

they can to hurt some way so that they can blame Republicans, when it's simply the decision of the President.

We answered by saying, Okay, Democrats across the aisle, you want a vote? Let's vote. There's no need to do this, and the response across the aisle was to have most of the Democrats vote to leave them shut. They weren't going to vote with us to fund our national parks.

And then we had a vote on Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, H.J. Res. 73, to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for lifesaving medical innovation and cancer research. Most, except for about 20 or so Democrats, all voted not to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Our friends across the aisle say, Give us a vote. They got a vote. You want to fund the NIH, then vote to do it. We'll send it down. But even though we passed it and sent it down the Hall, HARRY REID was not going to do it because, as my friend pointed out, when he was asked if you could save one child with cancer, why wouldn't you do that, he said, Why would we do that? And then he chastised the reporter for asking a question which in his mind he thought was a silly question. I thought it was an excellent question.

And then many of us believed there was enough latitude to pay some of our Reservists on Active Duty. But the Defense Department took a narrow interpretation so they could punish more people and blame the Republicans.

So to counter that, we passed a Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act on October 3 that ensured during the shutdown that it would not affect the pay for our National Guard and Reserves. Again, 160 Democrats voted against that. They asked for a vote, we give them a vote. Most of them voted against it. Then our friend, HARRY REID, down the hall said, No way, we're not funding them.

Again, maybe our friends were asleep. Sometimes when I talk, I put people to sleep. It happens. I'm a very restless speaker.

We passed the National Emergency Disaster Recovery Act. That provided immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that, and HARRY REID refuses to bring it up.

We actually brought up a bill to pay our veterans and make sure our wounded warriors were taken care of. The way the rules of the House have been—and are—you can bypass the committee of jurisdiction and go straight to the floor without the committee bringing the bill to the floor, without it being voted out of committee, under what is called a suspension. But to bypass the committee of jurisdiction, it requires a two-thirds vote in the House.

I, like Speaker BOEHNER, thought that surely you could bring the veterans bill to the floor under a suspension because surely they would vote to fund our wounded warriors. Most of us were totally shocked that the vast ma-

majority of Democrats voted against funding our veterans, our wounded warriors.

So we had to go back, have the committee of jurisdiction pass it, bring it to the floor under a rule so a simple majority would pass it. And that's what we did with H.J. Res. 72; and when 157 of our friends across the aisle who wanted a vote, they got a vote. And they voted against funding our wounded warriors.

We also took up the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act that provided immediate funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for women, infants, and children. It serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children and provides vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Then 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that bill, but it passed the House nonetheless. We sent it down to HARRY REID. They have been wanting a vote. We gave them a vote.

On October 5, we voted for the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. It provided for compensation for Federal employees furloughed due to the Senate Democrats' government shutdown. It's similar to the bipartisan legislation enacted during previous shutdowns. We did pass that, but HARRY REID thus far has refused to take that up.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### VOTING TO END THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania, bringing this whole issue forward.

There are a number of more votes that we did take. We took up the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, providing official education funding to support Head Start programs across the country, and 168 of the Democrats across the aisle voted against that. HARRY REID is refusing to take that up.

My friends across the aisle wanted a vote. So we voted for the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act. It seemed like if HARRY REID would not appoint negotiators before the shutdown really had a chance to take hold, I wasn't sure this was really necessary, but there's a Chinese proverb having to do with allowing your opponent a graceful way out.

□ 2145

So this bill was proposed as a graceful way out so that HARRY REID could come back and say, Okay, well, now we will, under this new bill, we'll go ahead and appoint negotiators and act like it was some new bill when the truth is

it's just us trying to have a bicameral discussion. Yet we had 197 Democrats vote against—well, there were 197 that voted against the bill, basically Democrats, saying we don't want to sit down and work this out with negotiators.

I thought about voting against it because it seemed pretty needless since we already voted to appoint negotiators, conferees. HARRY REID wouldn't do that. But I was persuaded, look, this is a way for HARRY REID to get out gracefully, go ahead and appoint negotiators. Now maybe we can get something worked out.

