my sincere congratulations and appreciation to Elijah for remembering the experience of being a foster child and for being a positive role model for the children who have not yet been as fortunate.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) announced that on today, October 7, 2013, he had signed the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 3095. An act 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.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3223. An act to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

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

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1568. A bill to make technical corrections to the Pay Our Military Act to include midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are appointed as midshipmen in the Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home

health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to exempt from sequestration certain fees of the Food and Drug Administration.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nominations of Mr. Michael L. Connor to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and Dr. Elizabeth M. Robinson to be Under Secretary of Energy.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov. For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224–4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 7, 2013 at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Social Security Disability Benefits: Did a Group of Judges, Doctors and Lawyers Abuse Programs for the Country's Most Vulnerable?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental affairs

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 7, 2013, at 5:50 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT REFERRAL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as if in executive session, the nomination of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, received in the Senate on October 7, 2013, be jointly referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3223, H.J. RES. 75, AND H.J. RES. 85

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I understand there are three measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

A 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 other purposes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 2013; 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; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. 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 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KELLY R. WELSH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, VICE CAMERON F. KERRY.

ARUN MADHAVAN KUMAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, VICE SURESH KUMAR, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ARNOLD A. CHACON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE LINDA THOMAS–GREENFIELD, RESIGNED.

DANIEL BENNETT SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH), VICE PHILIP S. GOLDBERG.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HELEN TIERNEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN R. LANZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT F. PLECZKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MILTON L. SHIPMAN
ROBERT W. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN C. ANDERSON
SCOTT K. BENNER
KENNETH M. BUCK
SAMUEL R. COOK
JOHN H. DAVENPORT
ROBERT S. DAVIDSON
DAVID W. DINENNA
KRISTEN E. DIXON
KELLEY L. DONHAM
SAMUEL F. DRIVER
PAUL S. DRURY
RAYMOND M. DUNNING II
CHRISTOPHER J. ELLIS
TONEY E. FILOSTRAT
MATTHEW D. FISHER
JAMES H. FITZGERALD
ERIC P. FLOWERS
WILFREDO GARCIA
JAMES J. GROARK
GEORGE J. HANHAUSER IV
LARRY D. HEARN
KIM J. HODGES

NELSON IRIZARRY
GEORGE D. JOHNSON
MARTIN F. KLEIN
CATHERINE L. LASSITER
CARL E. LINK, JR.
ALVARO W. LOFSTROM
EARL MACK III
GARY J. MANN
SEAN P. MCDONALD
DELWYN S. MERKERSON
EUGENE L. MONTAGUE
TAMARA L. MORRIS
ISOLDE K. OPPHILE
KURT D. OROURKE
REGAL L. PERRY
TODD M. PETERSON
CHERYL D. PHILLIPS
DAVID J. PINTER
ELIZABETH W. PREKKER
RANDY K. RIEDY
ERIC ROBINSON
KEVIN M. SANDERS
WILLIAM S. SCHAPER
GREGORY A. SCHEIDHAUER
SCOTT R. SHRADER
DOUGLAS D. SMITH
MICHAEL E. STEWART
MARK D. STIMER
ERIC P. TAUCH
KEVIN J. VINK
STEPHEN VROOMAN
KATTIRIA M. WALKER
ALEXIS M. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JAMES L. BRISSON, JR.
MARK E. FAIRBROTHER
KEITH N. GOODE
WILLIAM GREEN, JR.
SCOTT A. HAMMOND
JEFFREY D. HAWKINS
SCOTT F. JONES
ROBERT P. LASLEY
TIMOTHY S. MALLARD
JAMES PALMER, JR.
MARK A. PENFOLD
ROBERT E. PHILLIPS, SR.
MARK E. THOMPSON
DAVID A. VANDERJAGT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES D. BROWN
ERIK W. FEIG
JAMES D. GRAY
JAMES J. KRISCHE
LESLIE D. MALONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

LAURENCE J. BAZER
RUSSEL L. BETTS
DAVID D. COLDREN
DANIEL H. DENT
ROBERT J. DESOUSA
EDDIE M. FRIZELL
JORGE H. GALOFFINLOPEZ
MICHAEL J. GILLETT
STEPHANIE K. HORVATH
TODD H. HUBBARD
NATHAN F. LORD
KENNETH J. MARKWELL
KEVIN D. MCMAHAN
DAVID J. MIKOLAITIES
STEPHANIE A. PURGERSON
COLLIN D. ROSE
COREY L. SEATS
RANDY R. SIKOWSKI
JOHN E. TRUNZO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRIAN M. ADELSON
DON C. AHSHAPANEK, JR.
CALVIN AMOS
TODD M. ANDERSON
LISA T. ANGLESON
PETER A. ARCANO
RICHARD P. ATCHISON
TERRY A. AYERS
BETTY J. BANKS
KEVIN D. BANTA
MATTHEW C. BECKMANN
KRIS A. BELANGER
CHRISTOPHER M. BENTCH
ROBERT L. BERRY
CRAIG B. BEST
JOHN A. BIVONA
THERESE J. BLAKE
BRADLY M. BOGANOWSKI
RUSSELL J. BONACCORSO, JR.
ERIC D. BOWERS
KIMBERLY R. BOYD
JEFFREY A. BREWSTER
KENNETH B. BROWN
ERIC B. BRYSON
MICHAEL L. BUTLER
THOMAS J. BYANSKI
DENISE M. CALISE
JOHN F. CAMPBELL, JR.
ROBERT L. CAPECE
THOMAS A. CARLSON, JR.
STEPHEN M. CARROLL
BRIAN T. CASHMAN
ROBERT J. CENTENO
JOHN R. CICCARELLI
KEVIN E. CLARK
WILLIAM J. CLARK
KIRK M. CLAUNCH
JOHN J. COLLINS
ROBERT S. COOLEY, JR.
CHARLES W. CROWDER
LUIS CRUZ
STEPHEN F. DALE
TRACY L. DAWKINS
GARY W. DETTLING
JORGE I. DIAZ
MATTHEW R. DOSMANN
ERIN M. DOWD
KATRINA K. DOWIS
THOMAS J. DOWNEY
DENNIS R. DUFFY
THOMAS A. DUNCAN
PETER J. DUSICK
PETER DYKMAN
DOUGLAS J. EISENSCHENK
DANIEL L. ELLIS, JR.
WILLIAM E. ELLISON
STEVEN K. ESPLIN
CHERYN L. FASANO
MICHAEL G. FLORU
SANDRA L. FORREST
ANGELA D. FORTUNE
STEPHAN J. FRANK
BRYAN S. FRANKLIN
CLARK D. FREDERICK
MICHELE B. FRIEDRICH
JOHN G. GANINO
MICHAEL F. GARCIA
NORA M. GARONO
STACY L. GARRITY
KATY M. GARZABAIR
MARK E. GIARDINA
GLENN A. GIBBS
STEPHEN E. GIBSON
STEVEN M. GRADY
DONALD G. GREENWOOD
ROBERT A. GRIERSON
RICHARD G. GULLEY
JAMES D. HAGAN
JOHN R. M. HAHN
ROBYN R. HAMASAKI
LISA A. HARBACH
JOEL C. HARDIN
JOHN S. HARRIS
JEAN E. HENDERSON
ROBERT J. HENDERSON
SUSAN E. HENDERSON
MICHAEL HENRY
JON K. HOLLAND
LAWANDA J. HOLLIMAN
JAMES G. HOLLINGSWORTH
DAVID M. HOLLIS
GEORGE E. HOOVER
JOHN K. HOPF
JEFFREY A. HOPKINS
MICHAEL J. HOWARD
SHELIA R. HOWELL
HOPE M. HUBBARD
STEPHEN IACOVELLI
JIMMY IBANEZ
GARRETT L. IDE
JOHN C. JACOBI
ALEXANDER JAROTZKY
ISAAC JOHNSON, JR.
CHARLES A. JONES
DOUGLAS E. JONES
JOHN F. K. JONES
DONALD L. JOYNER
DAVID J. JUNGQUIST
MICHAEL J. JUNOD
RONALD J. KASTELEIN
ALAN D. KATZ
MATTHEW A. KEUREJIAN
KENNETH D. KIRK
STEPHEN E. KREBS
CHRISTOPHER R. KUDUK
RAYMOND J. LAGEMANN, JR.
RUSSELL M. LARAWAY
ERIC J. LARSON
DAVID E. LEE
LAWRENCE D. LEON
JEFFREY H. LEROY
SARAH E. LETTSSMITH
STEPHANIE A. LEWIS
JOHN K. LIM
ROBERT K. LIPUT II
ERNEST LITYNSKI
EARNESTRHEINOLD R. LLOYD
JEFFERY E. LONG
DEWEY S. LOWERY, JR.
WYATT A. LOWERY
JOSE LUCENA
WILLIAM F. LYONS, JR.
ERNEST J. MALDONADO
PATRICIA A. MANCE
MARK W. MARTIN
TIMOTHY F. MCCONVERY
JESSE D. MCCURLEY
ELAINE K. MCGARRY
MICHAEL J. MCINERNEY
CHARLES J. MCLAUGHLIN IV
RAFAEL MEDINAVAZQUEZ
KEVIN F. MEISLER
EDWARD H. MERRIGAN, JR.
MASAYO M. MESLER
MICHAEL H. MIDKIFF
KRISTO S. MIETTINEN
BRIAN E. MILLER
ERIC MILLER, JR.
WARREN L. MILLER
WILLIAM E. MILLER
JAMES C. MITCHELL
BYRON G. MOBLEY
WILLIAM D. MONTGOMERY
STEPHEN S. MORRIS
NORMAN D. NELSON
RANDALL D. NEWTON
DAVID L. NICHOLS
THOMAS A. NILES
RICHARD NORL, JR.
WILLIAM P. OBYRNE
DINAH F. OLAGBEGI
HEBER OLGUIN
RICHARD D. PANZARELLA
REINALDO PARAVISINI
GREGORY L. PARKER
BRIAN L. PATTERSON
JOHN D. PATTERSON
PHILLIP K. PATTERSON
FRANK W. PECJAK, JR.
MARISA K. PELOQUIN
WILLIAM PELT
EDGAR L. PEREZ
JOHN M. PERRY
ERIC R. PERRYMAN
LANCE S. PETERSON
CURTIS PHELPS
BRUCE PROTESTO
JAY M. PULLIAM
CARL D. RAMSEY
KEITH W. RAMSEY
TONY M. RATLIFF
TANYA M. RAWLINS
SCOTT A. REED
TODD L. RESSEL
DARWIN F. RICE
DALE A. RIDEN
JEFFERY P. RISNER
WILLIAM A. ROBERTSON
TERRY J. ROBEY
MARTHA D. ROBINS
MICHAEL A. RODRIGUEZ
MICHAEL E. ROERK
JOHN F. ROSNOW
CURTIS A. SAUBERAN
BRENDEN M. SCHERR
MITCHELL A. SCHMIDTKE
MICHAEL J. SEGUIN
SEAN E. SEIBERT
BRENT R. SELNAU
JAMES K. SHEARER
NATHANIEL SHROPSHIRE, JR.
ROBERT F. SILE
JONATHAN R. SIMMONS
TIMOTHY L. SIMPSON
JOHN C. SMALL, JR.
BRUCE M. SMITH
JOEL L. SOENKSEN
LOREN P. SOMMERFIELD
STEIN L. SORENSON
GARY R. SPEAR
KARL V. STAHLECKER
JOHN N. STIBBARD
RODNEY D. STOVALL
JOSEF W. SUJET
BRADLEY J. SUMMERS
CYNTHIA K. SUMMERS
DAVID N. TATE
DANIEL L. TAYLOR
HERMAN E. TERMEER
LESLIE R. THOMASON
JONATHAN D. THOMPSON
THOMAS P. THOMPSON
TIMOTHY L. THRASHER
HARRY R. TIDESWELL
CHARLES E. TIPTON
REDUS V. TITTLE
JIMMEY W. TODD, JR.
MARCI D. TOLER
DERRICK E. TOMPKINS
STEPHEN TORRES
JANET J. TSAO
PAUL K. TSATSOS
JOSEPH S. TURLINGTON
ANDREW UDZIELAK
DAVID J. UYEMATSU
KENNETH J. VALCOURT
EMILIO VARGAS II
CHRISTOPHER H. VARHOLA
WILLIAM A. VAUGHN
JOHN G. VERNICK
MITCHELL R. WAITE
GEORGE B. WALSH
JANICE M. WALTMAN
ANGELA M. WANNAMAKER
MATTHEW S. WARNE
GAYLENE K. WEBER
KEVIN R. WILEY
ANTHONY L. WILKERSON
MARTHA S. WILKINS
JAMES O. WILLIAMS
AARON C. WILSON
WILLIAM WILSON II
MICHELLE M. WOOD
SIDNEY C. WRIGHT
DAVID A. YASENCHOCK

BRIAN G. YOUNG

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

SENNAY M. STEFANOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

JESSICA Y. LIN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 7, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

COLIN STIRLING BRUCE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

SARA LEE ELLIS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING RAYMOND F. BARRY, SR.

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the remarkable life of Raymond F. ''Rambo'' Barry, Sr., who passed away on July 15th, 2013 at the age of 75. He was born on February 7, 1938 to the late Marjorie Barry of Altoona, Pennsylvania. Raymond happily spent his days traveling, watching his beloved Bengals, keeping up with politics, playing cards and engaging in lively conversations with his longtime friends.

Raymond felt an uncanny closeness to his fellow man, serving as a vital member of his community and church. He loved to support his friends and family, especially in their athletic endeavors. As Raymond was the recipient of a lung transplant, we were extremely fortunate that he was able to spend five and a half additional years with us. Every day, Raymond provided an example of friendliness and warmth, much to the benefit to those he met.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to Raymond's family, particularly his wife of 24 years, Teri Barry, as well as his sister Edna Hoskins, sister-in-law Ruth Reed, children Pamela Lucero, Warren Barry, Jerimie J. McKinley, and Jamie McKinley-Taylor, grandchildren Brian Hammer, Raymond Barry III, A.J. Hammer, Xzandria McKinley, Jonathon McKinley, Kat Taylor and Aleutian Taylor, 6 great-grandchildren, and numerous other family members and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE 102ND NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize the Republic of China (Taiwan) as they celebrate their 102nd National Day on October 10, 2013.

The Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan, maintains a robust economic and cultural relationship with the United States and serves as a strong trade partner. In my home state of North Carolina, Taiwan is among our top ten export markets in Asia.

As an ally in the Asia Pacific region and an important trade partner of the United States, Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to further this goal.

As we continue to nurture bilateral relations with Taiwan, I invite our friends from Taiwan to visit the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 519 through 524.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 519, on ordering the previous question regarding H. Res. 371, providing for consideration of 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; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and for other purposes, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present for rollcall vote 520, on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 371, providing for consideration of 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, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and for other purposes, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present for rollcall vote 521, on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present for rollcall vote 522, on passage of H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present for rollcall vote 523, to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding 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, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present for rollcall vote 524, on passage of 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, I would have voted ''no.''

REMEMBERING THOMAS GILLEN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life of my friend Thomas Joseph Gillen, who tragically passed away on March 9, 2013 at the age of thirty-eight. Tom was born on November 19, 1974 in Warren, Ohio, to his proud and caring parents, John and Gloria Gillen. He enjoyed hunting, fishing and spending time with his loved ones.

Tom led an exemplary life of service and dedication; he graduated from John F. Kennedy High School where he helped his football team win a State Championship in 1991 and place runner-up the following year. Afterwards, he went on to graduate from Youngstown State University and work for the State of Ohio Department of Corrections for the past fifteen years. Tom's life, although all too brief, was highlighted by success, commitment and loyalty.

I extend my deepest condolences to Tom's family. He is survived by his parents, as well as his sister Annie Needs, brothers John Gillen, Brian Gillen and James Gillen, niece Maggie Needs, nephews Matthew and Ian Needs, as well as several aunts, uncles and cousins. Although Tom is no longer with us, his memory will endure in the hearts of his family and friends.

Thomas was a successful and caring man, and I am deeply saddened by his premature passing. He knew how to be a team player and how to make difficult sacrifices. Thomas left an impression in the minds of everyone he met and will be greatly missed. The state of Ohio lost an outstanding citizen and his community will miss him dearly.

DAN THOEMKE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dan Thoemke for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Dan Thoemke for building community and making Golden a better place for all. Dan's contributions in Golden can be seen in many venues including his leadership with the Together Church of Golden, a voluntary group of pastors from all denominations, his work with the Golden Backpack program, Neighborhood Rehab project, City Unite, and as Chaplain for the Golden Police department. Dan is a quiet but powerful leadership force and a role model of excellence in our community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dan Thoemke for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

HONORING ROBBIE BRONNER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, reaching the age of 80 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Robbie Bronner was born eighty years ago and is celebrating that milestone today; and

Whereas, Mrs. Bronner has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Mrs. Bronner is celebrating her 80th birthday with her family members, church members, and friends here in Atlanta, Georgia on September 29, 2013; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her life and she prays daily and is leading by example a blessed life; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her 80th birthday with church members from the 4th District of Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Robbie Bronner for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all:

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim September 29, 2013 as Mrs. Robbie Bronner Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 29th day of September, 2013.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESS AND INDIVIDUAL INVESTMENT ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a slightly amended version of the District of Columbia Incentives for Business and Individual Investment Act (H.R. 2890), which I introduced on July 31, 2013. The prior version of the bill had a couple of drafting errors. This version of the bill corrects those errors by extending all of the D.C. tax incentives through 2015.

RECOGNIZING SAFEWAY FOR SERVING OUR TROOPS

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Safeway Inc., headquartered in Pleasanton, California, for receiving the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award from the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) organization.

The Employer Support Freedom Award recognizes employers who show a commitment to hiring and supporting service members from the National Guard and Reserve. Safeway was one of only 15 employers to receive this prestigious award, chosen from over 2,900 nominations.

More than ten years ago, Safeway was one of the first companies to extend full benefits and cover the pay differential for Reserve and National Guard employees called to active duty.

Additionally, in 2012, Safeway launched its Retail Military Recruiting project, which seeks to hire veterans from a variety of backgrounds. In 2012, Safeway hired 1,500 veterans, and it plans to hire another 1,500 veterans in 2013. Also, Safeway has instituted a special program to hire junior military officers and noncommissioned officers for managerial positions in the company.

As a nation we must pledge that when our troops return home we leave no service member behind. Safeway has shown our troops and veterans more than words of appreciation; it has provided meaningful support to our brave service members.

I applaud Safeway's continued service to our National Guard, Reserves, and veterans through these hiring and benefits programs. Congratulations again to Safeway for achieving this great honor.

REMEMBERING MARTHA M. MURANSKY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of an outstanding and charitable woman, Ms. Martha M. Muransky. Martha was born on May 28, 1923, to Joseph and Martha Kukara and spent her 89 years as a resident of the Youngstown, Ohio area. She witnessed almost a century of change and was always filled with humor, wit and kindness. She enjoyed cooking, baking, sports, and, most of all, spending time with her family.

Martha graduated from Campbell High School in 1940 and was an active member of the SS. Cyril & Methodius Church. Martha possessed a keen intelligence, a love for reading, and understood the value of commitment. She worked as a precinct committee woman during elections, belonged to the First Catholic Slovak Union and without a doubt was her son Ed's number one fan as he pursued an outstanding football career. A hard worker, Martha was employed by G.E. Mazda Lamp Company, operated her family's produce store until 1957, and worked for both Union Bank and the Home Savings and Loan Company.

I extend my most sincere condolences to Martha's family. Her long and productive life set an example to all of us and all who knew her. Her life and the values she embodied greatly influenced her relatives, including her two brothers, Larry and Ray Kukara, daughter Elaine Mulichak, son Ed Muransky, grandchildren Brian Mulichak, Melissa Kellgren, Eddie Muransky, Deloran Muransky and Donielle Muransky, and great grandchildren, Luke, Paige and Karter. Martha was preceded in death by her sister, Ethel DeNicholas, and two brothers, Frank and Joseph Kukara. Martha was a very special woman and will be long remembered.

HONORING FRANK LEAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Frank Leal Elementary School for being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. This is a remarkable honor that deserves our recognition and praise.

Frank Leal Elementary School is in Cerritos, California and was among three Los Angeles County schools named as a National Blue Ribbon School.

This prestigious award is given in recognition to schools where students perform at remarkably high levels or where significant improvements are being made in students' academic achievement.

Leal Elementary School was recognized as a "blue ribbon" honoree because it ranked among the highest-performing schools on state assessments in language arts and mathematics, achieving an Academic Performance Index score of 972. That's nearly 200 points higher than the state average of 789.

This award would not have been possible without the tireless dedication of teachers, counselors, parents, and, of course, the brilliant students at Leal Elementary School. Countless Leal parents will one day see their children attend and graduate from college, fostering future generations of service-oriented, civically engaged Cerritos residents.

The National Blue Ribbon recognition is just one of many more milestones to be achieved by these bright young scholars. The community pride they have created through their exemplary achievement encourages students in our communities to strive for even greater academic success. For that reason, I would like to recognize Frank Leal Elementary School for being named a National Blue Ribbon School.

TRIBUTE TO GREENFOREST COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Greenforest Community Baptist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past fifty-five years; and

Whereas, Pastor Dennis Mitchell and the members of the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family today continue to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past fifty-five (55) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 55th Anniversary of their founding; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim October 20, 2013 as Greenforest Community Baptist Church Day In the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 20th day of October, 2013.

IRWIN JOSEPH KRAMER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Irwin Joseph (Jim) Kramer on his 80th birthday. There are many ways to serve your fellow man, whether it by through service to one's country, advancing knowledge in a scientific field or by becoming a community leader, and I applaud Mr. Kramer for his great achievements in all of these areas.

Originally from Brooklyn, and a graduate of Brooklyn College, Mr. Kramer joined the United States Air Force and served in the Korean War. His military career eventually brought him to Newfoundland, Canada where he served as a meteorologist.

Mr. Kramer also demonstrated great dedication to the Aurora community after moving and settling down in Colorado. In addition to serving on the board of the Danbury Park Home owners Association, he served on the board of Aurora Mental Health Center and volunteered many hours of this time to the Aurora Mental Health Center. Improving the lives of his friends, family, and even strangers is the cornerstone to his legacy.

Mr. Kramer currently resides happily in Aurora, Colorado with his wife Barbara. He has 3 sons, 3 step sons, 5 daughters in law and 11 grandchildren.

CONGRATULATING GREENE EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Greene Early College High School located in Snow Hill, North Carolina for being recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School.

Since 1982, the Department of Education has recognized elementary, middle, and high schools whose students excelled or showed significant academic improvement on state or national assessments with the prestigious National Blue Ribbon School designation. This year, Greene Early College High School is being recognized, along with 285 other schools nationwide, for its academic performance.

Students from Greene Early College High School have demonstrated academic excellence by achieving 100 percent proficiency on North Carolina's End-of-Grade Tests, and by achieving a 100 percent graduation rate. These achievements have distinguished Greene Early College High School as one of the highest performing schools in eastern North Carolina. As a result, the North Carolina State Board of Education and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction named Greene Early College High School an Honor School of Excellence this year.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the students, faculty, and parents of Greene Early College High School for their commitment to academic excellence. A solid educational foundation and high school diploma are essential for achievement and success in today's competitive global economy. The Blue Ribbon School designation is a great testament to the Snow Hill community's commitment to prepare their children for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating Greene Early College High School's great achievement by being recognized as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon school.

IN RECOGNITION OF COUNTY LINE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150 years of fellowship and service Pilot Point's County Line First Baptist Church has provided to its members and community.

Originally founded in 1863, the County Line Baptist Church, then named Colored Missionary Baptist Church, quickly became the center of the African American community. Early members met under a brush arbor before building a chapel near the Cooke and Denton county line in 1874. In 1882, the church moved to Pilot Point. It was there the church served as the first school in the area for African Americans, working to educate people of all ages to strengthen the community as a whole.

County Line Baptist Church has become an iconic and central part of the African American community in northeast Denton County. The congregation has been active in the community and state. Through a variety of programs, including the establishment of adult literacy classes and serving as the host for associational conventions. Today, County Line remains a place of solace, worship, study, social events, weddings and funerals where both members and non-members are always welcome.

It is my honor to recognize the County Line Baptist Church and their continued dedication to their community, and to represent Denton County and the City of Pilot Point in the House of Representatives.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 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 $16,747,458,528,953.05. We've added $6,120,581,480,039.97 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.

FRANK LAY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud Frank Lay for his outstanding service over the years to our community.

Frank's career spans over 57 years in diverse business and political environments. Some of his accomplishments include teaching for seven years at Utah Technical College, 10 years as vice president of the Utah Building Trades and president of the Western Apprenticeship Coordinators Association. Frank's leadership and guidance during his tenure as president of the Utah AFL–CIO had an enormous positive impact on working families. Frank continues to bring the same diligence and compassion to the senior citizens of our community. Frank is a tireless advocate for the issues facing senior citizens and makes sure Colorado legislators, state and federal, are aware of the issues they face.

Though Frank Lay is resigning as president of the Colorado Alliance for Retired Americans, I know he will remain a champion for the community. I am honored to recognize him for his devotion to the middle class, protection of seniors and dedication to the public good. I am sure he will have the same unwavering commitment and enthusiasm to future endeavors. Thank you for your service, Frank.

TRIBUTE TO SPRINGFIELD MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, Springfield Missionary Baptist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past one hundred forty-one years; and

Whereas, Pastor Charles W. Levy and the members of the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually,

mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past one hundred forty-one (141) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with Newton County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 141st Anniversary of their founding:

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim October 6, 2013 as Springfield Missionary Baptist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of October, 2013.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls No. 519 and 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING GLADYS LATTIMORE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mrs. Gladys Lattimore has answered that call by giving of herself as an educator at Salem Middle School, and as a beloved wife, mentor and friend; and

Whereas, Mrs. Lattimore has been chosen as the 2013 Teacher of the Year, representing Salem Middle School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Mrs. Lattimore is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our children receive an education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, as she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Gladys Lattimore for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2013 Teacher of the Year at Salem Middle School;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim September 27, 2013 as Mrs. Gladys Lattimore Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of September, 2013.

HUGH KING

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Hugh King for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Hugh King, M.D., PhD., for his fourteen-year humanitarian career as co-founder of Namlo International, an organization that enables education and a better quality of life to citizens of Nepal, Nicaragua, the USA, and Spain through five programs—school construction, school improvement, scholarships, sister schools, and sustainable development. Hugh, a full professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering at the Colorado School of Mines, and his co-founder and wife Magda, the first woman from Spain to reach the summit of an 8000 meter peak, founded Namlo with the belief that the key to success is a focus on helping communities take responsibility for their schools.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Hugh King for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY 2013

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, October 10, 2013, marks the 102nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of China, Taiwan. I wish to congratulate the people of Taiwan on their National Day, also known as the Double Ten Day, as they celebrate the birth of their country and the great strides they have since made.

The United States and Taiwan have always enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship that stems from our shared values: democracy, the rule of law and free enterprise. Taiwan's strong democracy serves as a beacon and model for East Asia. Through their ingenuity and hard work, Taiwan has become a vital player in the world economy. In 2012, bilateral trade between our two countries reached $63 billion, making Taiwan our 11th largest trading partner. Last year, South Carolina's exports to Taiwan reached $225 million. Taiwanese companies are also heavily invested in manufacturing plants and distribution centers, creating jobs in my home state.

On the occasion of its National Day, I would like to reflect on how we can improve on our already strong partnership with Taiwan. As a fellow democratic ally of the United States, we must further support and encourage Taiwan's international participation. Both houses of Congress voted overwhelmingly to support Taiwan's observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization earlier this year, and consequently, Taiwan has been invited as a guest to its assembly. The United States should also ensure that Taiwan is not excluded from the Trans-Pacific Partnership or other regional trade agreements for any political reasons.

Again, I would like to join my colleagues and the people of Taiwan in commemoration of its 102nd National Day and wish Taiwan even greater success in the future and the continued friendship of our two nations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes No. 517–526, I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall No. 517, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 518, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 519, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 520, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 521, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 522, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 524, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 526, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 8, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 9

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on essential elements of the multifamily housing finance system.
SD–538

OCTOBER 10

8:30 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the debt limit.
SD–215

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.
SD–G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the impact of a default on financial stability and economic growth.
SD–538

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SH–219

OCTOBER 11

Time to be announced
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security.
SR–253

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.
SD–562

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 10

10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce
To hold hearings to examine the government shutdown, focusing on its impact on government efficiency and the Federal workforce.
SD–342

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 9

10 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.
SD–226

2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on European Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Eastern Partnership, focusing on the outlook for Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Belarus, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.
SD–419

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Veterans' Affairs claims transformation efforts.
SR–418

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the draft regional recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine women-owned small business, focusing on strengthening the Small Business Administration's counseling and procurement programs.
TBA

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7245–S7274

Measures Introduced: One bill was introduced, as follows: S. 1568. **Page S7271**

Kumar Nomination—Joint Referral Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that as if in Executive Session the nomination of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, received in the Senate on October 7, 2013, be jointly referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. **Page S7272**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. Ex. 213), Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois. **Pages S7265–67, S7274**

Sara Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois. **Pages S7265–67, S7274**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kelly R. Welsh, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

Arnold A. Chacon, of Virginia, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

Daniel Bennett Smith, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Intelligence and Research).

Helen Tierney, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, and Navy. **Pages S7272–74**

Messages from the House: **Page S7271**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S7271, S7272**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7271**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7271–72**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions

Additional Statements: **Page S7271**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S7272**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7272**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—213) **Page S7267**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:13 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7272.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Social Security disability benefits, after receiving testimony from Charlie P. Andrus, Administrative Law Judge, and Sarah A. Carver, Senior Case Technician, and Jennifer L. Griffith, both of the Office of Adjudication and Review, all of the Social Security Administration; Alfred Bradley Adkins, Pikeville, Kentucky; Srini M. Ammisetty, Stanville, Kentucky; Jamie Slone; and Melinda L. Martin.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 2 public bills, H.R. 3271–3272 were introduced.

Pages H6343–44

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6344**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 1804, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress semiannual reports on the cost of foreign travel made by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs (H. Rept. 113–227, Pt. 2). **Page H6343**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Holding to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6323**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:18 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H6325**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, DC. **Page H6325**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:11 p.m. and reconvened at 5:45 p.m. **Page H6326**

Food and Drug Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 77, making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 162 nays, Roll No. 528. **Pages H6326–34**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Farr 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 217 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 527. **Pages H6332–34**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on Friday, October 4th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6333–34 and H6334. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Business meeting to consider the nominations of Michael L. Connor, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and Elizabeth M. Robinson, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine security and governance in Somalia, focusing on consolidating gains, confronting challenges, and charting the path forward, 3 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: To hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 8 through October 11, 2013

Senate Chamber

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: October 10, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: October 9, to hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on essential elements of the multifamily housing finance system, 10 a.m., SD–538.

October 10, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the impact of a default on financial stability and economic growth, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: October 11, to hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security, Time to be announced, SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: October 8, business meeting to consider the nominations of Michael L. Connor, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of the

Interior, and Elizabeth M. Robinson, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: October 10, to hold hearings to examine the debt limit, 8:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: October 8, Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine security and governance in Somalia, focusing on consolidating gains, confronting challenges, and charting the path forward, 3 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: October 8, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

Select Committee on Intelligence: October 10, closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Armed Services, October 10, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''The Interpretation of HR 3210: 'Pay Our Military Act' '', 11:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Nuclear Weapons Modernization Program: Military, Technical, and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program and Future Stockpile Strategy'', 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on USAF, USN and USMC Development and Integration of Air/Sea Battle Strategy, Governance and Policy into the Services' Annual Program, Planning, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) Process, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 9, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Haiti: Is U.S. Aid Effective?'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 10, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3212, the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, October 9, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3141, the ''Biometric Exit Improvement Act of 2013''; and H.R. 3202, the ''Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act''; 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

October 9, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

October 10, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS's Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

October 11, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''Facility Protection: Implications of the Navy Yard Shooting on Homeland Security'', 9:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, October 9, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Implementation of an Entry-Exit System: Still Waiting After All These Years'', 2:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, October 10, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on H.R. 3176, to reauthorize the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3189, to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, October 9, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the IRS's Role in Implementing and Enforcing ObamaCare'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, October 9, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''The Effects of the Health Law's Definition of Full-Time Employee on Small Businesses'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Bungling Bundling: How Contract Bundling and Consolidation Remain Challenges to Small Business Success'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, October 10, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled ''Maritime Transportation Regulations: Impacts on Safety, Security, Jobs and the Environment, Part 2'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

October 10, Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation will hold a hearing entitled ''Funding the Nation's Freight System'', 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, October 9, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Effect of Government Shutdown on VA Benefits and Services to Veterans'', 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

October 10, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Between Peril and Promise: Facing the Dangers of VA's Skyrocketing Use of Prescription Painkillers to Treat Veterans'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, October 10, Full Committee, meeting on Member Access Requests, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing may close.

October 10, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 10:30 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, October 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, October 8

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1447
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1447
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1447
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E1446, E1446, E1447, E1448
King, Steve, Iowa, E1448
Meadows, Markk, N.C., E1445
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1446
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1445, E1447, E1447, E1448
Pittenger, Robert, N.C., E1448
Rice, Tom, S.C., E1448
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1445, E1445, E1446
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1446
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1446
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1445

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.