We also passed the Federal Workers Pay Fairness Act, which ensured all Federal employees who are still on the job during the shutdown will be paid on time. Again, we have not seen that the Democrats in the House have any interest in bringing that to the floor to get a vote.

So my friends across the aisle here in the House who kept screaming, Give us a vote, I hope that will be directed toward their friend, HARRY REID, down the hall, Give a vote to the Senate on these bills. I just can't imagine a majority of the Senate not being willing to fund the things that we have passed.

So, let's see, the term that was used in the prior discussion was "burning the house down," "rigging negotiation." Rigging negotiation? We appointed negotiators. It's not rigged.

Now, it is interesting that the President wishes to have the authority—takes the authority even though he doesn't have it—to just rewrite the entire ObamaCare law. Any part that he decides to wave his hand and dismiss, he's done that. But there are consequences for doing that.

We've also seen in this shutdown something that's just not normally been seen in America. We've seen Franklin Roosevelt say, We have nothing to fear but fear itself. But it's a rare thing—an extremely rare thing—to say that the market needs to be afraid and needs to start getting concerned, trying to gin up a panic to drive down the market. And the market, after a week's time of Republicans having negotiators sitting out there for over a week, waiting to sit down and negotiate with Senators, and the Senators thinking they're winning a political battle, so being unwilling to send negotiators to sit down and work out a deal. Today, between the concerns expressed by the President that the market needs to be concerned, basically saying it needs to start dropping so Republicans will get scared and they will give me everything I want.

So it's interesting they talk across the aisle about holding a gun to the head, burning the house down. The thing is, this is not our House. It's not the Democrats' House; it's the people's House. That's why I try to take people through tours at least once a week when we're in session. This is the people's House, and it breaks my heart that it's so hard to get in here nowadays. It wasn't when I was in high

school, and I would like for it to be more accessible to people.

But burning the house down, the references are so misplaced because it's the Democratic President that says, Give me everything I want. Do not stand in my way when I legislate and rewrite the laws to suit me. We already saw that happen with the GM and Chrysler bailout. The government became socialists for a while here and decided to take up nationalist interests in things—did so with Wall Street.

With the car dealers, it should have scared most Americans. It should have scared Americans enough that they would never, ever have wanted the government to be in control of their health care, because what we saw is mainly Republican dealers were the ones that lost their dealerships. There was no due process. They violated bankruptcy law right and left. And the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold, but then let it lapse. The Supreme Court hung their heads, let illegal actions, unconstitutional actions, takings without due process all take place. And Republican dealers, many of them were punished, had their dealerships taken away even though they still owed money on them. That should have been enough to scare everybody, but we didn't learn a lesson.

Then we find out that after the Citizens United case that the President got upset, stood up here in this Chamber, misrepresented—I know he didn't do it knowingly, but he was not familiar with the law regarding the Citizens United case and misrepresented the law as borne out by the Supreme Court Justice Alito sitting there shaking his head saying "not true." And the President, I'm sure, is just taking advice that's given to him by those around him, not knowing that those who gave him advice were as ignorant as they are.

But when people keep clamoring, Give us a clean CR, when people hear the term "give us a clean CR," they need to understand that this is people demanding that Congress reject the responsibility it has under the Constitution and help crown a monarchy. Let's make it official. We don't want the Congress to do its job and to appropriate as article I requires. We want Congress just to say, Here's the massive sacks of money, Mr. President; go do what you want. Go find all the Solyndras you want. Go find all the cronies that you can help in a capitalist way so that they can overtake their competitors. Go do what you wish. Maybe you can even find some more dealerships to take away without due process.

We hear friends across the aisle say they love to debate elected officials when the fact is during the 4 years the Democrats had the House as a majority and had the Senate, it was the most partisan, closed Congress in the history of this country. There were more closed rules, bills where no amendments were allowed whatsoever. Even

on ObamaCare, we were not allowed input. There was some discussion, but it was made clear our input was not allowed, so nearly half of the country was not misrepresented when had it came to ObamaCare.

And it's really amazing to hear people say that the ObamaCare law was passed by Congress, by both Houses; the President signed it into law; and then of course they misrepresent—I know they don't do it intentionally—but saying the Supreme Court upheld it. Now, the Supreme Court rewrote it and then upheld what they wrote—or at least five out of the nine did. Then the President has completely rewritten anything he doesn't like, given waivers, exemptions. So it's not the law that got passed.

And it's amazing to hear people say, gee, once a law is passed and the President has signed it, you can't change it. It's the law; get over it. And almost in the same breath come back and say, now the debt ceiling—parenthetically, which was passed by both Houses, signed by President Obama and is upheld by the Supreme Court—we want to change that immediately, do that now; don't use it as a gun to our head. What do you mean a gun to your head? It's the law. You just told us if it's passed by Congress, signed by the President—the President himself said it bears my signature, we're not changing it. So why would that be a gun to the head when I thought the President said we weren't supposed to talk metaphorically like that. We weren't supposed to use violent metaphors. Why are we talking like that? Why are we calling people arsonists when we're just trying to follow the Constitution? But again, that's consistent with Homeland Security saying that those who believe in the Constitution are extremists, and they must be watched at all cost.

I think my friends are right when they say go to the American people. The trouble is the mainstream media has not done that. They have actually stood in the way of the truth getting to the American people. They're not asking questions as my friend had asked Andrea Mitchell today, Why are you not asking why the President is not under ObamaCare? She says, well, why aren't you under it? Well, we are on it.

There was an issue about subsidies. I'm not going to take them, not when other Americans don't get them the way they used to. But, gee, let's be honest about things. Well, The Wall Street Journal says that Maryland has 326 enrollees in their health exchange—got an article here talking about there. "ObamaCare's Winners and Losers in Bay Area," an article from Mercury News that talks about:

Cindy Vinson and Tom Waschura are big believers in the Affordable Care Act. They vote independent and are proud to say they helped elect and re-elect President Barack Obama. Yet, like many other Bay residents who pay for their own medical insurance, they were floored last week when they opened their bills: their policies were being

replaced with pricier plans that conform to all the requirements of the new health care law.

Vinson, of San Jose, will pay \$1,800 more a year for an individual policy, while Waschura, of Portola Valley, will cough up almost \$10,000 more for insurance for his family of four.

"Welcome to the club", said Robert Laszewski, a prominent health care consultant and president of Health Policy and Strategy Associates in Virginia.

For years, the Nation has been embroiled in the political rhetoric of "ObamaCare," but this past week the reality of the new law sank in as millions of Americans had their first good look at how the 3½-year-old legislation will affect their pocketbooks.

It's a disaster. So when my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, let's just let it fully take effect, we've already seen what happens, this President and HARRY REID are not going to let the full thing take effect.

We've seen the way the IRS, with instructions from somebody around the White House—if not in it, we're still trying to get to the bottom of it—was instructed to go after conservative groups. And they did. The IRS was weaponized.

We've seen what's happened with other groups. They're paying a price. And you want these people to control your health care? You want them to decide whether you get a knee replacement or a hip replacement?

"Beyond the glitches: Will young and healthy Americans pick up ObamaCare?" is an article, October 7, that talks about one of the most heated arguments among health care policy writers has revolved around the issue of rate shock, which is a term for the premium increases many Americans—especially younger, healthier ones—will experience once the law kicks in. It's just going to get worse.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they want a vote. They've been getting votes. They will continue to get votes. We just ask them to join us in demanding that HARRY REID bring these bills to the floor for a vote. And let's get them passed so these things will be taken care of.

And in answer to his question: Why would we do that? The answer is: To help America. It's that simple. Mr. REID needs to bring these bills to the floor in the Senate; and if you're not going to bring the bills to the floor, for heavens sakes appoint negotiators so we can get America moving before any more punitive shutdowns by this administration occur just to punish the American people because of the temper tantrum being thrown by those who want their way or nobody gets to play.

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

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 3, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill: