United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013 No. 139

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SHUTDOWN AND AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we begin the second week of the Republican government shutdown. The proximate cause was the Republican effort to delay money that the government needs to fund the Affordable Care Act, to stop the Affordable Care Act. Well, it is also now the second week of the Affordable Care Act, which clearly now will not be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Just this last weekend, we all approved legislation that would pay all of the Federal workers on furlough the salaries they lost by being sent home making them whole. This is important because they had nothing to do with this travesty. But now, we're paying them not to work. One wonders why we're still in the middle of this exercise. Is there any way out of this cul-de-sac?

I find it encouraging that some of my Republican friends are talking about negotiating. We've been waiting for 6 months for negotiations to begin on the budget. Hopefully, Republicans will appoint conferees, and we can get down to talking about what level of spending we want, need, and can afford.

But maybe we can help things along in dealing with another area—to come together on the looming deficit of infrastructure. America's civil engineers tell us that more than $2 trillion is needed over the next 5 years for roads, bridges, transit, sewer, and water. These deficiencies create uncertainty, congestion, safety, and health problems, and undercut America's long-term productivity. Why don't we come together to address this problem? Ronald Reagan supported a nickel-a-gallon gas tax increase in 1982, when that was real money. The Clinton plan that led to our only balanced budgets in 40 years included our last gas tax increase. And remember the Simpson-Bowles deficit plan that called for a phased-in gas tax increase of 15 cents?

Since the last increase in the gas tax, the purchasing power of the highway trust fund has dropped by two-thirds due to inflation and greater vehicle efficiency. If we want to bring Americans together, let's work with the huge coalition that stands ready to work with Congress in taking this action. It includes people in the construction industry, obviously, but also local governments and professions like architects and engineers, truckers, and bicyclists. Everyone from the AFL–CIO to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce acknowledges that it is past time for Congress to act, and they will work with us if we take action.

The failure to address this loss of purchasing power is also a source of the budget deficit. Since the last big transportation bill expired in 2005, we have had to make four major general fund transfers of approximately $50 billion just to prop it up at its current inadequate level, and it's going to get worse when the transportation bill expires in 51 weeks.

I urge my colleagues to join me in averting another fiscal cliff, this one with the highway trust fund. Let's work with the vast array of interests that want to rebuild and renew America. Don't ignore this deficit. Instead, let's act responsibly in fixing the trust fund, putting hundreds of thousands of Americans to work at family wage jobs, in rebuilding and renewing America's infrastructure—making us safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

DOING THE PEOPLE'S WORK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just because the President and Senate refuse to talk to the House of Representatives doesn't mean we're going to stop doing the people's work. We will continue to make the case that there is no rational or acceptable reason for the President and Senate to deny working families fair treatment under ObamaCare.

Just as the President decided to give big businesses 1 year to ready themselves for all of the ObamaCare's drastic changes, the American people should have that same year. It is basic fairness.

Printed on recycled paper.

And while the Senate refuses to work with us to work through our policy differences to reopen government fully, the House of Representatives will continue building common ground with House Democrats to restore as many services as we possibly can. The Senate should consider these proposals—opening parks, funding the NIH, ending veteran benefits application delays, funding FEMA and the FDA, and restoring WIC. They are things we can agree on. Let's not squander these opportunities for common ground. Let's pass policies we can agree on and work through our differences together. Regardless of the Senate's non-negotiation policies, North Carolinians still deserve to have their voices heard at their Capitol.

My constituent Jeremiah from Rural Hall just received a letter from his insurance provider. He tells me:

> It appears that due to the health care reform, my insurance premium will double for the upcoming year. It also appears that there's nothing I can change with my current insurance provider to make it more affordable. I have been attempting to log onto the President's Web site, healthcare.gov, without success. I understand that I may be able to get a tax credit if I'm eligible. To my understanding, this will not help me in making my month-to-month bills. If this change goes through next year, I'll not be able to afford to feed my children, much less purchase health insurance. This needs to stop now.

Angie from Clemmons contacted me to say:

> ObamaCare is already adversely affecting my family in several ways. My son and daughter-in-law's family health policies are rising dramatically. They both are already working full-time jobs, and each one has part-time work also.

Robert from Lewisville wrote:

> My 27-year-old son, David, buys health care insurance through Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina. His current cost is $111 per month. He received a letter from Blue Cross saying his current policy is being canceled due to the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare. David's new cost is going to be $288 per month. He works hard and does not take handouts from government. How is ObamaCare helping people like him?

Jeffrey from Boonville told me his story, too:

> I went onto the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Web site this morning. If I buy health insurance today, the cost would be $256 a month, but come the first of the year, the same plan will be $556 a month. How is that affordable? This new law was supposed to make it more affordable. I've not checked yet to see if I can get a subsidy. Even if I was eligible for one, it's not the responsibility of other Americans to subsidize my family's health insurance.

Susan from Mocksville wrote to me to say:

> I had affordable health care. I paid Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina $181 per month. Now they sent a letter saying that if I keep this insurance, it will now be $464 per month. This is insane. ObamaCare is affordable for who? Please, who can I contact to have some kind of influence?

Mr. Speaker, we share Susan's concerns in the House of Representatives. We want Susan to be treated fairly and to have the same 1-year break from ObamaCare that President Obama chose to give to Big Business. And on Susan's behalf, House Republicans are trying to contact a body with some influence, the United States Senate, to find a way to reopen government and ensure ObamaCare is implemented fairly. But the Senate isn't willing to budge. They won't sit down to talk. They are not interested in making sure the President's unworkable law is at least applied fairly.

GETTING BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just days before the United States Government reaches its statutory borrowing limit, let's be clear: this is not new spending. This is agreeing to pay the bills we've already accrued. Senator Alan Simpson said it best:

> If you're a real conservative, an honest conservative without hypocrisy, you'd want to pay your debt.

Eight days ago, a minority faction of the Congress chose to shut down the Federal Government. This was touching the fire. To refuse to lift the debt ceiling is to place our entire hand into the fire. A Reagan economist called this debate ''playing with matches around gasoline.'' Yes, that's the same President Ronald Reagan who raised the debt ceiling 18 times without the accompanying brinksmanship. And let's remember, during the 2011 debt ceiling debate, the mere threat of a default scared the markets and drove up interest rates. Retirees lost $800 billion in assets as markets tumbled. Home buyers lost $100 a month as rates spiked. The harm this time could be much worse.

We need to pay our bills so we can start solving the real problems facing this country rather than fixing ones we caused ourselves. And, Mr. Speaker, what is most extraordinary about this fiasco is this: I thought budget negotiations were supposed to be about funding levels, but this Nation's most contentious budget fight in nearly 20 years isn't about funding levels at all; it's about using the budget as leverage to repeal or delay an existing law.

Despite the destructive effects of sequestration, in an effort to compromise, we gave in to the demands to the majority and accepted their $986 billion spending limit. Just put this into context. The $986 billion level is 17 percent below fiscal year 2010 spending and 10 percent less than the original Ryan budget. It is below Simpson-Bowles. If that's not compromise, I don't know what is. Those on the other side of this aisle don't know how to take ''yes'' for an answer. We agreed to deeply slash government spending. Please accept a victory and restart the government so we can get back to the real work of this body.

THE SHIELD ACT

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again this morning to thank the men and women of the Federal law enforcement community, as well as those brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, for what they do to protect this great Nation both abroad and here at home.

Certainly, we are thankful for them each and every day for protecting us in our Nation, but recent events again remind us of their importance.

After the Capitol was thrown into lock-down last week, Capitol Police and other Federal officers sprang into action to protect the building and those inside. In their rush to service, I'm sure none of them thought about the fact that as we continue in a partial government shutdown that they may not be paid even though, for some, that may have been the case.

While there is uncertainty about the Nation's fiscal path in Washington, that uncertainty should never be passed along to our servicemembers and Federal law enforcement officers. The Strengthening Homeland Security, Intelligence, and Essential Law Enforcement Departments Act, or SHIELD Act, of 2013 would alleviate that doubt. This simple, bipartisan legislation that I have introduced prioritizes and protects pay for soldiers and law enforcement personnel if borrowing limits are reached or if there is an interruption in appropriations like there is right now.

In our most difficult hours, we rely on our law enforcement officers and our military for the protection of our lives, liberty, and freedom. No servicemember or critical officer protecting the United States at home or abroad should have to worry about their paychecks in the event of a government shutdown, nor should they be used as a bargaining chip during partisan budget debates. Thankfully, during this current budget impasse, pay for our troops was secured early through a bipartisan vote, and I applaud the President for agreeing to it. However, the SHIELD Act would codify the measure into law, meaning paychecks would never again be threatened, and action would never have to be taken to protect this very basic principle.

□ 1015

This bill already has the strong support of organizations like the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represents dedicated first responders. Just as important, it is commonsense legislation that everyday Americans understand and expect from a Congress that often stumbles in its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the brave men and women who protect us—both abroad and in your communities—to make sure their pay doesn't become a

political pawn at the whim of battling ideologies.

No members of our Federal law enforcement community or armed services should have to worry about the financial situation of their family back home while they are on the job; nor should we let our financial problems rest on the backs of those who selflessly serve the American people.

By ensuring funding for critical Federal officers and our troops, we are allowing agencies and departments to sustain a strong law enforcement and military presence at all times, regardless of fiscal conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I call for leadership in both parties to consider the SHIELD Act for quick passage.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is day 7 in a bizarre, new twist on the Republican Tea Party trip down the rabbit hole. On Saturday, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pay retroactively every Federal employee, those who are working, Capitol Hill Police, those who are being kept from working, like the aviation safety inspector I talked with yesterday. He was quite concerned about what might happen with a long lapse in aviation safety nonpartisans, but he's not allowed to work. That's a bit bizarre. He's thankful that he will someday be paid for not working, but he would rather be working, actually.

How is it in this weird world that the Mad Hatter Tea Party explains to their people back home, Well, we've shut down government sorta. We've shut down the services, but we're going to pay people for the work they're not doing. We're going to let the Social Security applications pile up and not be processed. We're going to lock people out of the national wildlife refuges during hunting season. We're going to keep the crabbing fleet grounded in Alaska because we can't issue their permits, and we're not going to continue to do the surveys for the fishing season off the northwest coast.

We've withdrawn all of that. All of those people are sitting around at home, frustrated by law, can't even access their official email, but they're going to be paid. And the Republicans say, We made it good. We're going to pay them.

What about the American people getting the services?

It reminds me of Wimpy J. Wellington from Popeye, who says, I'll gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Somehow, Tuesday never came, and repayment was never made. In this case, perhaps someday, when they stop their games, we will repay people. But what about the people who have automatic withdrawals, and they're living paycheck to paycheck, and their mortgage is coming due today or next week? What are they going to do? I see the credit unions offering zero percent loans. That's very nice of them. Wouldn't it be better if we actually put those people back to work and we paid them, and you declared victory?

You have victory within your grasp, and you're refusing it. Is it about ObamaCare? You know that was an impossible goal. That victory is not within your grasp. If it's about the deficit, which is what Gingrich put the government out of work for, then you have victory within your grasp, because Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader REID agreed weeks ago to a 6-week continuing resolution, which is what has customarily been done around here for the 27 years I've been here when the two bodies can't agree on a budget. We don't shut down the government every year. Out of 27 years, twice have we got it done in time. So in 23 of those cases, we've continued. In this case, Senator REID agreed to continue running the government at lower levels of spending, a major reduction back below the 2010 levels. All Speaker BOEHNER has to do is bring that bill to the floor of the House, and it will pass.

There are enough Republicans who told the press that they would vote for that. They can declare victory. They cut the budget yet again. They're not off on this fruitless errand of trying to stop ObamaCare from going into effect, which went into effect last week. By the way, 234,000 Oregonians have accessed our Oregon Web site, which is working quite well, thank you very much. In the States that are cooperating, it's working well. In those bonehead States that said they wouldn't cooperate and wouldn't help their people and are actually prohibiting people from being helped like, Florida, no, it's not working so well. I wonder why. Go figure.

Let's not continue this, and let's begin to deal very quickly with the issues before us because we have looming a deadline that you can't make good later. You can't make it good later. You can't tell the people of the world, all those to whom we owe hundreds of billions of dollars and the Social Security trust fund and others, Oh, we'll make it good later after we default on the debt someday. Interest rates will jump up; houses become more expensive; the housing market probably crashes again; auto sales grind to a halt; credit card interest rates go to even more extortion levels. The damage you will do by credibly threatening to default on the debt of the United States of America for some clearly undefined goal will not be undone for generations. You can't go there.

Declare victory temporarily. You got your lower levels. Bring a bill to the floor today. Let us vote on it. The Speaker said on the weekend he doesn't have the votes. Let's check that out, because we really think he does have the votes; and it's making him not look too good that he actually accepted the deal before he rejected it and now says he doesn't have the votes. That's an interesting kind of conundrum, and we can prove it very easily.

Bring the bill up today. Fund the government. Pay people to actually work.

WORDS HAVE MEANING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, words have meaning, and we are coming to the floor regularly to talk about the fiscal issues of our great Nation and to talk about how we should approach these.

I'd appreciate that we have everyone in the body involved in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I want to drill down just a little bit and take a look at what we have going on out in the media and what we continue to hear from so many who are beginning to participate in this debate.

The President and some of our friends across the aisle love saying they want a clean CR. That sounds really nice. For them, they feel as if it implies that what we want is a dirty or an unclean or an evil CR, and I find their choice of words so very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

What we want is an accountable CR because, when they're saying they want a clean CR, I would encourage my colleagues to realize what they're wanting is the no-obligation loan. They want no strings attached. A ''clean CR'' means give us the money, but don't you dare expect us to be accountable for that money.

Words have meaning. When our colleagues hear that, I would encourage them to just realize that what they're really telling you is that they don't want the accountability, that they don't want the transparency. They do not want the responsibility. As we would say when I was in the State Senate in Tennessee, they don't want outcome-based budgeting; they just want to be able to spin what they can spin.

What we continue to push for is accountability, transparency, being responsible to the taxpayer and being responsible to future generations. We have to do that because the spending is out of control.

We talk a lot about the CR and the lower spending levels that are in that. Those came about because of the Budget Control Act. The fact is that we worked and got a 2 percent across-the-board spending reduction; and for the last 2 years we've been able to get the deficit, the annual spending overage, down a little bit. We were in 2010 and 2011 borrowing $3 billion a day to keep the doors open around here. Today, we're borrowing $2 billion per day to keep the doors open. We need to get to

the point that we're not borrowing a single cent. We need to get to that point. Our goal, for those on the other side who can't figure out what a goal is, our goal is fiscal responsibility, fiscal endurance and sovereignty, preserving freedom, free people and free markets. That is our goal for this Nation and doing it in a responsible way.

I've got a great niece who is due this month, and when Georgia Kati Graham arrives, I don't want her to be looking at a mess of a Federal Government. Right now, her share of the national debt is $53,000. Every newborn who is going to arrive: welcome. With your citizenship, here is what you owe.

That is not responsible. It is why we come to this floor day after day. It is why we continue to say to the Senate, Negotiate with us. Work with us. Sure, let's look at the short-term funding issues, let's look at the long run. How do we preserve this great Nation? How do we get this spending under control? I would offer, Mr. Speaker, we don't do it by going out and borrowing $2 billion a day. We don't do it by having the Fed monetize $75 billion worth of debt each and every month. We do it by saying we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. And it is time that we put the components of that problem on the table and negotiate our way through it so that we're looking at long-term fiscal health and fiscal solvency, not just for this year or next year, not just for the next decade, but for the next century. Let's put our focus on how we return to certainty, how we return to predictability with our Federal regulatory agencies and our Tax Code.

The time to tackle the problem is now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

AMERICAN NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the three recipients of the Nobel Prize in medicine for 2013. All three work at American universities.

Dr. James E. Rothman chairs the cell biology department at Yale University. Dr. Randy W. Schekman works at the University of California at Berkeley. Their German counterpart, Dr. Thomas C. Sudhof, is on the faculty of Stanford.

The Nobel committee has recognized the importance of their lifesaving work. The question is: Why don't the House Republicans?

On the very day that three researchers at American universities won the Nobel Prize in medicine, the House Republicans continue their siege against the Government of the United States, and their siege includes the National Institutes of Health, where the American people through their Federal Government support medical research and path-breaking, basic research in the difficult search for cures.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that Dr. Rothman of Yale received two grants under the Obama Recovery Act for his work in developing a better way to study cells. Of course, he would have received none if the Republicans in Congress had had their way. More to the point, the Republican shutdown has jeopardized hundreds of research projects like Dr. Rothman's, Dr. Schekman's and Dr. Sudhof's. The Republicans have essentially shut down the National Institutes of Health, which has told researchers that they cannot process their grant applications, which eventually will bring federally supported research to a halt.

I count more than 30 research projects underway just in Ohio at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland and at least a dozen more at the Cleveland Clinic and at the University of Toledo Medical University—cutting-edge research, peer-reviewed research, research that could save lives.

Thanks to the Republican Congress, these are ''dark days for medical research.'' So says the Atlantic Magazine.

> Between the sequester and the shutdown, repeated hits to research funding may have serious consequences for scientific advancement.

That's not something you see in the flash of but one day. But it erodes America's real strength over time.

□ 1030

Almost three out of four employees at the National Institutes of Health are sitting at home, thanks to the Republican Congress. They're not allowed to do their work of finding cures and stamping out disease. The Republican Congress locked them out. Two hundred patients at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center were turned away due to the Republican Congress' throwing its little temper tantrum over losing the Presidential election again. Many of those 200 people are cancer patients, and 30 of them are children, paying a heavy, heavy price for Republican intransigence. The Republicans told them, Go away.

Mr. Speaker, even if the Republicans lack any empathy whatsoever, at least you would think they would care about jobs in America. Research and development, including research and development in biotechnology, provides a competitive advantage for the United States. It's a very promising sector for economic development and job growth. Just come to Cleveland to see the new Health Innovation Center, or look at the neuropsychiatric research being conducted at Case and the University of Toledo Medical Center. Look at what it draws around it. Yet The Atlantic magazine says the sequester is killing 20,500 jobs this year in the life sciences field, and the government shutdown threatens to ground medical research into cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and disabling neuropsychiatric disorders.

The Nobel committee gets it. The American people get it. A recent poll showed that 83 percent of the public believes investing in medical research is important for our economy.

So why don't the Republicans get it? As NIH Director Collins told The Atlantic last week:

> We will not know what grant that was going to lead to the next breakthrough in cancer research didn't quite make the cut. We will not know what brilliant scientists, who were going to win a Nobel Prize, basically gave up because of the failure to get support from the current system and decided to do something else or move to another country, which some of them are doing already. We won't know. That is the sad tale that is wrapped up in all of this.

The good news is that three scientists working on the frontier of scientific research—three scientists at American universities—did not give up, and they have captured the Nobel Prize in Medicine for 2013.

The bad news is that House Republicans apparently have given up. They apparently don't care whether the U.S. keeps distinguishing itself by winning such prestigious awards. They apparently don't care whether we support the research that will help humankind and eliminate diseases and save lives. They don't care if the United States remains the global leader in medical and scientific research and enjoys the millions of jobs that it will create in the future—what a shame—and how easy it would be to bring up a clean continuing resolution and put the government of the people of this country back to work.

ATF CENSORS FREE SPEECH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk and discuss and debate the issues of the debt ceiling, of the continuing resolution, there are still things taking place in government. Some of them aren't so good.

Just to give a little background, which you are certainly aware of, we have our Constitution with the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a section in the Constitution that protects citizens from government abuses.

The First Amendment is first because it contains the most important rights. If those rights are abridged, the rest of the Bill of Rights—to me—is meaningless, and we all know that two of those provisions have to do with the freedom of speech and the freedom of press. We traditionally honor those because they are so important.

Historically, the most controversial of all speech and press was political

speech and religious speech. Those are especially protected in the First Amendment, and there are historical reasons for that. The colonists, our forefathers, they were an ornery bunch, and they were constantly hammering, through the press and through speech, King George III, Great Britain, and their abuses on individuals in the Colonies—and rightfully so.

Therefore, when our Constitution was written and the Bill of Rights was written, we wanted to ensure that, under our philosophy and under our democracy in the United States, freedom of speech, and freedom of press were protected.

Over the years, the Supreme Court has ruled on free speech and press cases; but they have gradually limited speech, which is another issue. The prevailing rule is that, if there's a compelling State interest—whatever that means—and we'll talk about that some other time—then speech can be prohibited. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment doesn't say anything about limiting speech when there's a compelling State interest.

But the Supreme Court said, if there's a compelling State interest, speech can be limited, and, of course, the Supreme Court decides what that compelling State interest is.

There are also two types of punishment for speech. One is censorship, which is the most egregious. That is to prevent someone from saying something or publishing something. Then there's the other type of punishment for speech, after the speech is made. Then there is punishment sometimes for what is said, such as a threat or yelling ''fire'' in a crowded theater. But the most egregious is preventing someone from saying something or printing something or publishing something. That is censorship.

So that brings us to what is taking place. We've all heard of Fast and Furious. That's the situation where our government sent guns to Mexico under the theory that they're going to track the guns. Americans were killed; Mexican nationals were killed. We're over in court because Eric Holder won't give us information about Fast and Furious. Now one of the ATF agents wants to publish a book, called, ''The Unarmed Truth,'' and it's about Fast and Furious. He is an agent in the ATF and whistleblower.

The ATF has a policy that says, Well, we, the ATF, decide whether someone in our organization is allowed to publish or have some type of outside employment, and we use our own discretion. It's just up to us. We don't have any policy rules. We just arbitrarily decide. And they have decided that because Dodson wants to publish this on his own time, not on company time, or government time—he went and tried to get permission—they said, You can't publish that book. Here's the reason he was given, Mr. Speaker. The reason given to him was, well, it might hurt the morale in the ATF.

Now, do you think that's a compelling State interest to prevent a person from printing something and violating his right of free speech because the government says it might hurt the morale in the ATF?

Absolutely not. You've got somebody that wants to tell the truth about the ATF, and it's a violation of his constitutional right not to be able to discuss openly what took place. It's a denial of the First Amendment freedom of speech. It is a denial of freedom of press.

These individuals of the ATF, censor police, ought to be furloughed. They ought to be sequestered, specifically those that are denying the freedom of press, the freedom of speech to someone who just wants to talk about what took place in the ATF. This ought not to be, but that's what has taken place by the ATF coverup squad. Unchain the freedom of speech and press.

And that's just the way it is.

DEBT CEILING INCREASE

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the irresponsibility of the Republican Party in holding hostage the full faith and credit of the United States.

As hundreds of thousands of Federal workers go without pay, as home buying slows to an eventual halt, and as Federal agencies remain unable to complete the important work of implementing the Wall Street Reform Act, Republicans are threatening another crisis that could have significant impacts on our financial markets and the economic security of all Americans. They do this in pursuit of an ideological agenda. The result is continued instability and uncertainty for our economy and fragile recovery.

We should not default on our obligations. The ramifications of doing so would be serious. The underpinnings of the entire financial system could be affected, with the possibility of triggering a financial crisis reminiscent of the days following the failure of Lehman Brothers—only this time, it would be far worse.

If the U.S. defaults on its debt, lending—the lifeblood of our economy—would dry up. The dollar's value could drop, and we could see dramatic increases in interest rates on everything from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards. Not only that, but every U.S. corporation and municipality would likely see their borrowing costs climb as well. Unemployment rates would rise precipitously just as we're beginning to recover.

If Congress cannot do its job in a timely manner, in the future, the government's ability to pay its debts will be looked upon with uncertainty by investors and markets, leading to higher borrowing costs in the future and, in turn, an increase in our Nation's deficit. Worst of all, we could see another dramatic loss of wealth for working Americans.

History tells us that even the threat of default can send shock waves through our financial system. In 2011, just the prospect of defaulting on our debt caused a drop in consumer and business confidence, a 17 percent decline in the S&P 500 index of equity prices, and increased volatility in the stock market; and, of course, we received a downgrade in the U.S. Government debt.

The drop in equity caused by the 2011 debt ceiling fight had serious consequences for American families. The months following saw a $2.4 trillion decline in household wealth and an $800 billion drop in retirement assets. The cost of homeownership also increased, as risk-averse lenders increased the cost of borrowing to purchase a home. The 2011 debate showed us the very serious consequences of even debating whether we should pay bills already incurred.

But no one knows with certainty the full extent of the damage to the economy should the U.S. actually default on its debts. We have heard speculation ranging from bad to the catastrophic. I, for one, do not want to find out.

What I do know is that everyone from Wall Street CEOs, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, to small business owners, and prominent conservative economists are concerned with the significant damage that could result from a debt ceiling standoff. Warren Buffett, Ben Bernanke, Hank Paulson, and the heads of the Nation's largest financial institutions have been outspoken about the need to end this hostage crisis now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been through enough. We remain in the midst of a government shutdown with no end in sight. It is hurting real people and damaging our economic recovery. At this tenuous time, defaulting on our Nation's debt could create the perfect storm that may roil financial markets and undermine the credibility of the United States; but, most importantly, it could be devastating for American families who are already suffering in the aftermath of a major recession, foreclosure crisis, and now a government shutdown.

So I urge my colleagues to stop using the debt ceiling to push extremist ideology and vote now on a clean debt limit increase.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee said she doesn't know what we mean when we talk about a ''clean debt limit increase.'' I think she knows. She knows that they should not try to do away with the ACA—that is, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare—and hold us hostage because they don't like it.

The ObamaCare legislation was passed. It is in law. President Obama was absolutely supported by the citizens of this country when they voted the President to be reelected once again. The Supreme Court supported it.

If they wish to do away with ObamaCare, they should go through the legislative process and repeal it; but no, they are holding us hostage on the budget.

BLIZZARD IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, a record blizzard hit my State of South Dakota. Some places in the Black Hills saw almost 4 feet of snow in just 2 days. Thousands were without power. Thousands are still without power. Emergency vehicles were stranded along with the people that they were trying to rescue.

The damage from the downed trees, the downed power lines covered with heavy, wet snow is monumental. On top of that, with warm weather expected this week, we expect to see massive flooding that could bring even more damage.

On the plains in western South Dakota, ranchers are still trying to recover from losing cattle in the drought last summer, which was the worst drought that we had seen since the Great Depression.

□ 1045

We've heard now that they've lost tens of thousands of cattle in this fall blizzard. We've heard that tens of thousands of cattle have been lost in the snow. They're being found frozen, smothered by the high drifts and injured from wandering in zero visibility in 70-mile-per-hour winds.

We talked with one rancher near White River, South Dakota, who found over 50 cattle who had died in one spot near a dam.

Another rancher north of New Underwood was finally able to locate his entire herd of 63 cows who'd taken refuge in a shed for protection, but none of them survived.

Another story is from a rancher near Union Center who said, ''It's bad. It's really bad. I'm the eternal optimist, but this is really bad. The livestock loss is catastrophic. It's pretty unbelievable.''

He said cattle were soaked by 12 hours of rain early in the storm, so many were unable to survive an additional 48 hours of snow and winds up to 60 miles per hour.

See, this blizzard came so early, cattle hadn't even had time to grow their winter coats. ''It's the worst early season snowstorm I've seen in my lifetime,'' he said, and he's 60 years old.

Another rancher said, ''This is absolutely, totally devastating.'' He's 52 years old. He's from Caputa, South Dakota. ''This is horrendous. I mean the death loss of these cows in this country is unbelievable.''

This man said he estimated he had lost half of his herd, but it could be far more. He was still struggling to find snow-buried cattle and those that had been pushed miles by winds that gusted over 70 miles per hour on Friday night.

An emergency management director in Butte County said that the trail of carcasses is a gruesome sight across the region. They're in the fence line. They're laying along the roads. It's really sickening.

And none of the ranchers that I have talked to can remember anything like it. Not only will this be devastating for this year's business, but also it will take years to rebuild what has been lost.

Yet another rancher, near Scenic, couldn't find his cattle over the weekend, and said he nearly killed a horse trying to get through the snow while searching for his cattle. He turned back, and yesterday, with the help of a pilot friend, flew over land south of the Badlands.

He found what he called the ''trail of death.'' About 200 of his 600 cows were dead, leading up to and throughout a draw. The calves that were still alive were standing by their mothers. The rest of his cows and calves are alive, but he can't get to them.

Those are just many of the tragic stories that we've heard. Our lack of a comprehensive farm bill leaves these ranchers without the protection of a livestock disaster program that would come in in these situations and blunt just a small portion of the loss.

I fought hard to include livestock disaster programs in the farm bill, which would cover these producers retroactively.

It's time we finish our work on the farm bill. It's time we go to conference, have a negotiation on the most reform-minded farm bill that has been put together for decades. Getting the farm bill done could give those in western South Dakota more certainty during this very, very difficult time.

THE ISSUE THAT WILL NOT GO AWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I do want to share with my colleagues an issue that will not go away.

What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word ''redskin'' is considered a very offensive racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have yet to master the English language. But I want to share again and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans all over America why our Native American Indian community considers the word ''redskin'' as very offensive, and clearly, the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term ''redskin'' is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for the killing and scalping of people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, I submit, Mr. Speaker, were called ''redskins.''

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that the word ''redskin'' is ''not just a racial slur or a derogatory term,'' but a painful ''reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people.''

Mr. Speaker, again, I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that that redskins scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or your son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children. They are not animals.

Our colleague, TOM COLE, from Oklahoma, the cochair of our Congressional Native American Indian Caucus and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states:

> This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, D.C.

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota, as cochair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, says this ''is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of Mr. Dan Snyder,'' the owner of the Washington franchise, ''and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multibillion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that 'redskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect,' is a statement of absurdity.''

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise, Mr. Dan Snyder, ''is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, yet who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians.''

Ms. NORTON also said:

As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to Redskin fans, no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age, with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers opportunities for higher education and economic opportunity.

Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams, like Troy Polumalu, and Chris Kemoeatu of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the late Junior Seau, and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, and the former player, Joe Salave'a, and Roy Helu, with the Washington Redskins.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, let's do the right thing, and I appeal to the NFL, do the right thing. Change the name of the Washington football franchise.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I want to share with my colleagues an issue that just will not go away. What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and the NFL Commissioner Mr. Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word ''redskin'' is considered a very offensive, racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have not yet mastered the English language—but I want to share again, and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans around the country—why our Native American Indian community considers the word ''redskin'' as very offensive, and clearly the National Football League, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term ''redskin'' is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps were called ''redskins.''

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that ''redskins'' is ''not just a racial slur or a derogatory term,'' but a painful ''reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people.''

Mr. Speaker, again I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that the ''redskin'' scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children—they are not animals!

Our colleague TOM COLE from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, and a member of the Chikasaw Nation, states: ''This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, DC.''

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, states that Mr. Goodell's letter ''is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of [Mr.] Dan Snyder,'' owner of the Washington franchise, ''and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that '[r]edskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage pride, and respect' is a statement of absurdity.''

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise Mr. Daniel Snyder ''is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, [yet] who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians.'' Ms. Norton also said, ''As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to Redskins fans—no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans.''

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers an opportunity to enter the realm of higher education and economic opportunity. Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams—like Troy Polumalu and former player Chris Kemoeatu of the Pittsburg Steelers, the late Junior Seau and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, former player Joe Salave'a and now Roy Helu, Jr. with the Washington ''Redskins,'' Haloti Ngata and former player Ma'ake Kemoeatu with the Baltimore Ravens, Isaac Sopoaga and former player Vai Sikahema with the Philadelphia Eagles, Tyson Alualu with the Jacksonville Jaguars, Samson Satele and Fill Moala with the Indianapolis Colts, Mike Iupati with the San Francisco 49ers, Ropati Pitoitua with the Tennessee Titans, Paul Soliai with the Miami Dolphins, and Domato Peko, Ray Maualuga, and former player Jonathan Fanene with the Cincinnati Bengals, and the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I love the game of football. I played all four years in high school. I love the NFL. But there is absolutely no excuse for the Washington professional football franchise to continue the shameful use of the word ''redskins.''

Just last week, another island boy weighed in on the name of the Washington, DC football franchise. He is none other than our own President Barack Obama, born in Hawaii and who played basketball for Punahou High School in Honolulu, Hawaii, and he said: ''If I were the owner of the team and I knew that the name of my team—even if they've had a storied history—was offending a sizable group of people, I'd think about changing it.'' President Obama further said: ''Native Americans feel pretty strongly about it . . . I don't know whether our attachment to a particular name should override the real, legitimate concerns that people have about these things.''

While race-based killing of Native Americans is a thing of the past, the tradition of mockery and insult—whether intentional or not—lives on through the Washington ''Redskins,'' a name that American Indian rights activist Ms. Suzan Harjo calls ''the worst thing in the English language you can be called if you are a native person.'' This is not a popularity contest. You don't take polls on issues with deep moral implications. That is just absolute nonsense.

For those who question whether this racist or derogatory word is offensive to Native Americans, I want to share with my colleagues an excerpt from a letter sent by the leaders and members of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)—the oldest, largest, and most representative American Indian and Alaska Native organization serving the broad interests of the majority of some 5 million Native Americans with well over 500 tribal governments and communities across the nation. In the letter, NCAI President Jefferson Keel of the Chikasaw Nation from Oklahoma states that Congressional efforts on this issue ''will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the [name] of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long.''

Mr. Speaker, the term ''redskin'' does not, as NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell suggests, offend just one person. And the responsibility for perpetuating this racial slur, as Mr. Goodell implies, lies not just with Mr. Dan Snyder, the owner of the Washington football franchise. The responsibility rests squarely on the National Football League and the 32 owners of their football teams, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell.

As for the ''Redskins'' sponsors—such as FedEx, Virginia Lottery, Sprint Nextel, Coca-Cola, Bank of America, Anheuser-Busch, and others—they are equally accountable for the continued use of this disparaging term. Their silence on the issue given their direct contribution to this racist and derogatory word is deafening.

Again, I ask NFL Commissioner Goodell and the 32 club owners—do the right thing—change the name of the Washington football franchise.

I submit for the record a letter from the National Congress of American Indians; and today's commentary from two articles in the Washington Post authored by Mr. Dana Milbank, Ms. Theresa Vargas and Mr. Mark Maske.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
AMERICAN INDIANS,
March 21, 2013.

HON. ENI FALEOMAVAEGA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FALEOMAVAEGA: On behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation's oldest and largest tribal government advocacy organization in the country, we applaud you for sponsoring the ''Non-Disparagement of Native

American Persons or People in Trademark Registration Act of 2013''. This legislation will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the mascot of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long.

The NCAI membership has been an active part of ending these types of derogatory stereotypes for several decades. The NCAI was one of many native and non-native organizations in support of the original court cases on this matter, Harjo et al v. Pro Football, Inc., and we support the current case, Blackhorse et al v. Pro Football, Inc., to cancel existing trademarks.

We are proud of all our people who struggle for dignity and fight against stereotypes, including Native and non-Native students, families, teachers, and others who have worked together to retire over 2,000 ''Indian'' names, logos, mascots, and behaviors in schools across the land. The use of Native Peoples as mascots is offensive and unjustifiable. We will continue to call for an end to this practice until the remaining stereotypes are gone from the American landscape.

Thank you and your co-sponsors for your leadership and courage in introducing this important legislation. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me or the NCAI Deputy Director, Robert Holden, at the National Congress of American Indians.

Respectfully,

JEFFERSON KEEL,
President.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

FOR THE REDSKINS, WHAT'S IN A NAME? PLENTY

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal So when Davis's name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team's name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment ''as a supporter of President Obama'' that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. ''We love our team and its name,'' he wrote, and ''we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group.''

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let's parse this statement. Are the Redskins really defending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it's right to use ''Redskins'' as a mascot, NFL owners gathering in Georgetown on Tuesday for their Fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets and see how they would sound: The Washington Wetbacks? The Houston Hymies? The Chicago Chinks'? Or perhaps the New York Niggers? That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

''This word is an insult. It's mean, it's rude, it's impolite,'' Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. ''We've noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits.''

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he'd think about changing the name if he were in Snyder's shoes. Snyder is on record telling USA Today: 'We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never—you can use caps.''

Actually, forget the Caps; let's use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the ''selective'' outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves' Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland's Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren't epithets.

''We're asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur,'' said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia's delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. ''My great-grandfather was a runaway slave,'' she said. ''I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don't see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you've got an uprising?''

That makes Davis's defense sound all the more trivial. ''The name 'Washington Redskins' is 80 years old—it's our history and legacy and tradition,'' his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans' history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won't last much longer. ''The name is going to go in the dustbin of history,'' she said. ''My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far.''

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history's dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we'd win some football games.

Make your case: Should the Washington Redskins change their name?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

INDIAN TRIBE PUSHES FOR WASHINGTON REDSKINS NAME CHANGE AS NFL OWNERS GATHER

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

''They know we're not going away,'' said Ray Halblitter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League ''a move in the right direction.''

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the longstanding debate, saying that if he were the team's owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the ''Change the Mascot'' campaign a few months ago, drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the ''Redskins'' moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team's 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Canton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Snithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D–Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.).

''I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans,'' said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team's name and said, ''If one person's offended, we have to listen.''

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins' name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL's senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league's offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

''I'd rather not get into it,'' Murphy said.

Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told USA Today, 'We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.''

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stop penning the word. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team's name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe's involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

''Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image,'' Gover said, ''and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond.''

During Monday's event, Gover—who wrote a letter to The Washington Post about the

offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called ''redskin'' and doesn't understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

''This is a public health issue,'' he said. 'This is not a political correctness issue.''

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board's president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school's team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school's new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged $10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a ''vested interest in the league being a unifying force,'' Habritter said.

''As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this,'' Habritter said. ''We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don't want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans.''

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

TACKLING THE OFFENSIVE

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. So when Davis's name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team's name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment ''as a supporter of President Obama'' that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. ''We love our team and its name;'' he wrote, and ''we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group.''

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let's parse this statement. Are the Redskins really defending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it's right to use ''Redskins'' as a mascot, NFL owners gathering in Georgetown on Tuesday for their fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets for Hispanics, African Americans, Asians and Jews and see how they would sound. That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

''This word is an insult. It's mean, it's rude, it's impolite,'' Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. ''We've noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits.''

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he'd think about changing the name if he were in Snyder's shoes. Snyder is on record telling USA Today: ''We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never—you can use caps.''

Actually, forget the Caps; let's use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the ''selective'' outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves' Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren't epithets.''We're asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur,'' said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia's delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. ''My great-grandfather was a runaway slave,'' she said. ''I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don't see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you've got an uprising?''

That makes Davis's defense sound all the more trivial. ''The name 'Washington Redskins' is 80 years old—it's our history and legacy and tradition,'' his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans' history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won't last much longer. ''The name is going to go in the dustbin of history,'' she said. ''My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far.''

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history's dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we'd win some football games.

NFL TO MEET TRIBE OVER REDSKINS NAME

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

''They know we're not going away,'' said Ray Halbritter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League ''a move in the right direction.''

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the longstanding debate, saying that if he were the team's owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the ''Change the Mascot'' campaign a few months ago, drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the ''Redskins'' moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team's 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Carlton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D–Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.).

''I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans,'' said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team's name and said, ''If one person's offended, we have to listen.''

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins' name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL's senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league's offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined to comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

''I'd rather not get into it,'' Murphy said.

Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told USA Today, ''We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.''

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stopped penning the name. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team's name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe's involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

''Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image,'' Gover said, ''and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond?'

During Monday's event, Gover—who wrote a letter to The Washington Post about the offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called ''redskin'' and doesn't understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

''This is a public health issue,'' he said. ''This is not a political correctness issue.''

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board's president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school's team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school's new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged $10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a ''vested interest in the league being a unifying force,'' Halbritter said.

''As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this,'' Halbritter said. ''We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don't want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans.''

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN COGHILL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to pay tribute to my friend Marvin Coghill, a great North Carolinian who passed away on August 18. Marvin was an international leader in the tobacco industry, but much more than this, he loved the Old North State, and his many acts of kindness and generosity exemplify the good and humble man that he was.

Marvin was born and raised in a farming community in Vance County. Always the diplomat, Marvin studied at NC State University for a year, then went up the road to rival UNC-Chapel Hill. His college days were cut short in 1952, though, when he joined the U.S. Navy and honorably served our country in the Korean War.

The end of Marvin's military service marked the beginning of his career with Standard Commercial Tobacco Company in London in 1957. He traveled thousands of miles from eastern North Carolina on behalf of Standard Commercial, eventually settling in Thailand in 1963, where he married his first wife, Tomoe.

Rising through the ranks, Marvin was named president and CEO of Standard Commercial in 1980. A year later, his adventure came full circle when he returned to North Carolina. For the rest of his life, he called Wilson his home. A man of great talents, he continued to lead Standard Commercial until his retirement in 2000.

In his later years, Marvin would be honored with countless local awards and recognitions, and many organizations, including Wilson Medical Center Foundation, the Salvation Army Boys and Girls Club, and the Tobacco Farm Life Museum benefited from Marvin's generosity.

Marvin also became deeply involved as a cofounder of Wilson Youth United, an organization dedicated to improving the prospects of at-risk youths.

But that was just like Marvin. He had personally helped pay for many young folks to attend college, and after retirement, he redirected his considerable talents towards improving his community.

It was also in retirement that he married fellow Henderson native, Anne Coghill.

One of Marvin's great contributions to the world was his love of people. With his impeccable manners and gift of storytelling, any conversation with Marvin was a real delight. He saw what men and women were capable of, and throughout his life, he always brought out the best in people. Always outwardly focused, Marvin looked for ways to enrich the lives of people around him.

Through the years, you'd often find Marvin enjoying breakfast at the Country Restaurant in Wilson. He was very modest, and you would never expect, when you first met him, that you were talking to one of the true titans of the tobacco industry worldwide.

But you were always touched by his big heart and bigger personality, and each and every one of us is a better person for having met and known my friend Marvin Coghill. He will be greatly missed by me and many others throughout the world.

END THE TRAVESTY AND DO WHAT'S RIGHT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start this morning with something that we, as Democrats and Republicans, can immediately address.

Coming from a State that has sent probably one of the largest percentages of men and women to our faraway shores as members of the United States military and, in particular, Afghanistan, I stand here today to reach out to the Pentagon and to others to be able to embrace the five families that are now facing the most devastating news: that their loved one was lost in Afghanistan in a war over the weekend.

Yes, as we bring our troops home, as I've advocated for a very, very long time, as well in Iraq, our soldiers are still dying in a place of war.

I want immediately for the $100,000 death benefit and the flight to Dover to be given to these families. I'm reaching out to the Pentagon, writing a letter, and asking that this be immediately resolved.

Last week, we passed legislation to indicate that the United States military would continue to be paid. I, as a lawyer, not in military law, could make the argument and make it today on the floor of the House that that gives authority to provide those death benefits and, as well, the transportation cost to Dover Air Force Base.

If we can do anything, if we cannot do much, we certainly can come together around the brave men and women in the United States military.

This shutdown is shameful. It is indicative of the worst of not appreciating the institution of this place and the priority of the American people.

But I know that there is a great love and affection and recognition that, but for those who leave this place, the United States of America, willingly, to sacrifice their lives on behalf of the great freedom that this country promotes, the constitutional government that this country supports, and is valued through the Constitution—there is no way that I will continue to stand here on this floor in the midst of a shutdown and allow this travesty to occur.

So I am asking that we immediately respond to these individuals and these families, and we let them know that God loves them and so does this Nation, which appreciates and is grateful for the sacrifices of their loved ones.

It is a grateful Nation, and we will not stand for this outrage that impacts these innocent families who now, not only are mourning the tragedy of the loss of a young life, but also the devastation of a response.

I don't know why we continue in this shutdown that is, frankly, a situation that is, in essence, not following the parliamentary procedures.

□ 1100

We know that the process of budgeting is a separate process from opening the doors of the government, and I just cited the tragedy that I want to have a solution to. But as I say that, I want us to have a solution to turning the tide on opening the government.

We know that there are enough Republicans and Democrats who would vote for a clean bill to open this House right now. I say this because it pains me to hear of the tragedy that I just spoke of, which I look to be resolved within hours, and I say that broadly to the military families around America and around the world.

But in addition to solving that crisis, we need to be able to open the government for veterans. In the next couple of days, they will see those veterans centers shut down. Those are the centers where veterans go for employment and benefit issues they have.

A couple of weeks ago, I stood before the DeGeorge Hotel in Houston, Texas, which is now a veterans center and a home for homeless veterans. I was there with people who said, My life has not been the best. I served my country, but this is my home now. I don't want to move. I want to get on my feet and live in the DeGeorge Hotel.

These are men and women who were willing to put on the Nation's uniform and offer themselves in Vietnam and many places around the world and now have come to a point where they're homeless and being served by veterans resources, and now we're telling them that they cannot have the services that they need.

In a couple of days, the Federal courts are looking at possibly shutting down Federal courts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hear from one of our Republican friends saying, This is exactly what I wanted; I'm excited the government is shut down.

Think of our military and our veterans. Let's come together to make a difference in this world.

COME TO THE BARGAINING TABLE

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, why are we here today in the middle of the government shutdown? The answer, frankly, is that the Senate refuses to come to the table to negotiate.

The House has passed four different measures that would have kept the government open. The Senate has ignored them all.

Before the government shut down, the House passed a bill which would keep the government open and defund the President's health care law. Well, it is probable that the Senate wasn't going to support that, but I was thinking at least we would be able to get documentation as to whether there would be some Democrat support for that.

That having failed, we passed a second measure to keep the government open and simply delay the President's health care law by 1 year. After all, the President himself had delayed portions of the law.

Obviously, that didn't play with the Senate.

So then we passed another piece of legislation which would have funded the government and would have funded the President's health care law, but simply would have made the law fairer for all Americans.

The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—but he changed the law, giving large employers a 1-year delay in the employer mandate. In other words, employers were required to offer insurance or face a fine. The President, by executive order, changed the law to delay that for 1 year. We asked simply to give the individual the same prerogative that the President gave large employers: delay the requirement to buy insurance for 1 year without having to pay a fine.

We also asked that Congress, the President, and the Vice President be treated the same as all other Americans. The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—saying that Congress would get a different deal in the exchanges than the average individual. When I went home to my district in August and did 12 town hall meetings, there was universal disgust for that rule.

So in our proposal to the Senate, we said, We'll fund the government, but simply change the rule concerning Congress so that Congress is treated the same as every American. Let's change the law so that the individual is treated the same as a large employer. I don't see how that's holding a gun to anyone's head. That is simply fairness for the American people.

And that was rejected by the Senate.

Then we simply asked the Senate to come to the table. Well, if this proposal, which just makes the law equitable for every American, is unacceptable to you, would you please come to the table and let's talk about what is acceptable to you. Let's sit down and negotiate.

Mr. Reagan presided over his terms in office with a Democrat-controlled House, and yet he worked with Mr. O'Neill and got significant legislation done. Mr. Clinton worked with a Republican House and got significant legislation done and made real progress with welfare reform and many other issues in the Clinton Presidency, but they worked across the aisle. They worked with a House of different parties and got things done.

Now we have a President who says, I'm not going to negotiate. We have a leader in the Senate who says, I'm not going to negotiate.

Each part of our government has a role to play—the executive, the Senate, the House. Frankly, in the whole history of the Republic, we've never had a situation where the President says, I'm not going to negotiate, or where one House says to the other House, We're not going to negotiate. This is, frankly, unbelievable. It's a step in our government which I don't think the American people want.

This is not about the President's health care law. This is about the function of our government and how each section of the government deals with each other. I think the American people want it to go in the traditional fashion, where the House, the Senate and the President work together to find a solution.

When the Senate refuses to pass legislation and won't even consider talking to us, that's not right. We in the House have passed legislation to fund FEMA, to fund our national parks, to fund WIC, to fund our veterans, to fund the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and the National Guard. By the end of tomorrow, we'll have funded more than half the government in this House, and yet the Senate won't take any of that up and won't even negotiate with us. We even made sure that furloughed employees will be paid.

The Obama administration has given exceptions to their allies, Big Business, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

The administration and the Senate should come to the bargaining table today and end this shutdown.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is now day 8 of House Republicans' reckless, irresponsible government shutdown. In that time, America has been demanding to hear one reasonable, responsible proposal from House Republicans about how they plan to reopen the U.S. Government.

While House Republicans refuse to capitulate, New Mexicans are still hurting. They're hurting because one radical faction of one party in the House stands in the way, holding the entire Congress and the entire country hostage.

First, this band of radicals forced a government shutdown just to get its way. They have caused significant economic harm and are wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars every day. These are the same Republicans who promised fiscal responsibility.

Now they're dangerously close to forcing an economic shutdown by threatening a catastrophic debt default if they don't get what they want. The problem? They don't even know what they want. As my Republican colleague from Indiana said last week:

> We have to get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

As Speaker BOEHNER admitted the other day, he committed to Senate leadership that he would support the very same bill—a clean continuing resolution—for which he now refuses a vote on the floor.

On Sunday, I was back in Albuquerque, meeting with Federal employees who have been furloughed. I heard heartbreaking stories of families who say that because of the shutdown, they're worried about paying their mortgages and utility payments and car loans and credit card bills. That's what they're concerned about. That's what keeps them up at night.

I heard from a civilian air traffic controller at Kirtland Air Force Base who was worried about the safety of the airmen because he's not allowed to work. Federal employees are demoralized and feel abandoned. They don't understand why they are being blamed for House Republicans' failure to pass a clean funding compromise.

But in a 2½-hour meeting, not one of the furloughed New Mexicans told me he wants to see the Affordable Care Act repealed. Not one. I think that shows how far removed from reality House Republicans are. They're willing to continue harming hardworking, innocent Americans because of their obsession with destroying the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is reckless behavior.

As this shutdown carries on into week 2, we keep learning of more negative impacts. Sandia National Labs, one of the largest employers in my district, has started notifying its more than 10,000 employees that they are likely to experience furloughs if the government doesn't reopen soon. That

will have an absolutely devastating ripple effect on our local economy that we may never recover from.

Instead of voting to end the shutdown, House Republicans have wasted time with false and misleading attempts to reopen the government bit by bit. After all, they didn't shut down the government piece by piece, so we shouldn't open it that way either.

The one bill that House Republican leadership should be bringing to the House floor today is the Senate-passed, clean funding compromise, which would go directly to the President and immediately open up the entire government for all New Mexicans and Americans.

We know that there are enough votes right now to pass a clean funding compromise. So why won't the Republican leadership allow a vote on it?

I understand that some of my Republican colleagues say part of the reason they got elected was because they pledged to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. We were all sent here to represent our constituents. I know that.

I'm here to represent constituents who are being hammered by the sequester. I've said many times in this Chamber that we need to immediately replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction, but I'm not prepared to keep the government shut down because of it, inflicting further harm on people, not only in my district, but around the country.

In spite of the damaging effect the sequestration continues to have on my State, I am prepared to vote right now for a temporary compromise bill that funds the government at sequester levels. I am prepared to vote for it as is virtually every Democrat in the House. The Senate has already passed it. The President says he'll sign it immediately.

We want to get rid of the sequester, but we're willing to vote for a compromised funding bill at sequester levels, and I'll tell you why—because, at this time, it's a reasonable path forward.

So to my Republican friends who don't like the Affordable Care Act, here's a proposal for you: let's reopen the government now with a clean funding bill. Let's put all the furloughed Federal employees back to work. Then we can work together to determine what parts of the Affordable Care Act work well and which parts need to be addressed. After a reasonable amount of time, we can make the necessary adjustments to the law.

That's how you effectively represent your constituents who still have serious concerns about the Affordable Care Act. That's a reasonable path forward.

Mr. Speaker, let's reopen government right now. Then let's work together on a long-term solution that addresses the serious and significant fiscal issues facing our Nation today.

TIME TO SHOW LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, Irish leader Henry Boyle once said:

> The most important trip you can make in life is meeting people halfway.

Unfortunately, in this debate, the President and HARRY REID's latest offers are way short of halfway. They won't even come to the negotiating table.

During this shutdown, the Republicans in the House have passed nine bills to fund and reopen vital functions of government. Let me go through some of them for you:

Twenty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to fund pediatric cancer research. Twenty-three of my Democrats colleagues voted with Republicans to reopen national parks, memorials, and monuments;

□ 1115

Thirty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans, honoring our promise to give veterans the benefits they have earned;

Thirty-six of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to pay our National Guard and Army Reserve personnel;

Twenty-three of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to make sure funds are available to provide disaster relief; and

One hundred eighty-nine of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to provide backpay for furloughed Federal employees.

Each of these are reasonable proposals, yet HARRY REID insists that virtually all of them will not be considered in the Senate, and the President has threatened a veto.

Let me repeat. House Republicans have passed bills to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, provide benefits to veterans, pay salaries for our National Guard, fund disaster relief programs and other vital services. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for each of these bills, yet the President and HARRY REID won't budge.

The American people are disappointed in this shutdown—after all, this is not the way government is supposed to work—but the American people are also figuring this out. This shutdown can end if HARRY REID and President Obama meet House Republicans at the negotiating table—but their chairs sit empty.

The American people don't want the President's health care law, but they are ready for this shutdown to end. It's time for both parties to listen to the American people, work out our differences, and find a commonsense way forward.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, while referencing how long the government shutdown lasts, a senior Obama administration official told The Wall Street Journal:

> It really doesn't matter how long the government shutdown lasts because we are winning.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you know and I know, this government shutdown isn't a game. There are no winners when Washington fails the most basic test of governing. That is why this body passed four bipartisan proposals to keep the government open while shielding Americans from the disastrous effects of President Obama's health care law.

Once a shutdown was triggered by Senate Democrats, we worked to minimize its harmful effects with the passage of bills to reopen our national parks and museums, to restore critical funding for children's cancer research, fund the Veterans Administration, and to continue providing nutritional assistance through the Women, Infants, and Children program, among other measures. Now we're waiting on President Obama and the Senate Democrats to do their part.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents can't wait too much longer. Across my district, Tennesseans are feeling the very real impact of President Obama and the Senate Democrats' continued refusal to negotiate.

Larry, in Jamestown, is a park concessionaire at Big South Fork Recreation Area. Fall is his busiest season. He estimates that he lost $7,500 on an engagement he had planned for 11 months—canceled because of the government shutdown.

Following the Veterans Administration's warning that they could run out of funding as early as late October, Charles in Crossville emailed my office pleading for help: ''I am a disabled veteran who depends on my compensation check to have some quality of life,'' he wrote. ''This is unacceptable.''

Bobby, in Fentress County, is a craftsman, who was supposed to have his work displayed in the Smithsonian American Art Gallery last Thursday—a proud moment stolen from him because of an unnecessary gridlock here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Senate colleagues have the power to end this arbitrary and unnecessary pain today by taking up the House-passed measures to reopen our parks and museums, to restore veterans' benefits and fund other important functions of government. What we need now is for them to act.

Our constituents expect us to listen to them, to work out our differences, and to find a commonsense way forward. Why can't we at least give them that? HARRY REID and President Obama need to listen to the people of this country and come to the table and negotiate. Let's get our work done.

SHUTDOWN DUE TO LACK OF LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, why are we here?

We are here because of a failure of leadership. The fact is the President of the United States has failed to negotiate. The fact is the Majority Leader of the Senate, the head of the Senate, has failed and refuses to negotiate.

It's interesting how time changes one's perspective. Let me quote Barack Obama before he became President. These are the words of Barack Obama. He said:

> Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means ''the buck stops here.'' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Barack Obama said it very well before he became President. Now he needs to serve and act as President and provide the leadership.

The fact is October 1 is the beginning of the financial year, and we should responsibly fund the government. The fact is, in just a few more days, we will reach $17 trillion in indebtedness—nearly half of that incurred since Barack Obama has become President. Think about that. They're going to come and ask for another $1.9 trillion to keep us going for 1 more year. That means in 6 years we will double the debt that's racking up the greatest debt in the history of mankind for any government.

Republicans might like to think that we won the House of Representatives back in 2010 and '95, but it was the same issues: spending, taxes, and health care. Remember HillaryCare and the taxes and other things imposed by President Clinton. The difference is President Clinton negotiated with us. We balanced the budget within 2 years. We can do that if good people of good faith will come together and negotiate, but we can't negotiate by ourselves.

The Constitution empowered the House of Representatives to be in charge of and responsible for levying taxes—because we're closest to the people—and spending. We have that responsibility. They sent us here. They elected us, rejecting the spending that went on. They saw what went on—$1 trillion more than you took in, spending, the first year of this Presidency, and $1 trillion since. So we must act responsibly, but we must have leadership starting from the White House, starting from the Senate.

Republicans in the House are ready to negotiate. We were here when the Senate didn't show up on Sunday. They didn't show up to work the day before the 1st of October to fund this current year. We must be here to meet, responsibly, our debt. We can't put that debt, as the President has said before he was President, on the backs of our children and grandchildren; but we can't do that without the system working. We need leadership—leadership from the President to negotiate, leadership from the Senate to negotiate.

Our leadership has said they will negotiate. We've been here—we'll stay here—but we need to responsibly fund all the activities of government even if it's piece by piece, as we have responsibly done, and sent them over to the other body, and they sit there.

But again, I urge all of the leaders to come together, and my colleagues, particularly the Senate and the President of the United States. We can do responsibly what we need to do, as designated by the Constitution of the United States, and provide that leadership.

MILITARY FAMILY BENEFITS DURING SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this body and the American people a great injustice. A few moments ago, one of my colleagues from Texas, from across the aisle, spoke of this as well. So as you can see, there are many times that we all can come together and agree upon certain items and move the American people forward in a better way; however, this particular situation is unthinkable.

A great injustice is being done to our servicemembers and their families. We learned last night that five brave American servicemembers were killed over the weekend in Afghanistan while selflessly protecting our country. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the loved ones of these fallen warriors receive assistance in the form of benefits to help them make those final arrangements for burial and other necessary preparations. Yet, as a direct result of the political gridlock here in Washington and despite legislation passed in this House last week with great bipartisan support, servicemembers and their families are no longer receiving their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, despite the government shutdown, our servicemembers are still expected to go to war, knowing full well that they may pay the ultimate sacrifice for this great Nation, and we should be expected to keep our promises to their family members. I am working, as we speak, to right this wrong, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help people, not to hurt people, and this shutdown is hurting innocent Americans.

This past Sunday, I flew back home because Congress was not in session. We were not voting on Sunday, so I took a flight home to California to meet with my constituents in my congressional district.

I held a town hall. I held it at Dublin City Hall. Dublin City Hall is where I served as a city council member. Dublin is also home to many Federal employers. In my congressional district, we have 4,000 Federal employees, plus a number of government contractors who work at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories. I also held it there because, for 2 years as a city council member, I worked in that chamber day in and day out to make sure that we provided a balanced budget. We provided a 2-year budget.

It is so frustrating for me here in the Congress that we provide budgets that are only 45 or 60 days at a time, and across America our city councils are thinking big and thinking forward and balancing their budgets while taking measured investments in the future.

So we gathered the community of California's 15th Congressional District at Dublin City Hall, and we had over 150 people attend. The room was filled with fear and anxiety. Federal workers were in the room, worried about what this was going to mean for the personal incomes, for their families, for their household bills. Even though Federal workers in my district have been furloughed, their bills have not been furloughed. The home lenders are still calling, asking where the mortgages are. Their auto loans are still going to be due. Their credit card statements will still arrive. If they have kids in college, they're still going to have to pay tuition.

The Federal employees told me about the stress that they're living under either by not being able to work or, even worse, by being told that they have to work, but they're not going to receive their paychecks right now. In fact, we were reminded in this very Chamber just last week how stressful that can be, when the Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard here at democracy's door, who protect the people's House, rushed to aid the Members of Congress and the employees who work in this building as an erratic driver drove into a barricaded area just outside the Capitol grounds. Those Capitol Hill police are working to protect us, but they're doing so without pay.

So I heard stories just like that in my congressional district from the employees in our district, who are very scared about what's going to happen next. We learned that this is affecting people who work not just inside government, but also outside government.

□ 1130

Inside government, we have employees at Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, the NASA facility in Dublin. We also have a women's Federal prison.

Outside government, we have government contract employees—about 6,500

of them—at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and about 1,500 of them at Sandia National Laboratories.

They told us, if the government shutdown continues, they may be furloughed within the next 10 days.

Most strikingly, the Republicans who attended expressed their concern, as we have heard in this Chamber, about the Affordable Care Act. I understand that, but not a single Republican who attended told me or told our other constituents that they believe their concerns over the Affordable Care Act were worth prolonging this government shutdown.

There are also concerns about, well, why don't we just get some of the government up and running like some of the bills that we passed last week but that the Senate won't take up? I told my constituents I will not support any bill that pits any constituency against each other. We saw bills that pitted veterans against seniors, sick children against the poor. It is time to get the government up and running for everybody. Veterans who attended our town hall agreed. They served this country to make sure that the government works for everybody, not just for the veterans who served it.

I am inspired by, and I told my constituents that I have hope in, a freshman group that continues to gather a couple times each week and that was here during the shutdown crisis, called the United Solutions Caucus. It has about 15 Members on the Republican side and 15 on the Democratic side. They are freshman Members of Congress who are meeting and talking about what we can do to work together.

Finally, to my colleagues across the aisle, I ask you this respectfully: Did you come to Congress to help people or did you come to Congress to hurt people? If you came here to help, just like I did, then I think you know what to do next. Turn on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world, and let's get America working again.

IT IS TIME TO PUT THE INTERESTS OF AMERICANS FIRST

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

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 8, Mr. Speaker.

Today is day No. 8 of a government shutdown. Enough of the gamesmanship. Enough with the name-calling. Enough with the blame game. It is time we opened up the government.

Real Americans are getting hurt, like Brian from Carmichael. Brian has been out of work for 2 years. He recently got a job offer that requires him to get a class B driver's license. Well, he went to the DMV. He was told he needed a Social Security card, which he lost a couple years ago. He went to the Social Security office to get a card. Do you know what he was told: the office is closed. They have been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open up the government. Real Americans like Brian are getting hurt. Let's get Brian his job, and let's open up the government.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know there are many Americans who look to the people's House as uncertainty about the future of the economy and their livelihoods hang in the balance.

Bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and the plans to assuage the fears of their fellow countrymen and -women.

We again ask You to impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(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, it has been 1 week since the government shutdown. For 1 week, the President and Senate Democrats have refused to negotiate to reopen the government's doors.

House Republicans know the hardships American families are facing due to Washington Democrats' failure to negotiate. We have worked over the past week, passing bills to have the government functioning.

House Republicans have voted to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, memorials and monuments, give veterans the benefits they have earned and deserve. On Saturday, House Republicans voted to pay 800,000 furloughed employees who are at risk of losing a paycheck due to the President's government shutdown.

With the debt ceiling limit looming, the American people are waiting for the President and Senate Democrats to negotiate a solution for fiscal responsibility.

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today we find our Nation in the midst of a government shutdown and in the shadows of a debt default.

A week into the shutdown, the partisan gridlock in Congress is as bad as ever; but across the country, millions of Americans are finding new hope in the affordable health coverage on the online exchanges.

Despite the more than 40 Republican attempts to repeal, defund, or derail this law, the Affordable Care Act is finally fulfilling the promise of dependable, affordable health coverage for millions of our fellow Americans.

On opening day, the exchanges were inundated with millions of users—

Americans excited to learn more about their new coverage options. It was a little bumpy, as expected, but no fleeting Web page glitches can distract us from the fact that for the first time millions of uninsured Americans who have lived in dread that an illness or an accident could plunge them into financial ruin will finally have access to good coverage that they can afford.

Today is a dark day here in D.C., but for the thousands of people I represent, a long night is ending. And that's worth celebrating.

ANGELS IN ADOPTION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2013 Angels in Adoption, Jessie and Kayci Prince, from my hometown, Plano, Texas.

As children, both Jessie and Kayci were touched by adoption. Having experienced the powerful impact adoption has on families, they decided to adopt one of their own. In 2012, Ezekiel—Zeke for short—from the Democratic Republic of Congo, became part of the Prince family.

As the Princes helped Zeke learn how to read, they quickly learned how challenging it was to find books that depict transracial families.

They decided as a family to write, illustrate, and publish ''That's a Yummy Color,'' a children's book celebrating adoption. This book is now helping other families form special bonds with their own adopted children.

I am grateful for the compassionate families like the Princes.

Jessie and Kayci, you are truly an inspiration. God bless you.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the health insurance marketplace opened, giving millions access to quality health care. Since then, there has been too much focus on the small hiccups that are to be expected when any large program is implemented.

Yesterday, I received a letter from a North Carolina woman who lives over 600 miles from my home district in Illinois. Like many Illinoisans, she believes the positives of the Affordable Care Act are being overlooked. She said:

> My family has already benefited from the Affordable Care Act as I have two children just finishing college. I am relieved I can keep them on my medical coverage at no cost. This saves them money and gives me peace of mind. The cost of our health care plan has decreased by $400.

Like many, she wants to ask Congress: Is this why you shut down the government, to keep me and my children from getting affordable health care?

Citizens are sick and tired of the misinformation being spread about the ACA. The ACA didn't cause the shutdown. The shutdown is a symptom of what really ails America—cynicism that allows a few to take hollow ideological stances at the expense of many.

Like me, she wants us to pass a clean CR and end this shutdown today.

MR. PRESIDENT: THIS IS OUR LAND

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, President Obama must stop playing politics with our National Park System. The parks belong to every American and should not be held hostage in President Obama's political game.

In the 1960s, the Federal Government established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in south central Missouri under the guise of protecting the rivers and forests for all Missourians. Some 50 years later, President Obama is taking away our access. The riverways do not belong to President Obama. They belong to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama is working to make his shutdown as painful as possible. The President has barricaded parks and monuments across the country, including the open-air World War II Memorial in Washington. It costs more money to barricade the monuments than it would to leave them open.

The national parks do not belong to President Obama. The parks belong to every American. It's time for President Obama to open our national parks. It's time for President Obama to stop playing politics with our parks.

MONEY AND POLITICS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this government shutdown has clearly demonstrated our democracy is not working the way it was designed. Unfortunately, this is largely due to the oversized influence and obscene amount of money in politics which continue to fuel our distorted political process, and it could get worse.

Today, the Supreme Court is hearing arguments in the McCutcheon case, the second-coming of Citizens United. This case could open the door to even more money flooding our political process. Money and politics have paralyzed Washington and have paralyzed my Republican colleagues' will to compromise. They would be more apt to compromise if they were not absolutely petrified of the Koch brothers spending millions of dollars to unseat them.

We cannot afford to have a system of government fueled by money that rewards confrontation and condemns compromise. If we don't fix this underlying problem, money and politics, we will continue to lurch from crisis to crisis, and the American people ultimately lose.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, back home, Hoosiers know that we only solve problems by sitting down and talking. Unfortunately, President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID refuse to join Republicans in the constructive, respectful dialogue that Washington desperately needs. Eight days ago, Senate Democrats shut down the government by refusing four separate House-passed bills to fund the government.

It's clear that the American people don't want this shutdown, and it's exactly why the House has passed nine bipartisan, commonsense bills to fund and reopen parts of government that we all agree on.

Together, House Republicans and House Democrats have passed bills to ensure that the National Guard is paid, veterans' benefits are funded, and our national parks are reopened. Unfortunately, these common-ground solutions are gathering dust in the Senate as HARRY REID refuses to come to the table and talk.

The American people don't expect Republicans and Democrats to agree on everything, but they do expect us to talk. It's time for Senate Democrats to put aside their obstructionism and come to the table.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the truth is out. Republican leaders and their big donors have been planning this shutdown for over 2 years. Why? They claim it's because of ObamaCare, but it's now clear to everyone that it is plainly and simply about Obama.

He won re-election, and they still can't deal with it, so they're willing to hurt their own constituents and the entire country just to try to keep our President from doing the job he was overwhelmingly elected to do.

The American people should be outraged and demand that this shutdown end now and that Congress lift the debt ceiling, pay our bills, and protect the good faith and credit of our Nation.

The good news is that even some Republicans are sick and tired of these childish, destructive tactics. They, like us Democrats, want to put our Federal workers back to work, to make sure they and those depending on Social Security will be paid, that all veterans

receive the services we owe them, that vulnerable women and children can get the care they need, and that our Nation will continue to remain strong.

So the American people must demand that Speaker BOEHNER bring the clean CR to the floor for a vote today. If he doesn't, then they must insist that their Representatives stand up for this country and our fellow Americans by stepping up and signing a discharge petition to end the madness.

□ 1215

NEGOTIATION

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves 1 week into a government shutdown. That's something I hoped I would never have to say on the floor of this House. I did not want this; House Republicans did not want this; and the American people surely did not want this.

So why are we here? We're here because Democrats in the United States Senate and the President of the United States refuse to negotiate with the people's elected Representatives here in the House.

How long can their refusal to negotiate go on? All we are asking for is a conversation, Mr. Speaker. That's it. House Republicans want to sit down in good faith and work to get this government open again and to make sure that all Americans are treated fairly under the President's health care law.

My colleague from Indiana, just moments ago, pointed out that we pass bills in this House with overwhelming majorities—margins of over 100 votes, bipartisan votes—to keep important, essential services up and running. There are grounds for agreement. We just have to negotiate.

Leader REID, Mr. President, let's talk.

IMPACTING AMERICA'S YOUNGEST LEARNERS

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the government shutdown and its detrimental impact on Federal programs like Head Start and Impact Aid for school districts.

Instead of punishing our youngest learners through this government shutdown, our Nation needs a responsible, forward-looking fiscal policy that repairs the damage done by sequestration and the government shutdown and that allows programs like Head Start to provide the highest quality early learning opportunities to our most vulnerable children. A piecemeal approach to funding Head Start is not a real solution to this government shutdown.

This GOP majority has slashed funding for education, including Impact Aid. Impact Aid school districts have been harder hit than any other school districts as they struggle to provide quality education for the children of active military and Native American students. Due to the GOP sequester, many of these school districts have been reduced to 4-day school weeks.

This is a reckless and irresponsible way to govern. Our Nation's children and families deserve more, not less.

AMERICA'S VETERANS AND THE SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to continue speaking out about the human consequences of this ridiculous government shutdown. We are now one full week into this shameful display of irresponsibility.

Yesterday, I spoke with a man in my district named Joe Burton, who lives in Monmouth, Illinois. He is a decorated war hero, serving 21 years in the military. As a retired Army sergeant, Joe received the Bronze Star for his brave service in the gulf war.

But after honorably serving our Nation for so long, Joe is now worried sick about how this reckless government shutdown is going to impact him and his family. This tough guy is literally frightened about the shutdown and how it is affecting his VA disability payments. If his benefits aren't there and don't arrive, he has no idea how he will pay his bills or even how he will pay for his next meal. More than anything, he just wants to know how veterans like him across the country are going to make ends meet if we don't get this solved.

Let's stop this nonsense now and do right by Joe and the others who have served our country.

NO WAY TO RUN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here at a time we should be celebrating the many freedoms bestowed upon us, but I am here in the midst of some Republicans crippling us.

It is fatal for the Congress to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the desires of the American people who want the doors of government open, ending the whirlwinds of piecemeal, cherry-picking funding.

Paraphrasing Martin Luther King: When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.

Instead, citizens are sitting at home, waiting for Congress to open the doors of government because bills are due, mortgage payments, rent, car loans, services are needed. So I request the Republican leadership to end this debate, because the American people are asking Congress to let them get back to work so they can cash their checks.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to run the government.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Instead of approving the Senate-passed funding bill, House Republicans have placed politics before people while important decisions on government funding and the debt ceiling await votes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with excitement to express my support for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which has already significantly improved health care for Americans. In my State of Texas, families have saved $46.3 million in insurance company refunds. Medicare beneficiaries in the doughnut hole have saved $420.7 million in prescription drugs. More than 40,000 Americans and 17 million American children with preexisting conditions gained insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act. Because of the health insurance marketplaces, in my district, about 204,000 individuals will have access to quality, affordable health care coverage.

The Affordable Care Act will grow stronger and expand access to quality care for all Americans.

UNDERMINING CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people; and yet this morning, the Senate minority leader and his big money allies in the Republican Party once again asked the Supreme Court to give billionaires more influence on public policy through our elections. If this effort succeeds, individuals would be permitted to give as much as $3.5 million each to candidates and parties next year in addition to the already unlimited amounts they can spend independently.

It should go without saying that the number of people who are able to contribute on this scale is minuscule, but the ranks of those who would be affected by this deluge of money cannot be overstated. It is simply not possible to turn up the volume on the already amplified voices of a few wealthy donors without drowning out the millions of Americans already struggling to be heard.

The fact is we will never have a fair and balanced budget or a more equitable tax system while the well off and well connected are allowed to control Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the Republic the Framers intended. When they created Congress and when the people approved the 17th Amendment, appointing themselves the electors of the Senate, they wanted to ensure government was accountable to the people it serves. The more we undermine campaign finance laws, the further we get from that fundamental principle.

EVEN ONE MORE DAY IS TOO LONG

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown has affected more than just the government. We all need to understand that.

Yesterday, I learned that a veteran-owned small business in my district that contracts with the Navy has had to furlough its workers; but because they are not Federal employees, they won't be receiving backpay when the government resumes full operations. The lost pay will have a terrible impact on these employees and their families, but their absence is also seriously affecting the financial well-being of the small business that employs them.

Let's think about this: How often is this happening throughout the country? And you begin to see how San Diego, alone, is losing $7 million a week during the shutdown. How much longer are we going to play political games when everyone is guaranteed to lose?

For our communities, for our economy, and, most of all, for those who are out of work, even one more day is too long. Let's fund the whole government and end this shutdown.

''CRUZ CONTROL''

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Republicans have shut down the government. They have shut the whole thing down. Their 2-year-old plan to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act is as harmful as it is fruitless.

However, all is not lost. The Republican shutdown can end today if the Speaker would simply disengage the ''Cruz control'' and hold a vote on a clean bill. This is day 8 of the government shutdown. With the debt ceiling vote looming, this is the time for action, not talk.

You can't negotiate with a Republican Party stuck on ''Cruz control'' on something so basic as a clean bill to reopen our government. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have determined that fealty to extreme Tea Party groups is more important than the needs of the people they represent.

It's time to end the stubborn, unreasonable, and mean-spirited obsession with killing the Affordable Care Act. The Republican shutdown can end today if only the Speaker would allow a vote.

FALLEN HEROES AND FAMILIES ASSISTANCE ACT

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, our Nation lost five brave servicemembers in Afghanistan. Shortly after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay their survivor benefits due to the shutdown. This is disgraceful and an outrage.

These servicemembers gave their lives in defense of our country. When they stepped up to defend our Nation, we promised that they and their families would be cared for. Now, due to the shutdown, we have broken and abandoned that sacred commitment.

Today, I am introducing the Fallen Heroes and Families Assistance Act, which will ensure that the promises we made to our fallen servicemembers are fulfilled. I urge its immediate consideration by the House. We must honor our commitments to our fallen heroes and their families.

ECONOMIC HARM OF THE SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this Republican shutdown and their threats not to pay America's bills are not only reckless, but they're playing with economic fire. Their irresponsibility is burning the American people.

There are currently more than 800,000 Federal employees out of work, with thousands already filing for unemployment benefits because they've been furloughed by the GOP shutdown. These are working men and women who have to pay their bills, their mortgages, their car loans.

The Republican shutdown is harming the whole economy. The Dow Jones Industrial Average went down another 136 points yesterday and has been down nearly 200 points during the course of this Republican shutdown. It is currently at its lowest levels in a month.

Global markets continue to slide due to the uncertainty that the Republican shutdown has caused. According to news reports, it has already cost us over $2 billion because of the shutdown, and it is hurting U.S. trade because inspections of imports and applications for exports can't be cleared by agencies like the EPA due to the fact that the staff in charge has been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is well over time to bring up a clean continuing resolution for a vote. End this needless Republican shutdown, which is not only hurting the American people, but the entire economy.

SBA GRINDS TO A HALT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the economic disruption caused by the Republican-orchestrated shutdown continues to mount. The negative impact on the lives of the American people and the loss of jobs and opportunities continues to rise.

As one example, in my home district of New York, the shutdown is hitting some small business owners really hard because it brought to an absolute halt any work of the Small Business Administration. On average, the Small Business Administration approves over 9 million loans in my district alone for small businesses each month, but because of this shutdown, zero. Zero are being approved—small business loans, real estate or equipment loans, and this has a terrible ripple effect on our economy.

It was bad enough that the majority would not bring a single meaningful jobs bill, infrastructure or transportation bill to the floor for a vote to create jobs; but now, this reckless, long-planned action to bring the work of the government to a halt, it is actively killing jobs, killing opportunity, killing hope.

Let's bring a clean budget up for a vote today and put people over politics.

□ 1230

DAY 8 OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, day 8 of the shutdown of the Federal Government.

What do we know, Mr. Speaker?

We know, 1, you and your majority wanted the shutdown, so you win. You have no plan to end this shutdown—that's obvious—and it's no longer about ObamaCare.

But what we don't know is, who do you want to punish?

It must only be the people of this great Nation. You pass bills for show only. You know that the Senate and the President will not cherry-pick among the departments, yet you continue to pass these bills. Yet, you won't let the House vote on a clean CR to open government.

Mr. Speaker, you tell us when you've made the people of this country suffer enough. You tell us when you're satisfied with the level of anxiety and pain that you have caused. At that time, maybe you'll let us vote the clean CR

and let the people see where we all stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Members will remember to address their remarks to the Chair.

HEAD START CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start 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 (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 84

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 Head Start 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 Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113–6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing all projects or activities under the Head Start Act (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—Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Head Start for Low-Income Children Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Head Start Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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. 84, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. This bill provides Federal funding at the current, post-sequester rate for the Head Start program, which millions of children across the country rely on to fulfill their educational and health needs.

As we work our way out of this government shutdown mess, we shouldn't let some of our most vulnerable citizens—low-income children with no recourse—suffer. In my home State of Kentucky, 20,715 kids rely on Head Start to provide a helping hand. If we don't do anything about this today, 2,800 kids in Kentucky will lose access to Head Start programs starting November 1.

This bill provides funding for Head Start at an annual rate of $7.586 billion. This funding will help reopen the doors to the more than 1,600 Head Start programs across the country. As before, the funding will last until December 15 or until we enact full-year appropriations.

This is another step the House is taking to alleviate the burden of this current fiscal dilemma and move us closer to ending the government shutdown.

The nine bills the House has passed since October 1 to reopen the government—this will be the 10th—constitute nearly one-third of the Federal Government's discretionary budget. These 10 bills fund very critical programs, cleanly, as the Senate has demanded, and have been supported on a bipartisan basis in this House.

So why are these bills still sitting on HARRY REID's desk?

Why is the Senate not making every stride it can to help our Nation's disadvantaged children, hungry families, and our veterans?

This method of funding the government is not my preferred way, Mr. Speaker, nor is it the standard, but while we work to find an end to the shutdown, we should fund those programs we can as soon as we can.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take this opportunity to meet us at the negotiating table. We've got a great deal to work out, but this can't be done if we are not willing to talk and listen to each other.

It is the time-honored way, Mr. Speaker. When the two bodies disagree on something, each body passes a bill, and we send it to conference with the other body. That's what should be done here.

In fact, this body, several days ago now, appointed conferees on this topic and sent it over to the Senate, only to be met by a loud snore.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want us to get together and talk about ending this shutdown. Though I wish we were able to end the shutdown in its entirety, this bill will at least reopen one indispensable government program and lessen the toll that the shutdown is taking on the American people.

This Congress is facing a great deal of difficult choices in the near future, but taking care of our children should be a top priority. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown. I wish my Republican colleagues had shown this same level of concern for Head Start earlier in the year when the majority proposed to slash the Labor-HHS spending bill by 22 percent. The majority did not have the courage of their convictions to stand behind their cuts and even release a copy of their bill.

Today's bill does nothing to help families afford child care or to invest in other pre-K services that are so important for children's development.

Even if House Republicans' piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they're going, it will take until after Christmas before the government is fully up

and running. The Republican plan is completely irresponsible.

We could end the shutdown today if the Speaker allowed a vote. Democrats have negotiated, and we didn't just meet in the middle. We agreed to the Republican spending level in the stopgap bill, but Republicans insist on repealing the Affordable Care Act, including allowing insurance companies to deny care to children.

Vote ''no'' on this bill. Demand the House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who is the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I strongly support the Head Start program, and I am so hopeful that the House will pass this bill today and, certainly, that the United States Senate will take it up as well.

Head Start is a program that helps American children get the extra help that they need at an early age. I'll tell you, you can talk to any mother or grandmother. You don't need some scientific study to tell you that this program, an early intervention, is absolutely critical to making sure that every child can optimize their individual potential and to achieve their own opportunities.

During this shutdown, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare, absolutely zero to do with ObamaCare. This bill is about America's children, about Head Start. There are no strings attached. It just funds Head Start.

Now, I know that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they can't support any funding bill unless they get exactly what they want, which is an entire continuing resolution to finance the entire government. They want exactly what they want, otherwise they can't do this kind of a thing. And yet, it is interesting to note that they call Republicans ''absolutists.''

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, many others on the other side of the aisle will support this funding bill for Head Start, as they have supported these other funding bills that we have been passing since the beginning of the shutdown, in a bipartisan way.

President Obama and the Senate majority leader keep saying that they will not negotiate, but I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker that they will negotiate and that we can go to a conference committee, that we can work out our differences, that we can stop the shutdown, because to just keep saying, as the President keeps saying and the Senate Majority Leader keeps saying, that they will not negotiate on funding the government and they will not negotiate on raising the debt ceiling, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper way forward. Certainly, on issues like American children, we can put politics aside.

□ 1245

Mrs. LOWEY. Before I yield to my next speaker, I would like to make it clear that we negotiated a spending bill. We took the Republican number. Let us pass that spending bill. Speaker BOEHNER should bring it to the floor at your number and then raise the debt ceiling. Then there is plenty of time to negotiate on all the outstanding issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join the National Head Start Association in opposing this bill.

At a time when our Nation's at-risk families are suffering on multiple levels due to sequestration and the Republican government shutdown, a piecemeal approach like this one is not in anyone's best interest. This disingenuous Republican effort would selectively fund some education programs while failing to provide funding for others that poor children and their families rely on.

The National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Title I, after-school, special education, and rural education programs, among others, are all left out of this bill. It's unconscionable that our Nation's most vulnerable children are being denied Head Start services because of Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to bring to the floor a clean bill to open the government.

Let's stop this charade of pitting seniors against children, veterans against families, one group of Americans against another. Let's open the government and serve all our countrymen.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. I thank the chairman from Kentucky for his work on this legislation to help provide funding for Head Start kids to have an opportunity to realize all the opportunities that life presents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask us to work together and set aside our differences for the good of the American people.

We are divided. We have an ongoing dispute about whether Congress should receive special treatment and whether individuals should be given the same exemptions that businesses have been given under the Affordable Care Act. That is in dispute.

Why can't we go forward with legislation and policies and things that we all agree on? The Senate has a position and the House has a position, and we can go on and on with this debate about whether we should fund special treatment for Congress, businesses, and labor unions under ObamaCare; but there are unnecessary casualties to that debate.

Today, we have an opportunity to take Head Start off the table—a program that serves 1,146,468 kids nationwide; and 1,436 of these young students are in Kansas' Third District. These vulnerable students need our help. These are kids with little opportunity, disadvantaged by poverty and circumstances that put them behind from day one. Head Start for low-income children is a ray of hope, coming at a critical time when these young learners are developing their young minds.

Head Start works for students, Head Start works for families, and Head Start works for the American taxpayer. So why can't we come to an agreement as to the funding for this portion of government? We can't come to it for every portion—we get that—but we are in agreement that this shutdown is unnecessary and that we can fund Head Start today.

For some, this is a philosophical debate, but for the young learners at Head Start of Shawnee Mission, Kansas; Olathe, Kansas; or the Children's Campus in Kansas City, these are real lives and real futures at stake. They are counting on us. Surely we can take our partisan hats off for a moment and fund a bill to get each of these kids a chance to succeed.

Let's pass a clean bill that funds Head Start today. Let's put aside our differences. Let's find common ground. We have the power today to take Head Start kids out of this debate and ensure their funding.

Let's show the American people that today, on this issue, on these kids, there is no disagreement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States of America has now been closed for a full week. People are out of work. Some are even going hungry. Our economy is poised on the brink of a disastrous default, and yet this Republican majority continues to play political games with the future of our country and the lives and health of American families.

The hostage being negotiated today is Head Start, one of the true American success stories. Unquestionably, it is the most effective early childhood development program ever developed, and I've heard so often from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how unsuccessful the program is and what a terrible program it is and that we ought to cut it.

For almost 50 years now, Head Start has provided comprehensive childhood development, literacy, and family services to nearly 30 million preschoolers from low-income and working families. It now serves nearly 1 million children every year. It's an example of how dedicated teachers, with the help of a smart Federal investment, can enrich the lives of our citizens—the cornerstone of our efforts to close the achievement gap—combat poverty, and provide all kids with the opportunity to thrive.

It is another important Federal program that Republicans are claiming to support today in full defiance of their previous voting record. It is as if the majority expects that we have all forgotten the positions they have been promoting for years—up to this point. We have not forgotten.

I am the ranking member of the subcommittee that oversees Head Start funding, and I have had to continually fight tooth and nail to see this program adequately funded and to protect it from the deep cuts put forward by the majority.

In 2011, the very first bill the Republican majority passed tried to cut Head Start by over a billion dollars; and 218,000 kids would have been cut from the rolls, 16,000 classrooms closed, and 55,000 teachers, assistants, and staff would have lost their jobs.

That was the majority's opening offer, and they didn't blink an eye. Parent, teachers, and advocates stood up and said ''no'' to these cuts, and the majority had to back down.

Instead, what they're doing now would be automatic cuts, the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, which was never meant to become law. They're using that to do their work for them. Because of those cuts, this majority has voted to make permanent that 57,000 students all across America have already lost access to Head Start. Even the children who are able to remain in Head Start can expect shortened school days, elimination of home visits, and teacher layoffs. In total, 78,000 children have lost access to this early learning since this House majority took office, and those sequester cuts will grow worse over time.

This is a self-inflicted government shutdown. Head Start centers are being forced to close. The longer the majority perpetuates this shutdown, the more kids are being denied an opportunity to learn.

I'm happy to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle embrace the importance of early childhood education. President Obama has called for universal preschool, which would make a profound and positive difference for children and their families across the country; but this Republican majority turned its back on that proposal, walked away from it, and didn't even consider it.

Let's stop playing games with people's lives, their health, and our children's future. It is little wonder that, according to the latest polls, a full 70 percent of the country opposes this hostage-taking and wants us to get back to work.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I just heard. The gentlelady was describing the importance of the Head Start program in glowing terms, and yet she turns around and tells us she's going to vote against funding for the Head Start program. That's a puzzle to me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, we all know that we're 8 days into this Tea Party Republican government shutdown with $2.4 billion in lost economic activity. This hostage-taking continues.

The Tea Party Republicans continue to want to deny millions of Americans health care. That's why this shutdown continues, and the public knows this.

Because of the devastating sequester, already more than 57,000 students have lost their Head Start spots. At the same time, the Tea Party Republicans insisted on cutting food stamps by $40 billion for these same children.

So you can't tell me that today they care about these kids when they fight to cut Head Start and every other program for young people in the Appropriations Committee.

The National Head Start Association doesn't buy this very sinister approach, which will not reopen the government. They know that there are enough votes to open the government up if Speaker BOEHNER brings the Senate budget bill to the floor.

Also, let me just say many Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but compromised just to get the government open.

Let's shut down this shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the chairman of the full committee, the National Head Start Association has said—I'm commenting on this sham of a bill before the House today—that they are opposed to this effort because they realize that it is a charade. I think it's important to note that. They are certainly committed—and have been for years—in terms of early-learning education and education for our children, but they, too, understand what is happening here today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is now the second week of the Republican shutdown of our government—shut down because they want to put insurance companies back in charge of America's health care.

Republicans in the House think they can get out of this horrible mess they created by partially opening one part of the government or another. Today, it's Head Start—a program I strongly support and one that used to be supported on a bipartisan basis to provide education, health and nutrition services to at-risk children.

When Republicans voted to shut down the government, they closed the doors on thousands of these children and their families. After several bad news articles about the Republicans shutting down Head Start, they now want to partially open it.

Keep in mind, restoring funding to Head Start only serves a small percentage of at-risk children who need preschool and are eligible for it. It is not enough to restore one set of early-learning services for at-risk children but to not fund the Child Care and Development Block Grant, special education services, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, which provides early childhood services for children from low-income families as well.

If the Republicans are serious about supporting early childhood education, we should vote on the clean, Senate-passed budget to reopen the government so that services for those kids and their families can be fully restored.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We should have that vote today.

It's time to stop the Republican shutdown. I call on the Speaker to let us vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on a bill to open the whole government.

As of today, enough Republicans have publicly stated that they're ready to join all of the Democrats to vote to open the government. Republicans should allow the House to vote on the Senate bill—a bill that was negotiated by the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID, but was rejected by the Republican caucus.

Bring that bill to the floor. Let us vote, and let these children get these services.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a quote from the National Head Start Association:

> The proposed Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, while attempting to provide a funding extension for Head Start, does not put forward a true solution to the government shutdown.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

□ 1300

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the definition of ''farce'' is: a foolish show, mockery, a ridiculous sham.

Now, this Head Start funding bill and cry for providing a head start for our low-income children is indeed a false start at this 22 percent sequestration level. The politicians' mantra that education is the key does not pass the laugh test where our babies are locked out and out of luck—no LIHEAP, immunizations, disability education assistance. This is a key to what—a key to a government careening toward default? It is a government that has defaulted on the future of our children.

Let's shut down the shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a headline from Connecticut's Hartford Courant: ''Head Start Memo: Nearly 1,000 Children Shut Out.''

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

You will find no stronger supporter of the Head Start program than I. For years, I worked first as a teacher in Head Start, and later I was a supervisor for Parent Involvement and Volunteer Services.

I know Head Start. The experience was life changing—inspiring me to join the war on poverty and dedicate myself to improving the lives of low-income children and families. Thanks to Head Start, thousands of children have been put on a solid path to a well-rounded education.

Head Start teaches children to feel good about themselves, to have a positive self-image. Head Start introduced children to books and reading and to how to resolve conflicts. We gave full examination and discovered educational disabilities, and we gave them the path to good health services.

The opposite side of the aisle claims they support Head Start and early childhood education, but they supported sequestration that has robbed 57,000 children of the opportunity to be in the Head Start program.

This Republican destructive strategy—picking winners and losers, who will survive and who will not—is not the right way to go.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. Put a clean CR on the floor so that we can vote for all of government to be protected. Don't pit children against veterans, et cetera.

I will not be bullied into supporting this measure. I urge my colleagues to stand with me. Despite my love for this program, I must vote against this measure.

I ask my colleagues to stand up to these Republican tricks and vote ''no.''

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really puzzled. We hear speaker after speaker on the other side tell us how committed they are to these poor children in the Head Start program, and yet here's the chance, Mr. Speaker, to continue this program. Yes, it does not include the entire government, but are we going to hold hostage these kids from poor families who are desperate for this program. Are we going to hold them hostage, or are we going to go ahead and approve this short-term funding for the Head Start program?

If you believe in Head Start, it seems to me you would stand in the well and say: I support this bill because it continues the Head Start program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just comment for a moment in that I think that it is not a question of holding these children hostage. You are holding the entire Nation hostage for an effort that is not going to change, and that is: the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land.

Let's have a vote on this floor of the House of Representatives. We can reopen this government and not hold anyone hostage any longer.

If my memory serves me well, in 2011, the gentleman, whom I do have great respect for, voted for H.R. 1—and maybe it was his bill that he passed—which would have cut Head Start by over $1 billion.

It is puzzling to me that all of a sudden my Republican colleagues have gotten religion on the Head Start program. It is so inconsistent with where this majority has been with regard to Head Start and so disingenuous and duplicitous that we know it is a political ploy.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republican shutdown is a disaster for families across America and this great country, and we are not fooled by this political gimmick on the floor today. It is a gimmick; it is a gimmick; it is a gimmick.

The Republican position in this Congress, as demonstrated in their budget, has been to slash support for Head Start students. I know this; Head Start parents know this; Head Start teachers know this; and our communities back home know it all too well. In fact, in the House Budget Committee just this past March, Democrats offered an amendment to eliminate the severe Republican cuts to education and Head Start students and to stop the layoffs of teachers. Republicans scoffed, just like they are scoffing at their basic responsibility to negotiate and pass a budget and keep government working.

Mr. Speaker, when you shut down Head Start classrooms, did you know that the parents of these students may not be able to go to work or keep their jobs? That is not smart. Head Start keeps parents working or studying for their own degree so they can move out of poverty into the middle class.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentlewoman 10 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. So I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring a clean bill to the floor that funds the U.S. Government, not these political gimmicks.

Enough of the gimmicks. We know we have 200 Democrats ready to support a clean CR and at least 20 or so Republicans. End these political gimmicks. Fund the government. End this calamity for American families.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I think the best way to resolve this debate is to ask a simple factual question.

There are two approaches here. The majority approach wants to pass this piecemeal bill. We want—''we,'' meaning the entire Democratic Caucus and enough Republicans to pass it—we want to take up the Senate clean bill and vote on it now.

Which of these two approaches would provide the most help most quickly to the Head Start centers across the country? Which would really help the program?

If this bill passes, it will languish in the current political turmoil and go nowhere. If the Speaker puts on the floor the clean Senate continuing resolution, it will pass this afternoon, and the Head Start centers that are afflicted by this problem all over the country will open tomorrow morning.

If you care about helping the Head Start program, you will vote in favor of the Senate bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because I actually think Head Start is an important program, and I've supported it. I've seen and I've gone to Head Starts throughout my district and have read to the kids who are there. The reforms that were done that made it more of an educational preschool type of atmosphere—that was done, gee, I don't know, probably about 7 or 8 years ago—I think actually helped improve Head Start, making sure that children are ready when they start regular K–12. So I support this.

This is important, and in this atmosphere where it is all or nothing and no negotiations—we're not going to talk to you—we are left doing these micro or minivan-type bills in which we take the most important, essential programs and say, you know, we agree with you that Head Start is a worthwhile program and that it's worth

funding. So why don't we just work together and agree that we will fund Head Start at the budget level.

I heard comments earlier about some Republicans wanted to cut it, and yes, there are going to be some that do. So if you think that it's that cynical, call us on it. Vote for it. You want Head Start to continue, and you think we're being cynical with this? Call us on it. Vote for it.

Let's send a bipartisan measure over to the Senate, and force them to vote for it. What's the worst thing that's going to happen? Oh, Head Start gets funded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague who just spoke, vote for it. Let's take the bill that was passed in the Senate, bring it here. There are apparently enough votes to reopen this government. Vote for it.

Why be afraid of the process? That's what we do here—we vote. Bring the bill here. Let's open it up and take our chances. What are we afraid of? What are we afraid of? Are we afraid that, in fact, some Republicans will join all of the Democrats to pass a bill that reopens the Federal Government and protects these children, protects our veterans, protects our workers, protects everyone? There is just a fear and a loathing here which I truly do not understand.

With regard to Head Start and other early childhood education programs, we know what those economic dividends are. It's about productivity; it's about prosperity; but it's about the quality of their lives and their futures. That's what ''Head Start'' means.

Given the record of this majority and its past actions in cutting funding over and over and over again for Head Start, it just proves how disingenuous this gimmick is here today. They're playing to the crowd, but the crowd isn't listening. No one will forget what you have done.

In fact, Head Start graduates are less likely to need special education services, to be left back a grade, or to get into trouble with the law. They're more likely to go on to college and to have a professional career. It is a program, yes, that works wonders, which is why we've all been surprised and dismayed by our Republicans and their attempts to slash this funding in the past.

May I ask the gentleman if he has any additional speakers or if he is going to close?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am dismayed, but we are all dismayed. We have fought these battles on Head Start in the committee. As to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who sits on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, we fought over and over and over again in talking about how important this program is; and day after day after day after day, we have been told that the facts belie themselves, that this is not a successful program, that kids aren't learning. They have dug up studies from 20 years ago to tell us that this program doesn't work. All of a sudden, today, they think that there is merit in Head Start?

I hope this extends to what the President has asked for in universal early childhood education. Do you know that the Labor-HHS Subcommittee never even saw a markup, nor did they ever mention, with their draft proposal, early childhood education? They dismissed the President's view of early childhood education and providing universal early education for kids; and now, today, they stand before this body and this Nation and say they support this effort.

Let me just tell you, this is more of the reason why the hostage-taking by the majority has to end. Every day, we waste time with these gimmicks mortgages our kids' futures and our future as a Nation. It's not responsible governing, and it's time for it to end.

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

□ 1315

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard here today what we have heard in the last several days from the other side—that they will not vote for any of these individual bills because we are not bringing the entire continuing resolution before the House.

But let me point out: with this bill—the 10th in this series that we brought out in a so-called piecemeal fashion—it will take us to about a third of the CR, the original continuing resolution. So we are passing the continuing resolution one piece at a time, but nevertheless we are passing a continuing resolution.

To say that I am not going to vote for this bill because you don't have all of the bills before us doesn't have much logic to it. It means that every bill that comes before the House could be argued the same way: I won't vote for that bill because it doesn't fund whatever or enact whatever piece of legislation that is waiting in the wings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is about Head Start. It is not about health care; it is not about procedure; it is not about whether or not this is piecemeal or full, or what have you. It is about Head Start. If you believe in the Head Start program and the hundreds of thousands of young children in this country—and families—that are depending on this program, it seems to me you would lay everything else aside and vote for that program, which I am asking our Members to do as I close.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Head Start and my opposition to this legislation, which locks in the automatic cuts to funding for this critical program.

A high-quality early education puts children on a path to succeed academically and in life. Decades of research and data show that investments in high-quality early education help close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rates, and reduce the need for special education. These investments also lower the rates of criminal activity and dependence on public assistance. In fact, one study found that for every dollar invested in high-quality early education, taxpayers saved $7 in other costs.

When first entering school, a child's health, emotional well-being, and social surroundings are all factors in their ability to succeed academically. Head Start recognizes this and, in turn, merges literacy and math activities with access to vision screenings and other basic health care services.

Additionally, the program brings parents into the development process by providing them with support services in and out of the home, such as access to social workers, peer counseling, and parenting programs.

In my state of Pennsylvania, Head Start centers serve more than 37,000 children, but now, this unnecessary government shutdown threatens this important program. Already, Head Start programs in six states have been shuttered as a result of the federal government shutdown. This is unacceptable.

Instead of playing games, House Republicans should join Democrats in finding a solution to this shutdown. It is time pass a clean CR, reopen the government, and allow all children access to early education.

Our nation deserves better. Our children deserve better.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res 84, Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. Head Start represents an innovative idea from a Democratic led Congress that was created for the education of our smallest citizens who come for poor or low income households.

We know that if these children have an early start in education it levels the playing field of life and they can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Families in my district who rely on Federal Government programs like Head Start are hurting. The pain did not start with the shutdown, but with sequestration which hit Head Start programs for 3 to 4 year olds in the Houston Area hard: $5,341 million dollar cut, 109 employees cut, 699 slots for children cut.

On October 2, I joined hundreds of Head Start supporters from across the country and many of my colleagues to protest the closing of Head Start programs due to the Federal Government shutdown.

I picked up one of the tiny blue chairs that represented the thousands of Head Start children from around the nation and said that an empty Head Start chair represents a future doctor, engineer, president, or teacher who is at risk because of the Federal Government shutdown.

My support of Head Start and Early Head Start is based on what I have seen and heard about programs like the AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start program serving parents and children in the 18th Congressional District.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start is a program serving low income families in my Houston Texas District.

I visited with AVANCE-Houston administrators earlier this month because I wanted to get an update on how low-income families with infants and toddlers and pregnant women served by the program were doing.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start's mission is simple. AVANCE-Houston works for healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhance the development of very young children, and promote healthy family functioning.

AVANCE-Houston serves nearly 1,800 children city wide. Each of these families and their children are suffering the effect of the legislative malpractice of the House majority.

The sequestration has cost Head Start and Early Head Start: AVANCE-Houston lost $842,518.

The impact to the AVANCE-Houston Head Start employees, teachers and administrators of the first wave of lost funds were: Furlough days, hiring freeze, extra workloads, morale level, outsource of custodial services.

In Houston, Head Start families and their children saw a reduction of days of operation; increase concerns about loss of services for their children and Hardy Center closure

AVANCE-Houston absorbed the sequestration reduction in federal funds by:

Reducing enrollment by 3.3% which ended access to the program for 72 children; Eliminating 11 Early Head Start and 9 Head Start Teachers and Support staff, and 12 custodial positions; and

AVANCE-Houston facing a Federal Government shutdown now must consider what it might mean to their future:

Possible loss of services for an already underserved population;

Increased costs of operation-Lease cost, building maintenance, medical insurance rates, unemployment, and worker's comp;

Maintenance of competitive salaries;

High staff turnover;

Limited dollars for new initiatives/curriculum.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of aisle speak about reforming malpractice lawsuit rights of victims, but what the public is seeing in the legislative malpractice of my colleagues in the majority.

When there are no perceived consequences for bad behavior or harm caused to another there are no incentives to stop the bad behavior.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is legislative malpractice because it does not address the earlier cuts to Federal Government employees and programs caused by sequestration and makes worse an already bad financial situation for our government's most important assets—Federal workers.

The importance of Federal workers and the critical programs or services they administer like Head Start in our Congressional Districts cannot be understated.

The Houston Chronicle reported that due to sequestration it had already caused Head Start children and their parents pain.

This school year, a parent Marlen Rosas hoped her 3-year-old son, Hector, would be attending Head Start so that he might learn English.

Her modest hopes for her son were that he would eventually earn the high school diploma she never had the opportunity to earn.

But when Ms. Rosas went to enroll Hector—even though he met all the qualifications for the federal Head Start program—Hecter was turned down.

Ms. Rosas said, ''I'm sad because he wanted to go to school,'' Rosas said through an interpreter. ''He only speaks Spanish, and that would be one of the advantages: for him to socialize with those who speak English, while learning the names of colors and numbers—just to be learning.

A couple made a contribution of $10 million to open Head Start Programs in 11 states for 7,000 kids from low-income families could continue to receive educational services. I commend this couple for their generosity of heart to assist some of the Head Start Children impacted by this curl majority led Federal Government shutdown.

The legislative malpractice of representing to the American public that the Federal Government is comprised of dismembered parts that can be funded without regard for what one part does or how one agency contributes to the work of other agencies.

It is like building a car with no regard for what a part does and how it would function when installed—because the purpose of car is transportation.

The purpose of the House of Representatives is to fund the Federal Government—what we are doing will not accomplish the outcome.

Those who control the House of Representatives is making a cruel tragedy out of the budget process by teasing Federal employees who watch while the House majority toy with their lives by passing one funding bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority should stop playing games with the American public and pass the clean funding bill from the Senate that would fund the entire Federal Government including all programs immediately.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act.

Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served over 30 million children and their families. The program's purpose has always been to serve children and pregnant women in centers, family homes, and in family child care homes in urban, suburban, and rural communities throughout our nation.

Last year, California Head Start received over $900 million in federal funding and taught over 111,000 children. In California, there are almost 23,000 Head Start employees serving children and their families.

My rural, low-income district relies heavily on the Head Start Program. Without it, families across the Central Valley would be unable to ensure proper care and early education of their young children.

Just last week, two of my constituents flew across the country to appeal to me and my California colleagues on the devastating impacts of this drawn–out shutdown on the Head Start Program.

After passage, this bill would provide immediate funding for the nation's Head Start program at the same rate and under the same conditions as were in effect last year ensuring that Head Start programs across the country will be able to keep providing education, health, nutrition and additional services to our 1 million enrolled children and their families.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. While I appreciate the concern for the harmful effects of the shutdown on Head Start and am deeply troubled by the children cut off from Head Start services, I am unable to support this funding bill. A far better approach to undoing the damage caused by this shutdown is to pass a clean continuing resolution, CR, that funds the entire government.

On the heels of devastating sequester cuts which caused more than 57,000 children to lose their Head Start slots—over 4,000 of whom live in Texas—this shutdown continues to harm even more of America's most vulnerable families. Already, thousands of children have been affected by Head Start program closures and reduced services due to a lack of federal support from this crisis and thousands more children are at risk of losing their seats in classrooms as the shutdown continues.

However, this piecemeal approach to funding Head Start fails to provide America's children with the same support as a fully operational government through a clean CR. The populations served by Head Start often rely on many other vital programs that provide critical assistance to students who are most in need, such as the National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), special education programs, and Title I programs, none of which are included in this funding bill.

The implication of students losing vital classroom time, nutrition, and instruction is severe and only makes the mission of improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps that much more difficult.

I urge my colleagues to immediately pass a clean CR and reopen the full government so we can put an end to the current political stalemate and bring the focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res 84, Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. Head Start represents an innovative idea from a Democratic led Congress that was created for the education of our smallest citizens who come for poor or low income households.

We know that if these children have an early start in education it levels the playing field of life and they can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Families in my district who rely on Federal Government programs like Head Start are hurting. The pain did not start with the shutdown, but with Sequestration which hit Head Start programs for 3 to 4 year olds in the Houston Area hard: $5,341 million Dollar cut; 109 Employees cut; 699 Slots for children cut.

On October 2, I joined hundreds of Head Start supporters from across the country and many of my colleagues to protest the closing of Head Start programs due to the Federal government shutdown.

I picked up one of the tiny blue chairs that represented the thousands of Head Start children from around the nation and said that an empty Head Start chair represents a future doctor, engineer, president, or teacher who is at risk because of the Federal Government shutdown.

My support of Head Start and Early Head Start is based on what I have seen and heard

about programs like the AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start program serving parents and children in the 18th Congressional District.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start is a program serving low income families in my Houston Texas District.

I visited with AVANCE-Houston administrators earlier this month because I wanted to get an update on how low-income families with infants and toddlers and pregnant women served by the program were doing.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start's mission is simple. AVANCE-Houston works for healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhance the development of very young children, and promote healthy family functioning.

AVANCE-Houston serves nearly 1,800 children city wide. Each of these families and their children are suffering the effect of the legislative malpractice of the House majority.

The Sequestration has cost Head Start and Early Head Start: AVANCE-Houston lost $842,518.

The impact to the AVANCE-Houston Head Start employees, teachers and administrators of the first wave of lost funds were: furlough days; Hiring Freeze; Extra workloads; Morale level; Outsource of custodial services.

In Houston, Head Start families and their children saw a reduction of days of operation; increase concerns about loss of services for their children and Hardy Center closure.

AVANCE-Houston absorbed the Sequestration reduction in federal funds by: Reducing enrollment by 3.3 percent which ended access to the program for 72 children; Eliminating ii Early Head Start and 9 Head Start Teachers and Support staff; and 12 custodial positions.

AVANCE-Houston facing a Federal Government shutdown now must consider what it might mean to their future: Possible loss of services for an already underserved population; Increased costs of operation-Lease cost, building maintenance, medical insurance rates, unemployment, and worker's comp; Maintenance of competitive salaries; High staff turnover; Limited dollars for new initiatives/curriculum.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of aisle speak about reforming malpractice lawsuit rights of victims, but what the public is seeing in the legislative malpractice of my colleagues in the majority.

When there are no perceived consequences for bad behavior or harm caused to another there are no incentives to stop the bad behavior.

Mr. Speaker this bill is legislative malpractice because it does not address the earlier cuts to Federal government employees and programs caused by Sequestration and makes worse an already bad financial situation for our government's most important assets—Federal workers.

The importance of Federal workers and the critical programs or services they administer like Head Start in our Congressional Districts cannot be understated.

The Houston Chronicle reported that due to sequestration had already caused Head Start children and their parents pain: This school year, a parent Marlen Rosas hoped her 3-year-old son, Hector, would be attending Head Start so that he might learn English; Her modest hopes for her son were that he would eventually earn the high school diploma she never had the opportunity to earn; But when Ms. Rosas went to enroll Hector—even though he met all the qualifications for the federal Head Start program—Hecter was turned down; Ms. Rosas said, "I'm sad because he wanted to go to school," Rosas said through an interpreter. "He only speaks Spanish, and that would be one of the advantages: for him to socialize with those who speak English, while learning the names of colors and numbers—just to be learning.

A couple made a contribution of $10 million to open Head Start Programs in 11 states for 7,000 kids from low-income families could continue to receive educational services. I commend this couple for their generosity of heart to assist some of the Head Start Children impacted by this curl majority led Federal Government Shutdown.

The legislative malpractice of representing to the American public that the Federal government is comprised of dismembered parts that can be funded without regard for what one part does or how one agency contributes to the work of other agencies.

It is like building a car with no regard for what a part does and how it would function when installed—because the purpose of car is transportation.

The purpose of the House of Representatives is to fund the federal government—what we are doing will not accomplish the outcome.

Those who control the House of Representatives is making a cruel tragedy out of the budget process by teasing federal employees who watch while the House majority toy with their lives by passing one funding bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority should stop playing games with the American public and pass the clean funding bill from the Senate that would fund the entire Federal government including all programs immediately.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 84 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. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's motion.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on this topic.

I worked for decades in our Nation's public schools as a school nurse, and I saw firsthand in my community the tremendous effects that Head Start programs have for so many of our most vulnerable children.

No one is a stronger supporter of this program, but today is really not about the children of Head Start or their families. Today is about ending the childish behavior of those of the Republican leadership, who continue to stand in the way of reopening our government.

Let me be clear: we are here today because one faction of one party in one House of Congress has shut down the United States Government because they don't like one law—the Affordable Care Act. This is a law that was passed by this Congress; it was affirmed by the Supreme Court; and it was a focal point of the last election in which the candidate for president who supported the law won.

But none of this matters to our Republican colleagues. Instead, they have let their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act bring our entire Federal Government to a screeching halt.

Mr. Speaker, this piecemeal approach pushed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reopen certain parts of the government is merely a facade. It is a "gimmick," as my colleague referred to it, giving the illusion that they are trying to fix the problem, but they are not.

Instead, we find ourselves here picking and choosing and waiting for them to decide whose lucky day it is to be funded by the Republican leadership. This is not the way to run a great Nation.

Even if we reopen Head Start programs, what about the millions of other students that benefit from programs administered by the Department of Education? What about the families who cannot get their childcare vouchers? What about the job-training programs to help the unemployed parents get back on their feet? How long do they have to wait, Mr. Speaker, until we get around to funding their programs? When is their lucky day?

We cannot continue government funding by picking programs out of a hat. If the House leadership really wanted to fix the problem, they could do so today if they would just bring a clean continuing resolution to the House floor for a straight up or down vote.

At least 25 of our Republican colleagues have publicly supported a vote for a clean continuing resolution. That

is enough votes to end the shutdown today—we know it, the Speaker knows it, and the American people know it—but we are still waiting.

Now, let me say it again: This government shutdown does not have to continue. We can end it right now.

My amendment today is the ninth time that Democrats have provided a solution to end the government shutdown. It is the only way to get a vote on the clean negotiated continuing resolution today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take this opportunity to stop wasting time. We must reopen the government, and we must get back to our work, which is to rebuild our economy, to support our veterans, to pass a farm bill, and to address the many other challenges that this great Nation of ours faces. To do so, we need to stop playing these games.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues, including my many Republican colleagues who have called for a vote on a clean CR, to join me today and to end this charade. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this motion.

POINT OF ORDER

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

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, and 7, 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?

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund only a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of our education programs are there for all of our children and families. Can the Chair explain, please, why it is not germane to open all of the Nation's education programs?

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

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

The joint resolution extends funding relating to Head Start. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, and October 7, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. 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. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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.

Mrs. CAPPS. 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 226, nays 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
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
Poe (TX)
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
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
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)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
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)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

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

□ 1349

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

Mr. YODER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—248

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

NOES—168

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

NOT VOTING—15

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1356

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

RECESS

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

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

□ 1520

AFTER RECESS

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

So what we are trying to do is to find another avenue, and that is to have the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and their appointees be able to meet together in a working group to resolve these issues. What do I envision? I envision a TV would be in the room. The American people could take part in these discussions and see how much progress can be made between Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats and House Republicans and House Democrats on these important issues, and hold those Members accountable for exactly the same thing that we're trying to do, and that is to get this government back opened up with an agreement about how we are going to fund this government.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

> Obama calls Boehner. Reiterates he won't negotiate.

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

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

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

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

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

The NIH should have been open already. We should have had lots of government agencies as a result of what we are doing, including Head Start. We should have these activities, even if it's one by one, to open up. Today, we're on the floor to say, We ought to pay those government employees who have been working when Tuesday rolls around. They should get paid. We should have people at the FAA come back to work and open that agency back up. That's what House Republicans are doing. We recognize this President will not negotiate, but we're going to offer ourselves up. I think the American people see what House Republicans are attempting to do.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

You own this shutdown whether you like it or not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1545

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Every time the President negotiates, unfortunately, your leadership can't deliver on the deals. So we have been negotiating, negotiating, negotiating. We still want to negotiate, but, please, the gentleman gave no reason why we should shut down this government, why the Republicans should have shut down this government, and he has given no reason why we should default on our financial obligations. We ought to pass a short-term spending bill to reopen the government, and we ought to pass a clean debt ceiling bill so we don't default on our financial obligations and ruin our economy.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Speaker negotiated with Senator REID. Senator REID accepted the Republican House number. The President of the United States accepted the Republican House number. The Democrats in the House accepted the Republican House number. The only people not accepting the Republican House number are the Republicans in the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1600

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You must be kidding.

As I said, who writes this stuff?

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

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

Who do we think we are?

Do we think that we are a party that is responsible, all of us—a Congress that is responsible—that wants to do the right thing for the American people, that knows that we have to come here to cooperate with each other to get something done in a bipartisan way?

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

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

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

Invest in education.

You want to increase the deficit?

Cut education.

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

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

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

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

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

Take ''yes'' for an answer.

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

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Enough is enough.

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

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

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

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

The games have to stop.

Best Regards,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So join with us and support a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the Dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from Massachusetts.

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

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

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

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

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

Now, we Democrats have shown a willingness to cooperate and to compromise. In fact, as the minority leader observed, we have asked Speaker BOEHNER to convene a budget conference all year, but to no avail.

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

And what is my Republican colleagues' response?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1615

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman is actually the one who appointed me as the rules designee to the Budget Committee, and I'm grateful to him for that because it really gives me an opportunity to express what, for my constituents, is commonsense budget reform, Mr. Speaker. They know you just can't keep spending and spending and spending and never have to pay the bills. The bills have to get paid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1630

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

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

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

Hostage-taking really is a deplorable tactic. The Tea Party Republicans continue to want to deny millions of Americans health care—and, yes, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, which the Supreme Court has upheld. That's why the shutdown continues, and the public knows it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that there is a lot of dialogue on the floor today about opening up the government. Yet this body has passed bill after bill after bill—whether it's the intelligence community, whether it's Head Start, whether it's NIH—making sure that we are going through a deliberative process. Repeatedly, you are seeing where our friends on the other side vote ''no,'' and when it gets to the other body, even though it's a passed piece of legislation, the Senate, our friends over there, ignore the bills. I kind of wonder what we're really trying to aim at, whether we're really just trying to score political points or whether we can begin working together. That's what House Republicans are here to do: to set aside our differences, to try and fund these issues, to try and deal with the President.

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I support this rule. I support the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

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

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

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

□ 1645

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do

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

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

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

A leading Chinese news service stated:

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

A German newspaper stated:

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

Another German newspaper said:

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has heard the reading of the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you.

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

The bylines stated: ''D.C. cess-pools shut down government,'' and ''They get paid while the Nation suffers.''

Just today, a new poll came out that demonstrated as follows:

A national poll asked the following questions:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or witches? Congress, 32 percent; witches, 46 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or hemorrhoids? Congress, 31 percent; hemorrhoids, 53 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or dog poop? Congress, 40 percent; dog poop, 47 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would again ask the gentleman from Florida to address whether or not this resolution is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I am explaining why it is privileged under rule IX.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as the gentleman confines his remarks to whether or not the resolution is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman fail to continue along that path, pursuant to the Chair's guidance, the gentleman will no longer be recognized, and the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the questions before the House on this resolution is whether the dignity of the House has been offended. I am demonstrating vividly that the dignity of the House has been offended in support of this resolution.

May I continue without interruption?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue under the previous guidance issued by the Chair.

Proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Good.

The current polling indicates:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Americans: Congress or toenail fungus? Congress, 41 percent; toenail fungus, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or cockroaches? Congress, 42 percent; cockroaches, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or potholes? Congress, 36 percent; potholes, 47 percent.

And finally——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Once again, the Chair requests the gentleman from Florida to confine his remarks to whether or not the matter is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman proceed in any other manner, the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, that is exactly what I have been doing. I would ask the Chair to allow me to continue without further interruption.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as his comments are confined to the procedural issue of whether or not the issue is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I want to repeat: one of the questions to make that determination is whether the dignity of the House has been offended.

As I indicated, there is one final point to make here before I get into further argument, which is this: the American public is now of the following opinion:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or zombies? Congress, 37 percent; zombies, 43 percent.

Now, clearly, statements such as these and others cited in the resolution call into question the dignity of the House. These statements are not from a single editorial or merely one passerby. These statements are being expressed around the Nation and across the globe.

They have contributed to a Congressional approval rating plummeting to 7 percent—that is 7 percent—in the latest Economist/YouGov poll, and they must be addressed by this body.

Thankfully, rule IX of the rules of the House of Representatives provides Members a mechanism through which to address those times when the dignity of the House has been harmed and called into question. It allows for questions of privilege.

Specifically, rule IX reads as follows:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and integrity of its proceedings.

I submit to you, Mr. Chair, that these are questions squarely within the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Further, rule IX provides that:

A resolution reported as a question of the privileges of the House, shall have precedence of all other questions except motions to adjourn.

I have offered a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House, and I am here today to secure a vote on that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, you should find the obvious, which is that the dignity of the House has been called into question and that no part of the resolution that I have offered goes beyond the scope of a question of privilege—such as attempting to legislate—so that a vote must be allowed on this measure.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, the vote that should be allowed would be on the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

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

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—that a government shutdown is

—and this is obvious at this point—

a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a ''clean'' continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

That is right—''a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a 'clean' continuing appropriations resolution to end it.''

What then is a satisfactory question of privilege?

Well, from the plain text of rule IX, and from existing precedent, a satisfactory resolution must demonstrate that the dignity of the House has been called into question. It has been called into question to such a degree that I wanted to show you the cover from the Daily News, that I was prevented from doing so, because to show it to you—just to show it to you—would somehow be considered to be offensive to the dignity of this House.

And the resolved clause of the resolution may not diverge into affecting the legislative actions of this body.

I argue, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution satisfies both accounts.

I have found no precedent in the annotated House Rules and Manual or Hind's or Cannon's or Deschler's Precedents that would allow the Chair to rule against the resolution before us today. In fact, one would question whether this entire body—including the Parliamentarian—has been politicized unnecessarily if you do rule against that today.

Not once do the precedents address a resolution that outlines a litany of condemnations against Congress from media sources around the world and here at home, as opposed to responding to a single source of criticism. Not once do the precedents rule on a resolution citing Congressional approval ratings below 10 percent in conjunction with persistent reporting against the dignity of the House.

If the first hurdle to be crossed today is that the dignity of the House has to be called into question, then, Mr. Speaker, you are required to rule in favor of this resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

If ''dignity'' means what the dictionary says it means—''the state or quality of being worthy of honor or respect''—then surely the honor and respect of this House has been called into question.

When only 7 out of 100 Americans approve of what we do—the lowest approval rating ever—then surely our dignity has been diminished and is actively being called into question.

If we are to be called ''obstructionists'' and practicers of ''partisan petulance;'' if we are to be called an establishment that is ''rotten to the core;'' and if we are leaving Americans wondering why there is ''so much poison in the system,'' then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we are accused of ''willingly provoking crises that suspend public services and decrease economic growth,'' then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we cause international media outlets to refer to us as ''politically bankrupt'' and responsible for ''breaking America's democracy,'' then our dignity as a body, as a House, is being called into question.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair has heard enough and is prepared to rule.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, the Chair has not heard my arguments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Florida that he is not recognized and that the Chair is prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, excuse me, but I have a point of parliamentary order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Hearing argument on a question of order is within the Chair's discretion. The Chair will once again advise the gentleman from Florida that the Chair is ready to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would remind the Chair that the Chair actually agreed to hear my argument. Having done so, the Chair needs to hear my full argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the question of whether the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, I have to say, Mr. Chair, that in doing so, you, yourself, at this point——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized.

The resolution alleges that a lapse in appropriations impairs the dignity of the House. It further expresses a sense of the House concerning action it might take on an appropriation measure. The gentleman from Florida casts this proposal as a statement.

As the Chair ruled on recent occasions such as October 2 and October 3, 2002; March 11, 2008; and December 13, 2011—in each case consistent with a principle enunciated by Speaker Gillett in his landmark ruling of May 6, 1921—a resolution expressing a legislative sentiment ordinarily does not give rise to a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

The precedent of March 11, 2008, is particularly illustrative. On that occasion, a resolution alleged that legislative inaction had brought discredit upon the House, and declared that the House should consider a motion to concur in a specified Senate amendment. The Chair held that the resolution did not present a question affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity or the integrity of its proceedings as required under rule IX.

These precedents are annotated in sections 702 and 706 of the House Rules and Manual. The principle upon which they stand was articulated by the Chair on January 24, 1996, as follows:

> To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.

The Chair would not distinguish between those precedents addressing resolutions that called for specific legislative action and a resolution that merely provided a statement about such action. Both express a legislative sentiment and are properly initiated through the introduction of a resolution via the hopper.

For these reasons, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to explain why the Chair is wrong and to finish my argument.

Mr. SESSIONS. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 373, by the yeas and nays; and

Adopting House Resolution 373, if ordered.

The first vote will be conducted as a 15 minute vote. The second vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
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
Poe (TX)
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
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
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)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
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, Gene
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Cantor
Clay
Crowley
Ellison
Gallego
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Lewis
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
Rangel
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Young (FL)

□ 1727

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

AYES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
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
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
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
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
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)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
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, Gene
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Clay
Crowley
Ellison
Gallego
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Lewis
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
Rangel
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Schakowsky
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1735

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and missed the following votes:

1. Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 and H.J. Res. 90—Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on this bill.

2. H. Res 373—Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89—Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, H.R. 3273 Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, and H.J. Res. 90—Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on this bill.

EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 89

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 salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. Such amounts as may be necessary for paying salaries and related expenses of Federal employees excepted from the provisions of the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.) who work during the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 15, 2013, when there is otherwise no funding authority for such salaries and related expenses: *Provided*, That not later than December 20, 2013, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying the use of funds made available to the Executive Branch by this joint resolution.

SEC. 102. 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. 103. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Excepted Employees' Pay 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 Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 89, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the legislation that I bring before the House today is very simple. It's very straightforward. It's very clear, very understandable, and, quite frankly, I think it should be noncontroversial; because what this bill does is simply say that the Federal employees who have been working during this shutdown are going to be paid, and they are going to be paid on time.

Now, a lot of people during this shutdown have been coming to work every day. They've worked for countless hours for the citizens of our Nation, and they deserve to be paid. As I said, it's very simple. If you work, you get paid.

For instance, the Capitol Police, they're on the job. They're working every day. You might remember last week, they rushed into harm's way in the line of duty. Now, those Federal employees deserve to take home a paycheck because they're on the job.

There are other Federal workers that are working every day during this shutdown. Some of them are working to make sure that our safety and well-being is in place. Some are working to make sure that the critical needs of our citizens are met. Some are working to make sure that businesses aren't unduly harmed during this shutdown, and some are working to make sure that the Federal Government extends a helping hand to those people that are the most vulnerable and are truly in need.

So what this bill does is simply say, as long as this shutdown is going on, until it ends, the people that come to work every day deserve to be paid. They deserve to be paid on time. Remember, the people who come to work every day, they're just like everybody else. They've got bills to pay. They've got mortgage payments they've got to make. They've got to pay their rent. They've got to make car payments. They've got to pay their utility bills. They've got mouths to feed back home. There is no reason that they should be punished because the Democrats and the Republicans and the White House can't agree how to move forward on funding the Federal Government.

Now, it's the goal of this Congress, as always, to make sure that Federal employees are paid and they're paid on time, and we usually do that by passing appropriations bills, and we do that. We fund the programs, and the salaries are paid on a continuing basis. We usually do that by the end of the fiscal year. It didn't happen this year, and I hope we don't find ourselves in this position ever again. But right now, it's time to come together. This is a logical, commonsense step to take—to make sure the people that go to work every day get paid on time.

We came together on Saturday, this weekend, on a unanimous vote, and said that those Federal employees who have been furloughed would be paid on a retroactive basis. It's my hope that we can come together today on a unanimous vote and say the people that go to work are going to get paid on time.

So I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution; and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me start by saying that I wish we were here on the floor today in order to consider a bill that would reopen the entire Federal Government.

This bill would pay all excepted Federal employees across the Federal Government as they would normally be paid irrespective of the shutdown. This is the right thing to do for all of our excepted Federal employees who have continued to work during the shutdown.

□ 1745

While this bill will provide some certainty to those individuals, we all know that there is a much easier and better method of accomplishing this goal, and that is to consider and pass the clean Senate continuing resolution which would reopen our Federal Government immediately.

I'm still unclear as to why Republicans are refusing to allow a vote on the most basic solution to this reckless shutdown.

While this bill guarantees timely pay for our employees, it does not reopen the Federal Government. That means it does nothing to solve the many problems the American people are facing as a result of the Republican decision to shut down the government.

Within the subcommittee that I am the ranking member of, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, the shutdown has required the Small Business Administration, for instance, to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. The agency has had to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas.

Within the Federal judiciary, the Federal defenders currently have enough funding to continue operations for a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they may be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been cut from 540 employees to 22, making it near impossible for the agency to perform its duty of fully reviewing thousands of different kinds of products. This will clearly increase the risk to the public.

The IRS has been forced to furlough most of its workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, to examine questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings.

The IRS brings in the vast majority of our Nation's revenue, and the Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

The American people need a full continuing resolution so that their government can perform the many duties that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses. A clean CR would do just that.

I realize that the majority wants to do this piecemeal, one at a time. I think I'm doing some math, and at this rate, the full government would be open by 2025, so I'm hoping we can do it before that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill addresses a critical issue facing the Congress right now. It ensures that the essential personnel who've been working throughout this shutdown receive their hard-earned pay on time.

These diligent men and women are protecting our homeland; they're ensuring our safety and well-being; they're providing critical services for our people and shielding our economy. They've been by our sides as we have worked to find a way out of the mess that we find ourselves in. They've been guarding this very building, putting themselves in harm's way. It's our responsibility to these dedicated professionals that they receive due compensation for their service to this Nation.

In addition, the House will consider a second piece of legislation this afternoon which will be combined with this bill and sent to the Senate. The second bill will provide a path forward to bring all parties to the table to end the government shutdown.

For a week, this House has been toiling, working, trying to find a way to end the impasse or at least mitigate its effects as we work toward a solution to this very serious problem.

We've provided bills that would fund the entire government and avenues to reopening certain critical government functions. We even proposed a conference committee, hoping the Senate would finally agree to talk to the House. We heard nothing.

But a week later, we're still no closer to a resolution. The Senate has turned down nearly every bill we've sent them and rejected every compromise we've offered. They've flatly refused a conference committee to attempt to find some sort of solution. After 8 days of a shutdown, it's high time that we all start having real, adult conversations about how to get out of this mess.

This second bill will establish a working group, Madam Speaker, that will provide a framework to get the House and Senate together to hash out our differences on the myriad fiscal crises that we are currently facing. If enacted, it will require, by law, Members from both Houses to meet and work our way toward a final agreement. There is far too much at stake now to be stuck in our ways. We must work together in a productive fashion if we wish to get anything accomplished.

It's imperative that we get our fiscal house in order and put our budgets on an attainable and sustainable path. We must have a common, agreed-upon, top-line discretionary spending level with the Senate, which will allow our annual appropriations work to be completed this year.

To do this, we must enact meaningful, commonsense entitlement program reforms that will slow the monstrous growth of these auto-pilot programs. We need to ensure that they're sustainable in the future—stop them from devouring the entirety of our Federal budgets—including funding for our domestic programs and our national defense, and prevent them from plunging our Nation further into debt.

I believe that the Members of this House and of the Senate are reasonable people, people of goodwill, people who wish to do right by this country. That's why I hope that this House will approve both of these bills today.

This is the right thing to do, to help find an end to this government shutdown, to tackle our spending problems and our debt limit, and to show the people of the United States that we are here to legislate, not to pontificate. They expect and deserve no less.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and this path forward.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my dear friend, the low-key Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from New York, and I trust that my very good friend from Kentucky wasn't referring to anybody on this side of the aisle when he used the word ''pontificate.''

Obviously, Madam Speaker, on this side of the aisle we are going to vote for this bill. The Democrats never wanted to shut down any of the government in the first place.

But I want to remind my colleagues that the vast majority of Federal employees in their districts are considered nonessential. I would like for my colleagues to reflect on what that means within each individual family when a breadwinner, who has been working hard at a job—making his family proud or her family proud—comes home and has to announce that they're furloughed because they were considered to be nonessential.

Imagine if that happened in the House and, if we had to divide up between essential and nonessential, how we would feel. I know it brings smiles as it did in the caucus just a few minutes ago, but think about it.

It's wrong to have this arbitrary distinction. Ninety percent of the IRS is considered nonessential; 90 percent of the Department of Energy, 90 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency, 81 percent of the Interior Department, 70 percent of the intelligence agencies are considered non essential. They're not nonessential. They're working hard. They ought to be able to get back to their jobs. We need them to be back to their jobs.

It's very disappointing that the Senate has held up the bill that we voted for unanimously on Saturday—I hope they'll let that loose—but the reality is, when we vote to pay people, we recognize they deserve to be paid, and if they're being paid, all of them want to be working for that pay.

So that's what we need to do. We need to open the entire government. Let everyone work for their pay as they want to do.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because people do need a paycheck. They need to be able to plan their expenses based on their income, and we have disrupted that income flow, so it makes sense to say, let's get the pay schedule back on track.

But I want to say something in a broader context that, after offering the Senate three different compromises on keeping the government open—three different compromises that were rejected—and then a fourth offer to let's immediately, last Sunday, go to a conference and start negotiating our differences, all of those were rejected; but even in that context, we have found a few things that we can agree on: the military pay bill, which not only included the men and women in uniform but the civilian support staff that they had.

As Mr. MORAN has pointed out, recently we came together again for the furloughed employees to be able to get back pay for the time in which they're out of work. Then we tried the other day to pass—and did from the House—the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, which passed the House floor on an overwhelming bipartisan basis; and we're looking at other programs that have passed, again, on a bipartisan basis, such as WIC—the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program—Head Start, Impact Aid, and we have a number of others.

Why, Madam Speaker, are those important?

Because many of us have actually chaired and participated in conference committees where House and Senate Members come together to iron out their differences. Frequently, the gap is huge, and frequently, the differences are numerous.

We know from experience that if you can start chopping those big differences into small steps, eventually you close the gap, and that is what the House Appropriations Committee, under Chairman ROGERS, is doing, and much of it with the support of Democrat House Members.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. But if we can get some of these things off the table—if we can agree on military pay, if we can agree on the civilian support staff for

military, if we can agree on furloughed employees, and if we can agree with NIH, that science and public health should be off the table—then, Madam Speaker, that big gap that stands between us and the Senate right now, it begins to narrow, and we create a little bit of momentum for a solution.

There are still going to be great differences that aren't going to be easy, but I think it is very important for us to come together and find the things on which we do agree, and at least move in a positive direction on them.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), one of the great gentlemen, and I mean that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in strong support of paying our Federal workers, but I oppose the parliamentary gimmicks being used by the majority to consider H.J. Res. 89, which is why I voted ''no'' on the rule.

This resolution would ensure that the more than 1.2 million dedicated Federal employees who have been required by their agencies to work during the government shutdown will receive their paychecks on time.

So far, these committed men and women have been at their duty stations without pay for 8 days since Republican extremists took our government hostage as part of their crusade to take health care from tens of millions of our fellow citizens.

It is only fair and right that we pay them in a timely manner for the services they have rendered. These employees have mortgages, student loans, and children in college. They have to provide for their families, and they need their paychecks.

Three days ago, the House unanimously passed H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would give back pay to 800,000 Federal employees furloughed as a result of this government shutdown. I understand, however, that a Republican Senator is blocking the consideration of that bill in the Senate.

Our Federal workers have endured relentless assaults over the past 3 years and have sacrificed much already. They have suffered through a 3-year pay freeze, reductions in their retirement benefits, and sequester-imposed furloughs.

It is time to stop the assault on our Federal workers. I urge the Senate to pass H.R. 3223 by unanimous consent immediately.

I support our Federal workers, and I support H.J. Res. 89, but I oppose the measure to which it will be attached upon passage, and note that by simply bringing to the floor a clean measure to fund the entire government, this bill would not be necessary.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

□ 1800

Mr. CRENSHAW. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW for yielding. I want to also thank him and Chairman ROGERS for their help today and on Saturday. I also want to thank their staffs. The staffs and leadership have been incredibly helpful in bringing this legislation to this floor.

Madam Speaker, I think if you look at the vote on Saturday, I and all Members believe that Federal employees should be paid, period. Too many Federal employees and their families don't know when their next paychecks will arrive and are worried about paying their next mortgage payments, paying utilities bills, filling up their cars with gas, or paying for their children's tuitions, which are coming up very soon. We need to fix this.

That is why I joined last week with Mr. MORAN and others in our delegation—colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor last Saturday to ensure that all Federal employees, whether exempt or furloughed by no fault of their own, are paid once this shutdown ends. I'm pleased that this bill passed the House 407–0.

I heard that both a Republican and a Democrat Senator had this bill on hold. I don't understand, Madam Speaker, the Senate's ways of going about this, but I think, if any Senators have a hold, they ought to feel strongly enough that they ought to do it publicly so we know who they are, but I understand it's both a Republican and a Democrat. On behalf of the people who are having a very difficult time, I would ask them to lift that hold.

Additionally, this House acted to ensure that members of the military and Defense Department civilians exempt from furloughs would be paid on time. I am pleased that the Pay Our Military Act, which the House passed by 423–0, was quickly approved by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

Today's legislation builds on these efforts by ensuring that other exempt Federal employees like the FBI team in Nairobi investigating the attack by Al-Shabaab; the CIA, which is looking at things coming in with regard to al Qaeda; the DEA, which is stopping drugs from coming into this country; the Border Patrol agents; doctors and nurses at VA hospitals; Federal firefighters; air traffic controllers; and prison guards will be paid as soon as possible. I hope the House today will follow the bipartisan precedent we have set over and over and vote for this legislation.

In closing, I know my colleagues recognize that Federal employees aren't just nameless faces behind desks. They are real people, out in the field, who work day in and day out to keep our country safe.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to clarify that it is a gentleman of the minority party that has objected and is holding up the pay bill in the Senate.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a great leader and the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely the right thing to do to make sure we pay Federal workers on time whether they're the Capitol Police or any other public servant doing the work of our country right now.

It was also the right thing to do on a bipartisan basis to make sure that Federal employees are not punished through no fault of their own. We did that unanimously by the vote on Saturday to make sure that Federal employees do not have to bear that burden when they're not the ones making the bad decisions.

What is very puzzling, Mr. Speaker, is, in having voted unanimously to say that we're going to make sure we pay those Federal employees who are being furloughed, we would at the same time block them from going back to work for the American people.

I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how the Speaker of the House can explain that to the American people when we have in our possession here in the people's House a piece of legislation that, if we were allowed to vote on it, could reopen the entire government right now, without preconditions.

Now, we've heard from our Republican colleagues that they want to open one little piece—let's open the national parks. Let's open another little piece—but on Saturday, what we did was vote to make sure that every Federal employee, whether they work for the national parks or any other Federal agency—everyone—would get paid for yesterday, for today, for tomorrow.

So why would our colleagues want to let one more day go by when we're compensating Federal employees and making them stay at home? Why wouldn't we open the Federal Government today so that they can do the work that we're paying them to do on behalf of the American people? It is absolutely mind-boggling, Mr. Speaker, that our Republican colleagues would take that position.

In the Senate right now you've got a Senator from Texas, Senator CORNYN, who is blocking that particular provision that we passed unanimously. I hope that he will let it go. But over here in the House, we have a bill that the President's waiting to sign right now. All we need to do is pass it, and the votes are here in the House to do it. If the Speaker doubts that fact, there's an easy way to figure it out. We all know that. Put it up for a vote.

What's the Speaker afraid of—a little democracy in this House?

So we're going to be paying all the Federal employees, as we should, because they absolutely should not be penalized—not for one day that we're forcing them to be out of work. These are men and women who are dedicated to providing service to our country. They want to get back to work, and what this House is saying is, We're going to keep paying you, but we're not going to let you go to work for the American people. That is an astounding position to take.

Let's vote to open the entire government right now. Let's take up the Senate bill. Let's get it done.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we keep saying it, and the folks who keep watching us wonder why we keep saying it—or maybe they know why we keep saying it. Little by little, you are reopening the government, but it may take until 2025 to accomplish it at this level. So our hope would be that we just pass the resolution that was passed in the Senate and open the government.

Now, this one is an easy one. Everyone is going to vote for this bill. In fact, this bill should pass on a voice vote so that we can get folks and pay them properly for the services they're rendering, but there are other people who need to come to work. There are other people who need to service the American people. There are Americans who need to be serviced, and this is not the way for us to behave.

A little bit of history—and I know that some people in the last couple of days have either refused to mention it or gave up on it—and that is that this all started not because there were differences in economic reasoning or behavior. It started because a group of people on your side wanted to attach killing ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—and they were willing to do whatever they needed to do to accomplish that.

That's not going to happen. How many times do we have to say that bill was passed by the House, passed by the Senate, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court? I don't know how many laws you can say that about in this country that we don't go after, and yet some folks just won't give up.

The time is now for us to open up the government. The time is now for us to pass this bill, to respect our Federal workers, but also to respect the American people in general by making sure that the government is open.

Take up the resolution. It will pass in 2 seconds, I assure you. In fact, I predict that if you bring that resolution to the floor, you may be shocked to get a unanimous vote, because that's what we want to do—to open up the government and then move on to deal with the issues that we have to deal with.

So let's do it, and let's do it quickly.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in this Chamber wanted to see the government shut down. Nobody wanted to see it down.

As has been pointed out, we passed a continuing resolution, funded the government, sent it to the United States Senate, and they said ''no.'' So we sent another resolution that kept the government open. The Senate said ''no.'' A third time we sent a resolution to the United States Senate to keep the government open. The Senate said ''no.''

Then we said, Why don't we just sit down and talk? Why don't we have a conference committee—one of those committees that we have all the time in this body when the House and the Senate disagree. We call it a conference committee. We appoint a group from the House. They appoint a group from the Senate. We work out the differences. That's the way you resolve conflict. That's the way you move ahead.

So the House appointed eight conferees. We went to a meeting, ready to meet with the Senate. They didn't show up. So we decided they don't really want to have any negotiations about how we continue to fund the Federal Government.

Then we said, If they won't pass a continuing resolution to fund the entire Federal Government, maybe we should just take certain parts of the Federal Government and see if the United States Senate or our friends on the other side would vote in favor of doing that. Of course, everyone has voted to say we ought to keep the government running as it relates to the military—both the defense and civilian employees. So our friends on the other side decided that was a good idea, and they voted for that.

Then we said, Since the District of Columbia is being penalized by our inaction, why don't we pass a bill that says we'll appropriate the money—it's their own money—and let them spend it the way they want to spend it. We had that on a suspension vote, and our friends on the other side didn't want to do that, so they voted ''no.''

Then we had a bill on Saturday that talked about folks that are on furlough, and our friends on the other side said, That's a good idea. We ought to pay them retroactively.

So they've been picking and choosing, picking and choosing, and some of these bills passed. In fact, if you add up all the bills we've passed, there have been 10 bills now that keep the government running in different ways shapes, and forms—that's almost one-third of all the discretionary spending—and we passed all that.

Where are those bills? They're sitting down in the Senate, waiting for the Senate to do something.

So we find ourselves in a situation that we didn't want to be in. We're all frustrated—people are angry—but we'll keep going. We're going to try to get the government running again. We're going to try to keep things open.

But for goodness sake, this bill before us today simply says the folks that are coming to work are doing the things that are important to our Federal Government, and they ought to get paid. If you work, you get paid, and you get paid on time. I think everybody agrees with that.

So let's not penalize them. A lot of people are being penalized because of our inaction, but let's not penalize the people who come to work every day to meet the critical needs of our country. Let's make sure that they get paid. Sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, we'll open this government back up. We've tried to do almost a third of it now. Still, people say no. We'll move ahead.

With that, I simply urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to make sure that the people who are working get paid on time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Last week the House passed support of H.R. 3223, the "Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act," which provided for retroactive pay for nearly 800,000 federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown engineered by the Tea Party faction of House Republicans.

The 1.3 million ''essential'' civilian employees as well as those who are on Furlough share the same financial fate neither will get a paycheck if the shutdown extends beyond October 15, 2013.

Federal employees whether they are working or waiting be called back to work are all waiting on the House to honor a promissory note for agreeing to give their best in serving the people of the United States.

We promise to pay Federal employees what is owed to them. We owe them dignity and respect as well as a debt of gratitude for electing to enter into public service.

The reason we are considering another Federal employee pay bill is that the earlier bill forgot something important that the majority is trying to fix—and I agree they should fix with passage of this bill.

We have not started the debate on the Debt Ceiling, but it is time to start considering the consequences should this method of legislating continue.

The world has a promissory note that is written on every dollar bill, "This note is Legal Tender for All Debts, Public and Private."

That promissory note means that people around the world highly value our nation's currency—not having that reputation will hurt everyone in this country.

In other words our money is only as valuable as its reputation, which is why threatening not to honor our debts is more than just a light matter to be down played by PR talking points.

But to my dear friends on the other side of the aisle this is another example of why this piece-mill process to attempt to fund the Federal government is a problem and why the American public can see that this process makes no sense.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1815

DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3273

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) reforms in direct spending programs.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(f) REPORT.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1830

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

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

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

A headline yesterday from National Journal sums it up:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

We believe that they have not addressed the underlying problems:

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, I rise in opposition to this bill that has been put on the floor, which is another way to distract from the business at hand—opening up our government. Eight days from now our government will be in a position for the first time in history where we won't be able to pay our bills. The wealthiest Nation on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, will be in a position not that we don't have the resources, not that we don't have the credit to borrow to make sure that we continue to be able to pay our bills—that won't be the case. It will be the case that we don't have the authority to do so because this Congress has not acted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is a pretense, not a substantive action.

It does not reopen government, nor does it ensure America pays its bills.

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

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

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

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

Instead of wasting more time on these reckless and irresponsible gimmicks, we ought to be taking responsible steps to end the shutdown, prevent a default, and then work together to achieve real, long-term fiscal solutions.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

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

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

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

□ 1845

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

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

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

And lastly, the President of the United States said:

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

In the United States Senate, on 18 occasions, in fact 19 now, the Democratic leader and Senator MURRAY tried to get consent to have a budget negotiation between the House and Senate. On 18 occasions, Senate Republicans said ''no.'' They didn't want to talk. They didn't want to negotiate. So the clock ticked until we got down to government shutdown. And then what happened?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is some truth to this. I and the Speaker and the majority leader and the whip and our conference do not want to have anything that would empower somebody to raise taxes. But we did want to empower that we would allow maybe Mr. DINGELL, the Dean of the House, maybe Mr. VAN HOLLEN, maybe Mr. HASTINGS, to be part of a committee, a working group that would sit down with their colleagues and speak honestly—and maybe Mrs. LOWEY—speak honestly about how we get out of this mess that we all have.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the remaining time.

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

□ 1900

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

800,000–plus—Federal employees expected to be furloughed as a result of the GOP's irresponsible shutdown.

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

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

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

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

49—Republicans who say shutting down the government over Obamacare is a big MISTAKE.

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

18—The number of times Senate Republicans have blocked Senate Democrats' efforts to go to conference and negotiate on the budget to avoid a government shutdown.

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION;
Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,
Director, Government Relations.

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed.

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

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

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3273. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How much damage would that do to the economy?

How many veterans would go without their benefits?

How many kids would lose Head Start funding?

How many families would go without nutritional assistance?

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

We can end this insanity right now. Reopen the government. Spare the American people the effects of this shutdown, and then come together to resolve our differences.

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
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
Poe (TX)
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
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—194

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

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1933

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—197

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

NOT VOTING—10

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1940

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—420

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1948

Mrs. CAPPS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 373, H.R. 3273 is laid on the table.

HOUSE PASSES 10TH BIPARTISAN FUNDING BILL

(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, weeks ago, the administration reached out to Capitol Hill to continue budget negotiations. According to the National Journal:

> Majority Leader Reid's office had a message for them: don't do it. The White House listened. The summit was nixed. And no serious talks have occurred since.
>
> As the government shutdown stretches into its second week, the White House has embraced Reid's hard-line, no-negotiations stance—at least so far.

Unfortunately, hard-liner, non-negotiable posturing seems to be all the Senate Majority Leader knows.

Today, the House passed the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, the 10th bipartisan stopgap funding bill to pass the House since the Federal shutdown began. The program remains a priority of the President; yet the White House just announced a veto threat on the bill—without a doubt, at the Senate Majority Leader's request. If this isn't a purely political move, I don't know what is.

I urge the Senate and the President to join 57 of my Democrat colleagues who are supporting the solutions being put forth by the House. The American people deserve as much.

LOCAL SHUTDOWN EFFECTS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight just one of the stories that comes in here each and every day from my congressional district highlighting the unnecessary hardship the Republican government shutdown has brought upon the American people.

One of my constituents, who works in business aviation, contacted my office just this week to tell me about the burden the shutdown has had on his business and his family's bottom line.

During the government shutdown, aviation components cannot be produced, financed, bought, sold, inspected, or registered without the Federal workers that are currently furloughed. Today, large parts of this industry—and our economy at large—simply cannot function. Stories like this will continue until the House brings up the Senate CR, which funds our government at the level House Republicans fought for.

Stories like these are not isolated to upstate New York. This is happening in countless corners of our Nation and across all regions and all of our districts back home.

A piecemeal approach that picks winners and losers in our Federal agencies is no way to run the country. Bring up the Senate CR. Take ''yes'' for an answer. Let's get this Nation back to work.

EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, there are just two issues stopping the Obama shutdown from ending: number one, make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everyone else; number two, the President let business off the hook for a year. We want workers to be let off the hook for a year, too.

That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district all want, and that's what the Republicans ask—equal justice for all Americans. What is so hard to understand about all that? It's really that simple.

They will negotiate with Putin, Assad, and even Iran, but not with House Republicans. That's not fair. That's not right. And it's not good for the United States of America.

BRING UP THE IMMIGRATION BILL

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have enjoyed in this House is sincerity. There's not a Member of this House that thinks the President of the United States is going to delay, repeal, or tear apart the Affordable Care Act; but if there's politics involved, I understand that. I'm a politician.

It just seems to me that if you have a plan, a strategy, and the whole world is saying that a handful of people are destroying the credibility of the Republican Party and therefore taking down the Democrats and the Congress with them—even the President of the United States—then I think it's safe to say it's time to look for some credibility so that we can regain being a two-party system.

So I didn't come here this morning to get arrested, but I did, because there are tens of thousands and millions of people that want to become Americans. They don't want to knock Republicans. They don't want to knock Democrats. They want to be Americans.

Bring up the immigration bill. Let's vote these new, wonderful citizens in, and maybe they can bring some sense to the parties.

SENATE SHOULD PASS HOUSE VERSION OF CR

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat what my colleague from Florida said. My Democratic colleagues have suggested that if the House only passes the clean Senate CR, we can move on with business. I will point out if the Senate will only consider the House CR, we can also move on.

But the problem is that there's two provisions. One provision takes away a sweetheart deal that only Members of Congress and their staff get. Secondly, since the President delayed the mandate on employers to provide insurance for a year, we would similarly delay the mandate on the employee to have that insurance.

If she is relying upon her employer to provide the policy, what is she to do if he is given a break on not providing that policy?

We can quickly reopen the government. The House Republicans have voted a budget which would completely fund the government, but it has those provisions which Senator REID will not even negotiate over. He will not come together to discuss these two things.

So, as a favor to both our country and the American taxpayer, I ask Senator REID to address it.

A LONG JOURNEY STARTS WITH SMALL STEPS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, over my years in Congress, I've had the

honor of chairing several conference committees. Conference committees are set up when there's a disagreement between a House-passed bill and a Senate-passed bill. You sit down with your list of differences and you start sawing away at them, if you will.

That's, in fact, what the House has been doing the past 2 weeks in the midst of this shutdown. We've been finding some things, such as military pay, science, civilian furlough issues, and health-related issues—things that are less controversial and on which we can agree—so we can get some momentum to come up with a big agreement.

Indeed, the gap is large. We have disagreement on ObamaCare because it's one-sixth of the American economy. It's very big.

Secondly, we have a disagreement on the debt ceiling. Do we continue along the path of spending that we are on or do we make corrections?

Thirdly, we have a $90 billion gap between our spending level between the House and the Senate.

These are bigs issues. Sometimes, a long journey starts with small steps. That's why I urge our friends in the Senate to pass the legislation which the House has sent over to them, and then we can start focusing on the larger issues.

□ 2000

OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas know that when the cattle starts stampeding, you're really in trouble; so my friends on the other side of the aisle haven't realized that the cattle in the United States is stampeding: 57,000 seats of Head Start are going; veterans centers will be closed in a couple of days; Federal courts are looking at whether or not they can stay open past October 15; U.S. attorneys are laying off various U.S. attorneys across America, up to 4,000.

We actually have rules in this House, the rules that brought about the agreement in the beginning of the year where we actually agreed to the 986 number that the Republicans had. We agreed to the tax reform that the Republicans had and Democrats agreed. But now they want to throw on us another supercommittee—fool's folly—talking about discretionary spending, the debt ceiling, and entitlement reform—all decent ideas, but open the government first.

Get the bill on the floor that is clean. Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling to pay our bills. Let the American people get back to work. Let our veterans get services. Stop throwing down another committee. We don't catch cattle. We don't go after cattle in Texas by throwing down a committee. We get it done.

Let's get the job done. Let's stop the stampede.

SPEAKER BOEHNER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, October 8. October 8. We are now 8 days into the shutdown of the government of the United States of America, presumed to be the strongest Nation on this Earth, presumed to be the greatest economic power, presumed to be the world's oldest democracy—perhaps oldest, but not functioning.

Why? Why are we in this situation? Eight days without a functioning government. What in the world is the Republican Party doing to this Nation? And why? Why? It's hard to say why because every day the goalpost changes. Every day a different demand. And today yet a new demand.

But what's the result of all of this? What does all of this mean? It means that this Nation is humiliated by this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go. Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go and vote. Why not? We think there's a majority. Let's see here. There's 198 Democrats that will vote for the reopening of this government tonight. Call us back into session, Mr. BOEHNER, 198 Democrats. And by the public record, there are 23 or more Republicans that have said they would vote for a clean CR. Mr. Speaker, let your people go and vote.

What does it mean that the government shut down? What does it mean to Americans? I'll tell you what it means in my district. It means that the day care centers, the early childhood education programs, the levee improvements, indeed, even today we've learned that the burials of those brave men and women—men, in this case—that have recently been killed in the war in Afghanistan, their families will not receive $100,000 that's been set aside for them.

Oh, I know we have a vote here. This is the eighth day of the shutdown, and we have, in this House, passed eight bills to appropriate pieces of this government.

These are the 12 appropriation bills. These are the 12 appropriation bills that fund every function of government, whether it's the military, whether it's the farm programs, the day care programs, the health care programs, the Centers for Disease Control. Here they are, more than 1,000 specific items. And in 8 days, our Republican colleagues have put before us eight bills to fund eight of the more than 1,000. At this rate, it will be 2020 before this government fully is functional. How foolish. How stupid. How humiliating for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on reopening this government. The votes are there. A simple blackboard will tell you the votes are there. Tonight, call us back to session, and tomorrow morning the people of America, the people across this world will see the strongest Nation in the world, the government of that Nation functioning once again.

How do I go back to my district and tell the people at the Dixon National Cemetery that those burials aren't going to take place? How do I go back to my district and tell them—yeah, maybe we ought to see this.

In California, northern California, it's hunting season, opened on Saturday, but the refuges across this great Nation are closed to hunters, the duck hunters, the men and women that want to recreate in those areas. And if you're not a hunter, maybe you're a fisherman, but don't go to a refuge. Don't go to the Bureau of Land Management fishing areas. Don't try to put your boat in the water at the national parks. You can't do it because this government is shut down.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us all vote. Let us reopen this government.

We have several of my colleagues with me tonight. We're going to cover this issue. How much I would prefer to be here with my colleagues from New York and other States to talk about putting Americans back to work. And I guess we are, in a way, putting the Federal employees back to work.

Mr. PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York, thanks for joining us once again.

Mr. TONKO. My pleasure. I appreciate the gentleman from California bringing us together tonight in thoughtful discussion about what is chaos here in the Nation's Capitol. So, Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together with Representatives from New Jersey and from Connecticut and from Pennsylvania, and others who will probably join us that will speak to the unnecessary pain that has trickled into the lives of far too many working families across this country and impacting so many small businesses from coast to coast with the ill effects of a government shutdown—a Republican government shutdown simply because, as you just heard the gentleman from California indicate, we need to vote on a CR, a continuing resolution, a bill that allows for the budget to continue into a date certain as mentioned in that bill, most likely 2 months—8 weeks—as an extender into perhaps mid-December.

Why do we need to do that? So that we can bring stability into the process, allow government to be funded, allow for the doors to be opened, allow for the lights to go on and reopen government. That's the first step in the sequence.

Secondly, another cornerstone bit of legislation coming quickly upon us, giving the green light to America to pay her bills. America's working families understand what that's about.

They know that they play by the rules. They roll up their sleeves. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their beloved country to do the same thing. Our second step in the process.

Then thirdly, buying this 8 weeks of time allows us to immediately name those individuals who will be the representatives for the majority and minority parties in each of the Houses of Congress to sit down and nail down a budget in those ensuing 8 weeks to make certain that stability again is the outcome. That's what we're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker not only to the Tea Party, not only to the Republican Conference, but to the entire House, the United States House of Representatives. Let all of us vote on what is a clean CR, which has been approved by the United States Senate—and, by the way, in negotiations to date, accepts your number, the lowest number in the process. We're not happy with that number, but we're going to cave to your request to allow for government to be refunded, to be reopened, and for us to move forward. That's what it's about.

We're asking for dignity to be expressed for America's working families. We're allowing for certainty to be the outcome for our small business community so that we can grow our economy, allow for the climate that produces both public and private sector job growth that allows us to move forward with a sense of hope. That's what the request is here.

Why don't you let us vote on a clean CR? Are you fearful that it might pass? Are you fearful that you don't get your way? Because you know, in the 45 votes that have been taken on a debt ceiling limit vote since the days of President Ronald Reagan, those 45 measures have been approved 38 times without any bells and whistles—and certainly unprecedented to have attached to the vote some sort of clutter that deals with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Never have we reached to that sort of negotiated outcome where we are repealing the law of the land—in this case, the law of the land that is 3 years old, was approved by a majority in the House of Representatives, was approved by a supermajority in the United States Senate, was tested, because of your concern, before the highest Court of the land, and the Supreme Court gave it thumbs-up in meeting the constitutionality test. What more do we need to do to convince you?

Let me just say this, Representative GARAMENDI, quickly so we can get to our colleagues. I want to share with you some of the results in these few 8 days already—but painful 8 days for far too many.

By the end of this month, food pantries like the one in my district in Cohoes, New York, may not have the money to stay open. That is the situation with many of our food pantries. This is a facility that helps feed 215 hungry families in the capital region of New York State.

Projections are that one of the providers of electronics for our fighter jets, our submarines, and our helicopters in Saratoga Springs, New York, in the 20th Congressional District that I represent, have grinded to a halt as inspectors can't complete contracts and new orders cannot come in.

We also have impacting us a forensic meteorology business in Niskayuna, New York—again, in the 20th Congressional District of New York—that works each and every day with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, that helps bring benefits to all of us from the devastation of Mother Nature. These are jobs that are meaningful—meaningful to the quality of life of people across this country, that are meaningful to working families who are now without jobs, people who are not getting paid and showing up to work. These are devastating consequences to the economy.

We implore the leadership of this House, we implore the Speaker to call for a vote on a clean continuing resolution that embraces your number, the lowest number in negotiations that we will settle upon. We will offer our votes for that kind of measure, only give us that chance so that America can have her government funded, we can move forward to advance the debt ceiling limit bill vote that will allow for America to pay her bills, and then finally move to that conference table, where representation from both parties in each of the Houses will nail down a budget in the ensuing 8 weeks.

□ 2015

That will bring stability to the economy and will bring economic and social justice to the people of this great country. Let's move forward with that sense of fairness.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, the gentleman from New York.

I would like now to bring to the microphone our friend from the great State of Connecticut, JOHN LARSON.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this hour, and I appreciate the eloquence of our colleague from New York, both of whom have addressed the most important issue of the day, in fact, the last 8 days, as Mr. GARAMENDI has articulated.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves dealing with the issue ''de jure.'' Each day the goalposts move, each day the American public sits in utter amazement and disgust with its elective representatives. It is astounding to them to see the greatest Nation in the world brought to its knees.

Our forefathers were very prescient—and certainly George Washington, who Daniel Webster, the Senator from Massachusetts in this Chamber—well, actually, it would have been down the hall—got up on the 100th anniversary of George Washington's birth and talked about the President's admonitions. Amongst his keenest admonitions was about that of ''excessive'' party spirit.

Now, in Washington's day, there weren't political parties, as we know them. It wasn't Democrat or Republic; it was Federalist or anti-Federalist. He knew very well and was concerned deeply about what factions could do. He warned about the outside influence of party. But what he was most concerned about is what happens within a government if people in that very government are at war with their own existence, are working against the interest of the government and therefore the people.

So we find ourselves this evening as Members of the minority coming to this floor and asking for one simple thing from the majority, and that is a vote. Now, we understand that we have asked for votes on this floor—we have asked for votes to put the country back to work. As the gentleman from California has articulated on many occasions to come here and talk about making things in America and allowing a vote to put us back to work, we have been denied that opportunity. We have been denied the opportunity here to vote on nutrition and funding and making sure that important bills like the agriculture bill, that the very poor amongst us and the very needy are fed. We have been denied an opportunity to vote on immigration, as you heard CHARLIE RANGEL talk about so nobly earlier this evening. We have also, most importantly, been denied a vote here that is fundamental to our democracy.

The most fundamental thing and the most patriotic thing that we do in a society is vote. Yet here, because of the tyranny of the majority, 200-plus Democrats are not allowed a vote. More importantly, the American people are not allowed a vote on the continuing of its government. As the gentleman from New York pointed out, not only is it the continuation and shutdown of government, but on the near horizon defaulting on the full faith and credit of the American people. This is unconscionable.

But Washington was prescient when a few, dangerously are at war with their own government, who seek to bring that government down, who seek to bring the government down through a shutdown; and then by not paying the bills that this body and the other body have racked up, the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. We need to be able to express the will of the people. All we ask of the majority party is for a vote, a simple vote, as the gentleman from New York said, on a continuing resolution unencumbered that does nothing more, and at the levels that they have requested, but put the Nation back to work and then respond quickly to the need to pay our debts without being held hostage.

You are not holding Barack Obama hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are not

holding the Democrats in Congress hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are holding the people of the United States hostage. For the sake of fairness and being responsible, bring the bill to the floor for a vote. Allow the minority the opportunity to vote.

If you don't have the votes, let it be so, and let the world know, and let every American citizen know, where their Members stand on this issue. Stand with your country. Do not let it be shut down. Do not let it default. At least give us a vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. LARSON.

Mr. Speaker, a vote—that is what democracy is all about. We are asking for a simple thing: the opportunity to vote on extending the operations of the American government.

Now I would like to turn to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. I thank my colleague from California and my colleagues from New York and Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, many of us that you will see on the floor tonight, we are not regulars, we are not people that come to the floor often to speak. But I think many of us feel it is important for the American people to understand the nature of this task, this battle, that we face on their behalf.

We hear a lot from Republicans about the President not wanting to negotiate, not wanting to talk. The Democrats don't want to negotiate. They have been pretty good at saying that over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker. But what they are not telling the American people is the nature of the negotiation that they want to have. I think it is important that that be revealed.

What makes me so angry—and the reason I am here tonight—is what we face in the country right now is completely a manufactured crisis. There is no structural economic reason that our country should be facing default come the 17th of this month. There is no reason that 800,000 Federal employees aren't working. There is no reason for this to happen.

This is being manufactured by a party because they are trying to get something that they have not been able to get at the ballot box. We have divided government. The Republicans control the House of Representatives, the Senate is controlled by the Democratic party, we have a Democratic President.

The Republicans had two goals going into this manufactured crisis. One was to destroy the health care bill. Now, this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed the Senate, it was signed by the President, it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had a Presidential election and their candidate said on day one of his new administration the first thing he would do if elected was to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That gentleman lost by 5 million votes.

What they can't accomplish at the ballot box they now were looking for a way to accomplish here. But it couldn't be done through the regular process, Mr. Speaker. It couldn't be done through the regular order.

So now comes this ingenious idea, hatched by the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party, to say: Here is what we will do. We will wait until the end of the fiscal year to come, and we will say we are going to shut the government down unless you repeal ObamaCare.

I was on this floor a couple of days ago and read something on the floor that I saw on the Internet by a young man by the name of Judd Legum. I hope I have said his last name correctly. He put an analogy about what we were actually facing. He said it is sort of like if someone comes up to you and says, I want to burn down your house, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he says, well, I just want to burn down the second floor, and you tell him, no. And he goes, well, what about your garage, can I burn your garage down? And you say, no. And the guy says, well, let's just sit down and talk about what part of your house I can burn down, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he goes, you see, you're not compromising.

This is what we are facing in this so-called ''rigged'' negotiation. What Republicans are saying is, defund ObamaCare, we will open up the government. We said, no. Then they said, we will delay ObamaCare for a year and we will open up the government, and we said, no. Then they said, well, just get rid of that individual mandate—which effectively kills the health care bill—and we said, no. Then they said, well, will you just sit down and negotiate with us and tell us what part of the Affordable Care Act we can get rid of, and we said, there are 20 million Americans that are counting on this bill, it is the law of the land, the answer is no.

And they look at us and say, the Democrats don't want to negotiate; the President doesn't want to negotiate.

Well, I got news for my friends over there: we are not going to negotiate the rights of 20 million uninsured Americans because they can't get this done at the ballot box.

So now, Mr. Speaker, what is the new strategy? They have shifted off of the health care bill now because the American public, by margins of over 70 percent, have said we don't want you to shut the government down to try to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

So now where have they moved? To the Ryan budget. What is the Ryan budget? It is a budget that keeps us in sequester, it is a budget that does not invest in our infrastructure, it is a budget that does not invest in the education of our children, it is a budget that makes it impossible for this economy to grow, and it is a budget that threatens the social safety net that many of our senior citizens depend on.

They couldn't get it passed in the regular order. They couldn't get it passed in their own House of Representatives for a long time. They were afraid to put the bill on the floor. They certainly couldn't get it passed in the Senate, and they knew the President wouldn't sign it.

So what is the strategy now? This new rigged negotiation that we are being asked to have with our friends is: Give us pieces of the Ryan budget, and in return we will open up the government and we will raise the debt ceiling, but only if you give us what we want in the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, we want to have a budget negotiation with our friends on the Republican side. The House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget. The numbers—there is a great disparity in the numbers. Democrats believe in investing in America. We want to rebuild our roads and bridges and sewer systems. We want to invest in the education of our children. We want to protect our seniors and our veterans. It costs money to do that, Mr. Speaker, so there is a difference.

But we are ready and we are willing to appoint conferees tomorrow to sit down and have a negotiation. I want the American public to understand that we have asked 18 times to appoint conferees to negotiate the differences in the Senate budget and the House budget, and all 18 times the Republicans in the House have said no.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say if there's someone in this House that's not willing to negotiate, it's our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. The American people deserve a budget negotiation where we sit down and settle our differences. We're not going to get everything we want, Mr. Speaker; it's divided government. The Republicans are going to get something in this budget negotiation, the Democrats are going to get something in the budget negotiation. But the country moves forward, we pay our bills, and we live to pay another day.

In closing, let me say to the American people, we will not be part of a rigged negotiation where Democratic priorities and principles aren't allowed to be discussed, only that which the Republicans couldn't get in the ballot box that they're trying to get now by holding a gun to our head. That's not how you do business in the United States of America. That kind of behavior has to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of the American people, I hope Republicans will come to their senses, pass a clean CR, and let's sit down and negotiate a budget agreement for the American people and move this country forward.

I thank you for yielding me this time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DOYLE, thank you so very much. The Republican shutdown has to end. It has to end, and how correct you were about the negotiations just this evening. They put a

proposal on the floor to create some sort of a negotiating committee that did not have all of the issues before them, as you so correctly pointed out, only their set of issues were to be allowed to be discussed by that negotiating committee, none of the issues that we care about on the Democratic side. That's hardly a negotiating opportunity.

I now yield to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for bringing us all together tonight. I couldn't stand with better Americans than I am standing with tonight. I mean that.

Mr. Speaker, the latest supercommittee plan that folks on the other side of the aisle gave us today is really absurd. In fact, as a member of the Budget Committee, this new-found Republican insistence on negotiations, referred to by Mr. DOYLE from Pennsylvania, is mind boggling, since my colleagues have spent the last 6 months avoiding negotiations. And I didn't come here tonight to water the wine, so we're going to say it like it is.

My fellow Americans, this House of Representatives passed its budget over 200 days ago on March 21. Then the Senate passed its budget 2 days later. Now, think about what I just said. What happened to it? Well, the usual protocol is the two sides name conferees, they come together in conference, and they work out a budget. That didn't happen. That's 6 months ago. We've been asking to go to conference so we can resolve our differences, and there are always differences within parties, between parties, you name it. We want to fund the government. We want to get rid of sequestration, like Chairman ROGERS said on July 31, 2013:

> I believe the House has made its choice. Sequestration—and its unrealistic, ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Mr. ROGERS is the chairman, a Republican, he said it. He said that; I didn't say that. He said it better than I could ever imagine saying it.

So what happened? Democrats attempted to go to conference 20 times. The Republicans objected every single time. Fact check this: over here in the House, we have almost 200 Members who signed the discharge petition calling for a conference on the budget. We tried four times to bring the resolution to the floor. Leader PELOSI even went so far as to name conferees. Some of them are in this room. Some of us are conferees. She did that on June 27. What's the date today—October 8? June 27. So why, after this stalling, have the Republicans finally found religion and now they want to negotiate?

I'll tell you why: we've just discovered we have a phantom government in the United States. Every Congressman, every House Member, every Senate Member should be concerned that they're elected by the people of this country, be they Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, it doesn't matter, they've been elected. They stood for election. We respect that, regardless of denomination, because we know that neither party is ever perfect. Come on, we all share in the pluses, we share in the minuses. There's never one party that has all of the answers. We know that. But why?

Well, just this past Saturday, October 5, we had a front page story in The New York Times. It was mind boggling—mind boggling—that article. Here's the title of that article, ''The Federal budget crisis months in planning.'' Well, I don't remember planning this. I don't know if any Republicans were out planning this. Who in God's name are they talking about? And this is what it says in the article in the second paragraph, which refers to a manifesto—a manifesto—put together by non-elected people in this country. Hear me, America, hear me.

They sat down one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret. Wow. And came—little noticed—a blueprint. This is what they said, Mr. Speaker. A blueprint to defunding ObamaCare signed by—oh, you're going to love this, Ed Meese. Boy there's a name that pops up. I can't believe it. Ed Meese. It's not funny, it's serious; a phantom government. Leaders of more than three-dozen conservative groups, and I will put in the RECORD tonight who those groups are, and I got part of their manifesto. Listen to this. This is what they put together. And I'm sure there are only a few Congressmen on the other side who even knew about this. It says this:

> Conservatives should not approve a CR unless it defunds ObamaCare. This includes ObamaCare's unworkable exchanges, unsustainable Medicaid expansion, and attack on life and religious liberty.

They said that February 14, 2013. This did not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't just happen. It wasn't an accident; it was planned. That is the lowest thing you could ever read about a government that wasn't even elected. Who the heck are these people to decide what we're going to do?

Now we know why Mr. RYAN did not want to go to conference. Now we know why Mr. BOEHNER did not want to go to conference, because that was not the plan. Read it. Judge for yourself. Judge for yourself.

It also said that these 30 groups, and the names of each group besides Mr. Meese's, are right here. You've got every right-wing group in the universe. They go into this manifesto on Medicaid expansion, permanent appropriations, implementation. They want to run the government. These people actually wanted to run the government.

My friends, the Republicans don't want to negotiate. They want to use this shutdown and the threat of default to invalidate the results of—oh, an election last November. These people weren't elected, we were elected. And I love debating people from the other side who are elected. That's their God-given right. That's what liberty is all right. Why don't they come in here, this shadow government, this phantom group, why don't they stand there and tell us who they talked to within the Republican Party. Tell us. America has a right to know.

Don't you talk to me, Mr. Speaker, about let's have transparency in government when you have this vagabond group out here funded by—guess. I'll give you three guesses. No, I'll only give you one guess: the Koch brothers. They think they're running this government. The Supreme Court heard another case today—isn't that interesting. This is mild compared to what would happen if they were able to do and spend as much money as they want.

I did not come here to water the wine. You better listen to it, and every member of the staff better listen because they tried every trick in the book, putting your own health care in jeopardy, saying that you get a subsidy from the government when it's just like any company that in some way contributes to your health care. Somebody gets hired by the Federal Government to be a secretary, making $20,000, $25,000 a year, the cost of their health care will go up between $5,200 and $12,000. How are you going to live on that being a staff member here on the floor or back in your districts. They will stop at nothing, nothing, to bring the government down at any cost. At any cost.

The November election apparently did not occur in their minds. We are dealing with dangerous people. Either they are on hallucinogenic drugs or they just lost their minds. This is what we're dealing with. To bring us to this precipice only a few days away, something's wrong. This is not how we debate things in the United States of America. This is not in any manner, shape, or form. As President Obama said, Democrats are willing to negotiate, but not with a gun to our heads. Never. I'm from Paterson, New Jersey; you never put a gun to my head, I've got news for you.

Let's end this irresponsible shutdown and default threat, and let's get back to work. That's what we were sent here for.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI for your patience.

Signed:

Edwin Meese III, Former Attorney General, President Ronald Reagan; Chris Chocola, President, Club for Growth; Jenny Beth Martin, Co-Founder, Tea Party Patriots; Penny Nance, President, Concerned Women for America; The Honorable J. Kenneth Blackwell, President, Constitutional Congress, Inc.; William Wilson, President, Americans for Limited Government; Duane Parde, President, National Taxpayers Union; Susan Carleson, President, American Civil Rights Union; Andrea Lafferty, President, Traditional Values Coalition; Alfred S. Regnery, President, The Paul Revere Project; Lewis Uhler, President, National Tax Limitation Committee; Brent Bozell, President, ForAmerica; Matt Kibbe, President, FreedomWorks; Marjorie Dannenfelser,

President, Susan B. Anthony List; David Williams, President, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

The Honorable David McIntosh, Former U.S. Representative, Indiana; David Bozell, Executive Director, ForAmerica; Colin Hanna, President, Let Freedom Ring; Stuart Epperson, President, Council for National Policy; Heather Higgins, President, Independent Women's Forum; Cindy Chafian, President, The Mommy Lobby; Gary Bauer, President, American Values; Mike Needham, CEO, Heritage Action for America; David Bossie, President, Citizens United; Mathew D. Staver, Chairman, Liberty Counsel Action; James Martin, Chairman, 60 Plus Association; Erick Erickson, Editor, RedState.com; T. Kenneth Cribb, Former Domestic Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Becky Norton Dunlop, Former White House Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Grace-Marie Turner, President, The Galen Institute.

Myron Ebell, President, Freedom Action; Craig Shirley, Reagan Campaign Biographer; Rev. Lou Sheldon, Chairman, Traditional Values Coalition; Richard Rahn, President, Inst. for Global Economic Growth; Lee Beaman, Businessman, Nashville, TN; Bob Reccord, Executive Director, Council for National Policy; Angelo M. Codevilla, Professor, Emeritus, Boston University; Tom Donelson, Chairman, America's PAC; Brian Baker, President, Ending Spending; Kay R. Daly, President, Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Don Devine, Senior Scholar, The Fund for American Studies; Gary Aldrich, President, Patrick Henry Center for Individual Liberty; Ralph Benko, President, Center for Civic Virtue; Andresen Blom, Senior Strategist, Center for Civic Virtue; Joe Gregory, CEO, Gregory Management Co.; Rebecca Hagelin.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PASCRELL, thank you very much. Whether you're from New Jersey or wherever, I'm not about to threaten you. But I would like to welcome to this microphone our friend from the State of Massachusetts, who is probably just as tough as the gentleman from New Jersey, and that's Mr. CAPUANO.

Mr. CAPUANO. For the first time in my life, I have no intention of being as passionate as the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I was going to walk people through this because to me, good people can disagree. Reasonable people can disagree. Even people I disagree with vehemently, that's what politics, that's what government, that's what life is all about. But you're not entitled to forget history or to ignore facts. And for me, there have been lots of misrepresentations in the last week or two because there's a lot of passion, a lot of emotion. But I need to back up a little bit, educational value.

When I'm told that the Democrats have to come to the table and compromise, my answer is: We have, repeatedly. And we will do it again, if necessary.

And people say, Well, no, you haven't. The President is saying no, you won't negotiate.

Well, no, we won't negotiate on this issue at this point in time because we have already gone far enough, and here's why. 2011, the last supercommittee, where did it come from? It came from the budget impasse. We couldn't come to an agreement. We couldn't make a deal. We had taken our corners. What did we do? We created a supercommittee and it was said if the supercommittee doesn't work, do something like Simpson-Bowles or whatever they would come up with, then we would institute a sequester. And a sequester, for all intents and purposes, is an across-the-board cut of roughly 8 percent per year every year for 10 years in a row. That's what it is. At the end of that 10th year if you don't do anything, you would be spending approximately 48 cents of every dollar you were spending when you started.

Now I understand that some people want a government that does that and the programs that would pay for. I don't agree with that, but that's a reasonable position to take. ''I don't want senior housing. I don't want childhood nutrition.'' I don't agree with it, but it's a reasonable position to take, and we should argue about that and we should debate about that, and the American people should have an opportunity to elect people that agree or disagree with them on those types of issues.

□ 2045

We couldn't come to an agreement, so the sequester took place; and the sequester set out numbers each year for 10 years. This is as much as you can spend unless you come up with some sort of agreement to get around it. We haven't been able to do it. We've had the first year of sequester and are about to enter the second year of sequester.

Pursuant to the law that was passed in 2011, a law, by the way, I voted against—I don't like the concept of sequester—but the majority ruled and it passed. Pursuant to that law in this coming fiscal year, we would have been allowed to spend a little over a trillion dollars. Remember, that number is based on an 8 percent cut from the prior year. So this already represents a cut, and, by the way, it represents a massive compromise between Democrats and Republicans to pass that sequester. So it was a Democratic compromise with Republicans to cut the budget for 10 years in a row. That's where we start.

This year, Republicans passed a budget of $967 billion, $100 billion below what the sequester allows. They're entitled to do that. Again, I can disagree, but I respect their viewpoint. If you really think the government can operate and provide the services the American people want on that number, fine. I will disagree, we will vote, pass it, and we'll move on. Of course, the Senate didn't agree with that number. The Senate passed another number. Here we are today.

What's happened? The last week or so, you have heard pretty much every Democrat, pretty much every Democrat say we want to vote on the clean CR, the continuing resolution, that the Senate passed. The average American has no clue what we're talking about. Here's what they passed. They passed a budget that would allow the spending of $986 billion. To me, if you're going to talk about a compromise—sequester allows a little over a trillion. Republicans want $967 billion. The compromise is here, a little over a trillion dollars. That would be a compromise on a compromise. But, no, the Senate says not $986 billion. That's a compromise on a compromise on a compromise. What did the Republican House leaders say? No. $967 billion, our number. By the way, no health care.

For those of you who thought Democrats haven't been compromising, I'm here to tell you, in my opinion, not only have we compromised; I think we have compromised too much from my philosophical viewpoint. I know that I'm the minority view in this House. So be it. I think the sequester was too much. I certainly think $967 billion is too much, and I think $986 billion is too much. You know why? My constituents want senior housing, they want children fed, they want young people educated, and on and on and on. They want veterans benefits. They want all the things that we do. Of course no one wants to pay for that. I get that. I don't either. I pay taxes. I wish everything was free. I'm going out to dinner in a little while, hopefully to watch the Red Sox win the series, and I don't want to pay for dinner, but I guess I'll have to.

Reasonable differences of opinion, no matter how dramatic they may be, a $100 billion difference, are realistic, they're honest, and the American people have a right to take sides. They don't have a right to say Democrats haven't compromised. This was a compromise. This would have been a compromise. This is a compromise. This is not. This is uncompromising. That's why I wanted to come up here.

By the way, there's one little point of historic note. I've been in the House 14½ years. This is my first Special Order. And, as I said, I probably missed the first inning of the Red Sox game, which in my district is close to a cardinal sin. But this is more important.

I'm not trying to convince anyone that my side is right or the other side is wrong. People have their opinions. I know that. You're probably not going to change them. I am here to say that there is a difference between compromise and capitulation. We have compromised one, two, three times to get where we are. To get to this number would be the fourth. To get rid of health care would be fifth; and not just fifth, it would be the ending. As far as I'm concerned, this Democrat will not compromise further on these issues. It's time for the other side to compromise off of what they think the world should be.

Thank you for yielding, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CAPUANO, thank you so very much. I think it's a

tragedy you've waited 14½ years to be so eloquent in explaining how we got to where we are and the fact that the Democrats have consistently cooperated, compromised, and watched those critical programs that we care so very much about being consistently hacked away at and reduced and, in many cases, all but eliminated.

Now, we are in the eighth day of the shutdown of the United States Government that used to be thought of as the most powerful democracy in the world. At the moment, it's a democracy that's not working. As pointed out by my colleagues, there was an election last November in which these issues were all fundamental in that debate, and the American people voted to fully enforce the Affordable Care Act and to provide the services, whether they're education, transportation, health care, and the rest. Here we are, the minority party in this House and actually a minority of that minority party, driving an agenda that is anathema to those things that I believe we need to do and completely contrary to last November's election.

I would like now to call upon Mr. RYAN of Ohio, a gentleman who often joins us on these evening discussions. We'd like to talk about jobs, and we'd like to talk about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. We know that can only be done when the United States Government is operating.

I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate my colleagues' words here tonight. There's not a whole lot left to cover, whether it was the gentleman from Pittsburgh or the gentleman from Paterson or the gentleman from East Hartford or the gentleman from Somerville in the Boston area, and also the gentleman from upstate New York. We've seen them cover many of the issues here. They've been broken down. I would just like to maybe touch on a point or two.

A lot of Members have come to this floor. On all the TV shows they talk a lot about, We've got to pay our bills, we've got to pay our bills. I think everybody here agrees that we've got to pay our bills. It's important for us to remember the bills that were racked up that we have to go out and pay, those appropriation bills, off-budget many times, were to fund two wars. They went right on Uncle Sam's credit card, both of them. They were not paid for, and many of our colleagues on the other side never came to this floor and said, Oh my, God, how are we going to pay for all of this?

Economist after economist would come back and say this is going to be maybe $100 billion, $200 billion, $300 billion, $400 billion, $500 billion today. If we factor in all the veterans that are coming back, these wars are going to be $2 trillion to $3 trillion to $4 trillion when it's all said and done. I don't remember being here watching a Member come up on the other side of the aisle, get in the well, and make an argument that we need to pay for these wars if we are going to go. There was not one.

Today, they want to talk about being responsible. They want to talk about us meeting our obligation. Now they want to say, Oh, yeah, we ran up those credit cards. We swiped them, and we kept swiping them. Then we doubled down. We need a surge. Let's double down. Let's run that credit card one more time. Now today they're saying, We're not going to pay the bills. We're going to default unless you repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then we'll have a conversation.

It's the height of irresponsibility.

Another thing that I find humorous is how over the past few years we've been lectured to by many members of the Tea Party about the Constitution of the United States and how they're the only Americans, this 20 percent, 25 percent, maybe 30 percent, are the only Americans who have read the Constitution, and they're the only ones who adhere to the Constitution. Yet when we talk about the political process that we need to work through, and as Mr. CAPUANO was just saying, you can have a reasonable position. If you don't like it, go to the ballot box and win the election. Yet those very same Members are now thumbing their noses at the political process that the Founding Fathers set up for us to adhere to.

We were here during the Iraq war. I was. I wasn't for it. I campaigned against it in my first campaign. Guess what? I didn't win. I didn't win the argument in 2002 and 2003. I didn't win it in 2004 or 2005. I came to this floor night after night after night. We finally won the House and Senate in 2006. We tried to stop the war. We didn't do it, but we took it to the people and we won the House and the Senate back. In 2007 and 2008, we took it back to the street, won the Presidency. Then, longer than any of us wanted, we finally started winding things down. We went through the political process. We didn't shut the government down. We didn't say we're going to default on the credit card bills that previous Congresses ran up, even though we disagreed with how they spent the money.

What's happening is radical. These are radical acts here in the House Chamber. To say we are here to negotiate, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, is ludicrous. It doesn't make any sense. Have the guts to go to the American people and make the argument. For the life of me, I can't figure out why you wouldn't let the Affordable Care Act get set up. If it's so awful, if it's so bad, set it up, and let it go. President Obama has his fingerprints all over it. The Democrats have their fingerprints all over it. If it fails, you'll win the Senate in 2014; and if it's so bad, you'll win the Presidency in 2016. You can then defund it, dismantle it, and put 30 million or 40 million people out of the health care system, make sure you can get denied health care for having a pre-existing condition and put the insurance companies between the doctor and the patient. Fine, you won the elections. You're perfectly capable of doing that.

Have the guts to go to the street and make the argument. Seventy percent of Americans are saying do not shut the government down to try to end the Affordable Care Act.

I will say what I think's happening here. I think the House leadership on the Republican side has Stockholm syndrome. I think they have started to identify themselves with their captors. The Tea Party has now convinced the leadership in the House of Representatives that they should have sympathy and empathy towards their captors, so the whole country at this point is being shut down because of this.

Lastly, let me say that the only successful moments in politics that our friends on the other side have had is when they divide the American people. Who's in a union; who's not in a union. Who's in a public sector union versus who's in a private sector union. Who's black; who's white. Who's gay; who's straight. Divide, divide, divide, divide; and here we are in 2013 a divided Nation that is ungovernable at this point because of the power that is held by the Tea Party in the United States House of Representatives.

I just want to say that there is a future waiting to be taken for this country, investments back in the United States into our infrastructure, into our research, into renewable energies, into expanding the grid and making it smarter, and into making sure everyone has access to the latest technologies such as three dimensional printers in schools, robotics, Legos. Get kids excited about learning.

We only have 313 million people in the United States. We're competing against 1.4 billion people in China, and we're sitting on our hands. We're not making the investments we need to be making, and there are colleges and universities and schools that need the investment. Every day that goes by, Mr. GARAMENDI, we see one more, two more, five more, 10 more situations where investments were made collectively by the public to benefit our country.

We need to end this lockout that's happening right now.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2100

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, thank you so much for bringing us just some sense of reality of what is actually happening here.

We're in the eighth day of the lockout. We're in the eighth day of the shutdown of the government of the United States of America. And it appears, from all that we hear from the Republican side, that this may go right up to the debt limit. What a tragedy it would be if we hit that and took down the entire economy.

I think it's time for me to close. I want to thank my colleagues. I would

ask the American people to pay attention.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us vote. Speaker BOEHNER, let us vote on a clean continuing resolution so that we can, once again, start this government. The votes are here. And if you don't believe the votes are here, put us up on the board. Let's see if there are 217 votes to reopen the American Government. We can only find out, Mr. Speaker, if you let us vote.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I am exceptionally privileged to be here on the House floor of the United States Congress this evening to speak on behalf of my constituents and in front of the Nation. It is an honor that few people realize, and it's worthy of mention.

I just want to also thank the fine gentlemen and ladies from the other side that were here this evening. I appreciate your impassioned pleas. That's what this place is all about. I might disagree with many of them, but I appreciate your passion and your willingness to serve.

I just want to talk about a couple of things and, at least from my side, Mr. Speaker, set the record, or at least kind of balance the record—maybe not set it straight in some people's minds because I'm sure some folks will disagree. But when the one gentleman said that he opposed the Iraq war and folks were here paying for it with a credit card and he was opposed to that, well, I wasn't here. So I can't really atone for the sins of the past, and there's a good chance that I would disagree with many of them, but one of the reasons I wasn't here was because I was in Iraq at that time.

And even though I think it is morally wrong to have spent this Nation into such debt over those conflicts, when you are attacked, you must respond, number one; and, number two, I think it kind of belies the fact that the current administration has nearly doubled that spending in half the time. So with all due respect, I think it's fair just to point that out.

And regarding another gentleman who talked about the interest of the other side to negotiate and agree to a compromise and to compromise, in looking at the numbers, the sequester came from the President of the United States out of another supercommittee that was created, and the President demanded the sequester, demanded the number. So this Congress has given it to him, and this Congress has held that number. It was demanded out of that negotiation. So by saying that they've compromised, they haven't compromised on anything. That's where we all agreed to be at the end of that negotiation.

Now, there's been a lot of impassioned talk and yelling and wailing, and I don't really think that's helpful to the narrative here. We're all going to have to work together at some point and figure this thing out, and blaming one side or the other side, I just don't know where that really gets us.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the facts. And these aren't my facts; they're not SCOTT PERRY's facts. I've got The Washington Post here, because some people say this is unprecedented, it's never happened before, and only one party does this.

Well, there was a shutdown in 1976. Gerald Ford was the President. The Democrats held both Houses. It was ended by all sides coming together and working towards a continuing resolution.

The next one was in 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats held both Houses. Amazingly, it was resolved by both sides coming together and working on a Medicaid ban.

Then there was the shutdown of 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats were in charge of both Houses. They signed a temporary bill because they came together and worked something out. The 1977 shutdown under Jimmy Carter, Democrats were in charge, and they were doing what they thought they needed to do. They're elected by their people to do the work of this House, but they came together after 8 days and they resolved it.

The next one, 1978. Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats controlled both Houses. Eighteen days—eighteen days—but they resolved it after they got together. The President, the Senate, and the House, they got together.

1979, Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats were in charge of both Houses. Eleven days. What resolved it? They got together and they talked. Nothing happens here, and nothing will happen here, if we're not going to be willing to be civil with one another and get together and talk.

1981, Ronald Reagan was the President. The Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. After 2 days, they resolved it. Again, Reagan came down and signed a bill extending the current spending limit.

And then again, in September of '82, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans held the Senate. Democrats held the House. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. But they resolved it in just 1 day because they got together. Both of them were out that evening having fundraisers, both parties. They let the government shut down, but they got together and moved beyond it.

1982, Tip O'Neill again the Speaker. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. Ronald Reagan was President. Over the MX missile, they shut it down, but they figured out a way to get past it because they negotiated.

And for 3 days in 1983, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats, with Tip O'Neill Speaker. And they resolved it, again, over about a $100 million discrepancy.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. Over a Supreme Court ruling, they shut it down, but they resolved it after all sides came together and negotiated.

This is from not a right-wing paper in town here. These are not my facts.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. And they shut it down again, but they opened it back up.

The 13th one happened in 1986 under President Reagan. Republicans controlled the Senate, Bob Dole. Democrats in the House by Tip O'Neill. And they resolved it by getting together—each side gave up some of their demands—and they expanded welfare in return for the appropriations necessary to reopen the government.

Ronald Reagan, in 1987, was the President. Democrats were in control of both Houses. And again, they found a way to get together on the fairness doctrine.

In 1990, George H.W. Bush was the President. Democrats controlled both Houses. They figured it out and signed a continuing resolution and reduced the deficit.

And then the 16th time, Clinton was the President and Gingrich was the Speaker of the House. The Senate was controlled by Republicans and so was the House. But even then, they worked it out. Even then, they worked it out. When both Houses of Congress were against the President, Mr. Speaker, they found a way to work it out.

And then for 21 days in 1995, with Clinton as the President and the House was controlled by Republicans and the Senate was controlled by Republicans, again, what resolved it? They worked it out. They got together, and they worked it out.

So let's go to the debt limit, because we've also heard this is a historic time, it's unprecedented, it's never happened before, Mr. Speaker.

So 1970 is where we found out the practice of attaching nongermane provisions to the debt limit began in earnest. In 1971, Social Security changes; 1972, the spending cap and impoundment of powers on the proposal to increase the debt limit.

And I'm just skipping because there's a pile of them here.

In 1980, Congress repealed an oil import fee. President Carter vetoed the bill. Both Houses of Congress were Democrat and President Carter was a Democrat. But he vetoed it, and they

overrode the veto by wide majorities, but they worked it out. They worked it out.

1985, 1990, 1993, 1996, 1997, 2010, 2011, 2012. The debt limit is the appropriate place in this divided government to find some fiscal sanity, and that's what's happening here right now in this town.

Now, of course, like I said, I don't want to get into the blame game here. I'm really going to try to stay out of it. Whether we agree with ObamaCare or not is not the issue. It might be a great law. And there are other laws that some people think are great laws or are not great laws. The question really should be and really is: Can we afford it? Can we afford it?

We are running a trillion-dollar deficit every single year. We take in $1 trillion less than we spend. So if you are a household that brings in $100,000, you are spending $25,000 more every single year as a ratio more than you bring in. I ask the American people, Mr. Speaker, how long can this be sustained?

So even if we agree that it's a good law—and many of us don't. That's fair. But even if we agree that it's a good law, how are we going to pay for it? That's the question.

Now Congress' job in this House and this Senate is to craft legislation and to determine our spending priorities and our spending levels. That's our job. The other gentleman said, We haven't read the Constitution or—it's in the Constitution. It's very simple. That is our job.

With all due respect to the President, I've got to tell you, it does not help. Again, we are going to have to work together. It's for the sake of our Nation. It does not help to be lectured to about what we must do here, according to the President, when it's exactly what he would not do and did not do when he served in this building. It does not help.

Now, our constituents elected us. The citizens of our districts elected us. They elected us to come here and do something, to do something. And we keep on hearing from the other side, Just pass a clean CR. Just pass it and everything will be fine.

I came here to do something. We are spending $1 trillion more than we bring in every single year. We are $17 trillion in debt. The bill that's being implemented, the law that's being implemented right now is going to cost us $2 trillion or $3 trillion. We don't know. And the President, I understand—I'm not sure of the number—is going to ask in a week to raise the debt ceiling another $900 billion. So that is $100 billion short of $1 trillion, which are still all numbers that are staggering to my mind.

So if we add that up, okay, so at the minimum, we're at $20 trillion, and that doesn't include Social Security and all the other obligations that we have. And the clean CR that we're being beseeched to just vote on so everything will be fine says, That's okay, just keep going. Don't change a thing. Everything's fine. Nothing to see here.

Everything's not fine. The constituents that elected me had three concerns when I ran, and I hear about them every single day at the grocery store, at the gas station, on my telephones, in email, and in the letters they send to me. Do something about this debt. Do something about this deficit. Do something about this spending. Do something about ObamaCare. That's what they send to me. That's what they tell me.

Maybe the world doesn't understand where this is going to end, but a lot of us do. When our dollar isn't worth anything, when we have to take a wheelbarrow of dollars to the grocery store to buy just what we need to survive, that's where it will end. We don't have to go there. We are choosing to go there. And it doesn't have to be that way.

Another one of the gentlemen said, Well, we need to move on so we can make investments, investments in education, investments in infrastructure. And he's right. The world is leaving us behind. He's right. But we only have so much money. So we have to prioritize, Mr. Speaker. We must prioritize. And that's what this is about. We said, We've only got so much; and if you want to spend a bunch more on education and on infrastructure so we can compete, then you are not going to have as much money to spend on some other things.

□ 2115

But nobody wants to make that distinction. Nobody wants to choose in this place.

Some of us, reluctantly, because it's unpleasant, but reluctantly we know it is your duty and so we are forced to choose, and we are ready to choose. I say it's doing nothing because passing a clean CR will do nothing to fix our $17 trillion debt and our $1 trillion annual deficits. It will do nothing.

So I will go home to my constituents, to the people that elected me, and they'll say, What did you get accomplished? And I will say nothing?

I won't say nothing. No, I will say I tried. I might fail. I might fail, but I'm not going down on my knees, Mr. Speaker. I'm going down, if I go down, I'll go down fighting, because I can't do nothing.

I don't want to see a government shutdown. Nobody in this place wants to see it. It's not good for this side, it's not good for that side, it's not good for the American people. It is not good. We acknowledge that.

But why should anyone believe the concerns about debt and deficit will be discussed when they haven't been discussed in the 5 years?

And to be clear and to be honest, they haven't been discussed really ever. Republicans, Democrats, nobody wants to touch it.

I've got a mother on Social Security, Medicare. I don't want to see her out on the street. I will take care of my mother. That's what we do in our family. We will not let that happen.

But some people don't have that option. I don't want to see it go bankrupt. But right now, Social Security Disability, that portion of Social Security, the last report I saw, will be bankrupt in a year and a half. In a year and a half.

Social Security, 10, 15 years behind it. Medicare, Medicaid, bankrupting our Nation. And we're doing nothing. We're doing nothing.

We can't do nothing. And so we must discuss it. We must get to the issue.

So we can't agree to this thing where the other side says, just pass it. Let us spend as much as we want to, and we promise you that we'll come to the negotiation table and talk to you about the things that are important to you.

With all due respect, they haven't been important enough in the last 5 years or the last 20 years; and so we have no reason to believe, I have no reason to believe that they will.

And those who say that one side is doing this for partisan reasons, for political gain, I ask, what political gain?

What is the upside?

What is the upside for me, any of us?

There is none. The Representatives in this body who disagree with passing a clean CR are putting themselves at peril for love of country and love of the future.

I've got two little girls, two little girls that I'm desperate to have the same opportunities that I had. When I grew up, our house didn't have electricity. We didn't have running water. My parents were often unemployed. Me and my brother ate some strange things just to eat because we didn't know any better. We did okay. And we made a life for ourselves, but we had an opportunity in America.

But that opportunity is going to slip away from us because of the way we are handling our fiscal house.

Look at what will happen if we continue without adjusting course. I would argue that the first people that would lose their jobs under this situation are government workers.

When we can no longer borrow from the Chinese, when we can no longer borrow from ourselves, Social Security, the Social Security trust fund, part of that $900 billion that they're going to ask us to raise the debt ceiling so we continue to borrow is coming out of the Social Security trust fund. Who agrees with that?

I don't know one American that says that's okay. And somehow this is the only place in the world where it would be okay.

But government employees, just like in Greece, when they ran out of money, when they ran out finally, the first ones to go—not for a week, not for a couple of days, gone. The job is gone. You are no longer working. You have no job. There's nothing to come back to.

We don't have to do it. We don't have to. We can make a choice now. We're

saying turn the ship around on a dime. We're saying turn the wheel a little bit, just a little bit, and let's start heading to the course of correction.

But voting for a clean CR says just keep going, just keep going. Don't worry about the torpedos, don't worry about the iceberg, just keep going.

So just like in Cyprus, we'll come home to find out the banks under Federal control and Federal order will have removed the money from our savings account. They'll just do it. That's what they did in that country because they ended up where we're going.

Why would we do it?

Now, those who say they want a clean CR, they are patriots. I know that. They are hearing from their constituents. I've had constituents come in, crying, literally crying in my office, and we talked about the situation.

Those folks that want a vote on a clean CR, they are patriots too. They want to fix it; they just want to do it now.

But I would say that it is time to do the hard right because for too long the easy wrong has been done. I don't know when they want to do something, but I want to do it now because I don't think we can wait.

Now, we have offered our ideas and we have asked for their ideas. We have offered them. We understand and respect the other side disagrees with our solution.

We had four votes in this House before this government shut down, four bipartisan votes. People on both sides of the aisle voted four times for something.

But the Senate disagrees. The President disagrees. I respect they disagree. I respect that they don't like our solution. It is their prerogative, and maybe it's their duty.

All we're saying is okay, fine. You disagree. I get it.

What's your idea?

What's your solution?

The solution should not be nothing. The solution from them has been no. Now go about your business and come up with what we want.

It just seems like not negotiating—if I had a fight with my wife, if I had a dispute with my daughter, I never want to go to bed angry at my family, and I never want my family to go to bed angry with me. Before the day's done, we're going to sit down at the table, and we're going to talk about it.

We might go to bed a little sore with each other, but we love each other and we love this country, and so it's imperative that we stay with each other to work through it.

We understand and respect the other side. We understand that they don't want to do anything with ObamaCare, but ObamaCare adds $2 trillion to $3 trillion to our national debt. So if you don't want to do anything about that, fine. What do you want to do?

That's all I'm asking. That's all we're asking. What do you want to do?

Some say, well, you need to raise taxes. ObamaCare raised taxes; I think it was the largest tax increase in history.

Okay. So we did that. And that wasn't enough, so just last December, when I wasn't here, another $650 billion in taxes on an economy that's struggling to get through, 1 to 2 percent growth.

We're choosing this, and I don't think we have to.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we're taking in more tax revenue right now, right now, than ever before in history?

There's more money coming in now than ever before, and we're $1 trillion apart every year. I mean, how much more can we take?

Should we just take it all?

I mean, that's another form of government. It's been done. It doesn't work out real well.

Well, some will say, well, cut the military. Well, this place cut the military about $1.2 trillion over the last year and a half. And for me, the Constitution says provide, it uses that word, provide for the common defense, Mr. Speaker.

The line below it is promote the general welfare. Words mean things. We have a duty to provide for it.

Certainly, there are inefficiencies. I've been in the military. I've served, and I know they're there. And it's right to take a look. Everything needs to be on the table.

But how much more, and how much do we enfeeble ourselves and disable our ability to do our constitutional requirement, which is to protect the citizenry?

It is our requirement.

Now, we passed a bunch of bills in the House here; and, to tell the you truth, I kind of like it. We're moving towards the CR one piece at a time, so I don't have to vote for things that I don't think we should spend money on for the sake of the things that we must spend money on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not optimal, but it's a way to get there. But, like, for cancer research for kids, we passed that out of the House, and the leader of the Senate says, when asked, well, why won't you pass it? He says, well, why would we want to do that?

My goodness, why wouldn't we want to do that?

That's where we have consensus. We have some consensus.

And another gentleman questioned why Congress has the right to pick and choose what gets funded. Isn't it astounding that someone in the Senate doesn't understand that not only is it the right of Congress to do that, but it's our duty. That's what we're here to do. That's what we're supposed to do.

We have offered numerous ideas. The Senate says no. They don't say no—but. They just say no.

Refusing to negotiate is, to my mind, irresponsible. I mean, I don't know if they're here for themselves or the greater good of Nation when I hear reports—I don't know if they're true—but they're reported in the newspapers that the park rangers are told make it as difficult as possible.

And when I see the World War II Memorial, when I went out on the Mall this morning, the World War II Memorial barricaded up. It costs more money to close it than it does to leave it open.

I saw a cone out on one the streets with barricades all around the cone in the middle of the street. I mean, why are we renting barricades?

And on the Mall adjacent to the street that's closed because it's a Federal park area, there's an immigration rally that's being supported by the Park Police.

What's happening, Mr. Speaker?

The Grand Canyon, closed. I guess you can't walk up to the rim and look over. The State offered to pay the bill, and the Federal Government said, no, we don't want your money. We want to close it.

Is that reasonable?

I don't know. It's not reasonable to me.

It was The Washington Post that reported employees were to make it as inconvenient as possible.

Now, some are characterized around here as being extreme, an extreme faction. The four bills that we passed to avert the shutdown were passed by this side and that side together, four bipartisan bills.

And they say the House is being held hostage by a few Members. I don't know. Bipartisan votes on both sides seems less than extreme to me.

And I've got to ask, since when are Americans who want to see the government act within the constitutional bounds, that is, the House and the Senate, the Congress figuring out our spending level and our spending priority, when is that extreme?

Why is that extreme?

That's our job. That's the division of powers. That's the checks and balances. That's what we do. That's why we're here.

How is that extreme?

How is spending trillions of dollars more than you have now viewed as responsible?

How is talking about trying to save some money and be responsible with the taxpayers' money on our future, how is that seen as extreme?

Why is it okay to think that spending that money is okay and acceptable to most Americans?

Who gets away with that kind of behavior in their own households?

Well, you do, but not for very long, I guess.

With that I'd like to yield some time, if I could, to the fine gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania.

You were mentioning some of the things that the prior speakers, the Democrats, were saying. And one of the things that was said was, give us a vote, when, as my friend from Pennsylvania pointed out, there have been plenty of votes.

They also were saying that, talking about budget conferees. We're past the end of the fiscal year. The way it's supposed to work, we're supposed to have a budget very early in the year, and then after that, do the appropriations bills.

Well, the Senate has not been doing budgets in the past. This is the first time in years. They haven't done what the law required. They seem to ignore the law anytime they wish.

They have not been passing any appropriations bills. And that's a political game that allows Majority Leader HARRY REID to avoid following the law so that any potential vulnerable Democratic Senators will not have to take tough votes like people do in the House constantly, because we've appropriations bills and we continue to do that.

And so we know, since we passed the military pay bill that required that the military get paid, we treat military pay somewhat like we do Social Security pay, so that if the government were shut down, the military still gets paid. People in harm's way don't have to worry about family members getting their check.

So since my friend across the aisle was so upset about not having a vote, and I realize we get busy here and some people forget the things we've been voting on the last 10 days.

So I'd just like to remind my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that actually, we voted, after we passed a bill to pay our military; and as my friend, Mr. PERRY knows, the Democrats voted for it. The Senate voted for it. The President signed it.

And in the bill, as we spelled out, civilians were supposed to continue employment that were assisting the military. Contractors were supposed to continue working that were supporting the military; and yet this administration had chosen to try to make as many people suffer as possible, even though the law didn't require it.

So the Secretary of Defense sat on his hands for about a week, had civilian personnel not working that could have been working all this time; decides, after a week, to follow the advice, he says, of his people that had been looking at the bill.

And we made clear from the very beginning, before the shutdown even started, you don't have to send all these people home, but he did it anyway.

□ 2130

It was consistent with what has been mentioned that one of the park rangers said, though it was disgusting to the ranger, We were told make things as difficult for people as we can.

And people keep saying we were demanding the total repeal of ObamaCare. Well, we know that would be best for America because a lot of people are already suffering. We've already seen ObamaCare is not being followed as law because the President has had hundreds of exemptions that he has waved his hand, waved his magic wand and said, You don't have to follow this law; you don't have to follow this law. You don't have to follow what's here in this provision; you don't have to follow what's in this provision. And by the way, the business mandate in the law makes no exceptions. Business folks, my party still wants to get your contributions, so I will wave my wand and you don't follow the law.

So when me friends across the aisle say, Just let ObamaCare go, I would say the same thing. You let ObamaCare go, if the President will, if HARRY REID will. If you just let it be enforced exactly the way it is, it won't last a month.

But he has had to do so many waivers, and it will continue. So it's not going into law. In fact, the Supreme Court had to rewrite it just to uphold it. Because they already said that the basis for the law that was given, the interstate commerce clause, was not a basis to take over health care in America. So they struck it down under the law as written; and the law, as written, said there was a penalty.

Well, the Supreme Court said at page 15 that it's a penalty, and therefore the anti-injunction act does not apply. Therefore, we do have jurisdiction, and so now that we have jurisdiction, we'll go ahead and decide it's not constitutional the way it's written as a penalty, but we will rewrite it, the five of us in the majority, and call it a tax. And then we'll uphold it as a tax, even though clearly that's not the way it was written.

It's not what the President promised the American people. So much for the Democrats wanting ObamaCare to be followed as it was written. We're way beyond that with all the waivers and exemptions.

But then we had a vote that said, Okay, let's just suspend it for a year because everybody knows ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Clearly. That's why the President had to give business a 1-year exemption, where we just won't follow the law as it's applied to business.

But then, after the Senate refused to even take that up, we did the most reasonable thing that some said they could imagine and that is, Okay, you just waved off the mandatory requirements for business. So if you're going to magically wave off part of the law that's mandatory, then let's agree to do that for everyone, like the person that's making $15,000, or 133 percent of the poverty level. A year or so ago, we were told that was $14,000 something. Now it's $15,000. But even with subsidies, you're probably going to end up paying a few thousand dollar. Somebody making $15,000 is going to have a few thousands over their subsidies? And if you don't do that, you're going to pay the $95, or 1 percent of your income, as an extra tax?

People do not have that extra money. People have been sent from full time to part time. When the union members figured out what the union leaders had done to them, causing many of them to lose full time and going to part-time employment, many of them losing their great health insurance and now they'll have to go under the ObamaCare exchanges, like Members of Congress, they got upset. All of a sudden, the leaders of the unions said, Gee, look at all the unintended consequences.

We knew there were intended consequences. We talked about them at the time.

So that was something that was passed. Just waive the individual mandate for a year. That was not taken up by the Senate. So then we passed what, to me, seemed like a capitulation. We appointed negotiators and said, Okay, you don't like any of those proposals, Mr. Majority Leader HARRY REID, then this is what adults do: we appoint negotiators, and we can probably have a deal done by morning before anybody realizes there's even been a shutdown at midnight.

But Majority Leader REID, following the lead of our President, made clear that they were going to follow the conventional wisdom of the last few years that if there's a shutdown, the mainstream media will clearly blame Republicans, and maybe that will help us politically. So he even refused to negotiate.

So once we saw that HARRY REID had completely refused to even negotiate, pretty reasonable folks that were appointed by Speaker BOEHNER, the majority leader says, We're not going to do that.

It's possible they could have slept through it. Maybe I was given a speech and my Democratic friends dozed off and didn't know we had all these votes. So if they happened to be sleeping while we had these votes, I would like to remind people that then we had a bill that we voted on to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. We know the District of Columbia has a lot of money of its own that comes in.

Frankly, I was shocked that our friends across the aisle—most of them—voted against allowing the District of Columbia to just move forward with its own money so that it could run the operations of the city. Apparently, they wanted to inflict as much harm as possible so that people would continue to blame the Republicans.

We know the mainstream media has long since quit being objective. Twenty-one stories from the mainstream media at first all unanimously blamed Republicans failing to report that HARRY REID would not even appoint negotiators to work something out quickly.

And then we passed the Open Our National Parks and Museums Act. It would have made sure that all of these places that have been shut down by this administration in the most hurtful, harmful, punitive way possible, trying to get everybody in America

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 restful 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 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:

H.R. 3233. To extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported that on October 7, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3095. To ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 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:

3251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9398-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3252. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Styrene, Copolymers with Acrylic Acid and/or Methacrylic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0381; FRL-9396-9] received September 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3253. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tuba City, AZ [Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0147; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3254. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TX, and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TSTC-Waco Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0136; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3255. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, Rickenbacker International Airport, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0270; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3256. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Grand Forks AFB, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0261; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3257. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Spata, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0165; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3258. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; San Marcos, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0273; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-9] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3259. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bedford, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0359; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-7] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3260. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Factoryville, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0345; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-6] 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. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 373. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–243). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3273. A bill to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; to the Committees on Rules and Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to make appropriations available to continue the payment of a death gratuity and certain other death-related compensation in the event of the death of members of the Armed Forces and certain other persons who pass away during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that the allowances of members of the Armed Forces covered by such Act include military tuition assistance programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3276. A bill to prohibit the operation of an exercise facility for Members of the House of Representatives during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BARR):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Environmental Protection Agency should hold

public listening sessions on regulations targeting carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants in those States most directly impacted by the potential regulations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 374. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to file, sign, and call up discharge petitions; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3273.

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

Clause 2, Section 5, Article I of the Constitution (Permitting each House to determine the Rules of its Proceedings).

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 3274.

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

Article 1, Section 8, To raise and support armies

Article 1, Section 8, To provide and maintain a navy

By Mrs. BLACKBURN

H.R. 3275.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3276.

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

Article I: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89.

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 Defence 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 Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90.

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 Defence 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 Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 91.

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 Defence 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 75: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 269: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 366: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 580: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 647: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 713: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 724: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 725: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 784: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 846: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 920: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1005: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1010: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1039: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1074: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1293: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1295: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1553: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1652: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1726: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1734: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1750: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1755: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1830: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1971: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2020: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2199: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2208: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2224: Mr. HIMES and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2305: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2376: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2429: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2500: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2510: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2547: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2643: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2682: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2697: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2725: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2734: Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2767: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2870: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2920: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2974: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2999: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3043: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3108: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3111: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3112: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3116: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HARPER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3133: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3134: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3142: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3160: Mr. DAINES and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3207: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. FOSTER.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 147: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 153: Mr. RADEL.

H. Res. 227: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 231: Mr. HIMES and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 281: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. RADEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 3273 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 89, the Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013 No. 139

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God, we praise You that although we have merely a feeble hold on You, You have a mighty grasp on us. Use Your mighty hands to lead our lawmakers to Your desired destination, making them instruments of truth and justice. May the tirades of majorities and minorities be equally impotent to sway our lawmakers from doing what is best for America. May our Senators' daily choice be characterized by ethical congruence as they strive to match their words with deeds.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 today. During that period of time Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The Senate will then recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now entering the second week of a Republican government shutdown. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is still sitting on the one bill that can reopen the government. Speaker BOEHNER insists the Senate-passed bill to end the shutdown can't pass the House. Well, I am not the first to issue this challenge—it has been issued all weekend and yesterday—and that is, prove it. Bring it up for a vote. If the Speaker really believes the bill will not pass, he shouldn't be worried about bringing it up.

The House, though, if we look at what has happened, has wasted weeks voting—and I have really lost track of the number of times, but I think it is 44 times—the House alone has acted to repeal ObamaCare 44 times. What is the result every time they vote? The same. Truly what Einstein said: The real definition of ''insanity'' is someone who keeps doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. If, in fact, Einstein is right, then that is insanity, what is going on over there—to vote more than 40 times on the same thing and lose every time. So let's talk about wasting time. Has that been a waste of time? Maybe after 5 or 6 times they should have maybe gotten the message, but how about 44 times? Talk about wasting time.

Could it be that the Speaker is really worried that reasonable Republicans will join Democrats to pass legislation to open the government? Sensible Republicans have grown increasingly fed up with the shutdown, and they are looking for a way out. Just yesterday PETER KING of New York, a Republican, said:

Republicans should not have started this. Closing the government down was the wrong thing to do.

Republican Congressman KING called Speaker BOEHNER's unreasonable strategy to shut down the government unless Democrats agree to defund or end ObamaCare—a law that will help 25 million uninsured Americans gain access to affordable care—doomed to failure. That is what PETER KING said.

Again quoting Congressman KING:

If we want to defund something, we should repeal it, and do it the same way the President got it signed—elect Republicans to both Houses of Congress, repeal it, and have a Republican President sign it.

Mr. President, it is pretty obvious what is going on. I have known it all the time. We have all known it all the time. When I say ''all the time,'' at least in these last many months. But it was made very clear to the world on Sunday in a front-page story in the New York Times. They worked a while on that story, but basically what the story said is that very rich people in America who don't believe in government have used ObamaCare as a conduit to shut down the government. That is what they wanted to do. That is what they have done, with huge amounts of money. We know this has been led by, according to the news article, a former Attorney General of the United States, Ed Meese, and the Koch brothers, who have been raising and spending hundreds of millions of dollars to get us where we are right now.

But what PETER KING suggested is that we follow the democratic process. That has been turned on its head. I know Republicans don't like ObamaCare, but the Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land for 4 years, been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, and millions of Americans—multimillions of Americans—are already benefiting from this law.

There are rumors floating around. One of my rich friends from Nevada called me on Friday. He said: HARRY, I am down here in southern California getting a little cosmetic surgery. My anesthesiologist told me one of his friends, who is a general surgeon, took somebody's gallbladder out. Do you know how much money he got back for that?

I don't know if it was a he or a she.

I said: No, I don't know.

He said: Fifty-eight dollars. That is what ObamaCare is all about.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

I said: That is not possible because ObamaCare, that aspect of it, doesn't kick in until January 1.

He said: Are you sure you are right?

I said: Yes. All this signing up for exchanges and all that will take 3 months.

These are the rumors floating around out there about ObamaCare.

If Republicans want to propose a legislative way to make the law work better or more efficiently, PETER KING is right. We are willing to do that and do it the way our democratic process provides.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

I see the Senator from Massachusetts has taken the Chair, and he served many years with PETER KING. I personally have watched his voting record. I don't like most of it, but at least he is speaking out, and I admire the man for doing that. By shutting down the government—and that is what has happened—we are satisfying the Koch brothers and Ed Meese, but millions of people in America are suffering.

ObamaCare is not going to disappear. It is here. The senior Senator from Arizona gave a speech here within the last week or so, and he said: I don't like ObamaCare. I campaigned against ObamaCare when I ran for President. I campaigned against it when Obama ran the next time. But, he said, we lost. It passed. He is President. Elections have consequences.

That is what the senior Senator from Arizona said, and he is right.

ObamaCare is not going to magically disappear.

Tom Friedman, a renowned journalist—his bipartisanship has been legendary. He is a brilliant writer. He was chief correspondent for the New York Times for many years in the Middle East. He has covered all parts of the world. He has won three Pulitzer prizes—maybe four—and he has had five or six best-selling books. But even Tom Friedman has given up trying to be bipartisan. He wrote in the New York Times, where he writes a column 3 days a week, that ObamaCare is not really at stake in this shutdown, it is democracy that is at stake.

Here is exactly what he said:

> When extremists feel that insulated from playing by the traditional rules of our system, if we do not defend those rules—namely majority rule and the fact that if you don't like a policy passed by Congress, signed by the president and affirmed by the Supreme Court, then you have to go out and win an election to overturn it; you can't just put a fiscal gun to the country's head—then our democracy is imperiled.

He went on to say more:

> President Obama is not defending health care. He's defending the health of our democracy. Every American who cherishes that should stand with him.

Mr. President, that is as true as anything could be. We stand with our President. We stand with a President who is President of everyone in America.

We believe deeply that ObamaCare is already saving lives and will save many more in the future, but we are willing to work with Republicans to change it if they think they can make it better. We want to do that.

I wrote a letter 1 week ago today to the Speaker of the House of Representatives—and he knows this—where I said: You know, we are in this position because you asked me to put you in this position to do this.

He said, going back as far as July and confirmed in the early part of September, I—the Speaker of the House of Representatives—want to have a clean CR, and the way we can do that is you agree to our number. He said this in July and early September.

I said: I hate your number. It is unfair. We passed a budget here—$70 billion more than that.

He said: But we have to avoid problems here. We can't have a government shutdown. Work with me, take that number, and we will have a clean CR and go on to other things.

I did that. It was hard. Senator MIKULSKI, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, hated it, and Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee, hated it, but then they said: OK, we will go ahead and do it. We will work with you to help talk to the caucus.

We did that based on the assurances of the Speaker of the House of Representatives that we would get this out of the way in order to fund the government for 1 year. Well, he didn't live up to what he committed to doing. In our business that is not good.

In addition to that I said in the letter: OK, you have sent us a little piece of legislation over here saying you want to have a conference. We agree. We will talk to you about anything you want to talk about. You want to talk about discretionary spending, you want to talk about the farm bill, you want to talk about postal reform, you want to talk about health care, we will talk, but open the government and extend the debt ceiling.

He read the letter. I called him 45 minutes later. He said: No, can't do that.

He can't take yes for an answer on the number in the CR or what he wants to talk about. I don't know what else is left to talk about.

All we are asking is that government be reopened. Stop threatening a catastrophic default on the Nation's bills. We have to pay our bills. What kind of a country do we want?

As I do every 2 weeks, I met yesterday with someone who briefs me on what is going on around the world with our intelligence services. This person told me his counterpart from a relatively small European country is making fun of our country because of what is going on here. In today's press China is complaining. They are doing pretty well economically. They buy our securities and they need a place to invest their money that is secure. China is now complaining about the fiscal integrity of the United States of America because we are arriving at a point in a few days where we are not going to pay our bills.

This is America. We are not asking the Speaker to do something that is unreasonable. We want him to pass a bill that has his number in it, not ours. Ours is $70 billion higher than that. We are also not asking him to do anything unreasonable. He asked us to go to conference. We say let's do it. All we want is the government open first, and we will agree to conference.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the distinguished President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was there, and I saw how hard the Senator worked to pass a continuing resolution—as a number of the Republican leadership of the House had asked and based on their assurances that we would use it.

I would ask my friend, the majority leader, is that sort of a classic bait-and-switch operation? If it is, I can think of another one where they asked us to pass a budget. Senator MURRAY led us in passing one where we finished the last vote at 5:30 or 6:00 on a Saturday morning, having gone around the clock. Then we wanted to go to conference after the Republicans demanded we pass one, and they then refused to let us go to conference with the Republican-led House. Is this bait and switch?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, through the Chair to my friend, the senior Senator from Vermont: We have a law in place. The Presiding Officer voted for it when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. We voted for it. There is a law that set spending levels for multiyear. We did that. It was part of a deal. It was a law that was passed. But in spite of us having passed a law that set the standards for 2 years, the Republicans kept coming to the floor many times saying Democrats need to pass a budget.

We didn't need to pass a budget. We already had those numbers in place. But after this haranguing that went on for so long, we said, OK, we want to get along. We don't want any problems. So Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Budget Committee, worked very hard to pass a budget, and we did that. Lo and behold, after the Republicans kept talking about regular order, we wanted to go to regular order, and they said: No, thanks. And she has been waiting 6 months. So the President pro tempore's description is absolutely true.

Let me close by saying all we ask is for the Speaker to be reasonable. If he brings his bill, his resolution, to the floor, it will pass. And then everyone has my commitment: Open the government, raise the debt ceiling, and we will talk about anything you want to talk about. We are not afraid to go to conference. We are happy to go to conference. That is what we used to do

here all the time. But we have a little problem: The Republicans won't let us go to conference. Maybe they will in this instance because that is what he said he wants.

So open the government and get back to the so-called conversation, as he talks about it. We will get back to the negotiating table and work out our budget disagreements. We can even start talking about ways to make the Affordable Care Act better—not worse, but better. We can get back to the business of legislating. That is what our job has always been and should be.

I would ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Vermont.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of our distinguished majority leader. He has probably the most frustrating job there is because he has continuously brought up and passed bills to get us out of this and reopen the government, and he is blocked by the Republican leadership in the other body.

Today marks the 8th day of this unnecessary government shutdown, more than 192 hours since the world saw the doors to the United States Government closed for this embarrassing and needless shutdown. While the Republicans in the House have the ability to end this shutdown right now—before noon today—they refuse to pass the clean continuing resolution approved by the Senate.

I have joined other Senators in coming to the floor to speak about the pervasive impact of the shutdown, and there isn't a single family in Vermont or in America—Republican, Democratic, or Independent—that this shutdown hasn't affected. All these families have been affected, but now we face cascading worsening effects to come the longer this senseless shutdown continues. I have joined the chorus of voices urging the relatively few in the House of Representatives holding up this process to put an end to this political act of destruction. It might allow them to send out bumper stickers and raise money from their supporters, but it is not helping the country.

If the human toll of the impact—if a Vermonter is not able to buy a home, or children turned away from potentially life-saving clinical trials, or the parents of our fallen soldiers who won't receive death benefits to pay for their funerals—and that is not an exaggeration. We have always had a program, when one of our soldiers dies overseas in combat, there are benefits established so the family can at least be there when the casket returns at Dover Air Force Base and to provide for the funeral. Even that is cut out. We send our soldiers to war. We tell them we are there to take care of their families if something happens. Now, because of a small group of tea party Republicans, we say we can't even take care of their families when they die in the service of the country. For shame if that happens.

If all of these examples don't motivate them to do the right thing, maybe I can speak their language for a moment and point to the fiscal cost of this Republican shutdown. The estimated cost per hour of the Republican shutdown—that the government remains shut down—is $12.5 million. That is $300 million a day wasted or nearly $1.6 billion per week. And what do the American people get for that? They get to watch fake budget conferences, staged photo ops, and the very Members shutting down the government and running to every single TV camera they can find. Over the last 8 days we have spent more than $2 billion for the government to not work, not function, and not serve the American people.

Can you imagine the actual good that could have been done with that $2 billion that was just wasted? And that figure only covers the cost of work and services the government can't perform because 800,000 Federal workers are furloughed. It doesn't take into account the ripple effects throughout our overall economy.

Where are the deficit hawks who claim we don't have enough money to provide SNAP benefits to hungry Americans in the farm bill? Where are the Members who shamefully held up disaster relief after Tropical Storm Irene and Hurricane Sandy, while insisting that spending be offset? Surely, they would want to put a stop to the shutdown to end this wasteful government spending. Yet here we are, waiting for the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to pass the clean continuing resolution and put an end to this shutdown.

Instead of passing a clean Senate-passed continuing resolution pending in the House—based on budget levels that, as the leader pointed out, Republicans themselves wanted—the proposals being offered by House Republicans would actually expand the deficit.

First, the House proposed we repeal the Affordable Care Act because of claims it is harmful to our economy. But if we repeal it, we would actually accelerate the health care cost spiral and boost the Federal deficit by $109 billion. They don't tell people they are voting to add another $109 billion to our deficit. Then they suggest we repeal just a portion of the Affordable Care Act, but add $30 billion to the deficit for which they don't want any offsets. Where were the Members in the House who attacked appropriations bills and insisted on cuts to funding for law enforcement officers, disaster preparedness, and medical research? Where were the Members who insisted the devastating costs of sequestration must remain in place because we simply can't afford to spend and must reduce the deficit, no matter what it does to law enforcement or medical research or disaster preparedness?

They ditched their principles, and now they have forced a government shutdown which is costing more than if we had stayed open because of the money wasted. It appears the only time the House is willing to compromise is when it comes to adding to the deficit in order to prevent access to affordable health insurance for millions of Americans.

We are here right now because the Republican leadership in the House refuses to act. They could end the shutdown right now and make this the last day we spend $300 million on nothing. Yet there is this faction within the majority of the House that has now brought the government of the United States to a halt, wasting hundreds of millions of dollars each day, day after day, and they will not relent. They talk about the Affordable Care Act, which, if we have children in college, allows them to be on our insurance policy. They want to do away with that, but they don't have any alternative. The Affordable Care Act allows a member of your family with a preexisting health condition—heart, cancer, whatever—to get insurance. They want to do away with that. They have no plan of their own.

I want to get back to work for Vermonters. I want help for the Vermont company who can't start their new business because the certificate is sitting on a desk at the Department of Treasury's Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau but nobody is there to sign it—I want pregnant Vermonters and new moms going without meals and whose babies are going to go hungry because they are unable to get healthy food and baby formula without the WIC benefits they are supposed to have access to—I want to see them fed. I want to see our farmers have the ability to continue to work as they do every single day and know the farm bill has been passed.

Let's stop the sloganeering here. Let's stop rushing to the TV cameras. Let's actually do what is best for America. Wouldn't that be a wonderful step in the right direction?

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for

the quorum call be rescinded and I be allowed to speak for up to 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are in the eighth day of a completely unnecessary partial government shutdown. Last week there was an official at the White House who said they were winning the shutdown debate and they were not concerned about how long the shutdown lasts. Well, there may be Democrats and folks at the White House who are content with the current situation, but Republicans remain focused on finding a solution to reopen the government.

The Republicans have offered multiple solutions to fund the government and will continue to work to find common ground while providing ObamaCare relief for middle-class Americans. Middle-class Americans deserve the same relief from ObamaCare the Democrats have already given themselves and big business. Senate Democrats even had the opportunity to give the same 1-year relief from ObamaCare to their constituents that President Obama has already given to big business.

We believe this is an issue of basic fairness. We believe this law should be delayed—not just for big businesses and not just for the favored constituencies but for all Americans because of the harmful impact it is having.

In fact, there is bipartisan support for giving individuals and families relief. A colleague of ours on the other side of the aisle—a Senate Democrat—recently said a delay for individuals would be very reasonable and sensible. There have been a number of votes in the House where Democrats have voted with Republicans in support of providing that delay to middle-class Americans.

With regard to where we are right now, we have a near-term issue and we have a slightly longer term issue. The near-term issue has an awful lot of folks increasingly concerned about the impact the government shutdown is having on people across this country. The House of Representatives has passed nine bills that have been sent to the Senate which are sitting here at the desk that would provide funding for some of these programs and services which impact people across this country that could be picked up today and passed by unanimous consent. And, by the way, many of those have passed with bipartisan support.

As recently as Saturday the House passed a bill that would provide back pay for Federal workers. There were 189 Democrats in the House of Representatives who voted in support of that bill. There have been up to 57 Democrats in the House of Representatives who have voted to give pay to our National Guard and Reserve, the same thing we have done for our active-duty military. They have also voted to provide relief to our national parks so they can open again. They have voted to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health so that those lifesaving medicines can continue to be provided. They have voted to provide funding for FEMA so FEMA can respond to the natural disasters that are occurring across the country.

There are nine bills sitting at the desk of the Senate that could be picked up and passed today by unanimous consent. There wouldn't be a single Republican that I know of who would object to any of those measures being passed that would provide funding and relief in support of the services and programs which impact people across the country.

The House will pick up a couple of more bills today. They will do one that funds Head Start and will then send it over here, so that will be the tenth bill that will be sitting at the Senate. They will pass a bill that funds Impact Aid, something which is very important to the people I represent in South Dakota. That will be the 11th bill that will be sitting at the desk in the Senate awaiting action. As I said, they could all be passed by unanimous consent. There would not be a single Republican that I know of who would be opposed to any of those being moved forward.

It is not a question of addressing the funding concerns and making sure the programs and services which impact people across this country are being funded; that can be done. It has been done by the House, and those items have moved over here to the Senate. All that is necessary is for the majority leader to come over, pick them up, ask for unanimous consent to pass them, and those items would pass.

I see the near-term issue as being one that is very easy to solve, and all that it entails is for the leadership in the Senate to pick up those bills and pass them.

The other issue I mentioned that is a little bit longer term, but not much, because it is about 9 days away, is we are going to hit the debt limit, which means the United States of America will no longer have borrowing authority. We will hit up against the amount we are able to borrow on our credit card to fund the services of our government. There is a request obviously to increase the debt limit to allow the Federal Government to borrow more money. I have had private conversations with members of the administration's team. They said they would like to see a debt limit increase that would take us through the next election—through November of 2014. To do that we would be looking somewhere in the trillion-dollar range. It strikes me that—and I think it is something supported by the American people—if we are going to have a debate about increasing the debt limit, we ought to do something about the debt. I think that is a sensible position to take. By a 2-to-1 margin, polls show the American people believe if we are going to raise the debt limit, we ought to do something to fix and address the debt.

What we are simply saying is: Let's sit down and have a discussion about things we can do that will put us on a different and sustainable fiscal trajectory for this country that won't saddle future generations of Americans with massive amounts—trillions and trillions of dollars—of additional debt. That issue is looming out there and it is not very far away. We don't have a lot of time to deal with that. It is not, as I said, as immediate as the government shutdown, which can be addressed by the majority of the Senate. I think the debt limit is going to require both parties here in Congress and the President and his team to get together and figure out what it is we can do that would not only raise the debt limit—the amount we can borrow—but address the underlying fundamental problem, and that is the fact that we have a $17 trillion debt.

There has been a lot said about things that various Senators have said in the past on the floor and in the course of these various debates we have had about debt limit increases, and I wanted to point out that the President of the United States, President Obama, when he was here in 2006, said raising the debt limit is a failure of leadership. He said it is a failure of leadership and described it as unpatriotic. Unpatriotic—failure of leadership to raise the debt limit.

Now he is saying he wants a clean debt limit increase—no negotiation, period. No negotiation on the debt limit. Well, at the time when he said that raising the debt limit was a leadership failure, the total Federal debt was $8.3 trillion. Today it is $16.8 trillion, $16.9 trillion. So the Federal debt, literally, is double what it was when the current President said back in 2006, as a Member of this Chamber in the Senate, that raising the debt limit would be a failure of leadership. Now it is twice that amount. It was $8.3 trillion in 2006, and now we are going on $17 trillion.

It seems to me the President of the United States—who described raising the debt limit in 2006 when the debt was half of what it is today as a leadership failure—ought to be willing to exercise some leadership and engage himself in a process that would allow us to sit down and talk about what we can do to get this debt under control.

There is a series of spending reforms that have been put forward by many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle that would deal with the out-of-control spending, particularly on what we call the mandatory spending part of the budget, those entitlement programs that currently are on an unsustainable path. We would like to try and get that spending under control. There are a number of other things that have been proposed that, frankly, would be good for the economy.

One of the best ways to get our fiscal house in order is to get the economy growing and expanding at a faster rate. When the economy is growing and expanding, more people are working,

more people are investing, more people are paying taxes, and government revenues go up. When we have an economy growing at 3 to 4 percent instead of an economy growing at 1 to 2 percent, which is what we have today, the result is a dramatic increase in the amount of tax revenue that comes into the Federal Treasury.

When they are talking about raising the debt limit, we should look at what we can do in association with that discussion to actually reduce the debt. One would be to put spending reforms in place, and the other would be growing and expanding the economy.

One of the things that has been proposed that would grow the economy is tax reform. I happen to believe, and I think a lot of us do, that the best thing we can do to get the economy growing at a faster rate is to reform our Tax Code in a way that makes us more competitive in the global marketplace. That would mean reducing the tax on business, which is the highest in the world. The United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the entire world.

Lowering marginal income tax rates, broadening the tax base, doing away with many of the loopholes, deductions, exemptions, and preferences that are in the Tax Code today that benefit particular constituencies and going to a broader based tax base, but one that has marginal rates that are significantly lower than where they are today—I think that would dramatically unleash economic growth in this country and get people back to work so they can pay taxes and get government revenues up.

In the context of raising the debt limit, we ought to do something about the debt, and as I said, that is fairly straightforward.

One of the ideas that has been put forward here is that we need a clean debt limit increase; we can't have any discussion or negotiation about this. If we look at history, it has been the case that many of the big accomplishments, if you will, when it comes to deficit reduction, when it comes to fiscal plans being put into place, occurred in the context of increasing the debt limit. In fact, throughout our history, going back to 1978, the debt limit has been raised 53 times in those 35 years. Of those 53 debt limit increases, 27, or more than half, were done around other policy considerations and policy discussions and legislation that was put forward to address issues—in many cases to address the out-of-control spending and debt we have in this country.

For 35 years now, with 53 debt limit increases, more than half have involved discussion of other matters. In fact, some of the biggest accomplishments we can point to in the history of the last 30 years occurred at a time when we had both sides trying to figure out a path forward for dealing with fiscal imbalances our country faced.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation passed in 1985, the Budget Acts in 1990 and 1993 and 1997, and more recently in 2011. All occurred in the context of a debt limit increase. So there is ample precedent in history for doing big things that are good for the country and good for future generations around the debt limit increase. It defies history to suggest we cannot come to the table and cannot negotiate in the context of a debt limit increase.

As I look at these issues that are converging on us now and what they mean for our children and our grandchildren and for future generations, it seems to me that taking a position of we will not negotiate, period—which is essentially what the President has said and what has been echoed here by the Senate majority—is not only wrong in terms of what we need to do to fix the debt and to get our country on a more sustainable fiscal path, but it is also completely at odds with what we know to be the case throughout our history. We can do better by the American people. We should do better by the American people. It requires leadership.

The President of the United States, President Obama, as Senator Obama back in 2006, said at that time that raising the debt limit would be a leadership failure and described it as unpatriotic. Here we are these many years later, with double—double—the amount of debt we had back when he made that statement.

This situation we are in today cries out for leadership. It cries out for leadership from the President and from those of us in Congress. I hope we can find our way to get together, to sit down, to negotiate, to come up with solutions that are good for the future of this country that would deal not just with raising the borrowing limit so we can borrow more money to fund government, but to address the underlying problem, and that is the fact that we have a $17 trillion debt that continues to grow at $600 billion, $700 billion a year.

We continue to have a chronically high unemployment rate. We continue to have a labor force, a workforce that is at historically low levels; in other words, the number of people who are working today as a percentage of those who could work is at the lowest level it has been in 35 years. We have a sluggish economy that is growing in the 1- to 2-percent range. Take-home pay for most Americans has gone down since the President took office by about $3,700.

We need to get middle-class Americans back to work, middle-class Americans earning more, being able to provide for their families, increasing family household income and take-home pay in this country, and the way to do that is to get the economy growing and expanding.

The other way to do that, I would argue, is to get spending here in Washington under control so we are not out there borrowing more and more money all the time, so that more and more of our country's assets and resources can be deployed toward things that will yield a return, that will put more people to work, that will grow the economy, and expand the standard of living and the quality of life for people across this country. Time is short. The clock is running. Time is a-wasting. We need to get this done.

In the near term we need to bring up the nine bills sitting here in the Senate that were passed by the House. That would put funding for a lot of these services and programs that impact people—which has been expressed so many times by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—back in place.

Secondly, let's get together—the President, Democrats, and Republicans here in Washington, DC—to talk about not only raising the debt limit but what we are going to do to address the underlying debt.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise to address the negative impact this government shutdown is having on my home State of North Carolina. It is a shame that some in Congress are playing political games with the most basic function of keeping our government open. I did not get elected to shut down the government. With each minute that goes by, more and more North Carolinians are feeling the impact of this irresponsible shutdown.

North Carolina is proud to be home to almost 1 million veterans. But as of this spring, we are also home to one of the worst VA disability claims backlogs in the country. We have pushed to have senior VA personnel dispatched to North Carolina. More caseworkers have been added. After a lot of attention and work, we were finally beginning to see the needle move in the right direction.

Claims were being processed faster, which means veterans were getting the benefits they deserved faster. But as of today, the Winston-Salem regional office is closed to the public. With claim processors furloughed and just a skeleton staff operation inside, this government shutdown threatens to reverse the progress we have made in addressing that backlog. So I ask, is it worth shutting down the government over a political game when veterans get caught in this crossfire? No.

In my home State we are also proud of the 11 national parks that are not simply just beautiful places in our country and in our State but also important drivers of our tourism economy.

As families flock to enjoy these affordable destinations, they stop at our local small businesses, they eat at our restaurants, and they stay in our hotels. In 2011, out-of-State tourists to national parks in North Carolina spent $720 million during these trips, which supported nearly 12,000 jobs.

I do not know how many of my colleagues have been fortunate enough to visit western North Carolina at this time of the year. But right now the fall leaves are turning and western North Carolina is opening its arms to welcome tourists from around the country and from around the world who come to see this beautiful landscape.

On the other side of the State, in the east, we have Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Cape Lookout. They are both closed. October is the most popular surf-fishing month of the year. But with beach access closed our fishermen cannot get to the fishing areas.

With parks from out west all the way to down east closed, we fear too many families will decide to cancel their vacations. So I ask, is it worth shutting down the government over political games when our small business owners who support our economy will be the ones to shoulder this burden? No.

In my home State we are proud that our university system includes a number of distinguished research institutions that are on the cutting edge of new technologies and therapies that will make our world better. NIH supports roughly 20,000 jobs in North Carolina. But the NIH will not take any action on grant applications or awards or admit new patients to clinical trials while our government is shut down.

So I ask, is it worth putting medical advances and thousands of jobs at risk just to play a tired political game? No. I could go on and on. While new vaccines are still being delivered, the CDC is not able to track flu cases as usual. They cannot support State and local partners who help monitor infectious diseases.

The FDA is not able to support the majority of its food safety activities. Pell grants and direct student loans could be delayed for 14 million American students. School districts, colleges, and job training centers could face major cashflow problems without money for Federal programs and grants coming in the door.

Our research universities, in addition to doing this cutting-edge research that benefits our entire country, are huge employers. Some of them receive tens of millions of dollars a month in reimbursement for work already performed for the Federal Government. Without those funds coming in the door, these universities can be put in an incredibly difficult position with respect to managing their expenses—not to mention the time lost in Congress when we should be talking about how to continue repairing our economy; we should be talking about how to improve job training programs; we should be talking about growing manufacturing in our country. But instead, we are just manufacturing crisis after crisis after another. There is no reason we cannot end this shutdown.

Fortunately, there is a simple solution. The Senate has passed a responsible bill that keeps the government running at currently reduced spending levels. The House of Representatives could pass that bill today. This shutdown could end within a matter of hours. Then we could have the time and space to come together on a long-term, balanced, and bipartisan plan to finally put our fiscal house in order. Instead, the other side of the Capitol insists on sending us bills that they know have zero chance of passing or becoming law over here just to stage a political stunt.

But political stunts will not process VA claims. Political stunts will not help restaurant owners in western North Carolina make payroll while the national parks are closed. Political stunts will not get this government reopened for business. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to stop playing this partisan game, take up the Senate-passed bill, end this government shutdown.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized following morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPACT OF DEFAULT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise today with just 9 days left until the United States hits the debt ceiling. Never before in our history have we failed to pay our bills, but in 9 days that possibility will reach our doorstep.

Even though defaulting on our debt could send our economy into a tailspin, even possibly another Great Depression, there are already those who are denying the impacts of default. The debt ceiling deniers try to claim that this won't be a big deal and that middle-class families won't be hurt. Well, these debt-ceiling deniers need a dose of debt-ceiling reality.

The truth is that failing to pay our bills on time would most probably be worse than in 2008 when Lehman Brothers and AIG went under and the economy went into a tailspin. We still haven't recovered from that debacle. To this day there are people out of work. There are middle-class families whose income is lower than it was then because of what happened in 2008.

Why could it be worse—in all likelihood would be worse? Because just as housing securities had to be marked down because of the Lehman crisis, if government bonds, which are much more widely held, have to be marked down in lower value, we could have a freeze where banks are not able to lend money.

What happened in 2008 was simple. Banks and other financial institutions had all these mortgage securities on their balance sheets. All of a sudden their value seemed to be a lot less, so the banks' balance sheets were in the red. That meant they couldn't lend money, and not just for long-term mortgages and car loans but also for overnight lines of credit. Businesses were shaken. Many businesses couldn't function. Wire transfers weren't allowed to be made, and the whole financial system came to a startling and devastating halt.

Now the effects would be worse, in all likelihood, and for this reason: Mortgage securities were widely held but not close to as widely held as U.S. Treasurys are. Imagine on the day of default or, God forbid, even a day or two before default, all of a sudden the markets determine—and they are mystical in some ways—that Treasurys should be written down significantly. There is a very real possibility that could—and not 5 percent but significantly higher than that; I would estimate a 30-, 40-, 50-percent chance—send us into a tailspin that might make the 2008 recession look like child's play.

How would that affect the average family? Well, if the United States defaults, middle-class family paychecks would be raided by higher interest rates on everyday expenses. Already interest rates on short-term Treasury bonds are creeping upward as the possibility of default looms over us. If we default, investors who always considered U.S. debt risk free will demand higher interest rates due to the heightened risk that they might not be paid. For the first time ever investors question whether the U.S. Government would honor its commitments.

The domino effect on interest rates that affect family budgets would be endless and cataclysmic. Credit card interest rates would go up, adding hundreds of dollars to monthly bills. Young families seeking to take out a mortgage on a new home would be faced with thousands of dollars in higher payments over the life of the mortgage. Many might not even buy that home, putting a crimp in one of the bright spots of our economy—the housing market. Someone wanting to take out a loan to buy a new car should prepare to pay hundreds or thousands of

dollars more in higher interest rates. That means car sales would decline and automobile manufacturers could lay off people. Do you have privately held student loans? Prepare for monthly payments to shoot upward. Innocent families, millions of them—tens of millions—would be hit with thousands of dollars in additional bills through no fault of their own if U.S. Treasurys were devalued.

The damage doesn't stop there. If we default on our debt, the dollar loses value, and a trip to the gas station or the grocery store gets more expensive. The dollar won't go as far. Americans will have to shell out more for gas and for milk to feed their kids.

Think of the effect of a default on 10,000 baby boomers who are retiring each day. In 2011 the stock market lost 2,000 points. How much more might it lose now? We gained that back by the beginning of 2012, but that is no comfort to the thousands of people retiring every day. And when you are dealing with U.S. Treasurys—and these are not certainties, but these are possibilities—it could be a lot worse. You can check your 401(k) and see that political brinkmanship took a huge bite out of your retirement savings. Imagine the pain of saving wisely, making smart choices, only to have your retirement account and family budget wrecked by dangerous brinkmanship from tea party Republicans in Washington. If there were ever a governmental action that merited the words ''playing with fire,'' this is it.

The devastation doesn't end there. If we don't raise the debt ceiling, the Federal Government will be faced with impossible choices. Do we pay foreign debts—because if we don't, those countries won't lend to us anymore—or do we pay veterans' benefits? Do we make sure Social Security benefits go out or Medicare? Do we pay our troops? Do we fund border security? What do we pay for education? These are all tough choices.

Make no mistake about it. If the debt ceiling is not lifted, we can't meet all our obligations.

So the chances of this are not 80 percent, but they are close enough to 50 percent that anyone who risks this, particularly for this forlorn goal: we won't raise the debt ceiling unless we repeal ObamaCare—which we know isn't happening—it is madness. Risk the economy of the United States, the possibility of going through worse than what we went through in 2008 because you demand ObamaCare be repealed when we know it won't happen? Wow. I have rarely seen such madness coming out of legislators, but it is coming out of a few.

So the consequences of failing to raise the debt ceiling are crystal clear: interest rates on the middle-class expenses such as home mortgages, car loans, and student loans will shoot up. Housing markets, automobile markets, and others decline as many are laid off, and then others are laid off in a cyclical cycle. The dollar will lose its value, making everyday purchases more expensive, and the Federal Government faces terrible choices about who we pay—seniors, veterans, military, creditors. To risk these consequences would be a terrible mistake.

In conclusion, I come here with a simple plea—not to our tea party activist colleagues but to mainstream conservative Republican friends. Please help us avoid the default crash. Please help us avoid an economic apocalypse. We are ready to talk. We are ready to negotiate on anything. But first open the government and pay our bills. Then we can sit down and debate our differences. The future of our financial system, the future of millions of Americans, is at stake. We don't play around with that. We don't hold that hostage.

To my mainstream conservative Republican colleagues, please do the right thing. Let us pay our bills and take the threat of severe economic collapse off the table now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to speak as the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who would like to reopen government and have our committee get back to regular order to be able to move our appropriations bills, to be able to debate them on the floor, amend them on the floor, and go to conference to resolve either fiscal or other issues we might have with the House. But we can't do it because we are in lockdown politics.

There is much about where we find ourselves that is very frustrating to me. One of the main ones is the fact that the tea party Republicans are out there saying things that simply are not accurate. Tea party Republicans say President Obama won't negotiate. That is not true. Tea party Republicans are saying Democrats in the Senate won't negotiate. That is not true. Tea party Republicans say the Senate has not moved appropriations bills. That is not true. The Appropriation Committee has. Tea party Republicans say the House doesn't have the votes to reopen the government. That is not true. And tea party Republicans say the debt limit is not a big deal. That is not true. So let me elaborate on these point by point.

Tea party Republicans say President Obama won't negotiate. The President has negotiated time and time again. He had a framework for a grand bargain in his 2014 budget. Read it. Let the print speak for itself. He had $1.8 trillion of deficit reduction over 10 years, including $400 billion in health care savings, $200 billion in savings from mandatory programs, $200 billion in further discretionary cuts in strategic funding and discretionary spending. And, yes, he would even change the cost-of-living calculation for Social Security. But the Republicans couldn't take yes for an answer. Here was Obama, here was his budget, here is what he was offering—to reduce debt, to take on mandatory spending, to take on discretionary spending. They couldn't take yes for an answer. It included items in there I didn't agree with, but they were to be negotiated, to be discussed. Since he became President, the deficit has gone down by 50 percent, from $1.4 trillion in 2009 to an estimated $700 billion in 2013. High? Yes. But cut in half.

Now let's go to this President who they say won't negotiate. He negotiated in December of 2012 on a fiscal cliff deal. He wanted a 2-year delay in sequester, but we got 2 months. He wanted tax cuts for the wealthy to be eliminated above $250,000. He agreed to an estate tax exemption. He wanted a $3.5 million exemption, the Republicans wanted $5 million. He said OK. The 2-percent Social Security payroll tax was ending without offsetting stimulus provisions. He gave and we supported him. Now they say he won't negotiate.

Speaker BOEHNER says, we just want to have a conversation. That is what the President did. What were those summits at Andrews Air Force Base? I thought that was going to be kumbaya. The President has had private one-on-one meetings, and nothing has come from that. Then he did a larger charm offensive—he had dinner with Republicans both at the White House and at different restaurants around town. Nobody seems to be able to take yes for an answer. This is the President who has invited people to the White House, invited leadership to play golf with him to build relationships, he has had dinner there. But instead of having lunch with the President, they want to have his lunch—over and over again.

The President has expressed a willingness continually to negotiate. And where are we now? We need to reopen the government. The House needs to pass the Senate clean short-term CR and raise the debt limit. Once it is open for business, we can talk about other matters.

Now let's go to tea party Republicans saying Democrats won't negotiate. Senate Democrats have tried to negotiate on the budget since we passed it on March 23. We were here for a marathon session led by Senator MURRAY—vote after vote, amendment after amendment—and we passed a budget resolution.

The rules of engagement and the rules for dispute resolution in the Congress are, take what one body passes, like the Senate, and meet with the House in a conference. Senator MURRAY was ready to go. She asked permission—which she has to do under the rules of the Senate—to have her budget conference to hammer out the budget with PAUL RYAN and other House Members.

Nineteen times since March 23 Senator MURRAY has stood on this floor and asked for the ability to negotiate

with the House. Nineteen times she was blocked by six tea party Republicans. Nineteen times, using the rules to protect the voice of the minority—which I understand they used not only their voice but what was used to protect them to prohibit the Senate from meeting with their House counterparts.

So Senate Democrats want to negotiate. There is PAUL RYAN. There is PATTY MURRAY. Let's have the budget conference and hammer it out. The Democrats have been ready to negotiate on a budget since March 23, 2013.

Let's have a conversation? We have been trying to have that conversation since March. Who has stopped us? HARRY REID didn't stop PATTY MURRAY. CHUCK SCHUMER didn't stop the Budget Committee. BARBARA MIKULSKI is not stopping it. Six tea party Republicans have stopped the ability of the Senate from going to the House to negotiate a budget.

Free the Budget Committee. Why is that so important? Because they not only come up with an overall budget in discretionary spending, mandatory spending, and revenues, but they put a cap on us appropriators. One of the outcomes of a budget agreement is they set the total amount of money the Appropriations Committee can spend on discretionary spending. To the shock of everybody, there is actually a cap on discretionary spending established by the Budget Committee. That has been the rule of the Budget Act going back to the 1970s. I would accept a cap agreed upon in a duly constituted process established by the rules of the House and the Senate—which is, we pass a budget, we meet in conference, we come back and give the appropriators what they call the 302(a)—the total cap we can spend—we take a look at it, and we meet and we follow the law. It also says what revenue should be and then total mandatory spending.

So when we hear Democrats won't negotiate—the Democrats have negotiated.

Going to this situation where we know the fiscal year expires October 1, the Senate put forth a bill. It came out of the Appropriations Committee. It was really, as the Chair, at my suggestion we would have a short-term funding resolution so we could deal with issues such as debt limit, canceling sequester for 2 years, and what our funding as a cap should be for 2014—short term, no new money, but a goal of getting us to canceling the sequester, following what the Budget Committee would set as the cap on us.

In order to get there, I was willing to compromise. I didn't want to. I felt it was too harsh, too rough on important discretionary spending. But sometimes you have to negotiate and compromise. So I was willing to compromise in order to get to negotiations. What was the compromise? The House has a level of $986 billion. It follows fiscal 2013 at the sequester level, meaning reduced by over $100 billion. I thought that $986 billion was too low. The Senate bill was $1.058 trillion. That is over a $70 billion difference.

But that is what a conference is. That is what negotiation is. So in order to get us across the dome into negotiations, I was willing to compromise, particularly on very important domestic spending.

The liberals who want to fund Head Start, who want to fund NIH—well, maybe we are not liberals. Maybe we are just Americans and, I believe, friends on the other side of the aisle—we were ready to go. So in my mind, as an appropriator, I have already compromised just to get us into the room. But they won't even take up that bill. They won't take up the bill that Speaker BOEHNER said he would pass if we agreed to their number—$986 billion—to get us into the room to talk. If you tell the Senate: If you agree with us on this, just to get a short-term negotiation going, we will pass it, and then you don't, why should we believe it will be any different?

But as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I am ready to negotiate. I am ready to compromise. I have reached out to my House counterpart, the chair of Appropriations. We have a marvelous, civil, candid relationship. We are ready to go to work.

We differ on money. There is no doubt. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman HAL ROGERS, is a wonderful gentleman, but I will tell you he is a rock-ribbed, no-nonsense fiscal conservative. But that is OK by Senator BARB because that is what compromise is. That is doing what Colin Powell asked us to do: Let's talk things over. Let's find some sensible center. Let's make sure we run the U.S. Government in a smart, frugal, effective way. That is what it would take.

We are ready to do it, but we need—I need Speaker BOEHNER to pass the short-term CR so we can even get into the room to do this. So when you say Senate Democrats will not negotiate or will not compromise, it is not true.

Also, I heard the junior Senator from Kentucky say that the Senate has not approved appropriations bills. The Appropriations Committee, despite being hamstrung by not having a budget, reported 11 appropriations bills. Eight of them were supported by Republicans. By August 1, our Appropriations Committee had marked up every single bill except one, Interior. We had marked them up with bipartisan support. Eight of them had bipartisan support; three did not: Labor-HHS, Financial Services, and Legislative Branch.

Why did we not get that? Because the Labor-HHS bill and Financial Services play a role in funding ObamaCare. There we go again. Don't do anything that would fund ObamaCare. There we go again.

I am so fed up with those riders, those poison-pen riders. We could have done that to them. We chose not to. I would like to see the comprehensive immigration bill passed. I didn't put any riders on the appropriations bills coming out of the Senate. I would have liked to have seen a farm bill. That has been worked on so hard by Senator STABENOW, the Senator from Michigan, and Senator ROBERTS, the Senator from Kansas—they worked wonderfully on a bipartisan farm bill. It was something to be proud of in the Senate. I would have liked to have attached that to the continuing. But we decided no riders, nothing cute, nothing clever, no earmarks, nothing like that—straightforward money bills ready to go to conference.

We could not get it, but they are passed. They are passed in the Appropriations Committee and we are waiting to get to work.

The Republicans, the tea party Republicans say they do not have the votes in the House to reopen government. Give it a chance. Put the vote to the floor. If we win, government is reopened. If we lose, at least we offered a suggestion and we can go back to the drawing board. But the solution to reopening the government lies on Speaker BOEHNER's desk. He says he wants to have a conversation. We say pick it up, have the vote. That puts the conversation to work for a short-term funding resolution.

We say to our six Republican Senators who have blocked the Budget Committee, let the Budget Committee go to conference. Let Senator PATTY MURRAY and Congressman PAUL RYAN meet to resolve these issues. Let's follow the regular order. Let's get back to the way this government and this country should function.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:26 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

QUORUM CALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators

entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3]

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Murphy
Baucus	Johnson (SD)	Murray
Begich	Kaine	Pryor
Blumenthal	King	Reed
Boxer	Landrieu	Reid
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Levin	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden
Heinrich	Menendez	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of all absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Ayotte	Flake	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Moran
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Begich	Grassley	Murphy
Bennet	Hagan	Murray
Blumenthal	Harkin	Nelson
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Pryor
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Burr	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Chiesa	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Levin	Toomey
Corker	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	McCain	Warren
Enzi	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Feinstein	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—14

Alexander	Heller	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cornyn	Lee	Scott
Crapo	Paul	Vitter
Cruz	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Inhofe	Udall (NM)

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. As soon as I finish my remarks, we will enter into an agreement on how the speakers will go forward.

The shutdown of the Federal Government is now affecting some families more than others. It is affecting families who are the most vulnerable, denying them the benefits to help with the funeral expenses of loved ones killed while serving our country.

This part of my presentation is not something I got from my staff; this is in the press right now:

The families of five U.S. servicemembers who were killed over the weekend in Afghanistan have been notified that they won't be receiving their benefit, normally wired to relatives within 36 hours of the death. The death gratuity is extended to help cover funeral costs and help with immediate living expenses until survivor benefits typically begin. The money also helps cover costs to fly families to Dover Air Force Base to witness a return of their loved ones in a flag-draped coffin.

''Washington may be shut down, but it's still asking people to go to war,'' says the head of the Council on Foreign Relations, Gayle Lemmon. ''When people realize that they can serve and fight for their country, but that their families will get an I.O.U. until the shutdown is over, I think they're just shocked.''

I know I am.

For example, LCpl Jeremiah Collins, 19 years old, was a marine who died Saturday while supporting combat operations in Afghanistan. He was one of the five killed, including four troop members who died Sunday by an improvised explosive device.

A law passed last week to continue paying civilian members of the military during the shutdown, but does not allow for payouts of the death benefit to the families of the fallen, officials told Andrea Mitchell of NBC.

One senior official said he was disgusted by the predicament.

That is where we are.

I have asked each Senator to come to the floor today because it is important that we have an opportunity to talk about the crisis facing this great Nation. This government shutdown is an embarrassment to our Nation—not only to the people of America but around the world. An economic conference in the Far East that President Obama was to attend—he couldn't because of the government shutdown. So who is there pontificating about how bad things are in America? The President of China. And that is what he is talking about—America can't pay its bills.

The families who lost five loved ones—it is an unbearable loss, but now they are being denied death benefits because of this senseless shutdown. It is shameful and embarrassing. There are no words to describe this situation that at least I am capable of expressing, that America could fail the families of our fallen heroes. Appalling, frightening—everyone can come up with their own description.

It is time for us, Members of this august body, to stand before the American people and publicly discuss the path forward. Democrats stand unified, asking the Speaker to reopen the government—the whole government, not bits and pieces of the government. It is bad enough with all of the sequestration that has cut, for example, the National Institutes of Health this year by $1.6 billion, and add to that the government shutdown, add to that the second year of sequestration, which will be another $2 billion for the National Institutes of Health. This premier search we have in America for cures for disease, there has never been anything like it in the world; the Library of Congress, there has never been anyplace like it in the world. The great library in Egypt didn't compare to the Library of Congress. But there has been nothing ever in the history of the world like the National Institutes of Health. We are mindlessly going forward and cutting these scientists by billions of dollars.

We need to reopen the whole government—not in some piecemeal fashion that further demonstrates to the world that we are unable to find real solutions. Open the whole government so we can get back to work. Allow the government to do its duty by our military families and by every American family.

Quickly—I have said it before—in July of this year the Speaker of the House of Representatives and I sat down in his office. I was there, my chief of staff was there, and his chief of staff was there—the four of us. The Speaker wanted to figure out a way to go forward. We talked about a number of things. The one thing he was firm in, he said, it has to be at 2013 levels. I said: I can't do that; it is $70 billion less than the budget we passed just a short time ago. So the conversation continued. In September we talked and talked.

I spoke to Chairman MURRAY and to Chairman MIKULSKI. It was really hard. They had worked so hard to get regular order back in the Senate. But, like the good soldiers they are, we decided to try to talk to the rest of the caucus and swallow really hard because we had the assurance—I had the assurance that we would have a clean CR now, in September. That didn't work. The Speaker didn't deliver on what he said he would deliver.

So the government closes and we have one thing after another coming over here and we send it right back.

The last thing they sent over a week ago was to say let's go to conference. So last Tuesday I sent him a letter, and in the first letter I talked about a very decisive time in my life when I voted for the Iraq war. Within weeks of that I felt I had been misled. But regardless of that, that is how I felt. So I became an opponent of that war, and I did everything I could to focus on that war, which was having our military subjected to violence, and that is an understatement. Thousands were being killed, tens of thousands wounded. The number of Iraqis who were being killed is really hard to demonstrate adequately.

There was a time that came in my life when we had an opportunity, under my direction, to shut the government down. How? By not funding the war. I made a decision—and that is in my letter to the Speaker—not to do that.

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

I, frankly, received a lot of help from around the country. But that is what I did. And I do not look back at all. So I was trying to tell the Speaker: Do not do this. However, I said: You have done it, and you have asked for a conference. We will go to conference on anything you want to go to conference on. We don't care. But first you have to open the government and allow us to pay our bills. That is in the letter of last Tuesday.

Forty-five minutes after he got the letter, I called him. He said: No, I can't do that. So for someone to suggest we have not negotiated is just absolutely wrong.

Madam President, $70 billion—it is the biggest compromise I have ever made in my career as a Member of Congress—some 31 years. It may not sound like much to some people, but it was really big. My caucus remembers what I asked them to do. So for someone to suggest to any of my Senators that we have not negotiated is simply unfair, and to say that we will not negotiate is unfair. I put it in writing. We are happy to go to conference. But you have to open the government. This is unfair—just like these five soldiers killed. So open the government, let us pay our bills, and we will negotiate on anything you want to negotiate.

I have spoken to the President. I am certainly not name-dropping. I have told my caucus this several times over the last 2 days. He cannot, as President of the United States, negotiate on paying the bills of the country, the debt ceiling. I think there are Senators over here who he has sat down with and talked to individually and as groups to talk about a budget deal. There were many conversations in the Oval Office that I attended to talk about a budget deal. He has put in writing things that he would be willing to do that, quite frankly, our base is not excited about. But he put it in writing. He is still waiting for the first sentence from the people he invited to dinner and met with—the first sentence—as to what they were willing to do.

As said late last week by Haley Barbour and Ed Gillespie, former chairs of the national Republican Party, Republicans—now, they said this, not me—there is a time now when Republicans have to start being for something, not against everything.

So I do not come here to argue and badger people. I am happy to talk about anything. Senator MURRAY will deliver a presentation in just a little bit. We know how hard she has worked. She has the respect of both Democrats and Republicans. But I repeat, when the Speaker said he wanted to go to conference last week, we said: Good. We will do that. I am not a one-man show over here. I clear everything with my caucus, with rare exception, before I go marching off into the blue.

So I repeat, we are ready to go to conference as soon as the Speaker reopens the government and removes the threat of default. He has to take yes for an answer. You folks have to take yes for an answer. We are just as willing to sit down and talk today as we were in the spring and as we were this summer. In the meantime, let's open the government and live up to our obligations as a country.

To that end, I will introduce a bill to allow the United States to pay it bills with no preconditions or strings attached. I will do that later today and start the so-called rule XIV process.

We may have our differences, Democrats and Republicans, but we should not hold the full faith and credit of this great country hostage while we resolve it. At a later time Senator BAUCUS will talk, and I hope he repeats here on this Senate floor what he told us in our caucus that we just completed: Great nations are not guaranteed greatness. There have been books written about it, and he will talk about one author, a famous author, who recently wrote a book about how great nations have to meet expectations. We are great today. That does not mean we will be forever. How is this country going to look to the world community if we no longer have the full faith and credit of the United States meaning anything?

I hope we can get Republican cooperation to move this bill quickly; that is, the debt ceiling bill. If not, the process could take us right up to the deadline—one day before.

I am optimistic, however, that my Republican colleagues here in the Senate will not filibuster this bill. I am cynical by nature. That way I am not disappointed as much as those who are optimistic. My friend, Senator SCHUMER, and I have ongoing issues. He is optimistic about everything. I am cynical about everything. But I am optimistic, even though that is against my nature, that Republicans are not going to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage. I hope I am right.

We need to reopen the Federal Government now—not 10 minutes before the debt ceiling is gone. We need to get back to the business of protecting American families, back to the job of legislating. We are not doing anything in this body anymore. It is our job to legislate. That has always been our job; it always will be our job. Open the government, pay our bills, and let's negotiate.

It is my understanding that this consent request has been cleared. We will hear from the Republican leader. Then we will hear at that time from Senator MCCAIN for 15 minutes, followed by Senators DURBIN, SCHUMER, and MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCONNELL be recognized, which we really do not need consent for him. He has time under his leader time. Following his statement I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized for 15 minutes, then Senator DURBIN for 10, Senator SCHUMER for 10, Senator MURRAY for 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would ask the distinguished majority leader if he would consider modifying his consent request so that we could alternate back and forth across the aisle. With that modification, I have no objection.

Mr. REID. Well, after we get this out of the way, you mean?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the majority leader asked for a number of Democratic Senators to speak without any intervening speeches or remarks by Republicans. All I am suggesting is, after he and the Republican leader speak——

Mr. REID. Madam President, I say to my friend from Texas——

Mr. CORNYN. And after Senator MCCAIN speaks and a Democrat speaks, that a Republican gets to speak and so forth. That is all I am asking.

Mr. REID. I say, Madam President, through the Chair to my friend: three Democrats, two Republicans. It does not sound too outrageous to me. So would the Senator object to that?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. OK. So following Senator MCCONNELL, I will call upon Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my good friend, the majority leader. I might say, however, that as much as I appreciate his comments to all of us, the real challenge is his relationship with the House and whether or not we can begin the discussion process to get to an outcome.

Nobody is happy with the government shutdown, certainly not anybody on this side, and not anybody on the other side. But I would remind everybody on both sides of the aisle that

Democratic Senators have said repeatedly ObamaCare is the law of the land and, basically, we should get used to it.

We have suggested various modifications, some of which enjoy bipartisan support. But, obviously, so far that is not something our friends on the other side are willing to do.

But let me also point out to all of you that the Budget Control Act is also the law of the land. It was negotiated on a bipartisan basis, signed by the President of the United States, and the Budget Control Act is the law of the land.

When my good friend the majority leader says he was negotiating with the House over the CR level, my view was that was not a negotiation, that was current law, in place, passed on a bipartisan basis, signed by the President of the United States—current law.

So I think I can pretty safely say that nobody on this side believes that we ought to revisit a law that has reduced government spending for 2 years in a row for the first time since the Korean War, at a time when we have a debt the size of our economy which makes it look a lot like a Western European country.

So as we go into whatever discussions we end up having to solve the shutdown problem, I would say to my friends on the other side, revisiting a law negotiated by the President, passed on a bipartisan basis, that is actually reducing government spending ought not to be a part of the final outcome.

But talk we should. The American people have given us divided government. And when you have divided government, it means you have to talk to each other. This is not 2009 and 2010 when our friends on the other side had a total hammerlock on all the government. We now have divided government. It means we have to talk to each other and get to an outcome.

I think it is far past time to get that done. I hope, given where we are today, there is adequate incentive to get those talks started, principally between the majority leader and the Speaker, to get us to the outcome we all want, and to get us there soon.

But let me just conclude by saying the Budget Control Act is the law of the land. If you believe in reducing government spending, it is working. My Members and the American people think reducing government spending is a good idea. So we have a law in place that is achieving those kinds of results. That is not something at a time when we have a debt the size of our economy that we ought to lightly walk away from.

So I hope my good friend, the majority leader, will, in addition to talking to us, which we appreciate, talk to the Speaker because that is how we resolve this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, since the beginning of this great Nation, 1,948 men and women have served in the U.S. Senate. That service is a singular honor and carries with it an important responsibility. James Madison said the ''use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch.''

Throughout our history it was this Senate, many times in this very room, that took on the most difficult challenges facing America: the creation of the Federal judiciary, the abolition of slavery, decisions to go to war, and the advancement of civil rights.

At each of those moments, skeptics questioned whether there were Senators capable of resisting political pressure and whether there were Senators prepared to lead a divided nation.

My colleagues, this is our moment. This is our chance—our chance—to bring this Nation back from the precipice. We should agree to restore the functions of government, not in a piecemeal fashion but in an orderly process befitting a great nation. We should spare America's workers and businesses the tragic consequences of a first-ever default on our Nation's debt. And we should restore the time-honored process of legislating—legislating—by adopting a bipartisan budget with the House, by considering spending bills on the floor of this Chamber, and passing appropriations bills in an orderly process.

We can vote today, this afternoon, to go to conference on the budget and begin to resolve our differences with the House. If we fail, we know we will have diminished this great body and our great Nation—a nation which we have all taken a solemn oath to serve and protect.

So let's agree to restore the functions of government—all of it. I have spoken with many of my colleagues and friends—and they are my friends—on the Republican side of the aisle. We have shared our frustrations at the current situation. To a person, each one of you has said to me: We have to bring this impasse to an end.

Waiting for the House of Representatives to save us is beneath the U.S. Senate.

We have our own responsibility and our own opportunity. We can come up with bipartisan Senate solutions. We can show the House of Representatives the path to end this crisis. Why are we waiting for them to show us? Let's begin to restore the confidence of the American people in this institution, in the Senate. We can fund the government, we can go to conference on a budget, and we can extend our debt authority.

I see my friend Senator MCCAIN on the floor. I know he is going to speak in just a moment. Over the last year I have seen moments in the Senate where we have defied our cynics and our critics: our successful bipartisan effort to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, a historic farm bill with far-reaching reforms, and a bipartisan extension of the Student Loan Program.

We came together and we found common ground. We led as the Senate. Now we need to summon the political courage and purpose to find a bipartisan way to meet this challenge. I know it will not be easy, but I know we are up to the job. I know we have an opportunity that comes once perhaps in a political lifetime.

But I wish to say this: What we are dealing with in the Senate is not just another political dustup. This confrontation is of historic proportion. Let's not wait on the House to find a solution. It is our responsibility as elected Members of the Senate to find that solution.

The solution I think is clear. Summon the political courage and the sense of purpose that comes down to us in the Senate, and throughout our Nation's history it always has.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the order now before the Senate is Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized for 15 minutes. Everyone else will continue on the other order of 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to return to the normal one side and then the other side as far as speakers are concerned.

Mr. REID. That is fine. That is our plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I say to my colleagues, I bring to your attention two events today that I think deserve our attention. The first one is a story entitled, ''Grand Canyon food shortage turns dire.'' The St. Mary's Food Bank is set to deliver food boxes to Grand Canyon National Park today as a Federal shutdown strands thousands of employees inside the park without work and pay.

The Grand Canyon, thousands of people inside the park without food or pay. This great Nation, we are having to have charities deliver food to people who are trapped in the Grand Canyon.

Also today, ''Shutdown outrage: Military death benefits denied to families of fallen troops.''

> At least five families of U.S. military members killed . . . in Afghanistan over the weekend were given a double-whammy by federal officials. Not only have your loved ones died, but due to the government shutdown, you won't receive a death benefit.

The approval rating of Congress we joke about, about being 12 percent or 11 percent. I have a line I use all of the time: We are down to blood relatives and paid staffers. But should not we as a body, Republicans, Democrats, no

matter who we are, should we not be embarrassed about this? Should we not be ashamed?

What do the American people think when they see that for those who served and sacrificed in the most honorable way, their families are not even eligible for death benefits? I am ashamed. I am embarrassed. All of us should be. The list goes on and on of people, of innocent Americans who have fallen victim to the reality that we cannot sit down and talk as grownups and address this issue.

I am not going to take the full 15 minutes because I frankly get a little bit emotional. But we started with a false premise on this side of the aisle that somehow we were going to repeal ObamaCare. That is after 25 days of debate, including up until Christmas Eve morning fighting against ObamaCare, and that is after a 2012 election where I traveled this country with passion, the first thing saying that the first thing we are going to do when Mitt Romney is President of the United States is repeal and replace ObamaCare. The American people spoke.

So somehow to think we were going to repeal ObamaCare, which would have required 67 Republican votes, of course, was a false premise and I think did the American people a grave disservice by convincing them that somehow we could.

Now, 70 percent of the American people, according to a Washington Post poll this morning, disapprove of Republicans, but they disapprove of Democrats as well. They disapprove of the President of the United States as well. Meanwhile, the Chinese, great role models of democracy, are now criticizing us because of a looming failure by the American Government to pay its debts, both domestic and abroad.

I say to my friend the majority leader, and he is my friend—we use that word with great abandon around here, but he and I have known each other now for 30 years—let's find a way to allow the adversary—I ask my good friend from Utah who is a history major, the words of Abraham Lincoln, ''Charity toward all, malice toward none.''

Let's find a way out of this. Let's find a way that we can sit down. I do not care if it is appointing people. I do not care if it is the informal conversations that we have been having back and forth. But there should be a way out of both of these dead ends that we are in.

How is this going to end? We know how it is going to end. We know how it is going to end. Sooner or later the government will resume its functions. Sooner or later we will raise the debt limit.

The question is, How do we get there? If there is anybody who disagrees that we are not going to reach that point, I would like to hear from them. So why don't we do this sooner rather than later? Why doesn't the Senate lead? I have great respect for the other side of the Capitol, but I understand the contradictions that are there and the difficulties the Speaker has. I am in great sympathy there.

So why don't we get together? Why don't we sit down and—look, this body voted 70 to 29, I think it was, to repeal the medical device tax. Do my colleagues want to renounce that vote they took on the budget? Why don't we use that as one of the areas where we could reach agreement? What about the issue out there the American people believe that we are under a different health care system than they are and ours is a better deal than theirs?

There are a number of issues that we could sit down and negotiate within an hour if we will stop—stop attacking each other and impugning people's integrity and honor. So all I can say is let's start this afternoon. I do not care who it is or how it is shaped, but let's sit down and get out of this, so that these families whose loved ones just died—just died—will receive the benefits at least that would give them some comfort and solace in this terrible hour of tragedy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those on the Democratic side be in this order: SCHUMER, MURRAY, BAUCUS, MIKULSKI, WARNER, CARDIN, KLOBUCHAR, WHITEHOUSE, STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise because we are getting very close to a time of crisis, perhaps one of the greatest economic crises this country has known. I have many good friends on the other side of the aisle. I do not doubt for a moment their motivation, their desire, and their love of country. It is every bit as strong as those of us on this side of the aisle.

So I make a heartfelt plea: We must come together and avoid a default of the United States. Many have said, I heard some even say on the other side, that default does not matter or it does not mean much. Let me explain the danger. There is a very real chance that if we default, there will be a recession greater than what occurred in 2008 and all too real a possibility it could put us into a depression.

Let me explain why. What happened in 2008 was simple. Mortgage securities declined in value immediately—dramatically they declined in value after Lehman and AIG went down. Banks' balance sheets instantly flipped from black to red. Loans were frozen, not only long-term loans but even overnight loans, lines of credit. The economy came to a screeching halt. We had to offer huge rescues or bailouts to overcome that. But even so, interest rates climbed.

If that happened with mortgage securities, the likelihood of it happening with Treasurys is all the more frightening because Treasurys are more widely held, more internationally held, the currency of the land, of the world. If Treasurys were to dramatically drop in value the day we defaulted or, make no mistake about it, it could happen a day or two before, here is what would happen: The economy would decline dramatically. Things would freeze. Interest rates would go way up. The cost of a mortgage, the cost of a car loan, dramatically increasing, hurting every middle-class family. Home sales would decline. Auto sales would decline. Hundreds of thousands, millions would be laid off.

Why risk that? We all have political goals. They differ. That is reasonable. There is a time and a place, as the Scriptures say, ''A season for everything.'' There is a time and a place to debate these things. It is not while our government is shut down and while our debt hangs in the balance, risking default. There is a simple and logical solution which good men and good women on both sides of the aisle can come to.

Let's open the government. Let's pay our bills. Then let's debate every issue you wish to debate. Nothing should be off the table. We are happy to go to a committee, a conference committee. The Senator from Washington has asked, I believe it is 18 times—will ask again in a few minutes. Of course we want a conference committee where we can discuss things but not at the price of keeping the government closed, hurting millions of families in every way, not at the price, even worse, of defaulting on our debt.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleagues in the House, they have it backward: First, go to conference and then decide whether to open the government or default. No one—liberal, conservative, Democrat, Republican—could say that is a rational strategy if you care about the country and worry about the risk of doing these things.

I understand the frustration with ObamaCare. We would argue there was an election in 2012. We would argue that every Democratic incumbent had to debate that issue over and over, as did President Obama when Governor Romney made it a major issue. The electorate decided they didn't want to get rid of ObamaCare. But we understand how passionately people feel, and we understand you will continue to try and do that. But again, there is a time and a season, and now is not the time and it is not the season when the government is shut down or default hangs in the balance.

I plead with my colleagues to allow us to come together. We want to negotiate. We want to sit down and talk to you. We are eager to do it. But first let's open the government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, my understanding is we were going to go

back and forth, and if the Senator from Texas wishes to go, I will yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his impassioned remarks today, and all of us weep for those service men and women who have lost their lives in defense of this great Nation.

I would note this Senate can right now, today, move to correct the problem the majority leader described. The House of Representatives has passed eight separate bills funding vital priorities of the government. All eight of those bills now sit on the majority leader's desk. This Senate has not voted on those bills. To date, the majority leader has not allowed the Senate to have even one vote on the bills that would fund vital government functions. One of those bills is a bill that funds the VA—funds the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It seems to me we are going to have political differences, and those political differences are not going away anytime soon, but we ought to be able to say, regardless of what happens in the battle over the shutdown, that our veterans should be beyond politics. We should have bipartisan agreement on standing for our veterans.

Right now veterans disability payments are not funded. The House has passed legislation to fund that. That was bipartisan legislation, with a number of Democrats in the House, and yet the majority leader has not allowed the Senate to vote on it. The only thing in the way of funding the VA today is the Senate voting to do so—is the objection the majority leader has raised to funding the VA.

Let me note that the bill the House passed funding the VA is a clean CR on the VA. It doesn't mention ObamaCare. It doesn't say a word about ObamaCare. It simply says our veterans should be beyond partisan politics, regardless of the shutdown.

Let me also note this body has already engaged in bipartisan cooperation. Earlier in the course of this debate, the House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the men and women of the military—to pay their paychecks. For weeks there had been politicians suggesting if there were a government shutdown the men and women of the military would not be paid. The House passed a bill, a clean CR, that said we will fund the men and women in the military. I commend my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, and I commend the majority leader, because the 54 Democrats in this body made the right decision to act in a bipartisan way and cooperate with the Republicans in this body and with the House of Representatives, and in 24 hours the bill funding the men and women of our military became law, went to the President and was signed into law. That is the way we are supposed to operate.

So I would ask: If we could work together in a bipartisan manner to say we are not going to hold the men and women of the military hostage, why can't we work together in a bipartisan manner to say we are not going to hold our veterans hostage; that regardless of what happens in the shutdown, let's fund the VA now?

Likewise, the House of Representatives has passed a bill funding our parks and national memorials. We have seen day after day our World War II veterans coming to the World War II Memorial and facing barricades the administration has put up. The administration has expended money to keep them out. The House has passed a bill to fund our parks and our memorials. Let me suggest if the Senate would only vote, we could open every park and memorial in the country.

The House has passed a bill to fund FEMA. If the Senate would only vote, FEMA could be funded.

The House has passed a bill to fund the National Institutes of Health so we can provide vital cancer research. The majority leader spoke quite passionately just moments ago about the need to fund the National Institutes of Health. I agree with the majority leader, and I would ask the majority leader to withdraw the objection he has raised to funding the NIH.

Let me note, some have disparaged the House's approach as a piecemeal approach. Yet that is the traditional means of appropriating and legislating that for centuries this body has done. The VA is usually funded—just the VA—not connected to anything else. Why would the Senate want to hold veterans hostage because of disagreements over ObamaCare? I don't think we should. I think we should fund the VA right now.

Why would the Senate want to hold our parks and memorials hostage?

Why would the Senate want to hold the National Institutes of Health hostage?

Why would the Senate want to hold Federal workers hostage?

On Saturday, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill to provide back pay for Federal workers who had been furloughed. Every House Democrat who voted voted in favor of that. Yet the majority leader has not allowed this body to vote. I am going to say right now I agree with those House Democrats, and I urge that Senate Democrats stand with House Democrats who voted unanimously in favor of back pay for Federal workers.

We can work together with bipartisan compromise, but we can only do so if both sides come to the table. Right now the House of Representatives is working constructively to fund vital priorities and, unfortunately, President Obama, the majority leader, and Senate Democrats are refusing to negotiate, refusing to compromise. That is not a reasonable approach. It is not a path that will lead to resolving this.

I hope we come together, resolve this, fund our vital priorities and, at the same time, respond to the millions of people who are hurting because of ObamaCare—who are losing their jobs, who are pushed into part-time work, who are facing skyrocketing insurance premiums and who are losing their health insurance.

We need to answer the call of our constituents. We need to answer the call of Teamsters president James Hoffa who put in writing that ObamaCare right now is destroying the health care of millions of working men and women. ''Destroying'' is the word Mr. Hoffa used. I think the Senate should respond to the concern Mr. Hoffa raised, and we should stand with millions of working men and women and we should protect their health care so the hundreds of millions of Americans who have health care right now don't lose it.

People all across this country are getting letters in the mail telling them they are losing their health care because of ObamaCare. We need to listen to them. So let's fund our government, let's fund our vital priorities, and let's listen to the American people and stop the No. 1 job killer in this country that is ObamaCare.

I urge this body to work together in a bipartisan manner to listen to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think there is one thing every one of us can agree on: There are innumerable problems across our country—families who have been challenged, sad stories that should be taken care of in every part of our country, in each of our States, with families we know who are hurting because of this government shutdown. There is one answer to that, and it is an easy one. It is for the House of Representatives to simply take up the bill that is in the House today and pass it. We know there are enough Members of Congress who can pass that today and every problem we have heard about or haven't heard about yet will be solved. Republicans simply need to end this government shutdown so Americans stop hurting.

Our families also need to know they are not going to be threatened by a catastrophic default. And when that happens, we will be waiting at the table, as we are today, to negotiate a long-term deal in the budget conference that the other side has spent months blocking.

We have been trying to work with Republicans toward a fair, long-term budget deal for years. Since 2011, Democrats from the Senate to the House to the administration have sat in rooms, we have negotiated, we have talked, we have discussed, and we have offered compromise after compromise. We have tried regular committees, we have tried supercommittees. If there was a room where Democrats and Republicans could sit and talk, we found it and we got to work. But no matter

what we did, no matter how much we offered, we were unable to come to a place that we could agree was a fair and balanced approach that the American people deserved.

So this year, our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle asked us to return to regular order. That was the most important thing they said—for us to get to a place where we could find a budget deal that could be agreeable and we could move forward. That is exactly what we did. In the Senate we passed our budget more than 6 months ago. The House of Representatives did the same. Since that time we have asked 19 times to go to conference to work out our differences. Nineteen times we have come to the floor to say let's have regular order, let's work out our differences in a conference committee.

We wanted to get in a room with the House Republicans to sit at a table and do everything possible to bridge the divide between our two budgets. We knew it would not be easy. There are significant differences between the House and Senate budget. But the American people expected us to try and we were committed to doing that. Importantly, we wanted to make sure we had enough time to bridge that divide and get to this difficult deal so we would not be here today where we have lurched into another manufactured crisis.

Republicans rejected our attempts to sit down and negotiate. Every time we asked to go to a budget conference, we were shot down. Democrats came to the floor again and again, along with, I would add, a number of responsible Republicans who agreed. Even though they did not support the budget that was passed here, they agreed we should go to conference with the House Republicans and work out our deals. But each time we asked, a handful of Republicans objected and said: No discussions. They refused to allow us to go to a table. They had no interest in any discussions or negotiations or talk, and they pushed us until they got exactly what those few Republicans here wanted, and that was an avoidable—completely avoidable—government shutdown.

After spending 6 months rejecting talks, causing this crisis, now all of a sudden some of our Republican friends seem desperate to make it look as though they are the ones interested in negotiating. They know it is clear to families across the country the only reason this crisis continues is the House Republicans' refusal to take up the bill and pass it right now—a bill that will get our government open and running again.

And, by the way, they are now trying to do everything they can to distract their constituents from that simple fact. But the American people are smarter than that. They know the world did not begin the day of the government shutdown. They know it is not possible for Republicans to have just discovered negotiations 20 minutes before a shutdown, when all they need to do is take up the bill and vote.

The latest gimmick the House seems to be considering is to start another supercommittee to debate this issue. Instead of simply taking a vote to end this crisis, they want a repeat of 2011. They want another supercommittee. Well, as everyone here knows, I cochaired that supercommittee, the Senator from Montana worked for hours and hours and days on end with me on that committee, and it failed. For reasons that we believe in and they believe in, which could be debated, the supercommitte did not come up with a resolution. I think House Republicans are going to have a lot of trouble explaining to those families who haven't seen a paycheck since this shutdown started that they should wait for another supercommittee to go to work.

Here is what should happen. House Republicans should end this crisis. They should simply allow a vote on our bill to end the shutdown, which would pass with bipartisan support.

They should stop threatening an economic catastrophe if they don't get their way, and we are happy to sit down and negotiate. We know on our side that negotiation on a budget deal is not going to make us happy. We know the House Republicans won't be happy. But that is how a democracy works—by working out our differences. Democrats are here today to say we are willing to negotiate and we are willing to work with our Republican counterparts to find a path forward. Of course we want to negotiate. We have tried to start a budget conference for 6 months.

I know the vast majority of my Republican colleagues came here to help our families and to help our communities. I know they came here to solve problems. The vast majority came here to work across the aisle to make the country better. So I urge our Republican colleagues here in the Senate today to support the unanimous consent we are about to offer to end this crisis, take the threats off the table, and sit down and work with us toward a balanced and bipartisan budget deal that I know so many of us in this room want.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives a message from the House that they have passed H.J. Res. 59, as amended by the Senate, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should all note that this unanimous consent agreement essentially asks the Senate to direct the House on what to pass and to pass the CR the Senate desires. There won't be any need to, in effect, deal in that fashion. That won't work.

I would also note in response that there is a unanimous consent request agreement I could agree to and I think Members of this side would agree to, and that is that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to a vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate. I further ask consent that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

That is the reason there has been an objection over here—because, under the way we believe we should proceed, raising the debt limit is a legislative act that should be subject to 60 votes. The concern from Members of our conference who have objected is that if we put the debt limit on the budget, then we would only have to have 51 votes. They have insisted they would approve going to the House and having conference on the budget, but they want an agreement that they are not going to attempt to slip that through. And if it is not a problem, why won't they agree?

So for these reasons, we are not able to agree, and I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, responding to the unanimous consent request the Senator from Alabama propounded, I reserve the right to object. We may have just reached the heart of the matter. While we hear day after day that our House Republican friends want to negotiate on the debt limit, the Senator from Alabama asked us now to specifically preclude ourselves from talking about that very subject. I respectfully suggest that perhaps the real problem here isn't that Democrats aren't talking to Republicans; it is that Republicans aren't even talking to each other.

I also would note that this modification the Senator from Alabama is asking would leave us in a shutdown facing hundreds of thousands of families

who would wonder when their next paycheck would come while we do our work.

So I object to the Senator's request, and I renew my unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama objected to the request from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SESSIONS. And I believe I understood she has renewed it, and so I would renew my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to all requests.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, just briefly, I appreciate Senator MURRAY having passed a budget this year in the Senate for the first time in 4 years. It is a budget that is far from the kind of budget we should have, but it was one they stood up and voted for. That is something of value to begin our process around here.

I would note that the reason it is such an unacceptable proposal from my Democratic colleagues—very similar to what President Obama asked for—is that it raises taxes $1 trillion over 10 years and raises spending $1 trillion over 10 years. That is above the lawful Budget Control Act levels we agreed to on a bipartisan basis in August of 2011.

If we remember, the President insisted we have a debt ceiling increase then. He said that we couldn't negotiate on it, that the country would sink into oblivion if we even got close to the debt limit, and we all had to back down and just agree to raise the debt limit without any limits.

Polling data showed the American people did not believe we should raise the debt limit of America without at least cutting spending and reducing our deficits; the credit card Congress was on was going to be pulled back. So Republicans stood firm. An agreement was reached, and the President approved it. It had no tax increases and raised the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion over 10 years. How much is that? We were projected to increase spending over 10 years by $10 trillion. This would reduce the increase in spending from $10 trillion to $8 trillion—not enough to throw the government into default, disaster, and confusion if properly executed. And it certainly wasn't the best way it was done. So that was the agreement. Before the ink is dry, with a year or so under it, now our colleagues have already abandoned ship, thrown in the towel, and want to raise spending by $1 trillion over what they agreed and raise taxes by another $1 trillion. That is why we have a big disagreement.

What do our colleagues want? They want to tax more, spend more, with more debt. It is not the way to run America, and the American people know it. So somehow, in this debt crisis, we all have to work together. And I respect my colleagues, but I cannot agree to doing something in this process that violates the solemn agreement. We told the American people: OK, we have raised the debt ceiling $2 trillion, but we reduced spending by $2 trillion. The debt ceiling has already eased up by $2.1 trillion, but we still made a promise we have to honor—that we will save $2.1 trillion of growth over the next 10 years. That is our responsibility and duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two Republican Senators to be recognized would be Senator COLLINS from Maine followed by Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska and that we would continue to alternate between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS be recognized at this time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, would the Senator repeat his request.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the two Republican speakers on this side be Senator COLLINS from Maine and Senator MURKOWSKI and that we continue to alternate between both sides. Since I just butted in as part of our budget debate, I did not intend or desire to take Senator COLLINS' time. She has been patiently waiting next in line.

Mr. BAUCUS. I certainly will not object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish to underline the gravity of the financial condition our country is headed to at this point. I think in the back-and-forth we tend to overlook just how serious this matter is. Here in the Capitol we walk in the footprints of our forefathers. Walking through these halls, their presence is felt at every turn. Just outside this Chamber are the likenesses of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and dozens of statesmen cast in bronze and marble.

At the end of this month a new leader will be added to the halls of Congress—Winston Churchill. A bust of the late Prime Minister will be added to the Capitol collection in the National Statutory Hall later this month.

Churchill once said, ''The price of greatness is responsibility.'' We here in Congress have a great responsibility—a responsibility to conduct the business of this Nation, to represent and do what is right for our people and help the people we represent. That is our responsibility here. However, the inaction of a small group of Members in the House has crippled Congress and is now threatening to impede the ability of the United States to fulfill one of its greatest responsibilities—to pay the government's bills. It is completely irresponsible to threaten to default on the Nation's debt. Since 1789 this country has always honored its obligations. Even when the White House and Capitol were burned to the ground right here in 1814, America still honored its debts.

America is the greatest country on Earth. We are the leaders of the free world. Nations look to us as examples in democracy. We are supposed to be ''the shining city upon a hill,'' but unfortunately the shine risks being tarnished by a debt default.

I agree with many of my colleagues that more could be done to reduce the deficit and promote economic growth, but, as the President said, we cannot negotiate under the threat of default of the Nation's debt. It reminds me of what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said: Never fear to negotiate, but do not negotiate out of fear. Failing to raise the debt limit and shutting down the government are two fearful actions that should not be on the table as we attempt to negotiate other matters in our Nation's fiscal policy.

The path is clear. We need to open the government and raise the Nation's borrowing limit. Take away those two guns to our head as a country. Then and only then can we responsibly address the Nation's long-term budget challenges.

Right now we need to come together to ensure that we do not permit another self-inflicted wound to our Nation's economy, and that is what defaulting of the debt is—a self-inflicted wound with global consequences.

When is the X date? When is the date on which the U.S. Government can no longer pay its bills? We don't know exactly. It is uncertain, and that is part of the problem. Uncertainty creates unpredictability. Nobody knows for sure. The Treasury Secretary says it is October 17. That is as good a date as any. At that time we will have exhausted all ''extraordinary measures'' to stay under the debt limit. I reminded my colleagues that we have been over the debt limit since I think it is May. But we have been taking extraordinary measures; that is, not fulfilling other obligations; that is, not making the government contribution to, say, the government retirement system, for example—we are not doing that anymore. That is an extraordinary measure. We are not making that contribution so we can make other payments such as Medicare payments and other payments the government is obligated to make.

After October 17, after all extraordinary measures are exhausted, we would risk defaulting on payments. This is dangerous territory. As of next Thursday it is expected the Treasury Department will have only about $30 billion cash on hand, barely enough to support the government for 1 or 2 weeks. After that the government's wallet is empty. We are in uncharted waters.

Again, this country has never in its history defaulted on the national debt. If the debt ceiling is reached, government would immediately have to slash its spending by 20 or 30 percent, driving the Nation back into recession.

Make no mistake about it. Social Security payments and Medicare would have to be slashed, veterans' benefits

hit, farm payments, farm funding, Department of Defense, payments to the disabled—every program this government runs will be devastated by cuts.

The default would also have global consequences, not just here in America but worldwide. Christine Lagarde, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, warned that a failure of the United States to raise the debt ceiling could damage the entire global economy. She is right. Look at how precarious the European economy is right now, and the great effort the European countries have been undertaking to try to stabilize the southern countries in Europe, along with the creditors of the northern nations of Europe. She said it is ''mission critical'' that the debt limit be resolved as soon as possible. Mission critical, says Christine Lagarde, Managing Director of the IMF.

We are the most important economy in the world. We are the reserve currency for the world. Our Treasury bonds are the very foundation of the global financial system. Default would put the global economy in chaos. The New York Times has an article today entitled ''Default Threat Generates Fear Around the Globe.''

Five years after the financial crisis in the United States helped spread a deep global recession—

Don't forget, Lehman Brothers collapsed 5 years ago in December.

—policy makers around the world again fear collateral damage, this time with their nations becoming victims not of Wall Street's excesses but of a political system in Washington that to many foreign eyes no longer seems to be able to function efficiently.

We have read the article. We know it is true. The plug has been pulled on negotiations between the United States and Europe on their trade agreements. Why? Because of the government shutdown, not so much the debt limit but the shutdown.

We also read articles, I am sure it is true, that President Obama had to cancel his trip to Southeast Asia because he had to stay here and try to work out this crisis. The United States is losing influence in Southeast Asia because he is not there. Who is there? President Xi, the President of China. President Xi is there, explaining to the Southeast Asian countries that China is their friend and he is making loans, an international development bank sponsored by China, tens and twenties of billions of dollars—not by the United States but China.

Those countries are trying to escape the gravitational pull of mainland China. President Xi's presence there helps increase their gravitational pull. The President of the United States is not there, not there to show to those other Southeast Asian countries that we care. He is not there because we are not doing our work. That is why he is not there.

His absence creates another almost deeper concern among countries, let's say in Southeast Asia. Where is the United States going to be militarily if there is some military difficulty in Southeast Asia? Where is the United States going to be? Can the United States be counted on? Can the United States be trusted?

It seems as though there is a question there because the President is not in Southeast Asia and the other question is there because there is a question whether the United States is going to pay its debts, going to pay its bills. I think we eventually will, as the Senator from Arizona Senator MCCAIN said. I think most Members of this body think we eventually will. But let's get there now, not later.

There is a real danger here, a big danger here. The danger is we are going to get close to the cliff and get so close to it that we will go over it. We know the cliff is out there. The cliff is default. We know it is not too far away. We know we do not want to go over the cliff. We do not know exactly where that cliff is. We don't know. It may be closer than we think. We do not know what payments we have to make, when they are due. We do not know what the revenue is going to be. That is why the X date is so uncertain.

In addition to that, something might happen that triggers a catastrophic economic global response. I don't want to overstate this point, but back in 1914, the Archduke of Austria was assassinated—Serbia. That spark started World War I, that spark caused it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. Very briefly, in addition, there have been other instances when pressure was being built up, people did not heed warnings, they let fate tempt them, and the result was collapse. There have been financial bubbles. The tulip bubble, for example. Lehman Brothers is another example. We knew with the mortgages being written that a bubble was building in that market, but we let it. We would say, oh, nothing is going to happen, but it eventually did.

I plead with my colleagues here. Remember, we cannot control fate. We can't control it. We can do our best. We all know that we are going to raise the debt ceiling, we all know we are going to open the government, so let's do it early rather than late.

I know it was exceeding my time a little bit, but I think it is important to remind ourselves.

I know we are the greatest country in the world.

The leader asked me to refer to a book I mentioned a couple of hours ago in the Democratic luncheon by Paul Kennedy, a Princeton historian. He pointed out in the sweep of history, civilizations and countries rise and fall. There is no guarantee that any country or civilization continues forever—Greeks, Romans, Persians, Genghis Khan, the United Kingdom—they rise and they fall. We are No. 1 right now. How long can we continue to be No. 1?

He also pointed out, Paul Kennedy, in the sweep of history, countries are defeated not by external armies but by internal decay. So I am saying let's not decay here. Let's resolve this as adults and let's be responsible in the spirit of Winston Churchill.

I apologize to my good friend from Maine for speaking on her time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the government shutdown represents a failure to govern and must be brought to an end. Disabled veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country are waiting for their claims to be handled. Pregnant women and small children are at risk of their WIC benefits not being funded. Crucial biomedical research is being disrupted and the sickest of children are being turned away from clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

The impact goes far beyond the direct consequences for Federal employees and the programs they administer. One has only to look at the impact of the closure of Acadia National Park in my State of Maine to see the ripple effects on shopkeepers, servers at restaurants, inn owners and others who depend on revenue from these disappointed tourists.

That is why I have worked hard to put together a three-point plan to bring this impasse to a speedy end. I am very delighted that my friend and colleague from Alaska Senator MURKOWSKI has joined me in shaping and supporting this plan. Let me quickly describe it and let me give credit to those who have talked about concepts that have been incorporated into this plan—people such as my colleagues Senator HATCH and Senator TOOMEY, and on the House side, Representative KIND and Representative DENT.

The first point of the plan would fund government for the next 6 months at the level of $986 billion, so that would allow government to immediately reopen.

Second, it would repeal the tax on medical devices and equipment such as x ray machines and pacemakers. This tax will only serve to drive up the cost of health care because it will be inevitably passed on to the consumer, it will stifle innovation, and industry estimates that it will lead to the loss of some 43,000 jobs. It is a tax that does not make sense.

The administration has pointed to the $30 billion that would be raised by this tax over the next 10 years. Fair enough. There is a way to replace that revenue and it is a way that has beneficial consequences to many employers who are struggling to make pension contributions in this difficult economy. It would do so without in any way weakening the pension obligation to their workers. It is a complicated issue. It is called pension smoothing. But it is one that this body has dealt with before in the transportation bill known as MAP 21. We would extend that pension smoothing on the contributions which have been produced

by the fact that the Federal Reserve has held interest rates at a very low level.

I will describe this in more detail in a written statement. It is in the statement that I made on the Senate floor on Saturday. But suffice it to say that by smoothing these pension contributions, we can replace the lost revenue that would result from the repeal of the 2.3-percent tax on medical devices and equipment.

The third point of our plan, the Collins-Murkowski plan, includes a bill that Senator MARK UDALL and I introduced earlier this year that would provide flexibility to Federal managers in dealing with sequestration, but it does so in a way that preserves the important congressional oversight. Sequestration is a flawed policy because it does not discriminate between essential programs and those that are duplicative and wasteful. But if we are to have sequestration, surely we should give Federal managers the ability to set priorities and apply common sense in its administration instead of having across-the-board, equal meat axe cuts for every line item in their budgets.

But to ensure that this flexibility is not abused, we would have the Appropriations Committee oversee this process and have the right to reject the plans. It is very similar to the reprogramming requests that the Appropriations Committee receives now and either accepts or rejects when agencies want to move money from one account to another.

This would represent a modest proposal that could bring this impasse to an end, allow government to reopen, give those on both sides of the aisle who have voted during the course of the budget resolution by 79 votes to 20-something votes to repeal this harmful tax on medical equipment and devices and yet replace the revenue. I don't see how the administration could object to that because the revenue would be replaced. Yet this harmful tax would be repealed and we would give Federal agencies the flexibility to deal with sequestration.

There is something in the Collins-Murkowski plan that everyone on both sides of the aisle can point to. Yet it would get us out of this impasse that is increasingly harmful to our country and its image in the world.

It is past time for us to come out of our partisan corners, it is past time for us to stop fighting, and it is past time for us to reopen government. We have all made crystal clear what our positions are on ObamaCare at this point. Let's proceed with governing rather than continuing to embrace a strategy that will lead us only to a dead-end and whose consequences will be increasingly felt by our economy and by the American people. We can do this.

I ask my Democratic colleagues to take a close look at the plan we are putting forward. It is a reasonable approach. I ask my Democratic and Republican colleagues to come together. Let's get this done. We can do it. We can legislate responsibly and in good faith.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to respectfully say that we in the Senate and we in the Congress have to do what our constituents elected us to do and what the Constitution requires us to do: keep the United States Government open and make sure the United States of America pays its bills. To do that, we are open to negotiation and examining a variety of ideas, but the main idea is to go through the regular order in the committee process.

We can keep the government open and we can meet our responsibility on the public debt if we embark upon two solutions and they are in the hands of the other party. We call upon the House to pass the Senate continuing funding resolution that would reopen government and keep it going until November 15. It is not a long-term solution. If we get to it right now, we will fund it at 2013 levels, acknowledging the sequester level. That was a big compromise. I compromised, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, to move that continuing funding resolution. It was $70 billion less than what I wanted, but in order to get us in a room and get the conversation going and the negotiations going, I was willing to compromise.

I call upon the House to pass that. I call upon the Senate Republicans who have objected to going to the Budget Committee to lift their objection so we can take the Senate-passed budget and go to conference so we can get a budget.

Why is this important? For those who say we have to control spending, there is nobody who disputes that, but the way we control spending is to go through the regular budget process. I say to many of my colleagues who might not understand the Budget Control Act and I say to the American people who are listening, the way to control discretionary spending is to pass a budget that sets a cap on what the appropriators can spend in domestic spending.

I heard the wonderful Senator and distinguished war hero from Arizona JOHN MCCAIN ask us to get to it today. I agree. Let's get to it today and lift the objection for Senator MURRAY, the chair of the Budget Committee, to take appointed conferees so they can negotiate on the budget.

I say to my colleagues—again, to explain the Budget Control Act—we appropriators are not wild spenders. We appropriators can't go rogue in terms of wild runaway spending. We have a budget cap imposed upon us through a budget process and something called a 302(a), but we can't get the cap on spending unless the Budget Committee is able to move. This is very serious.

I have the high honor of representing the State of Maryland, and I see my colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, on the floor. We represent 5½ million people and a lot of civilian agencies. I note also on the floor are the distinguished Senators from Virginia, both of whom are former Governors of Virginia.

Between the four of us, we represent the largest concentration of Federal employees in the world. We represent Federal employees from the Department of Defense to the National Institutes of Health, to the National Institute of Standards and Technology. There is a rollcall of honor in service and duty that makes the United States a stronger country, a stronger economy, and so on.

When we speak about government, we know what we are talking about, and we know what is going on. Many have spoken about opening NIH. I want to open NIH. NIH, which is a clinical hospital, is not accepting new patients. This week 200 people have been turned away. Children in the United States of America were turned away. It is not just BARB MIKULSKI talking, the Washington Post reported on a lady who has cancer and wants to come to NIH, but she can't get into a clinical trial because it is closed down. They say: Senator BARB, open NIH. But we have to open the rest of the government.

Right now the Centers for Disease Control has a substantial number of its workforce furloughed. Having the CDC closed constitutes a danger to public health. Right this minute in 18 States, 278 people have been sickened by salmonella. Thank God there have been no deaths, but it is making people very sick. We don't have CDC on the job to track diseases and alert the public health departments around the United States of America so they can stand sentry to protect people against salmonella. Open the CDC. Open the whole government.

Just this week, in our own metropolitan area, a worker was killed trying to service the Metro. This should be under investigation. There was one death and several injuries. There was a bus crash in Tennessee, but right this very minute the National Transportation Safety Board has the majority of their people furloughed. They can't investigate the Metro accident, and they can't investigate the bus crash in Tennessee.

A few weeks ago Senator CARDIN and I were informed that a person had a terrible accident on the Bay Bridge in which a car went over the side of the bridge. We asked for an investigation to make sure our bridge is safe. That was under way, but now it is going to be delayed.

Let's take our FBI. Our FBI agents are on the job. They are being paid with IOUs. A group of FBI agents, called Voices from the Field, said to us, their U.S. Government: Guess what. We don't have gas for our cars. The FBI does not have gas for its cars. The agents' gas allowance is limited to 200 miles per week, and they can't even buy gas out of their own pocket.

Not only is the FBI running out of gas, I think we are running out of gas here. The way we fuel our tanks and get America running and rolling again is to reopen government. The way we reopen government is for Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House, in his job as Speaker, to bring up the vote on reopening the government and vote on the Senate-passed resolution.

We say to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to lift their objection to the Budget Committee going to conference so the Budget Committee can come up with a budget with their caps on domestic discretionary spending. We will cap all discretionary spending. We appropriators will abide by the cap. We will not have runaway spending, and we will not go rogue. We will follow the rules, but I think we all need to follow the rules. Under the statutory requirement of the Budget Control Act, they were supposed to bring the budget back April 15. We passed one on March 23 and we have been waiting and waiting.

I wish to join with my colleague from Arizona. Let's get to it. Let's get the job done. Let's reopen government. Let's pay our bills. I am willing to negotiate. I am willing to compromise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, from what I heard from those who have just spoken prior to me, it sounds as if we ought to be able to get something done. We listened to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, with her commitment to advancing issues through the budget process. I think we too need to go to conference and get that moving.

We are sitting here in a kind of a rarefied world in the Senate Chamber. Some would suggest we live in a little bit of a bubble. Let me tell everyone about the folks who are not living in a bubble: the furloughed Federal employees and those who have been shut out of whatever it is that they had hoped they were going to be doing this past week and those in my State, for instance, who are looking to fill the family freezer.

It is moose season in my State, but now they were told they cannot access any of the refuge lands because Fish and Wildlife has said they cannot access the land regardless of what ANILCA provides and regardless of the full public access to these Federal lands. Those folks who are feeling the real impact of a government shutdown are not living in a bubble.

We just heard the chairman of the Finance Committee talk about the looming threat we are facing as we approach the debt limit, and he refers to a fiscal cliff. In fact, as a nation, we could lose our financial footing. We could go over that fiscal cliff.

For a lot of folks, they are already looking at their own fiscal cliff. They are not waiting for us to figure out what we are going to do or not do when it comes to dealing with the debt limit. They are not getting paid. They are perhaps a small business, such as Seong's Sushi Bar & Chinese, which is located across the street from the Federal Building in Juneau. They are sitting there losing revenues on a daily basis because they don't have the customers they anticipate every day. The folks who frequent Capital Brew, which is a drive-through coffee shop that is also in Juneau across from the Federal Building, Bill's Mini Cache, which is a snack shop inside the Anchorage Federal building, these are folks who are looking at it, and they are feeling their own fiscal cliff right now, with or without the threat of the debt limit.

So they are looking at us and they are saying: Wait a minute. You told us a couple weeks ago that we were going to avert this shutdown, that we would figure out how we were going to pass a continuing resolution.

We didn't pass a continuing resolution. Somehow, that all gets wrapped up in ObamaCare. They are trying to figure out where the nexus is here between funding the government and what is going on with the Affordable Care Act. They then find out: We are in a government shutdown. What does that mean for me? I am sitting here in Alaska, 4,000 miles from Washington, DC. But then they learn Fish and Wildlife is saying: No, you can't go out and get the moose to put in your freezer to make it through the winter. Or you are the crab fisherman who is waiting at the crab grounds beginning October 15, but the quotas have not yet been determined from within the National Marine Fisheries Service center yet, so you can't go out. The revenues the industry might be able to derive, about $7 million from the sale of great king crab that we would all love—a great market out there—but they are not going to be able to get out in the water because some Federal agency 4,000 miles from home hasn't delivered to them the quota.

So when we talk about these fiscal cliffs, it is not just waiting for us to hit a debt limit. It is what is happening with this government shutdown.

So what they are asking me—and I know each and every one of us is hearing from our constituents—is: So what is your plan? And oh, by the way, you better get on it pretty quick, because you have my attention now. What is the plan? So they see some of the things coming out of the House. The House has these mini efforts to fund a specific section, and it doesn't go anywhere here. We are told: Well, we want to open the whole thing. So if we can't open the whole thing and we can't open a portion of it, nothing happens. Nothing happens. So where is the plan? What are we going to do?

So I am pleased to stand with my friend from Maine Senator COLLINS as she has described a plan which I think is pretty reasonable. I think it is pretty sensible. When we think about those small, rational, reasonable steps that might get us to a place where we can stop the madness, if you will, break this impasse—a proposal that would pull back on the medical device tax, with an offset, so that we are not eroding, we are not undercutting the revenues that would come in for the Affordable Care Act, a 6-month extension of the continuing resolution, as well as a sequestration with a little bit of flexibility and, oh, let's add in some oversight, it sounds pretty rational.

Some suggest maybe the President doesn't want to do this because it is a small incursion in his signature bill. Do my colleagues know what. Right now, what we need to be thinking about is who we work for, whether it is the crab fisherman who wants to get out in the water and who is waiting for NMFS to step it up, whether it is the family out in Galena who is hoping they are going to be able to get their moose before moose season closes, whether it is the guy at Seong's Sushi Bar and Chinese there in Juneau, or whether it is the Alaska family. I got an e-mail a couple of days ago. This family has been planning for a year to bring all the kids together, including boyfriends and girlfriends. They are going to do a great hike out in the Moab National Park for a week, and they are stuck. Nothing is going on, and their family vacation is ruined.

What about what is going on—this is an amazing one—in the Kenai River, which happens to proceed through some refuge areas. People can still go fishing now, and there is good rainbow fishing out there. But when you move down river through that refuge park, you better bring your lines in because we are going to have enforcement action on the river.

There are so many stories we can all attest to, and some of them are horrible. Some of them, as Senator MCCAIN has indicated, are about families who are grieving the loss of their loved one—someone who has served this country with honor—being denied death benefits.

The country expects us to get our act together, and they expect us to do it without delay. They are not interested in knowing which side is going to gain more leverage the further we delay. Nobody is winning. I tell my friends the Democrats: You are not winning. And I tell my friends the Republicans: We are not winning. The administration is not winning. Everybody is losing when we cannot come together with a plan, with the resolve to do the job we are tasked to do, which is basic governing, and keeping the government open is basic governing.

So whether it is Senator COLLINS' plan, whether it is an effort that is yet to be created, as the Senator from Arizona challenged us, let's start this now. Let's not delay any further because real people—the people we care for, the people we are charged to help—are hurting right now. This goes beyond mere inconvenience. This is hurt.

So let's do what we have pledged to do. Let's do what we have signed up to

do, which is to work together. At the end of the day, this is not going to be a Republican plan or a Democratic plan or a Senate plan or a House plan. It is going to be a plan that allows us to govern.

With that, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the period of morning business for debate only until 7 p.m., and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to follow up on the remarks of my colleagues and the Senators who have spoken before me.

It seems as though we have accepted this new normal, that shutting down the operations of the largest enterprise in America is acceptable. I concur with my colleague, the Senator from Alaska, about the real stories and real pain that is taking place because of this government shutdown. I commend some of my colleagues for their comments. When we read these tragic stories, whether it concerns NIH or it concerns our veterans or concerns our National Park Service, they say: Oh, but that part of the government we want to reopen. Does that mean that every other aspect of government remains closed until we can find that story?

I point out stories to my colleagues that were in both The Washington Post and The New York Times today—stories we should be celebrating about—three American Nobel Prize winners. Does that mean we should now reopen the NSF, because if the National Science Foundation isn't funded, there may not be a next generation of American Nobel Prize winners? Do we have to bring in a story about some child being hurt because their food or their meat or their fish wasn't inspected correctly?

I have to tell my colleagues, I spent a lot longer in business than I have in politics, and I have been involved in a lot of business negotiations. But I have never been involved in a negotiation that says during the negotiation we have to shut down the operations of our business and inflict pain not only upon our employees but upon the general economy across the board.

That is not the way to govern.

We have talked about stories about Federal workers. But I agree with the Senator from Alaska. It also hurts the hotel owners along the Skyline Drive in our State of Virginia and the government contractors who start and stop because they don't understand how government is going to operate. I heard a story this morning about a small business outside a government facility in St. Louis that is hurting as well.

This piecemeal approach to reopening government makes no sense. What might be better—as we hear from some folks who want to have this piecemeal effect—is to ask: What parts of the government should stay closed. This is not the way to operate. We ought to reopen this government, put our people back to work, get this economy going again, and continue the very real conversations we have to have about getting our fiscal house in order.

What makes this different to me, in the 4½ years I have been in the Senate, than previous discussions and debates is that we have this—the first in my tenure in the Senate—government shutdown which disproportionately is hurting Virginia and Maryland. But it is literally hurting every community across America. But we have this tragedy, this catastrophe merging now into a deadline that is going to hit us next week where there are certain Members of Congress who say: It is OK if America defaults.

I find that stunning.

When we look back, we find there has never been a major industrial country in modern history that has defaulted. As a matter of fact, the last major country to default was Argentina, back in December of 2001. In the aftermath of that default, they had over 100 percent per annum inflation. Every family in Argentina saw literally 60 percent of their net worth disappear within a few weeks. America is not Argentina, but why would we even get close to that kind of potential economic catastrophe?

It has been mentioned already that America holds a record as the reserve currency for the world. When crises happen, as have happened around the world recently in many countries, people and capital flow into the dollar. That is because the dollar and the full faith and credit of the United States has never been suspect. There has never been a question of whether we are going to honor our commitments. Next week, or very shortly after, that history is going to be put potentially in jeopardy.

I have heard those who say we can prioritize payments. There is no business group in America or no economist that I know of, from left to right, who believes that somehow America can partially default and prioritize payments. Are we going to pay interest? Are we going to pay our troops?

Those of us who served at State levels realize that sometimes our budgets are close to 50 percent passthroughs from the Federal Government.

The Presiding Officer was the governor of the great State of West Virginia. How long before West Virginia defaults if America starts prioritizing its payments? How many other Detroits will there be all across America if we were to take this type of irresponsible action? Even if there were some possibility that there might be some chance of some logic behind this partial payment scheme, it has never been tried before. No industrial country has ever gotten this close to a default. Why would we take the chance? Why would we play Russian roulette with only one bullet in two chambers? It is something that at this moment, for our national economy and the world economy, can be devastating.

I know we seem to all be repeating ourselves on both sides, but to me it seems very easy in a negotiation; we have differences. I would say to my colleagues I probably make folks on my side more angry than almost anyone else on these issues around getting our country's balance sheet in order. I am anxious to continue those discussions about tax reform, about entitlement reform, about bringing our debt-to-GDP ratio down. But that kind of negotiation hasn't happened while we have this government shutdown and the full faith and credit of the United States potentially in jeopardy.

So let's open the government, not just because we hear some tragic story about one component of the government, not just because we need to make the case about food inspectors, about the National Science Foundation, about NASA Langley where we do aeronautics research—3,500 people and 7 people were at work last week. China, India, other nations around the world are not stopping their research, not stopping their investments because we can't get our act together. Open this government. Take off the table the idea that America will default. Then I am anxious to join with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get our country's balance sheet in order. But to continue to hold this economy and these stories of these Americans lives in this limbo is irresponsible beyond words.

So I hope we will go ahead and—agreeing with my colleagues who have spoken already, let's get this government open. Let's take and make sure we are going to honor and pay our debts, and let's get to the very real, important questions of how we get our Nation's balance sheet right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 72

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I want to again thank the majority leader for bringing the attention of this body to the tragedy of those servicemen who lost their lives and the fact that, unfortunately, their families had been notified improperly, I believe, that they will not be paid the tax-free death gratuity they are entitled to under law. This is wrong. Every Member of this body agrees this is wrong. Every Republican agrees this is wrong, and I am confident every Democrat agrees it is wrong as well.

Indeed, the way this announcement that was made was highly troubling.

The Department of Defense notified our military families via Twitter that those servicemembers who die in battle will not be paid their tax-free death gratuities due to the partial Federal Government shutdown.

I think this is yet another pattern that we have seen distressingly from the Obama administration of politicizing this shutdown and playing partisan games to maximize the pain that is inflicted on Americans. It is part and parcel of the pattern we have seen, barricading the World War II memorial, barricading the parking lot at Mount Vernon, George Washington's home, even though Mount Vernon is privately operated, barricading the roads leaving Mount Rushmore, even though they are State roads and not Federal roads.

The actions by the Department of Defense are also contrary to the statute that this body just passed. The military death gratuity is by statute a pay and personnel benefit. Accordingly, it is clearly funded by Public Law 113–39, the Pay Our Military Act that was passed in a bipartisan manner this week. We already acted to prevent this and, unfortunately, the Defense Department is declining to follow that law that we passed.

The legislation this body already passed would immediately act to take the families of those soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines whose lives are tragically taken—to take them off the table and say: Regardless of what happens in a government shutdown, we are going to stand by the men and women fighting for America.

Indeed, the House of Representatives has introduced a bipartisan bill to immediately fund death gratuity payments. When that bill is passed, the Senate should pass that bill immediately. Indeed, the Pentagon should abandon this policy to begin with and simply follow the law that was already passed. But if they do not, I call upon all 100 Senators to come together, to listen to the majority leader, who spoke powerfully about the need to stand by our service men and women whose lives are tragically taken. When the House passes that bill, which I am confident it will do so with considerable speed, I would call upon every Senator to listen to the majority leader's call and to stand with our service men and women.

But there is something else we can do right here today to demonstrate that this body does not have to be locked in partisan gridlock, to demonstrate that bipartisan cooperation is possible, and to demonstrate that our veterans are truly not the subject of partisan dispute but are separate and deserve to be treated fairly, deserve to have the commitments, the promises we made to our veterans honored; that is, this body can stop blocking the legislation that the House of Representatives has already passed—bipartisan legislation to fund the VA, to fund disability payments—so we do not hold them hostage to what is happening in Washington.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014; that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has stated again what has already been talked about here a lot, and that is a piecemeal approach to funding our government.

As do most Americans, we Democrats support the purpose of this bill to fund the Veterans' Administration. But there is no reason for us to have to choose between this important government function and disease control, NIH, highway safety, FBI, poor children, workplace safety, or protecting the environment.

We could do all these things if the House Republican leadership would just allow the House to vote on the Senate-passed measure to end the shutdown. Everyone knows the votes are there.

Our position is simple: Open the government, pay our bills, and then we will be happy to negotiate about anything.

We need to end this government shutdown.

First of all, my friend talks about these five families who are in bereavement, and that is an understatement. Five sons, husbands, friends were killed over the weekend.

Providing the funding that my friend requests would not enable DOD to pay a death gratuity to the families of 17 servicemembers—five over the weekend. We have had others die who have given their lives to protect the Nation since the shutdown began on October 1. Seventeen.

This is but one example of how the efforts of the Senator from Texas to fund the government on a piecemeal basis does not work.

If the Speaker would allow the House to pass the Senate continuing resolution, the Department of Defense would have the authority it needs to bring families to Dover, DE, to receive the remains of their family members and to pay the death gratuity benefits.

The junior Senator from Texas expresses concern for America's veterans. But his consent request addresses only some of the ways in which the American people, through their government, have committed to help our veterans.

Let me quote from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY. He gave these remarks on October 3. Here is exactly what he said:

I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

So there could not be a better example of: Why we are involved in this? Why could not we just open the government? Let our former colleague, the former Senator from Georgia, Max Cleland, a decorated, disabled American veteran who runs the cemeteries, do his job. He cannot do that. Let's get it all over with. Let's have the NIH go forward, the Centers for Disease Control, the Park Service. We cannot have this piecemeal approach, because you wind up with the same situation in which we now find ourselves. We want to do something for the veterans, but it does not take care of much of what the veterans need.

So I ask unanimous consent that my friend's request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government—everything; veterans, there are cemeteries, there are benefits, everything—and it is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

So I would ask my friend to really surprise the world, surprise the country, and say: I agree. Modify it. Let's fund the government.

And then, as we have said, as I have said—and everyone listen: We are happy, when the government is open, when we can pay our bills, to sit down and talk about anything they want to talk about. It does not matter. No restrictions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader and I be able to engage in a colloquy so that we may perhaps be able to, as the majority leader said, surprise the world by finding some avenues of bipartisan cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am happy to sit down and talk to the Senator—his office or my office. The point we have right here today is that we need the government open. With all due respect to my friend, the junior Senator from Texas—I want to say this in a most respectful way—he and I, with the dialog here on the Senate floor, we are not going to work this out. I have asked that the government be open so

that everyone can have benefits. The veterans measure he proposes leaves many veterans out in the cold—out in the cold—including the families of 17 of our servicemen who were killed since this came into effect, this shutdown.

So we will go as we have. I object to his proposal. I assume he will object to mine. And then we will go through the 10 minutes per person and see what happens later today. But I do—I am happy to sit down and talk to the Senator in my office, his office, any place he suggests, privately or publicly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, was there——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, just a clarification: Was there objection to the request that we be able to engage in a colloquy? I was not clear as to what the majority leader was objecting to.

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will note with regret that the majority leader objected to engaging in a discussion, to engaging in negotiations here on the Senate floor. I think that is unfortunate.

So I will promulgate the questions I would have asked him directly, and he may choose whether he may wish to answer.

The majority leader read from comments that Senator MURPHY made on the Senate floor, suggesting that the House bill funding the VA was not broad enough. I would note, in my office we have drafted legislation that would fund the VA in its entirety. And if his objection is that it is not broad enough, I will readily offer that I would happily work with the majority leader to fund every bit of the VA as it is right now today, and we could introduce that bill. Indeed, I would be happy to have it labeled the Reid-Cruz bill and to give lead authorship to the majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator be willing to take care of the 560,000 veterans who are Federal employees, many of whom have now been furloughed?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Illinois for that question. Indeed, I enthusiastically support the proposal that the House unanimously passed to give backpay to Federal workers. Indeed, I would ask a question of the assistant majority leader: whether the Senate will even vote on that proposal because there are eight bills funding the Federal Government that are sitting on the majority leader's desk. We have not been allowed to vote on any of them.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from Texas is asking me a question, I would respond through the Chair that we have given the Senator from Texas ample opportunity to completely fund the government, including all of the veterans who work for the Federal Government, and all of the functions of the Federal Government so we do not run into the embarrassment of these poor families in their bereavement being denied the most basic benefits that our government gives.

He has had a chance to do that over and over. I believe he has declined that opportunity. So he bears some responsibility for the unfortunate circumstances we face.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I would note the fact that there are some issues on which we have partisan disagreements does not mean there are not other issues on which we can come together.

Ms. STABENOW. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend for a question.

Ms. STABENOW. Through the Chair to the Senator from Texas, I am wondering if his motion includes the full funding of the VA medical system, which is a completely government-run, government-controlled health care system?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend for that question. As I said, I would readily support legislation fully funding the VA, because the VA is a vital government system. It is a promise we have made. It is unrelated to ObamaCare. My principal complaint this past week has been that the Democratic majority in this body is holding programs unrelated to ObamaCare hostage in order to force ObamaCare on everyone. We agreed for active-duty military.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if I might, just to clarify so that I understand, because the Senator from Texas has, in fact, made the ending of a private sector competitive health care system for up to 30 million Americans part of what he wants to stop, I wanted to be clear that the fully government-funded, government-run, with government doctors system through the Veterans' Administration is something the Senator is advocating that we continue to fund through the Federal Government?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Michigan for that question. Yet again, the answer is yes. I believe we should fully fund the VA. The two questions I would promulgate——

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. I would note the majority leader seems not to want to engage in debate. So I object. I hope the majority leader will start negotiating.

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modified request.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, using leader time, we have a number of people who are wishing to speak. They should be able to do that. But I say as nicely as I can, the problem we have here is what people are saying, like my friend from Texas, little bits and pieces of government. It will not work. We have to open the government. So until that happens—we have to open the government. We have to make sure we can pay our debts. Then we will negotiate.

I know he is fixed on ObamaCare. We know that. But the problem is that is not going to change. So I would hope we can do what needs to be done, open the government, make sure we pay our bills, and then we negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I want to join with most of my colleagues who have talked about the urgency of us getting the government open. It is causing great harm to our country. Make no mistake about it, it is hurting our economy. I could talk about my own State of Maryland. Our Governor has estimated that we are losing $15 million every day. So every day is precious.

I could talk about over 100,000 Federal workers in Maryland who are furloughed out of the 800,000 nationally, having a huge impact on our economy.

This morning Senator BOXER held a news briefing where we talked about the impact on the Environmental Protection Agency where 93 percent of its employees have been furloughed. We can talk about the direct impact of those employees not being there.

There was a representative from the Ding Darling Refuge in Florida saying not only did it hurt the local economy directly, but she talked about one of the contract services that provided the touring service to the refuge had to lay off 20-some employees.

There are private sector jobs that are directly being lost as a result of this furlough. It is going to be very difficult to get back that loss in our economy the longer the government shutdown lasts. It is wasteful to the taxpayer. The last shutdown cost the taxpayers $2 billion. Here we talk about conservatives who want to do something about the national debt and they are wasting taxpayer dollars by keeping government closed.

Yes, it is hurting our Federal workforce. I joined with Senator MIKULSKI in the comments she made a little bit earlier. Our Federal workforce has had to endure freezes in salaries, furloughs as a result of sequestration, freezes in the number of employees who can be hired, doing more work with less, and now furloughs again under a government shutdown. Those who are working do not know when they are going to get paid. It is not what we should be

doing to our Federal workforce. They have suffered. This is wrong. It is totally avoidable.

The furloughs at the Environmental Protection Agency are jeopardizing our public health. We had experts come in today and talk about the fact that we do not have the people on guard to protect our waters, to protect our air, to protect our environment. It is jeopardizing public health. It is jeopardizing our environment.

I mentioned this morning, and let me mention again, the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge located on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, in Cambridge. This is a community in which that refuge is a huge part of their economy. This is a popular month for visitors to visit Blackwater. Well, the local businesses are hurting. The restaurants have less customers; the hotels, less rooms are being rented. It goes on and on and on, the damage to our economy.

Harbor Point is one of the most important economic developments in downtown Baltimore. It is an RCRA site, which means it is under court order requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to sign off on the development plan. Well, we have a development plan. The city council is acting. We are ready to move forward. But guess what. We cannot get EPA to sign off on it because the people responsible are now on furlough. That is holding up economic growth and economic development in Baltimore. That is what this is doing. It is harming us.

Maryland farmers on the Chesapeake Bay are doing what is right to try to help our bay. They depend upon the protections of the programs that are out there on soil conservation. The Senator from Michigan knows through how hard she has been working on the agriculture bill to provide the tools that are necessary to help our farmers be responsible farmers on land conservation.

I received a call from a farmer near Centerville, MD, on Monday that sums up pretty well how important the Natural Resources Conservation Service is to their work. This person is enrolled in the Conservation Stewardship Program, the CSP. That means he is planting bumper crops in an effort to help us deal with the runoff issues of pesticides and insecticides into the bay, helping us in helping the bay.

He receives certain payments as a result of participation in the program. He is no longer getting those payments. We are asking him to make sacrifices, but we are not giving him the Federal partnership. That is not right. He is hurt. He said: What am I supposed to do? Am I supposed to continue to do this? He told me he has a son with a medical condition that requires regular clinical eye treatment. He does not know whether he can afford that this month. He was helping us with the environment. Now what do we do? We back off of what is necessary.

I could give you many more examples. There is no piecemeal way you can correct each one of those.

On our foreign policy issues, I have the honor of chairing the East Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. President Obama was supposed to be the headliner at the East Asia Economic Summit this past week. Guess who stole the headline. President Xi of China rather than our President. Asia is wondering whether America is open for business. We were missing at the table. That is no way for America to be conducting its business. We need to be open. We need to get government open.

I hear my colleagues who want to negotiate budget deals. I am all for that. I think I have a reputation around here and people know I am interested in getting Democrats and Republicans together and getting a budget that makes sense for our country. But let me quote from the Baltimore Sun from this morning, because I think they say it better than I could say it. This is an exact quote from the Baltimore Sun about negotiations and how we have to go through negotiations.

> Passing a ''clean'' continuing resolution keeping government fully operating at funding levels that GOP has already endorsed is no compromise. It's status quo. Raising the debt ceiling isn't a concession either—it allows the nation to pay the bills Congress has already incurred and prevents the possibility of a government default, which would hurt the economy, raise borrowing costs and increase the Federal deficit.
>
> So when Speaker Boehner lashes out at President Obama for failing to negotiate, one has to ask, what is this thing he describes as negotiation? House Republicans are not merely leveraging their political position—as some dryly claim—they are threatening to do grievous harm to the global economy and the American public.
>
> The gun isn't raised to Mr. Obama's head or to the Senate's. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That's why descriptions like ''ransom'' and ''hostage'' are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

The editorial ends by saying:

> It's time for Mr. Boehner to put down the gun and put more faith in the democratic process.

We need to negotiate a budget for next year. We absolutely need to do it. We tried to go to budget conference many times. The majority leader has repeated that request today. The formula of what is right for this country to do—and it is not one side getting advantage over another—the right thing to do is open government, pay our bills, and, yes, let's negotiate a budget that will not be what the Democrats want, will not be what the Republicans want. We are going to have to compromise as the Framers of our Constitution envisioned that we would do. That is what we should have done months ago. We passed our budget in March. We should have been negotiating months ago.

But what we need to do right now is open government, pay our bills, and, yes, then it is ripe for us to sit down and negotiate. I can tell you, we are ready to do that. But it is up to Speaker BOEHNER now to vote, to vote on the resolution that will keep government open, to vote on a way we can make sure that we will continue to pay our bills, and then accept our offer to sit down and negotiate a budget for the coming year. That would be the best thing we can do for the American people.

I urge my colleagues with a sense of urgency that we move this immediately because of the damage we are causing to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that no one wants to be here. Not one Member of this body wants to be in shutdown. We all may have different reasons, different explanations as to why we are here. We might differ with regard to our own beliefs as to how best we should get out of this. But not one of us wants to be here. Every one of us recognizes how awful it is to be in a shutdown posture.

I would like to take a few moments and explain my thoughts on both of those two points. I believe perhaps the single most important reason, single most undisputable reason why we are in a shutdown posture has to do with the fact that for a variety of reasons we have been operating on the basis of continuing resolutions for several years in a row. A continuing resolution, of course, is a bill, a legislative vehicle through which Congress may choose to keep government programs funded at current levels. It is kind of a reset button. It propels us forward on the basis of our current spending pattern, rather than on the basis of an independently, freshly negotiated set of priorities.

This is a different way of running government. Normally this is reserved for unusual circumstances. It usually does not last as long as we have been going this time around, for about 4½ years this way. But this causes us to do things in a way that is different than one would otherwise choose to do them. It is certainly very different than the manner in which we would operate in any other aspect of our lives.

To use one familiar example, let's analogize Congress's spending pattern, its spending decisions, to a consumer going to the grocery store. Suppose you went to the grocery store having been informed by your spouse that you need to bring home bread, milk, and eggs. So you went to that grocery store, you put bread and milk and eggs in your basket. You go to the checkout counter. You place the bread, the milk, and the eggs on the counter. The cashier rings you up. The cashier at that point says: Okay, here is what you will owe us for these items, but we will not allow you to buy just bread, milk, and

eggs. In order to buy these items at this store, we will also require you to purchase a half ton of iron ore, a bucket of nails, a book about cowboy poetry, and a Barry Manilow album.

Of course, anyone being told that would be a little surprised. Anyone being told that would be reluctant to shop at that same store in the future. And if another store existed, another alternative, very few, if any, consumers would continue shopping at that institution.

Yet that in some ways is the way we are asked to spend money here in Congress when we are operating on the basis of back-to-back continuing resolutions, just pushing reset on our spending button, keeping a Federal Government that spends about $3.7 trillion a year operating sort of on economic autopilot.

It would actually be a little bit closer analogy if we changed the hypothetical to a circumstance in which the cashier said not just that you have to buy half a ton of iron ore, a bucket of nails, a book about cowboy poetry, and a Barry Manilow album, but you also have to buy one of every single item in the entire grocery store in order to buy anything—no bread, no milk, no eggs, nothing unless you buy one of everything in the entire store. That would bring us a little closer to the analogy we are dealing with here where we have to choose to fund everything or alternatively to fund nothing. Neither one of those, it seems to me, is a terribly good solution. Neither one of those fairly represents good decisionmaking practices.

We ought to be able to proceed, as past Congresses have historically, passing a dozen or so—sometimes more—appropriations bills and going through our Federal Government category by category debating and discussing each appropriations measure, discussing the contents of that measure to make sure there is sufficient agreement within this body and within the House of Representatives to continue funding the government function in question.

We have a new item in the store, so to speak, as we are shopping this year. This new item in the store is called ObamaCare, one that is about to take full effect on January 1, 2014. Yes, it is the law of the land, but we do have the final choice, the final option, the final authority to choose whether to fund that moving forward or, alternatively, to defund it. We can take that out of the grocery cart.

It is a new item that has caused a lot of people a lot of concern. A lot of people are fearing and experiencing job losses, cuts to their wages, having their hours slashed and losing their health care benefits as a result of this law, and they see more of these disturbing trends coming in the near future. So they are asking for Congress to help. They are asking for Congress to defund the implementation of this law.

A lot of people and many of my colleagues in this body have responded by saying: Yes, but it is the law. That is true. It was passed by Congress 3½ years ago and signed into law by President Obama. It is important to remember two facts about this, however.

First of all, the President himself has announced that he is not following the law. He himself says the law is not ready to implement as it is written. He himself has refused to follow it as it is written.

Secondly, it is not unusual, it is not unheard of by any means to have a law that puts in place one standard, one program, and then have a subsequent appropriations decision made by Congress that results in the defunding of that very program. Let me cite one of many examples I could point to. Under Federal law, currently there is designated something known as the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository. That is our official nuclear waste repository. Yet for many years it has been defunded by the Congress. That is Congress's prerogative. Congress holds the power of the purse. Congress may decide to do that.

It is also important to remember that this was by design that it would work this way. Our Founding Fathers understood and set up the system so that it would work this way, and they put the power of the purse in the hands of the House of Representatives, understanding the House of Representatives would act first when exercising the power of the purse.

James Madison acknowledged this fact in Federalist No. 58, and if I can quote from that in pertinent part, James Madison wrote:

> The House of Representatives can not only refuse, but they alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of Government. They, in a word, hold the purse; that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the People gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any Constitution can arm the immediate Representatives of the People, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

So we find ourselves now in a position in which the House of Representatives is wanting to get the government funded again and is acting to keep the government funded on a step-by-step basis, starting with those areas as to which there is the most broad-based bipartisan support, those areas of government that have nothing to do with the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare. Moving step by step in this fashion, we can get the government funded again. We should be getting the government funded again.

In many respects, what we have seen over the last week—the conduct of the Obama administration during the first week of this shutdown—may well serve as the single best argument against ObamaCare. What we have seen is a willingness of this President and his administration to utilize the already vast resources of the Federal Government to make it hurt—to hurt families, to hurt businesses, to hurt those who depend on their access to Federal lands, to national monuments, national parks, and other Federal installations. This itself is evidence of the fact that when we give government too much power, that power may, and ultimately will, be abused.

I want to be clear that this is not a problem that is distinctively Democratic. It is not something that belongs uniquely to liberals. This is equally a Republican problem. Republican and Democratic administrations in the past and in the future will have chosen at times to abuse power when it suits their interests in order to get their way politically. We need to not give yet another source of power to the Federal Government—a source of power that intrudes into one of the most personal aspects of human existence.

When we give the Federal Government control of our health care system, we give them control of aspects of our lives that are intensely personal, very intimate, and, frankly, not the business of the Federal Government. We don't want to give that power to a government that may one day be used against us for someone's partisan political gain. It is for that reason we are having this discussion. It is for that reason we need to keep the government funded.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, we are now in day 8 of the government shutdown, and the pain has been felt by all across the country—by the cancer patients being denied access to new clinical trials at NIH, by the mom whose son has muscular dystrophy. His name is Jackson. She told me that every day those researchers aren't working on a cure for her son's disease is a day lost. She said every day counts. Small businesses can't get affordable loans through the SBA. Farmers write me about not being able to get their conservation loans.

I have here a letter I read on the floor on Saturday:

> Please do whatever you can to stop the government shutdown. We have 14 acres of land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program. Our rental payment is made to us this first week of October. We depend on this money. It is not a small amount for our family.

Kathy, from Minnesota:

> I am an employee of the Social Security Administration, Office of Disability . . . I have seen you intervene on matters for claimants who have disability hearings pending. I am furloughed as part of the government shutdown. If you want your constituents' hearings addressed, I need to be at work in my office.

Alicia, from Hastings, MN:

> I am writing to express my extreme concern over the federal government shutdown.

I am a teacher, a mother of three boys, and the wife of a furloughed veteran who works for the Minnesota Air National Guard. I have never before written a letter to my representatives, but feel so utterly helpless and frustrated at this time; I needed to voice my concern. . . . At this point in time, my husband, who is a veteran . . . is out of work because he is a federal employee not deemed essential. I am afraid that not only are the other 800,000 laid-off federal employees deemed non-essential, but the rest of the American citizens are non-essential as well.

She goes on to say:

Our struggles are real-life struggles; not a game, not philosophical, not in theory, not distant, and not imaginary. My hope is that these struggles and hardships matter to you . . . That is your duty. That is your charge. That is your enormous task. Shutting down the government is not one of those responsible actions.

That is what we are hearing from the people in my State, the people all over the country.

It is time to end the shutdown, and I will continue to urge my colleagues in the House to do the right thing and pass the straightforward bill the Senate passed on September 27 that would get the government back to work and get those employees back to their jobs.

It is great that the House passed a bill to pay them. That is a good thing. But now they are paying them to stay home. They are paying them to not do their job. They want to come back to work.

As you know, Madam President, we are now facing another critical deadline—the deadline for paying our bills or facing default. Next Thursday, on October 17, our country will hit its legal borrowing limit, and when that happens we will be asked to do what Congress has routinely done 70 times over the past 50 years; that is, pay our country's bills.

Let me be clear. This is about making good on commitments we have already made. This is about doing what regular Americans do every month when they pay their credit card bills. Yet lately we have heard voices from the other side from a number of people who seem to think this is just no big deal.

Just the other day Republican Congressman JOE BARTON of Texas said:

Some bills have to be paid and some bills we can defer and only pay partially, but that doesn't mean that we have to pay every bill the day it comes in.

Then there was Dan Mitchell, a senior fellow at the conservative Cato Institute, who said:

There's no need to fret.

No need to fret? That is not what history teaches us.

As chair on the Senate side of the Joint Economic Committee, I had a hearing a few weeks ago about the cost of this brinkmanship, about what happens if we go over that cliff, if we let our bills go, if we don't pay them.

Let's turn back to 2011. We have a very clear lesson of what happens when the mere prospect of a default sent shock waves through our economy. I recently released a report examining the fallout of that brinkmanship. The results were ugly. The Dow Jones plummeted more than 2,000 points, our credit rating was downgraded, and $2.4 trillion in American household wealth was wiped away.

I think it is important for everyone to remember that in 2011 all of this happened before we averted default. The Treasury Secretary sent a letter to Congress about the looming debt ceiling starting on January 6, 2011. On May 2 he announced that the debt limit would be reached on August 2. That was the magic day. We now have people saying maybe it is not October 17. They were saying that back then. But do you know what happened in the lead-up to August 2? On July 14 Standard & Poor's warned that it may downgrade the U.S. credit rating. They followed through on that. They downgraded it after the magic day of August 2, but it was 2 weeks before that they warned they might do it. What happened then? Well, over late July and early August, leading up to the date, the Dow Jones dropped more than 2,000 points.

So the next time someone says there is no need to fret over playing games with the debt ceiling, tell them to talk to the families whose retirement plans took a hit.

Make no mistake. This brinkmanship has very real consequences for our economy. We can't afford to go down this path again because this time around the fall could be so much harder. Our Joint Economic Committee analysis indicates that rates could rise on everything from credit cards and home mortgages to borrowing costs for businesses. At a time when our economy is finally turning a corner, this would put a real strain on families and small business owners.

But don't take my word for it. Secretary Lew has said extraordinary measures will be exhausted by mid-October. Already our government is not matching the retirement fund that Federal workers put in. Already they are not issuing some of the municipal bonds. Already they are not making some of the typical investments they would normally make. The business community and my friends on the other side of the aisle know businesses are overwhelmingly opposed to the idea of America not paying its bills, including key leaders such as Randall Stephenson, CEO of AT&T, who said:

It is unthinkable that the US could default, and it would be the height of irresponsibility for a public official to consider such a course.

Our country cannot afford to keep lurching from crisis to crisis. It is time for both parties to focus on real solutions and get the government back to work in the short term so we can focus on responsibly reducing our deficit in the long term. I supported the work of the Gang of 6, the work of the Gang of 8, the work that was being done by the Domenici-Rivlin Commission, the work that was being done by the debt commission. I was one of 14 Senators who pushed for that work to be done, and I think it is a great basis. I don't agree with everything in it, but it is a good start for how we can negotiate a major deal. We cannot do that in the next few days. We need time to do it, and that is why the Senate proposal is 6 weeks—6 weeks to allow the government to open again so we can truly negotiate the kind of long-term debt reduction deal that we should.

We need to be forward-looking. We need to be forward-looking enough to recognize the decisions we make today go far beyond the next election cycle; they will be felt by generations to come. We have a responsibility to get things right. We can't allow our country to go over the brink. It is not the American way.

In a 1987 address to the American people when he was talking about the debt ceiling and the need to pay our country's bills, President Ronald Reagan said:

The United States has a special responsibility to itself and the world to meet its obligations. It means we have a well-earned reputation for reliability and credibility—two things that set us apart from much of the world.

I urge my colleagues to take these words seriously and to join me in ensuring that Congress acts responsibly and in the best interest of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be divided between myself and the senior Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, not to object, I wish to clarify and ask if we might expand that to indicate the order which I believe we agreed to on the floor; that I be allowed to speak after my two distinguished colleagues, then Senator WHITEHOUSE, and then Senator COBURN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator modify her request?

Ms. AYOTTE. Absolutely, I modify the request to reflect what the senior the Senator from Michigan said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I think it is time for us to end this government shutdown. I said on the floor twice last week, and prior to that, that I didn't think the strategy of defunding ObamaCare was a strategy which would be successful. While I support repealing and replacing ObamaCare, because I have seen the negative impact in my own State of New Hampshire, we have already seen the government is shut down and yet the ObamaCare exchanges have opened—showing already many of the problems with those exchanges, with the computer system, what are called glitches but are major flaws at this point. So it is time for

both sides to come together and resolve this on behalf of the American people.

Let me say it is appalling that we have soldiers who have been killed in the line of duty and their families aren't receiving death benefits. It is wrong. It is outrageous. We need to solve this right away and we need to solve this overall government shutdown.

In New Hampshire, we have private campgrounds which contract with the White Mountain National Forest which are closed, despite the fact that they actually bring revenue into the Treasury. They are run privately and actually make money for the Federal Government. I think the administration is playing games with things like that, and they should open those campgrounds. But ultimately we have to get this government open.

I wish to praise my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine Senator COLLINS, who came to the floor earlier today with an idea she has drawn not only from Members in this Chamber but in the House of Representatives of a way we could resolve this impasse, and that is taking something we have already voted on in this Chamber on the budget resolution. There was a vote in this Chamber on the medical device tax repeal, and that vote got on the budget resolution 79 to 20. We voted on a bipartisan basis to repeal this tax. I have been against this tax since I campaigned, because in New Hampshire we see the impact on our companies. It is going to increase health care costs. Many companies in New Hampshire, such as Smiths Medical and Corflex, are negatively impacted by this tax. Their workers are put in a difficult place when these companies can't expand or they have to reduce their workforce because of this onerous tax—which, by the way, is a 2.3-percent tax on revenue, a tax on innovation and new ideas in health care, rather than a tax on profit. But ultimately we should repeal this tax. It is wrong.

I wish to support what my colleague from Maine came to the floor on today as something we should take up and discuss in this Chamber; that is, a repeal of the medical device tax with a pay-for, a CR proposed for a longer period of time within the Budget Control Act numbers. She has proposed 6 months, and flexibility for the agencies to address the sequester in a way that is best and most sensible for the American people.

I thank my colleague from Maine. We can come together and resolve this. I hope that along with Members on the other side of the aisle who voted for the repeal, we can work together with Members of the House of Representatives, we can work this out, get the government open, and also address concerns that we have with ObamaCare which is impacting an important industry, the medical device industry that provides innovation and important lifesaving devices for people in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, four times the House of Representatives has sent over continuing resolutions with various additions for consideration by the Senate. Each time Senator REID and the majority party have tabled those provisions, essentially shutting them down without giving them an opportunity for a vote on the merits.

The last time, though, I believe Senator REID led his colleagues down a very treacherous path, because the provisions of this otherwise clean CR would have repealed the provision that carves out Congress and members of our staff and gives us preferential treatment under ObamaCare. The second part of it has to do with delaying penalties on individuals, just as the President has unilaterally done in delaying penalties on employers.

There is no good reason for us not to pass both of those provisions. But instead of trying to deal constructively with the House of Representatives—which has sent four separate bills over here on the continuing resolution—the majority leader has chosen to stiff-arm each of those efforts.

So when the majority leader comes to the floor and bemoans the government shutdown—something we all agree we should try our best to avoid—he claims they are willing to negotiate and the President is willing to negotiate a change in the outcome. But we know that is not true. We know each time they have shut out Republican proposals from the House of Representatives which would open the Federal Government with reasonable bipartisan agreements.

But what really is beyond belief is when I hear our colleagues come to the floor and they say, Why can't we have cancer research for children at NIH continue? Yet we come to the floor and offer bills which would open funding at the National Institutes of Health, that very same cancer research, and they are objected to by the Democratic side of the aisle. I don't know any other word to describe it than hypocrisy.

This morning, the Washington Post talks about the case of Michelle Langbehn from California, who was diagnosed with sarcoma and is unable to have an opportunity to participate in a clinical trial at NIH. This is the very same sort of program which would have been funded by the bill we offered on this side of the aisle and was objected to by the majority leader and the Democratic side.

There is one bright spot of agreement, and that is we were able to agree unanimously to pass the House bill that funded our troops which passed the House 423 to 0. That is the good news. But the bad news is this has now all morphed into a debate not only on the continuing resolution but on the debt ceiling. What the majority leader and his side of the aisle are apparently proposing is that without making any arrangements whatsoever to pay for the $17 trillion in debt that has already been accumulated, they want another clean debt ceiling increase, and the President says he won't negotiate, but in all likelihood we will be voting later this week on another $1 trillion added to our maxed-out credit card without doing anything whatsoever to take care of the debt which has already been incurred.

That is fundamentally irresponsible. That is not me saying it. The American people have said this. The Congressional Budget Office has said this. The President's own bipartisan fiscal commission has said that.

In a recent poll from NBC-Wall Street Journal, when people were given the choice between raising the debt ceiling or not raising the debt ceiling, 44 percent said don't raise the debt ceiling, 22 percent said raise the debt ceiling. I realize we have more choices than that. There could be, coupled together with the raising of the debt ceiling, some real reforms of our broken entitlement programs to shore up Social Security and Medicare. But our colleagues and the President himself have said, No, I am not going to negotiate. No, I want a clean debt ceiling. No, I want the freedom to max out the credit card another $1 trillion, without doing anything to pay off the debt that threatens not only our future prosperity, but our national security.

I remember very clearly when ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked what the greatest national security threat to the United States was, and he said the national debt.

Why would our colleagues and the President of the United States ignore what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff called the most significant national security threat to our country by saying, We are not interested in any reforms, we are not interested in anything that would actually pay down the debt and remove that threat to our national security and our future prosperity? Why would they say, No, we want to keep on spending money—money we don't actually have—and continue to borrow from our creditors like China and other foreign countries that hold a majority of our national debt? And when interest rates start to tick back up again as the Federal Reserve begins to taper its purchase of our own debt, we are going to see more and more of our national expenditures go to pay interest on that debt, crowding out not only national security but the safety net programs for the most vulnerable people in our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first I apologize for the hoarse voice. I have been recovering from a cold. But it is important for me to have the opportunity to speak on behalf of the people from Michigan about what is happening, as everyone at home is scratching their head trying to figure

out why, in the greatest country in the world, we have seen government services now shut down and why there are those who think it is all right for us not to pay our bills and default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America, and why folks aren't willing to just open the government, pay our bills, and then negotiate.

In fact, we have been negotiating. We have negotiated on a lot. I am proud to say we negotiated a successful bipartisan farm bill not that long ago, a real deficit reduction proposal which actually passed the Senate with over a two-thirds vote. So we certainly are willing to negotiate.

Our leader Senator REID was willing to negotiate and in fact did negotiate with the Speaker of the House. As we all know, the Speaker called him in September and indicated he would like to see a 6-week extension of the current funding levels for the government while we were negotiating something more broadly on a budget. It was at a funding level which we don't believe is the right one in terms of investing in education, innovation, and creating jobs, but it was 6 weeks. After talking with us, our leader said that in the interest of negotiating and compromising, we would be willing to do that.

As we know now from Republican colleagues in the House who said that was the intent, unfortunately the Speaker could not follow through on the agreement he had negotiated.

That is because a minority of the minority in the House that is extremely intent on—and in fact has successfully achieved one of the goals they ran on—shutting down the government. But we have negotiated.

We also have negotiated on the big picture. We know that a few years ago with the Bowles-Simpson Commission, with others, that $4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years was picked as an important goal to be able to rightsize and bring down our long-term debt. The good news is that not only have we cut the annual deficit in half, but of that $4 trillion we have already agreed to $2.5 trillion of that in deficit reduction over the next 10 years. So over half of that has already been achieved.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle act as if nothing is happening, I have to say the deficit has been cut in half and, second, over half of a long-term goal on the debt has been achieved. We need to keep going. We don't need to shut down the government to do that. We do not need to default on our debts as the greatest country in the world to do that. We just need to work together to do that. That is why we would say we need to open the government, pay our bills, and continue to negotiate. Let's negotiate, but it is a continuation of negotiating.

In fact, weakening the full faith and credit of the United States of America—think of that, the greatest country in the world, the full faith and credit of the United States of America, that has been the highest standard in the world, when you say the full faith and credit of the United States of America—right now there are folks playing Russian roulette with that who are willing to weaken that and undermine our recovery, if not take us over another horrible economic cliff and cost billions of dollars for American consumers.

Given the seriousness of it and the fact that we are very close to having that happen and the fact that we are the world's leader, 30 years ago President Ronald Reagan warned about the consequences of the richest, most powerful nation in the world suddenly running out of money to pay its bills. He said:

> The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—

As people are flippantly discussing these days—

> by the United States of America are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate.
>
> Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States of America [would cause] incalculable damage.

This is President Ronald Reagan.

President Reagan reminded Congress:

> Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations. To fail to do so now would be an outrage.

His words.

> The Congress must understand this and bear full responsibility.

We know if the United States defaults on its obligations, if we don't pay our bills, the result will be a financial crisis worse than what we went through in 2008. Frankly, I don't want any part of that. I know what happened in Michigan in 2008, 2009. I know our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, understands that as well, what happened to families and businesses all across America. To even come close to that is irresponsible.

If that were to happen, 57.5 million Americans could very well not get their Social Security checks on time.

My mom called me the other night. She is 87 years old, doing great. She said I was at church on Sunday and my friends were asking: That couldn't really happen, could it?

I didn't know what to tell her. No, Mom, it should not happen. It has not happened before. But I can't promise, given the words of people on the other side of the aisle who believe it is no big deal or of what is being said by the Speaker and by the tea party Republicans in the House—I couldn't absolutely say to her don't worry about that.

Madam President, 3.4 million veterans might not get their disability benefits on time. We have just been debating whether we should make sure, as we must, that the VA is fully funded. Yet next week if we do not back up the full faith and credit of the United States of America, veterans could very easily be in a situation of not getting disability checks or seniors' Social Security, Medicare. Children, families, communities, businesses, farmers, that is who will pay the cost of this default. Middle-class families will pay the cost of this.

It will be catastrophic in terms of interest rate increases and loss of jobs if we do not stand together as Republicans and Democrats in the Congress of the United States and back up the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

According to Goldman Sachs, if we adopt the ''China first'' model of only paying the interest on our debt, which has been proposed by the House, where we pay some of our debts but not others, the drag on our economy would be massive. They estimate we would lose 4.2 percent of our gross domestic product. To put that in perspective, when the recession hit bottom in 2009 we lost 4.1 percent of GDP, from the peak in 2007. That was the worst recession in our lifetime.

This is not a game. This is serious.

Even more concerning to me is that this would drive up borrowing costs for families, for small businesses, for our manufacturers who are back on their feet now and roaring and bringing back our economy. For every 1-percent increase in interest rates, we are told Americans will pay $75 billion—$75 billion lost to the economy. When Republicans in the House took us to the brink of default 2 years ago, which resulted in the lowering of America's credit rating for the first time in history—even though we didn't default, just talk of default ended up lowering our credit rating for the first time in America's history—it cost the average family buying a home at the time about $100 every month for the life of their mortgage in higher interest rates; $100 a month for the life of the mortgage. That is outrageous and irresponsible.

That same default crisis in 2011 cost taxpayers $19 billion in additional interest when our credit rating fell and interest rates went up. Where did that $19 billion go? Right back on top of the national debt, not only adding to the national debt, it threatens to erase America's retirement savings. In 2011, over $800 billion was lost in retirement accounts after the House Republicans played politics with the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

If I might just take 1 more minute, I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. This time, if we actually default, the fall could be even worse and the damage could be permanent. This is the greatest, wealthiest, most powerful country in the world and it is outrageous that this would even be considered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, expressing their deep concern about the possibility of default.

I will share, finally, remarks of the chairman of AT&T.

It is unthinkable that the United States could default on its financial commitments and it would be the height of irresponsibility for any public official to consider such a course.

Our country deserves better. The people of this country deserve better. We have to do better for them.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
October 8, 2013.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADERS PELOSI, REID AND MCCONNELL: On behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)—the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing small and large manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states—I write to strongly urge you to act as soon as possible to raise the statutory debt limit.

The failure of policymakers to address this critical issue is injecting uncertainty in the U.S. economy, hampering the ability of manufacturers and the broader business community to compete, invest and create new jobs. In a recent survey of NAM members, almost two-thirds of respondents said it is extremely important for the President and Congress to make progress on funding the government for fiscal year 2014 and extending the nation's debt ceiling. More than 90 percent said that addressing the nation's fiscal challenges was important for their company.

Manufacturers believe the United States must meet our financial obligations to ensure global investors' continuing confidence in the nation's creditworthiness. Our nation has never defaulted in the past, and failing to raise the debt limit in a timely fashion will seriously disrupt our fragile economy and have a ripple effect throughout the world. In particular, a default would put upward pressure on interest rates, raising both the short- and long-term cost of capital and discouraging business investment and job creation. In addition, a default would create an uncertain fiscal environment that will discourage foreign direct investment in the United States that could harm our economy for years to come.

Our nation's economic future depends on your actions. Now is the time to rise above partisan differences and put the nation's best interests first by addressing the debt limit. Thank you in advance for the leadership that will be necessary to appropriately resolve this critical issue.

Sincerely,

JAY TIMMONS.

Ms. STABENOW. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am glad to join this debate, which throughout the afternoon has been peppered with the assertion that either Majority Leader REID or the President or Democrats in general will not negotiate—that we will not negotiate. I remember when I was younger there was a radio commentator, a man named Paul Harvey, and his little motto in his radio bits was to surprise you with ''the rest of the story.''

On ''will not negotiate,'' we don't even have to go to the rest of the story. Go to the rest of the sentence. The rest of the sentence is that the President and the majority leader will not negotiate—while the other side is holding hostages, while the tea party is holding hostages.

Here is what our former colleague, my former ranking member on the Budget Committee, Senator Judd Gregg, has said about this:

A small group of Republican legislators led by the junior Senator from Texas, decided to take as hostages government operations and the raising of the debt ceiling.

Those are exactly the hostages, Federal employees who cannot work, people and businesses that want or need Federal services, those families we have heard so much about today who lost loved ones on the field of battle and cannot get their death benefits.

There is an even bigger hostage out there, which is the threat of a catastrophic default which would be the result of a failure to lift the debt limit. Our country has been through a lot, through Civil Wars and world wars, through depressions and calamities of various kinds. Through all of that we have never defaulted on our debt. But there is a group in Congress so desperate that they are willing to use that, that threat as a hostage for leverage in negotiations.

When colleagues on the other side invite us in the old phrase, ''Come, let us reason together,'' let us negotiate, they do not mean come let us reason together, let us negotiate; they mean let us negotiate, but we want a blackjack in our pocket. If the negotiations don't go just the way we want, we want to keep hundreds of thousands of Americans out of their jobs and we want to threaten the economic security of this country.

There is a difference that every American understands between negotiating and negotiating while threatening the hostages. I will say that sanctimoniously offering to release a hostage here or a hostage there when a program becomes too popular or there is too much scrutiny on the damage that one thing is doing, to say, oh, we will give up that hostage, we will let us vote on that hostage, doesn't change the principle. There is a difference between negotiating in good faith, negotiating on the merits, and negotiating with threats to hostages. That is no road to go down. That is a very dangerous threat.

As President Reagan warned us:

Congress must realize that by failing to act they are entering very dangerous territory if we don't raise the debt limit. Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations. Too fail to do so now would be an outrage.

Ronald Reagan:

The Congress must understand this and bear full responsibility.

We have to address these problems in the traditional order of government with real negotiations because if we don't, if we yield to hostage-taking as the new way of governance in this country, where does it end? The continuing resolution that we proposed that the Speaker has refused to have a vote on—in all this time he has never had a vote on the continuing resolution that we passed that would open the government—it would only extend the operations of government for 6 weeks. We would be back at it again. What would the price be next time? After we defunded ObamaCare, would they want to privatize Social Security? They tried that before. Over and over, the popular will has to rule. That we do through our American procedures. The vaunted procedures of our American system of government would be lost in a devil's game of threats and hostage-taking on both sides because two can play at this game if those are the new rules. We don't want to go there.

America is a great country and in part we are a great country because our democracy is an example to the world. We are no example to anyone when we legislate by threats of default, disaster, and confusion, to use the felicitous phrase of our colleague from Alabama.

There is a condition that sometimes befalls pilots called target fixation. It happens when a pilot diving on a target becomes so fixated on hitting that target that they become disoriented with their surroundings. The worst thing that befalls somebody who has target fixation is that they crash the plane.

Right now we have Republican target fixation on repeal ObamaCare. Imagine passing it 40-some times in the House, which they have done. If that is not a sign of target fixation, I don't know what is. Not seeing the damage that is being done by closing down the government, not seeing the damage to families, not seeing the damage to employees, not seeing the damage to people who depend on government services and licenses and safety checks seems to me to be a sign of target fixation.

If they have target fixation this badly, they may not even see President Ronald Reagan's warnings of how dire and dangerous it is to play around with our debt limit. On the House side, they are already talking about playing around with our debt limit. They want to go into the danger zone, and who knows how close to the flame they are willing to fly. When they have target fixation, their judgment is not very good.

They are certainly not seeing the damage to American values and American procedure that an insistence on

legislating by holding hostages and threatening them does. It does damage to our values, and it does damage to our procedures.

A great observer of the American system of government once described procedure as its bone structure. We can throw it all out, the Constitution, the bicameralism, and we can go back to the basic animal state that whoever can make the worst threat wins the argument. That is not the American way. The American way isn't to win the argument by seeing how many people you can put at risk and how badly you can threaten them, but that is the stage we are in right now.

Let's negotiate, indeed, but let's negotiate as Americans. Let's negotiate under our proper procedures. Let's open the government. There is no reason for it to be closed other than bargaining leverage and hostage-taking. There is no other reason. That is exactly why the tea party has shut down the government, just for that purpose. They say it. They use nicer words. I think the word that was used earlier in debate today was to create adequate incentive. When somebody else is holding hostages, we have incentive, but it is not an appropriate incentive.

So open the government and stop threatening the debt limit. That is wildly irresponsible. If they don't believe us, believe Ronald Reagan, believe the Secretary of the Treasury, believe the National Association of Manufacturers, believe the CEO of AT&T, believe virtually every responsible, knowledgeable adult who has observed what the dangers are of blowing the debt limit and default.

Open the government, stop threatening the debt limit and, by all means, let's negotiate. We could set a date tomorrow. I am sure the President would have a meeting at the White House the next day. Anything people wanted could be on the table, but they would have to come in and negotiate like Americans. They would have to negotiate on the merits fairly and not with a blackjack in their back pocket, with threats that if they don't get what they want, they are going to start wrecking things such as our economy and our government. That is not the right way to proceed. If we go down that road, who knows what evil lurks at the end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I have listened very carefully to the two previous speakers on the floor, and I understand a lot of their frustration. We are where we are.

I think we have two big problems. Actually, we have two major problems. One is our country is bankrupt. People don't like to hear that, but let me give the facts. The total unfunded liability of the United States of America is $126 trillion. If we add all the net worth of everybody in the country and all the assets of the Federal Government and all the assets of the States and combine them, we have $94 trillion worth of assets. We are already in the hole $30 trillion. That doesn't include the $17 trillion in debt we have.

So I would like to correct a couple of things. One, the Senator from Michigan mentioned that we were downgraded because of the impasse in Congress. No, we were downgraded because Congress has failed to address the real problems of our debt and deficits. Go read their statements. It had nothing to do with action here. It had to do with the fact that we will not address the biggest problems in front of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have some scissors on the floor because I wish to make a point in a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. We have a credit card. I want you to think about your own personal life that if, in fact, you have a limit on your credit card and your financial situation worsens, you are still paying the payments, but you are not bringing down the principal on your credit cards and you are not earning significantly more money and you go to Citibank or American Express or Chase and say: I want you to raise my limit. The first thing they are going to ask you is: What have you done to improve your financial situation so we might consider raising your credit limit? That is what happens to every other American.

We have this big talk about a debt limit. There is no debt limit in this country. We have increased it every time it has come up. There is no limit right now in this country on the debt we have.

We hear all of these speeches about the risk. You know what the real risk is? The risk is continuing to do nothing to address the underlying problems of our country. The risk is continuing to add entitlement programs that have no way to pay for themselves and no reform of the entitlements we have today. That is the risk.

How does that play out? We have heard all of these dire warnings of what will happen. What is going to happen to your children and grandchildren is what has happened over the last 15 years in this country. Do you realize that the average median income in real dollars now is at the same level it was in 1989? We are going backward right now. We are not addressing the real problems.

Since I am a doctor, I will put it in medical terms. If, in fact, you treat symptoms of disease by raising the debt limit rather than treating the real disease, which is reforming the problems, reforming our spending, quit having 100 percent involvement by the Federal Government in everything Americans do, if you continue to borrow the money and treat that as the symptom, when there is a lack of oversight by Congress and lack of real work by the Members of this body to actually eliminate waste, which is over $250 billion a year as outlined by the Government Accountability Office, we ignore that for the political arena we have seen over the last couple of weeks in Washington.

The real disease is not fixing the real problem. All of the politicians—Republicans and Democrats alike—want to give you a soft answer. Here is the answer: If you are $30 trillion in debt that you cannot pay for, what you have to do is have everybody have some pain, but we refuse to do that. There is no leadership in Congress to address the real disease we are facing. This is a government that has totally ignored the enumerated powers, totally ignored the 10th Amendment. We have a Justice Department that ignores the rule of law in terms of how they decide what they will enforce and what they will not enforce on a political basis rather than on what the law says. Those are the real problems in front of us.

We have heard all the dire warnings about how we cannot raise the debt limit. What does default mean? They always say we can't raise the debt limit, but they will not talk about what default means. Default in the international financial community means you will not pay the interest and you will not pay back the principal on your bonds. That will never happen to us. It would require less than 6 percent of the cash we are taking in now to manage the debt we have right now—less than 6 percent.

So only somebody who wants to hurt us further would play the political game if we ever got there. I am not saying we should get there, but if we got there, it would only be to play the political game to not pay Social Security or not to pay Medicare. We have more than enough money to do that. But what we have is a bloated, oversized, inefficient, ineffective Federal Government that nobody wants to hold accountable except the American people.

So the question is, Who gets to decide? Congress obviously is not deciding very well. The President has not shown any leadership. Maybe it is time for the American people to decide. Maybe it is time to take some of the power away from Washington and restore it to where our Founders thought it should reside: by respecting the enumerated powers very specifically listed by our Founders with great commentary so it would not be distorted, but we have distorted it anyway. We need to reembrace the 10th Amendment which says: Everything that is not specifically enumerated in these powers is left to the power of the people and the States.

We find ourselves with a credit card. This happens to be our debt. The number I chose to put on here was our debt this morning: $16,747,458,528.90. We need to cut this up just like we would do for an adolescent or young adult kid when you are responsible for their credit

card. If they are not responsible, you cut up the credit card. You fix the real problem. You don't continue to ask for an increase in their propagate spending.

Members of Congress who will not do oversight and get rid of $250 trillion of fraud, waste, and abuse every year should not be rewarded, but that is what we will end up doing because we don't have the courage, nor the leadership, to address the real problem in front of our country. The real problem is cowardice. The real problem is to not recognize where we are and not act on making decisive decisions.

We heard how bad it will be if we don't raise the debt limit. I agree, it will be tough. There will be ramifications. How bad will it be if we do? What happens to your children? What happens to the declining family income in this country if we continue to let the Federal Government run uncontrolled and out of control? What happens if we continue to not hold Congress accountable for forcing efficiencies on the Federal Government.

I know what could be done. There was an agreement called the Budget Control Act, and what it did is it forced sequester. Sequester is a stupid way to cut funding in the Federal Government, but it is far better than not cutting it at all.

What has the sequester done? The sequester has forced agencies—because Congress will not force them because we are afraid we might offend somebody—to start making choices. They are still making tons of bad choices. For instance, on the last day of the State Department's budget, they spent all the remaining money. They just spent $5 million for new crystalware for all of our embassies. Do we have $5 million? What is wrong with the crystalware we have now? They had to spend the money because they couldn't come back to Congress and say we saved $5 million.

We are addressing the wrong problems. We are not holding people accountable. Consequently, maybe it is time for the States and the people to exert some common sense on us. I dare say there is not one Member of this body who would let their adolescent child run up a bill and then not eventually try to intercede on a credit card but just let them continue to run it up.

Congress and the U.S. Government is that adolescent child. We are the adolescents and the people and the States are the grownups. We are at an impasse, and it does kind of sound like a kid. I am not going to talk to you. I don't like the way you did that.

We had the majority leader the other day claim that the House was out of bounds because they got to pick and choose what we pay for. It just so happens that in the Constitution, that is what it says. The House of Representatives gets to pick and choose. All spending bills start in the House. They have to start in the House. They get to pick and choose. We don't have to accept it, but they get to pick and choose. So there is a lack of understanding on the basic concepts our Founders set up.

We know the history and they know the history of republics. Republics always die. There isn't one that has survived as long as we have. They decline and die over the same thing: They get in trouble financially.

We are in trouble financially. We are $30 trillion in the hole, plus another $17 trillion in debt. Wouldn't it be smart if we started addressing that problem before we blankly allow an increase in the level of the credit card? Actually, what we should do is cut this credit card up, which is what I am going to do because that is the way I vote. I think it is time we quit borrowing money—actually, I think I better tear it up—it is time we quit borrowing money for the future of our kids. It is time we quit mortgaging their future. It is time we start taking responsibility for the actions of the Federal Government rather than giving excuses on why we can't get together and address the real problems of this country. Congress fails to do the oversight.

We just had a hearing yesterday where we showed one of the problems inside the Social Security and disability system. It was a bipartisan hearing, with lots of work done. There are real problems. The trust fund for those people who are truly disabled in this country will run out of money within 18 to 24 months. The Finance Committee hasn't offered any bill to fix it. The House Committee on Ways and Means hasn't offered any programs to fix it. Yet it is going to be bankrupt. What does that mean for somebody who is truly disabled? It means their check is going to get cut. Now tell me whether we would rather spend $5 million on new glassware for our embassies—crystal—or $5 million for someone who is truly disabled. That is where the real decisions need to be made, but we won't make them.

If we talk about our national debt—when I came to the Senate in 2005 every American owed $24,000 on the national debt. It is now almost $53,000—in a little over 8½ years. So we now owe 2½ times what we used to owe. How did we get there? Why did we let that happen? Why don't we learn to live within our means? Is there always a political reason? Is there always a reason where we can game somebody and say they don't care if they don't want to do this? They certainly couldn't care about Americans if they want to spend money we don't have on things we don't need.

If we look at the $125.8 trillion, that works out to $1.1 million per family. Think about that. That is our unfunded liabilities, and that is going to come due over the next 50 years. If a person has children or grandchildren, as I do, I really don't want their opportunities to be totally limited by this debt load we have.

So we have all of this politicking and posturing and political expediency going on in both bodies, and nobody is talking about what the real problem is. The real problem is we are spending a lot of money we don't have, and we are borrowing from other countries for things we don't absolutely need.

The second part of the problem is we have programs that are designed to benefit people which are riddled with waste and fraud—$100 million in Medicaid and Medicare. Nobody really questions that number. It has been authenticated by four separate studies outside of the government, and inside the government we say it is $80 million. Why would we continue to let a system run that has that kind of fraud in it?

We are getting ready to crank up the Affordable Care Act—we are cranking it up—and we have now said we are not going to authenticate somebody's reliability as to their income? What do we think the fraud rate on that is going to be? We know what the fraud rate is with the child tax credit. It is well over 20 percent. In the earned-income tax credit, we know it is well over 20 percent. So $1 out of every $5 we pay out is to people who don't deserve it. We are going to see the same thing with this. Why would we do that when we have this kind of problem in front of us?

In the last 2 years our debt limit has increased twice what our economy has grown. For every dollar of new debt we take in, we are getting about 2 or 3 cents of economic growth out of that new debt. It used to be that when America borrowed a dollar, it would get 35 or 40 cents of growth out of that debt. So in the last 2 years we have increased the debt limit $2.405 trillion and the economy has grown less than $1.2 trillion over the last 2 years.

We are adding $26,000 to our national debt every second—every second. There is no question that our economy is growing some—some—far less than marginal. Why isn't it growing? It isn't growing because the American people don't have confidence in the future. How do we restore confidence in the future? We restore confidence by modeling a behavior that says we are going to act responsibly with our future, which means we are going to make the hard choices, even if it costs us our political career, to solve the problems in Washington so the generations that follow us will not suffer a lower standard of living but also so we can instill confidence in the American economy.

There is $3 trillion in cash sitting in this country right now—not Federal Government money, private money—$3 trillion. Why is it sitting there and why is it not being invested? That $3 trillion would create 700,000 or 800,000 new jobs a year—that $3 trillion. Why is it not being used? Because people don't have confidence in the future.

I want to tell a story about Virgil Jurgensmeyer. Virgil grows mushrooms and other vegetables in a business. This past August he told me he was thinking about expanding his business, a $5 million expansion, adding a

couple hundred jobs in a very small town in northeastern Oklahoma. He was afraid to do that. He has plenty of business. He is buying $50,000 to $100,000 of product from his competitor every month because he can't produce it. He says: I don't think it is worth the risk right now given where our country is. That is happening all across this country. There is no confidence.

It brings me to another point I wish to speak about. We are not just bankrupt as a nation. Our leadership is bankrupt. Leadership is about creating a vision and bringing people together, not creating controversy and dividing people. It is not about pointing out the worst flaws of somebody. It is about reinforcing the best flaws. It is about selling the confidence that we can do this together.

Do my colleagues realize we can do this together as a nation? There isn't a problem in front of us that we can't solve if we choose to solve it. Do my colleagues remember the debt commission? I was a member of that committee. We voted on some big plans that would have solved a lot of the problems we are facing this very week in this body. I didn't like every bit of it, but it was a chance to try to solve—bring together both sides and solve it. Not once was it taken up on the floor by the majority leader. The President never embraced it—his own commission, his own fiscal commission—never embraced it. It was the greatest failure of leadership I have ever seen. We had conservatives and liberals agreeing that here is a plan we can work out. Yet it was thrown away.

With the politics we see in Washington today, the only time we are going to solve these big problems is when both political parties take the pain evenly. Nobody wants to do that. Everybody wants to win. It is all short-term political expediency.

In the words of my friend Erskine Bowles, where we are today is the most easily predictable problem we ever would have seen. All we have to do is look at the path of the numbers. It is true that our deficits are down a little bit, that we raised $70 billion in taxes last year, and the economy is growing. It just shows what potential there is if we would put the economy on steam, where we had confidence. We could have had $500 billion, $600 billion a year in revenues to the Federal Government. But we won't do that.

Today we find ourselves in worse condition than we were in 2011, and in 2011 we were told we can't do big things. We have to wait.

So we had a debt limit increase. So tell me how we have gotten better since then. We have unfunded liabilities that are growing faster every year. Our true debt-to-GDP ratio is now over 100 percent, counting all debt, internal and external. We have not done it.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers right now are furloughed because Congress—not Republicans, Congress—has failed to do its job, has failed to compromise, has failed to reach a meaningful agreement that gives both groups something they can claim they actually worked on the real disease.

Madam President, how much time have I consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I will finish. Would the Chair let me know in about 28 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Let me describe also what is going to happen in about 20 years, maybe 10. If we don't address these problems, it won't matter what the debt rating agencies say; we will have developed a pattern that says we think we can continue to borrow and continue to raise the debt limit and not make the structural changes that put us on a path to solvency. So what does that look like? What that looks like is borrowing costs going up.

My friends all say—and the President said today—maybe our borrowing costs will go up if we don't, in fact, raise the debt limit. Guess what. Our borrowing costs are going up every day we don't address these problems whether we address the debt limit or not because eventually the rest of the world is going to say: We don't think they are willing to cut up the credit card. They are not willing to make the sacrifices necessary to put their country on a path of prosperity.

We have all the capabilities in the world to address our problems. We do not have the leadership that will get us there. I am not just directing that at the President; I am directing that at my own party.

So what is the solution?

I am going to spend the next couple days outlining waste in the Federal Government, fraud in the Federal Government, duplication in the Federal Government. But the solution is called sacrificial leadership. It means modeling the behavior that says you are willing to give up something—maybe the prestige of being in office—to actually fix the long-term problems of our country. It is leadership that calls out the best in us instead of pointing out the worst in us. You do not see that very often here. You did when I first came. You certainly do not now, and that is a function of leadership in the Senate.

Majority Leader REID and I do not agree on much. That is obvious. But in a previous discussion on the Senate floor, Leader REID said: ''Meaningful deficit reduction requires shared sacrifice.'' We are never going to get there unless everybody shares in it.

The other point I would make is that we are living off the next generation right now. We are going to borrow $2,000 against the future of every man, woman, and child in this country this year alone. They are going to have to pay it back. Another way of putting it is that 1 out of every 4 hours you work, the Federal Government right now is confiscating—of everybody in our economy. It is soon going to be 2 out of every 4 hours you work.

Our country was founded on the idea of liberty and freedom. When the confiscatory rates that will have to be there to pay back our debt or to at least borrow more money come, half of your work is going to be for the Federal Government—not your State or local governments; it is going to be to pay the bills of the Federal Government. So money that is going to go for interest is money that is not going to be invested. It is money that is not going to improve education. It is not going to invent the new technology.

So I believe we can solve our problems, but I think it requires an informed public. Do you realize the Federal Government is twice the size it was in 1999? It is twice that size. It is two times as big as it was in 1999. Think about that for a minute. If you extrapolate that, that means in another 12, 13 years, it is going to be four times as big as it was in 1999. The question comes: Are you getting value? Is it efficient? It is productive? Is it what we want to do?

I think we can cheat history as a republic. As a constitutional republic, I think we can cheat history. I do not think we have to go down the path every other republic has gone down, but it is going to require real leadership and shared sacrifice on the part of everybody in this country. It is going to require that we take the spending out of the Tax Code for the well-heeled who have placed special benefits in the Tax Code for themselves. It is going to require that we reform Medicare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

It is going to require that we reform Medicare, that we fix Medicaid, that we control how the Federal Government buys and uses things. It is going to require us to eliminate multitudes of duplicative programs that have no real benefit other than to benefit the politicians. It is going to require shared sacrifice.

So we can go down that path, unite our country, bring us together with a vision that through this, together we can all accomplish what is needed for our children and grandchildren or we can continue this petty little kindergarten game that is going on in Washington right now where everybody's nose gets bent out of shape, saying they are right or they are right, and playing off the American people.

None of us in Washington are right. The Founders were right. The enumerated powers were right. The 10th Amendment was right. We are dead wrong. It is time we grow up and start understanding the vision of our Founders that secures our liberty and preserves our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his commitment to this issue, for his candor. We do not necessarily agree on every single thing, but I do know he is a man of great conviction and we are lucky to have him in the Senate. It is my hope we can get to a place where we actually are together addressing these budget issues in a way that is not management by crisis or one across-the-board cut after another but actually is a thoughtful plan to relieve our children and our grandchildren of this burden we are threatening them with.

So, through the Chair, I thank my colleague.

Madam President, I come to the floor today, after the Senator from Oklahoma described today as a day of petty kindergarten political games, to talk about a place where they are not playing any of those right now, and that is a town in Colorado that I represent called Estes Park, which has been a beacon of resilience. It is in the mountains just northwest of Boulder. It is the gateway to Rocky Mountain National Park.

I can see from the Presiding Officer's reaction that she may have been there.

The town has several thousand residents and hosts close to 3 million visitors a year, including an average of over half a million visitors in the month of September.

This time of year is peak tourist season. The weather is beautiful. The aspens' leaves are even more beautiful than the weather, and the elk famously wander through the park and through the town. Whether you are coming to rest or recreate, Estes Park welcomes you, and it always has.

In 2011 visitors generated $196 million in tourism spending and supported more than 2,700 jobs. By some estimates tourism accounts for 43 percent of local employment. But when the floods hit in Colorado, Estes Park was almost entirely cut off from the outside world.

As shown in this picture, here is Route 34 going to Estes Park.

Two of the major roads into town were wiped out for miles at a stretch, leaving only one road into town. Many homes and businesses were destroyed. But the residents of Estes Park picked themselves up and began the recovery process. Limited access to the town has been restored. Folks had just started opening their businesses again. Visitors had just started to return to Rocky Mountain National Park. And then Congress stepped in and dealt an unbelievably cruel blow by shutting down this government.

Let me quote what Estes Park resident Tom Johnson said on the Tuesday of the shutdown:

> I think politicians are playing around, like they do, and it's the people who wind up—

> ''And it's the people who wind up''—

> with all the problems for it. Man, they did it to Estes Park, when they shut down that park.

Rocky Mountain National Park closed with the shutdown. Hundreds of campers have had to cancel their reservations, and likely thousands more canceled their plans to visit.

The Denver Post reported that if visitors to Estes Park decline by 70 percent, it could mean the loss of 1,100 jobs, $90 million in spending, $5.8 million in State sales tax revenue, and $4.4 million in local taxes. This is one community in Colorado, one community in the United States of America tonight, as we horse around here in the Congress.

The shutdown is a kick in the teeth to our local governments and small businesses in their efforts to recover from these floods.

One of the area's more famous businesses is the Stanley Hotel. John Cullen, the hotel's owner, told us that while it is booking visitors for long weekend trips, it has been slow to bring in the usual number of guests during the week. He says it is because locals cannot come to Rocky Mountain National Park for the fall foliage. He tells us they have done everything they can to keep the hotel open because it is a major employer in Estes Park, but he is losing money on a daily basis.

Diane Muno is a local business owner in Estes Park, with four retail shops. The Spruce House and the Christmas Shop are two local Christmas and holiday stores; the White Orchid and the White Orchid Bridal Shop sell clothing and other apparel.

Some of these businesses have been serving customers in Estes Park since 1969. They are institutions in this Colorado community.

The flooding damaged three of four of her businesses. One was seriously damaged and has not yet reopened. The other two rushed to reopen to recover, and they would have been fine except we closed Rocky Mountain National Park, and that has slowed foot traffic in a significant way. Diane's October revenue for these four stores is down 67 percent—two-thirds down—from this point in October last year. She typically has 12 to 15 employees, but she is working a skeleton crew of 6.

Another business damaged by the floods was Kind Coffee. Its owner, Amy Hamrick, has been relying on Internet sales while she is working to reopen the store. The community has rallied around the store, as our communities that have been struck by the floods have done. It bought coffee beans and mugs and T-shirts online and helped clean up floodwaters. But the same story holds: She took a huge hit when the government shut down. Making horrible things worse, Amy's husband David Hamrick, a firefighter with the U.S. Forest Service, has been furloughed.

This is what this inability of Washington's politicians to get done the most basic function we have—to keep the government running—has wrought in this one Colorado community.

Amy told National Public Radio:

> We carry on through the middle of October with tourism dollars and locals coming to see the elk rut and to go into the park and see the color. . . . And the national park is also our largest employer in town. So our community now has lost a lot of jobs in the interim.

This is exactly why it is the wrong moment for Colorado, for Estes Park, to have Washington's dysfunction come crashing down. They do not deserve it. They do not deserve it. But, as they are now saying in Estes Park, they are mountain strong and they will get through it. And I know they will.

Amy Hamrick took the time to remind us that 90 percent of the town is open, dry, and ready for customers. She said:

> The town . . . is beautiful and the golf courses have elk on them 24 hours a day.

Estes Park, like much of Colorado, has taken a hit, but it will not stay down. The community continues to pull together and recover. As expected, its neighbors are going the extra mile to help everybody out.

This quote from Jeannie Bier captures the spirit of Colorado. She said:

> We live down in Loveland and it is difficult for the people down there right now—

I know it is difficult down there because I was there last week with the mayor and county commissioners and others looking at devastation in Loveland—

> but we also knew it is just as difficult up here in Estes and they are our neighbors, so we took the roundabout way to get up here to support Estes as well.

The floods will not deter them, and neither will the outrageous stupidity of this shutdown.

Rocky Mountain National Park is closed, but there are still plenty of other reasons to come and enjoy Estes Park.

Earlier today somebody who works with me named James Thompson spoke with the town's mayor Bill Pinkham and asked him what is the one thing he would want me to say on this floor. The message was plain and simple. He said:

> Michael, tell them it's spectacularly beautiful up here. It's still a great experience. We're open for business!

This town has been through a lot and has risen to its challenges.

So I say to everybody, come to Estes Park. Enjoy the beauty. Shop at our businesses. Dine at our restaurants. And meet the folks who would not let a natural disaster or a manmade disaster stop them from succeeding. You can learn more about a trip to Estes Park at visitestespark.com.

To my colleagues, I urge you to come to Colorado for a different reason. Maybe we could all learn something from these incredible people about what it means to pull together in the face of a crisis.

For those of us playing politics with this shutdown and playing politics with this fiscal cliff, I would really encourage you to spend a single moment in one of our flood-ravaged towns. That

might bring some welcome clarity to the debate.

With that, 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. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, most of us here in the Senate have read at least something about our Nation's founding. Although it is striking, what is almost always overlooked is the Founders' use of the language of ''the republic.''

Asked by a citizen on the street which was being created behind closed doors in Philadelphia, ''a Republic or a monarchy,'' Benjamin Franklin famously said: ''A republic, if you can keep it.''

As with most foundational decisions, the Founders made this choice deliberately. The idea of democracy frightened Hamilton, Adams, and others, because they equated it with mobs in the street. They worried that mob rule would overcome rights bestowed not by their government but by their Creator. They studied the classics and their models were the Greek and Roman republics.

They set out to do something never done before, to create a republic of the scope and scale never before attempted, and one that could expand as the country grew.

Today we are the world's oldest and greatest democracy. During the last century, America has expanded the constitutional rights of women and people of color well beyond landowning White men, originally privileged. In our time, we have come to understand that democracies are about the rights of citizens, but a republic, the Founders understood, is about the duties of citizens, the obligations a citizen has to a society whose constitution guarantees his or her rights.

Basic duties are to pay taxes levied by a representative government, to defend our country when called upon, and to obey the law. Our Founders had something even greater in mind, qualities that would make a republic endure. Like republics from ancient Athens forward, they believed in popular sovereignty, based on citizen participation in government. They believed in the commonwealth, all those things we hold and value in common, such as our defense and our shared infrastructure, and the welfare of the next generation of Americans.

They believed in putting the common interest above personal or narrow interests, a sense of the national interest. How else could committed slaveowners and abolitionists form a country and a government?

They believed in resistance to corruption, those who would turn the national interest to personal gain. We were founded as a republic and we have become more democratic across time. We are democratic and republican. Interestingly enough, what came to be the semblance of the first political party in America called itself the Democratic Republicans. It was founded in 1791. Sounds pretty weird today, I know, but it simply meant those who believed in democratic equality and freedom, working to uphold the ideals of the Republic. One of our bedrock American principles is that we must protect our rights through performance of our duties. That is not some abstract political theory. This is a definition of who we are and how we must govern ourselves.

We have rights and responsibilities as citizens and as Senators. We have the right to free speech but the responsibility not to shout ''fire'' in a crowded theater. We have the right to assemble but the responsibility to do so peacefully. In this body we have the right to filibuster but the responsibility to govern on behalf of the American people.

But the fewer the Americans who exercise the most fundamental right, I would say duty, of voting, the more political influence extreme groups in our society have. This is where we find ourselves at the dawn of the 21st century, with a Senate that at times is dominated by a small faction that does not represent the mainstream of American political thought, and a House that is gerrymandered into dysfunction. This institutional paralysis has created a vacuum into which a million special interests happily roam.

Actually, I should call them narrow, not special, interests. From ancient Athens onward, narrow interests have been the enemy of every republic. That has never been truer than it is today. Keeping the Republic created by our Founders should concern every generation of Americans, including our own. The sovereign power belongs to all the people, not just a vocal few. It is our responsibility, it is our duty, as elected officials when that ideal is tested, to work together to restore a sense of the commonwealth and the common good that enabled us to prevail in world wars and to overcome depressions.

This is our cause, but we are stuck. We are stuck because we are fighting over yesterday's battles instead of seeking to anticipate, as our Founders did, how we will manage change. To one degree or another, all Senators and possibly all Americans are conservative. If conservative means to protect our Nation's principles and ideals, I am a conservative. If conservative means to preserve a culture of tolerance, justice, and equality, I am a conservative. If conservative means to respect the unique cultural heritage of America, I am a conservative. If conservative means to protect our natural heritage, I am very much a conservative.

But while we protect and preserve the best of what makes us who we are, we must adapt to change. Scarcely one of us in the Senate has ever sought office without advocating some kind of change: change of officeholder, change of party, change of policy. That is good, because the future is arriving faster and faster and we have gotten no better at anticipating it.

Even with the seemingly endless crawls of the words ''breaking news'' at the bottom of our screens, no one predicted the Arab spring before it sprung. That is the most closely watched region in the world.

There are great historic tides that demand that we change and adapt to them in order to preserve and protect and conserve our central values. We do not live in a stagnant world. Indeed, we are living in the midst of great revolution that makes the 21st century as different from the 20th as the 18th century was from the 17th. We are living through what may be the peak years of change on the scale of the Industrial Revolution. But even though we may come here oriented to change, the institutions of government, Congress included, are oriented to the past. Our committee structure and our regulatory agencies imagine an economy that existed deep in the last century. We are designed to support incumbent interests, not the innovators that will drive job growth and wage growth in the 21st century. This is a fatal flaw, if we are ever going to tackle the growing income inequality that our Nation faces, an inequality that has been unmatched since 1928.

We are regulating the telegraph when the world is wireless. Just one example: Almost a year ago I visited Apple out in Silicon Valley to learn something about their work in education. A little over 4 years ago, when I was superintendent of Denver Public Schools, I did not spend one second thinking about how to apply a tablet to the education of our kids, because there was no such thing as a tablet—a little over 4 years ago.

Today the tablet, combined with platforms such as the iTunes platform, presents an unbelievable opportunity for our children and children all over the world to learn and to teach each other. It was amazing to see.

In any case, Apple presented a slide showing that 75 percent of their last 12 months of revenue was derived from products they did not sell 5 years before—75 percent of their revenue came from things they did not sell 5 years before.

We have not updated our Tax Code since 1986. I was in college in 1986. What are the chances that our Tax Code is helping drive job and wage growth in 2013, 27 years later, more than a quarter of a century later?

In this Congress and in this government, we are desperately out of sync with the world as it is. It is, in fact, an irony that we must change and adapt to preserve the principles that we treasure. But we must.

Today, many flying the tea party banner resist all change. Indeed, they

want to go back, often to a past that never existed, or to a time that has no relation to our time. Too often, their politics embrace old interests that will not drive us forward to an economy that is creating jobs and raising wages.

Our founding principles should not change. I agree with that. But our practices and methods must change to become relevant. These two parties, or three with the tea party, have to escape their orthodoxies for this to be possible. Efforts to maintain the status quo or to return to some mythical past are doomed to fail. That is simply because time and the tides of human affairs will not stand still. We do not control history and cannot dictate to it. Change is the one constant. How we attempt to shape it to our purposes, by creative, imaginative public policies will determine whether we can preserve the best of our past, our principles, our heritage, and our values.

Those who seek to protect our Nation against change by sitting on the beach before a massive incoming tide with shovel in hand will be swept away as surely as King Canute. As I mentioned earlier, anyone who believes their orthodoxy or their ideological orientation prepared them for the Arab spring or made us safer is deluded. Our job must be to create a shared understanding of the facts when we work in a town that is arranged to obscure them.

Despite the desires of nostalgia, we are not going back to the laissez faire world of Herbert Hoover. Social safety nets are here to stay to protect children, the elderly, the poor, the disabled, and to protect our ability to call ourselves a civilized nation. But even they will have to be changed if they are going to survive for the next generation of Americans.

The revolution of globalization and information has transformed the world's economy and cultures and societies all across the globe, including here in the United States. These revolutions, like the Industrial Revolution before them, cannot be stopped. It is up to us to decide whether we can accept this new reality and position our country to lead, as it has since our founding, or whether we shrink into an imaginary conception of what the world once was and what the United States once was.

With all of this change and pace of globalization comes fear of the future and a sense of loss of what once was. That is human nature. I do not exempt myself from that. At a time of uncertainty, it has become fashionable in some political circles to capitalize on it politically. This kind of demagoguery is not unknown in American history. Anytime Americans become fearful or worried, there have always been those who saw personal advantage in fanning those flames. But they do not join an honor roll of history, an assembly of our greatest leaders. Media attention, which is easy and cheap, is not a measure of leadership. Division does not require moral authority.

If we are at another of history's turning points, as many believe, as I believe, one road leads to the worst of our past. The other leads to a new definition of our freedoms. We treasure the freedoms incorporated in the First Amendment to our Constitution.

We remember at the height of the Great Depression that Franklin Roosevelt declared four new freedoms: Freedom of speech and worship and freedom from want and fear. Today, in the middle of what one might characterize as a political depression, let's consider some new freedoms for the 21st century: Freedom from foreign oil; freedom from false patriotism; freedom from the politics of division; freedom to create a constructive future; and, yes, freedom from unconstitutional government surveillance.

We have duties to perform far greater than merely funding the government. Just ask any poor child or her teacher in a typical American school. The good news is that fear has never and will not now dictate the fate of our Republic. History's dustbin is filled with failed demagogues. And we are not going back. But we need to hurry. The world is not waiting for us.

Americans want us to move forward into the 21st century with the imagination, creativity, adaptability, and values that have made this country so great from its founding. The stakes are simply too high in our time to allow our institutions to be crippled by politicians who color far outside the lines of conventional American political thought and who react with angry and mock surprise when their policy objectives are not achieved.

It is time to close this sorry chapter in the history of the Congress, reopen our government, preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, and work together as Senators from the various States on the people's business. I suspect that is why most of us wanted to serve to begin with.

Madam President, I yield the floor and 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. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING DR. PAUL R. RAO

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to honor an outstanding gentleman and friend, the man who guided me through years of speech recovery. Dr. Paul R. Rao, a recognized leader in his field of speech-language pathology, will retire from his work as vice president of Inpatient Operations at the National Rehabilitation Hospital, NRH, on October 17, 2013, his 67th birthday and 43rd wedding anniversary.

Dr. Rao began his professional career more than 32 years ago at MedStar Health and skillfully guided the development of the new speech and language department when MedStar opened the National Rehabilitation Hospital in Washington, DC, 27 years ago.

I met Dr. Rao when I entered NRH in February 2007, following an AVM and a month in intensive care. Over the months he became more than a therapist for me, he was a friend and a coach. When I returned to South Dakota in August of that year, Dr. Rao took his own time to join me as I greeted the people of South Dakota for the first time since the AVM. I continued to work with Dr. Rao in outpatient therapy, despite his demanding schedule as a vice-president for NRH, for another 3 years. I have been told that we were truly the odd couple, he the ebullient, loquacious Italian and I the stoic, reticent Norwegian.

He is widely recognized for his professional skills and is a sought after public speaker. Among his honors is the Clinical Achievement Award by the American Speech-Language Hearing Foundation that he received not once but twice, in 1989 and 2001. The DC Association for Healthcare Quality conferred on Dr. Rao the Janis Willis Annual Award for Educational Excellence in 2001 and the Beth Lang Award for Outstanding Leadership in 2003.

In addition, he is a national leader in medical rehabilitation, serving as president of the American Speech and Hearing Association, and as fellow of the American College of Healthcare Executives.

Dr. Rao is the editor of Managing Stroke: A Guide to Living Well After Stroke published in 2000 and the lead editor for the second edition of this text in 2009.

He has made invaluable contributions to MedStar's National Rehabilitation Network and was recognized for his leadership as steward of the patient safety journey when he was awarded the National Rehabilitation Hospital's John W. Goldschmidt Award for Excellence in Rehabilitation.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to thank Paul for sharing his talents with me. I wish him and Martina a wonderful retirement.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Michael L. Connor, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

*Elizabeth M. Robinson, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

*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. REID (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

S. 153

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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. 1530

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1530, a bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 254, a resolution designating November 2, 2013, as ''National Bison Day''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; read the first time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1569

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Default Prevention Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. ENSURING TIMELY PAYMENT.

Section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''date of the enactment of this Act'' each place it appears and inserting ''date of enactment of the Default Prevention Act of 2013'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''May 18, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''; and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''May 19, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. 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 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2013, at 3 p.m., to hold an African Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Security And Governance In Somalia: Consolidating Gains, Confronting Challenges, And Charting The Path Forward.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1569 AND H.J. RES. 77

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there are two measures at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the measures by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1569) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

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

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading en bloc and ask that my objection appear in the RECORD on both measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The measures will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 9, 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 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 9, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*SCOTT S. DAHL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DAN McMICHAEL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an esteemed American, R. Daniel McMichael, who passed away recently at the age of 87, having dedicated his life to the advancement of sound, conservative policies and principles.

I knew Dan for many years as a fellow member of the Free Congress Foundation Board, where his expertise and advice were invaluable. An Air Force veteran of World War II, Dan became an expert on international strategic issues and was particularly sought after for his knowledge and guidance about ballistic missile defense. He was a member of the advisory board of the National Strategy Information Center, the International Security Studies Program of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, the Institute for Strategic and International Studies of Lisbon, Portugal, the Center for Strategic & International Studies at Georgetown University, the National Defense University Foundation, and the East-West Center.

Dan served for six years as vice-chairman of the National Strategic Materials and Minerals Program Advisory Committee of the Department of the Interior and in 1980 was named chairman of President Reagan's Strategic Minerals Task Force, which completed its work during the transition. For the next decade, he served as an advisor to both the Administration and Congress on strategic resources and continued, until his passing, to provide strategic advice and strategy to numerous organizations as an independent consultant and defense and security analyst.

Dan played a pivotal role for many years as Secretary and advisor for both the Sarah Scaife Foundation and the Carthage Foundation, foundations that support conservative organizations and public policy programs. Groups supported by these foundations include the Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute, Center for Security Policy, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, and the Hoover Institution, among many others. Dan also served as director and past president of the World Affairs Council of Pittsburg, which recognized his efforts to further international understanding and education.

Dan leaves a distinguished legacy of service and commitment to conservative values that will be long remembered, and his influence will be felt for many years to come. I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to this great American and patriot, R. Daniel McMichael.

CONGRATULATING JELLY BELLY'S NORTH CHICAGO PLANT ON 100 YEARS IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 100 years of Jelly Belly Candy Company production in North Chicago. For more than a century, Jelly Belly has been making in our Illinois Tenth District some of our favorite candies, including candy corn, mint wafers, and of course, the Jelly Belly gourmet jelly beans that are a worldwide institution and a local treasure.

Since its inception in the late 19th century, the confectioner now known as Jelly Belly has remained family-owned and committed to producing the highest-quality products for its consumers. This singular dedication to excellence and customer service serves as Jelly Belly's sole business philosophy.

Now for 100 years, Jelly Belly has made its home in North Chicago, enriching the community and building strong, deep roots.

Extending the values of the family-owned business, Jelly Belly has maintained a continuous level of commitment to its employees and treated the community like family as well.

Among the oldest Jelly Belly locations, the North Chicago plant is not only an important employer, with more than 140 staff, but it is also a community landmark and institution. We take great pride seeing millions of Jelly Belly jelly beans and other candies produced each year in North Chicago.

Jelly Belly's decision to remain in North Chicago for a century speaks to the innovative and dynamic spirit of the Tenth District's business community, as well as the loyalty of the firm and its respect for its workforce.

Jelly Belly has achieved remarkable success in its 100 years in North Chicago, and it has done it the right way and with integrity. I want to personally congratulate them on 100 years in the community, and I look forward to another Jelly Belly century in the Tenth District.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTMINSTER AT LAKE RIDGE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20th Anniversary of Westminster at Lake Ridge, a continuing-care retirement community in Lake Ridge, Virginia.

Founded in 1906, the Westminster Ingleside Family of Communities was established in the District of Columbia by the Washington City Presbytery. This group of continuing-care retirement communities currently comprises Ingleside at King Farm, Ingleside at Rock Creek, and Westminster at Lake Ridge.

The Westminster Ingleside Foundation supports charitable activities in these communities and advances initiatives aimed at improving senior health and well-being. The three communities and foundation are managed by the Westminster Ingleside Service Corporation.

The planning for Westminster at Lake Ridge (WLR) began in 1978. Myles Golbranson took the lead in organizing the effort to build the community. Mr. Golbranson and his group of Presbyterians envisioned a continuing-care community that would provide a nurturing and stimulating living environment for seniors and retirees. It was established as a not-for-profit in 1989, and just four years later, the first residents moved into their new homes in Lake Ridge.

Today, Westminster at Lake Ridge is a community of civically engaged and well-informed seniors. Residents donate thousands of volunteer hours to the surrounding community. They participate in literacy, citizenship, education, political advocacy, and various other charitable programs. Many of the residents are active in informative monthly speaking organizations as well as fitness and hobby groups. I am honored to host an annual Senior Issues Forum in the community where I can always expect a thoughtful exchange with my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the 20th Anniversary of Westminster at Lake Ridge. A vision that began 35 years ago is now a vibrant continuing-care retirement community and a welcoming place where anyone can feel at home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Monday, October 7, 2013, due to Flight #4205 being delayed in leaving Hilton Head Island Airport and arriving late into Charlotte Douglas International Airport, such that I missed my connecting Flight #2896 to Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair—Vote: "yes."

H.J. Res 77—Food and Drug Safety Act—Vote: "yes."

TRIBUTE TO HENRY ''HANK'' HAROLD ADAMS

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier,

Henry "Hank" Harold Adams, who passed away on October 6, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our community, state, and country.

Mr. Adams was a Tennessee native, who moved to my home county, Lake County, to run appliance stores in Gary and Hammond. Although not born one, Hank was someone we were proud to claim as a Hoosier. His first foray into politics started because of a strip mall that was approved in his town in 1991.

Mr. Adams served as the St. John Township Assessor for 16 years where he fought for fairness in the property tax assessments across Lake County. In 2010, he did what many thought was impossible—he became the first Republican in several decades to be elected to a countywide position. As Lake County Assessor, Hank worked tirelessly to ensure property tax assessments were fair, accurate, and completed on time. Hank served in this capacity until last week, when he resigned while battling cancer.

As an elected official, Mr. Adams was well known for being a tough but fair man. For nearly two decades it was through this tough demeanor that he delivered essential leadership for Lake County. But, those of us who had the privilege of knowing him as a man, not merely as a politician, saw much more.

Hank was a kind and caring man who gave his best effort every day to his family, friends and to Lake County. He was someone who would do whatever he could to help a friend, or stranger, in need. Hank was a mentor of mine, a coach of sorts when I ran for Indiana Secretary of State in 2001. His advice was invaluable in my early years, and something I still do my best to adhere to even today. He was instrumental in my efforts to improve election security with Indiana's photo ID law.

Mr. Adams left his loving wife, Jean, and his extended Lake County Republican family. His legacy is one that will be remembered and honored by those who knew and loved him. His electoral victories prove that most in Lake County, Republican and Democrat, shared my belief in Hank Adams, the man and leader. Rest in peace my friend, and thank you for your leadership.

COMMEMORATION OF NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of China (Taiwan) has had no stronger supporter than the United States Congress and today I rise in commemoration of the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China on October 10, 2013.

The United States and Taiwan share many basic principles such as democracy, human rights and trade. In particular, Taiwan is very important to the U.S. economy. In 2012, Taiwan was the 11th largest trading partner with the U.S. Additionally, Taiwan was the 7th largest destination for U.S. agricultural exports. Furthermore, bilateral trade between the United States and Taiwan is over $63 billion annually.

For Taiwan to remain competitive, it is important that they are able to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). This 12-nation trade agreement is currently being discussed among Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, and Singapore. The TPP is open to all APEC [Asia–Pacific Economic Cooperation] economies, of which Taiwan is a member, and therefore would be incomplete without Taiwan's inclusion.

As the Administration follows through on its Rebalancing of Asia policy, Taiwan will play an integral role. Since Taiwan is one of our strongest allies in Asia, we need to continue to support their inclusion in the TPP; otherwise they will fail to remain competitive, which may result in a decrease of purchases for American products. This in turn, could negatively impact American farmers and manufacturers that count on Taiwan to buy their products.

Once again, I congratulate Taiwan on the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China, and look forward to continuing our working partnership.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUMAN SERVICES COUNCIL OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Human Services Council of Fairfax County and to thank the many citizens who have spent countless hours ensuring that the county meets the needs of its citizens.

In response to the challenges brought about by the dramatic growth of Fairfax County in the 1970s and 80s, the Board of Supervisors recognized the need to assess the county's ability to meet the diverse needs of its citizens. In June 1988, The Board chartered the Human Services Council to develop a comprehensive human services plan to establish and coordinate service needs, resource requirements, funding allocations, and priorities across all human service agencies.

The Council is comprised of twenty citizens who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors. It is charged with analyzing the needs and effectiveness of the human services system; advising the system on annual and strategic goals, objectives, and priorities; enhancing the coordination of services among human service providers both public and private; overseeing key aspects of change in the system; and serving as a liaison to governing and advisory boards of existing human services organizations as well as to the community.

In 1989, the Human Services Council's first report, Toward a Long-Range Plan for Human Services in Fairfax County, provided a comprehensive review of human services programs in the county and set the foundation for improvements in needs assessment and service delivery that continue to this day. The Council's contributions proved invaluable in 1992 when due to a severe recession, devastating reductions for human services were proposed. The Council worked with other stakeholders to examine the impact of the cuts, prioritize services and analyze service delivery systems, thereby providing information that resulted in the preservation of funding vital to the well-being of vulnerable residents. In 1996, the Council adopted three primary objectives that have provided a clear focus for the human services system in Fairfax County: ensure the protection of children and other vulnerable members of the community; maximize prevention opportunities in order to strengthen the well-being and stability of families and communities; and promote self-sufficiency and help families achieve maximum independence from long-term public supports.

Over the past 25 years, the Council has not only worked within the county government, it has partnered with community-based organizations, schools, nonprofit organizations, and state and local government agencies to develop a regional human services safety net that promotes independence, ensures the availability of safe affordable housing, supports families and individuals in crisis, prevents abuse and neglect, responds to threats to public health, responds to crime in the community, addresses alcohol, drug, physical health, and mental health issues, prevents social isolation, and prevents neighborhood deterioration.

As Providence District Supervisor and later as Chairman of the Board, I had the great honor of working with the Human Services Council in many areas of critical need in the County, most notably on creation of the standalone Office to Prevent and End Homelessness, and the Penny for Affordable Housing initiative. I personally extend by deepest appreciation to Kevin Bell and the other members of the Council for their untiring efforts on behalf of the most vulnerable in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the crucial role the Human Services Council members have played over the last 25 years in making sure all of Fairfax County's residents have the safeguards and support they need to live up to their fullest potential.

RECOGNIZING MARIA GOMEZ

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Maria Gomez, president and CEO of Mary's Center, for her outstanding contributions to health care, education and other social services in the District of Columbia and for being awarded the 2012 Presidential Citizens Medal.

A nurse by training, Maria Gomez holds a nursing degree from Georgetown University and a Master of Public Health degree from the University California at Berkley. Mary's Center's services often are comprehensive, but Maria Gomez has never strayed far from health care. Maria Gomez founded Mary's Center in 1988, initially to provide bilingual prenatal and maternity care to vulnerable immigrant women in the District of Columbia. The small, basement- level facility, which served 200 women yearly in 1988, quickly expanded and today there are six locations in the District of Columbia and Maryland, and two mobile units, which serve over 50,000

men, women, and children of every background yearly. Maria Gomez molded the mission of Mary's Center into a model wraparound non-profit to improve the futures of our Hispanic residents through the delivery of health care, education and social services.

Maria Gomez's has received numerous awards for work at Mary's Center. Among her awards are recognition in Washingtonian Magazine as one of the 45 individuals who shaped Washington, D.C. between 1965 and 2010, a Washington Post Award for Excellence in Nonprofit Management, and a Champions of Choice Award from Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington. She also has been singled out by the federal Health Resources and Services Administration for her excellent leadership in providing access to care for Latino women and children.

Mr. Speaker, in this first month of the D.C. Health Benefit Exchange, it is appropriate to note that Mary's Center is a neighborhood Health Exchange Assister, a natural role for a leadership organization and for a leader whose career exemplifies offering health care to D.C. residents. I ask my colleagues to join me honoring Maria Gomez for her work in health care and her excellence in providing other services to the people of the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes yesterday. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 527 and "nay" on rollcall vote 528, final passage of H.J. Res. 77, the Food and Drug Safety Act.

The Republican piecemeal bills to fund only select governmental entities leave the American public without the critical services in food safety, public health, and consumer protections. This bill fails to fund the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission, which work alongside the Food and Drug Administration to ensure food safety and public health. However, I stand ready to vote for a clean continuing resolution to end the Republican Shutdown and fund the entire federal government.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRS, INC.

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate PRS, Inc. on its 50th anniversary and to recognize PRS for assisting thousands of individuals with mental illness, substance use disorders, mild intellectual disabilities, and autism spectrum disorders achieve personal wellness and play productive roles in the community.

PRS provides critical services to people living with severe mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, bi-polar disorder, major depression, intellectual disabilities, substance use disorders, or pervasive developmental disorders. Through innovative service delivery and programs, PRS can quickly assess the needs of an individual and implement services such as counseling, interpersonal skills training, vocational assistance, substance abuse services, and community housing. Thanks to the support offered by PRS, clients can and do increase their independence and self-sufficiency, allowing them to take critical steps toward leading strong and fulfilling lives.

Originally known as The Social Center, this institution began in 1963 in the basement of a church as a social program to assist recently discharged patients from Western State Hospital in Staunton, VA. Formally incorporated in 1970, by 1974 the Social Center had grown to serve more than 300 individuals at three locations with a staff of 18. By 1989, the agency was providing a range of rehabilitative skill training and support services including vocational, educational, case management, recreational and other services. In 1992, PRS opened the Reston-Faraday Clubhouse and between 1994 and 2002, opened five residential facilities for clients who need full-time, intensive support.

PRS Community Support Services helps people develop skills necessary to remain in their homes and out of the psychiatric hospital. In FY2013, 100% of the clients in that program maintained their homes and avoided eviction. The PRS Recovery Academy provides a curriculum-based day program that helps clients in the early stages of recovery master the essential skills of daily living and begin working toward their recovery and community integration goals. Over the years, PRS Employment Services has grown from serving just over 200 clients in 2000 to 502 in 2013, 89% of whom retained employment for 12 months or longer.

In 2011, PRS expanded the populations served to include persons with emotional and/or behavioral disorders irrespective of a diagnosis of mental illness. Thus, PRS began providing services to individuals with mild intellectual disabilities, substance use disorders and pervasive developmental disorders, including autism. All told, PRS served 920 individuals in FY2013 and 98% of them stayed out of the hospital.

PRS reached some other very significant milestones in 2013 by earning an Honorable Mention in the 2013 Washington Post Award for Excellence in Non-Profit Management, by being named one of the 50 Best Nonprofits to Work For in the United States by The Non-Profit Times for a third year in a row, and by opening its doors for the first time in the District of Columbia with the DC Recovery Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing PRS for 50 years of service and for its commitment to ensuring that every person has the right to live in dignity.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 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 $16,747,429,285,635.12. We've added $6,120,552,236,722.04 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 528, Making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Fairfax County Planning Commission.

The mission of the Fairfax County Planning Commission is to advise the Board of Supervisors on all matters related to the orderly growth and development of Fairfax County. This includes stewarding of the comprehensive plan for the physical development of the County, amending zoning and subdivision ordinances, and reviewing specific project proposals. The Planning Commission also provides citizens with an opportunity to provide input and contribute to matters involving development in and around their communities.

When the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to establish a Planning Commission in July 1938, the County had a population of about 40,000 people. The original five members were appointed based on the land-use interest they would represent, such as farmers, townspeople, commercial, and industrial interests. Commissioners met in closed sessions and did not record minutes until 1941. Today, Fairfax County has a population of approximately 1.1 million and the Planning Commission consists of twelve volunteer members—one for each of the nine supervisory districts and three who serve the County at large. They meet weekly in public sessions that can be viewed online anywhere in the world. Additionally, commissioners form subcommittees as needed to focus on specific topics such as parks, transportation, housing, and the environment.

For much of its first 75 years, the Planning Commission shepherded the County's transformation from a predominantly rural area to one dominated by sprawling suburbs and job centers. The transportation patterns were indicative of this; people travelled into Washington, D.C., for their jobs and back home to Fairfax County. This landscape began changing as more and more corporations, especially technology companies, relocated their corporate headquarters or opened large offices in

Fairfax County, primarily in the Dulles Corridor and Tysons areas. The expansion of professional opportunities continued to fuel the population growth of the County, irrevocably changing commuting patterns and posing new challenges and opportunities. In this century, as the County continues to redefine itself, emphasis has been placed on smart-growth, multi-use development easily accessible to public transit. Through the natural cycle of growth and redevelopment, new activity centers have been established throughout the County in communities like Reston, Laurel Hill, Springfield, and the Mosaic District in Merrifield.

In May 2010, the Planning Commission presented the most ambitious redevelopment plan in the County's history to Board of Supervisors—The Tysons Plan. The Tysons Plan was a culmination of years of planning and analysis, much of which I had the honor of working on while serving as the Providence District Supervisor and then as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. Under the Tysons Plan the area known as the ''downtown of Fairfax County'' will be transformed from a district filled with a patchwork of unconnected development and businesses into a vibrant, walkable, sustainable, transit-oriented mixed-use community. When completed, Tysons will be an urban center where people live, work, and play, and it will be home to up to 100,000 residents and 200,000 jobs. This plan received the American Planning Association's 2011 Daniel Burnham Award, which recognizes one urban plan in the nation each year, for advancing the science and art of planning.

Looking forward, the Planning Commission and staff will continue to seek a balance between this phenomenal growth and the need to maintain open space, manage traffic, and provide affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fairfax County Planning Commission on the occasion of its 75th Anniversary and in thanking the volunteer Commissioners and the staff of the Fairfax County Planning Commission for their efforts, expertise, and dedication toward making Fairfax County one of the best places in the country to live, work and raise a family.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, Taiwan, our dearest friend and closest ally in East Asia, is celebrating their 102nd birthday on October 10 of this year, known as ''Double Ten'' day given it is the tenth day of the tenth month.

Taiwan and the United States' strong relationship is based on the common standard that human rights, democracy and the rule of law are critical to maintaining a flourishing society. Both nations do not just speak of these as theories, but create environments for which they can be attained.

Because of this friendship, there are a few areas that I would like to shine a light in the hopes of strengthening Taiwan's global standing.

First of all, I would like to see a Bilateral Investment Agreement, BIA, between the United States and Taiwan as soon as possible. The protections afforded in a BIA are greater than what currently exists. This BIA will give investors of both countries greater confidence investing in each other and provides a platform for sustained economic growth.

I would also like my colleagues to join me in supporting Taiwan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP. As a Member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, APEC, Taiwan is rightfully allowed to be a part of TPP. The absence of their membership could create an unfair disadvantage for Taiwan and will be a hardship for our good friends in this global economy.

Taiwan is a beacon of democracy in East Asia. The United States should do all that it possibly can to ensure that Taiwan is in position to prosper and is on a firm foundation for sustained economic growth.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH SEPTEMBER 15–OCTOBER 15, 2013

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, since 1968, America has annually celebrated the National Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize the contributions of those whose ancestors came from South and Central America, Mexico, Spain, and the Caribbean. The start day of National Hispanic Heritage Month, September 15th, is significant because it is also the anniversary of independence for some Latin American countries such as: Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Additionally, Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16th and September 18th.

This year's theme, ''Hispanics: Serving and Leading our Nation with Pride and Honor,'' highlights the tremendous impact Hispanics have made in all sectors of our society. It is individuals like Thomas Pérez, the country's first Cabinet Secretary of Dominican descent, who reminds us that willingness to work hard can help achieve great success. Secretary Pérez is not only a role model for youths in our congressional district, but also an inspirational example of the American Dream.

I am proud to represent a congressional district with one of the largest and diverse Hispanic populations in the country. Our District is blessed to have great organizations that provide very useful services to my Hispanic constituents such as: Casa de la Herencia Cultural Puertorriquena, Institute for the Puerto Rican and Hispanic Elderly, Hispanic Federation, El Museo del Barrio, Julia de Burgos Cultural Center, Casabe House Development Fund, Inc., the Dominican Women's Development Center, El Centro Civico Cultural Dominicano, Inc., the PR Dream, Boriken Neighborhood Health Center, Dominican Sunday, Inc., The Dominican Bar Association, the Hispanic Community Organization for Life, El Asociacion Tepeyac de New York, New York City Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Federation of Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, MASA, Acacia Network, Casita Maria, and Comunilife. I am grateful for their continuous efforts to improve the lives of people in our district.

I will tirelessly continue to fight for various issues that are most important to our Hispanic community, such as comprehensive immigration reform which can create a path to citizenship, and provide more opportunities for Hispanics to achieve the American Dream.

TO CONGRATULATE BARBARA LIPPA ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Barbara Lippa on her retirement as Executive Director of the Fairfax County Planning Commission and to thank her for 35 years of service to the community.

Ms. Lippa began her career with the Planning Commission in 1978 as a Planning Aide. In 1979, she was promoted to Deputy Director and was promoted to Executive Director in 1999. In December 1999, Ms. Lippa earned designation as a Virginia Certified Planning Commissioner.

During her 35 year tenure with the Planning Commission, Ms. Lippa witnessed an explosion of growth. In 1978, the County population was less than 579,000. There were approximately 192,776 residential housing units, nearly 60% of which were single family detached homes. Ethnic diversity was virtually non-existent; 91.6% of the residents were white, 5.4% were African-American, and all other minorities combined comprised only 3% of the population. The median household income was $15,707, and 62% of housing was owner occupied with the median home value of $35,400. And while Metrorail operated in Washington, D.C., and a few close in suburbs, it would be nearly another decade before Metro would be an option to Fairfax County residents.

By the end of 2012, the population of Fairfax County had nearly doubled to more than 1.1 million residents. There are more than 408,000 residential housing units and the percentage of single family detached homes has decreased to approximately 47%. Fairfax County is now an ethnic tapestry; nearly 40% of its residents are minorities with Asian/Pacific Islanders comprising the largest single ethnic group. The 2012 median household income was $105,797 and the median home value was nearly $431,000. Metro is a daily part of life, and the Silver Line through Tysons and the Dulles Corridor will extend this service through Fairfax and into Loudoun County.

In 1978 there were fewer than 159,000 jobs in Fairfax County, today there are nearly 600,000. With 10 Fortune 500 Companies headquartered here, Fairfax County is home to more Fortune 500 companies than 33 states and is tied with 3 others; this exponential job growth has fueled the need for additional facilities, infrastructure, development, and services.

Ms. Lippa has excelled in leading Fairfax County's planning efforts during 35 years in an ever-changing climate. Her management and guidance has contributed greatly to the evolution of Fairfax County from a suburban enclave to a 21st century metropolis. In 2010, she was honored with a Team Excellence Award for her work with the Commission's

Tysons Committee and in October 2012, Ms. Lippa received the Marge Bleiweis Peace Builder Award. In addition, under her leadership, the Fairfax County Planning Commission was recognized with the American Planning Association's 2011 Daniel Burnham Award for its work on the Tysons Plan.

Despite the demands of serving on the Planning Commission, Ms. Lippa still found the time to remain involved and active in the community. For 28 years, she has been a member of Zonta International, holding numerous leadership positions and in 2012 was named as the Zonta Club of Fairfax 2011 Volunteer of the Year and honored by the Inter-Service Club Council of the City of Fairfax. From 1994 to 2008, Ms. Lippa continued her work to improve educational opportunities while serving as a member of the Northern Virginia Community College Business Advisory Curriculum Committee.

For generations to come, the benefits of Ms. Lippa's dedication, expertise, and commitment will be felt by millions of residents and will pave the way for the continued prosperity of the entire region. On behalf of the residents, businesses, and visitors to Fairfax County, I thank and commend her for a job exceedingly well done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Lippa on her retirement and thanking her for 35 years of service to Fairfax County and our community.

CELEBRATING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, the United States and the Republic of China, commonly referred to as Taiwan, have shared a close friendship. I'm pleased to recognize the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan is a shining example of democracy in the Asia Pacific region and promotes shared values with the United States, including respect for human rights, a market-based economy, and freedom. Taiwan is a very important trading partner and our economies are closely linked. Last year, Taiwan was our eleventh largest trading partner overall, was our seventh largest agricultural export market, and shared more than 63 billion dollars in bilateral trade.

Taiwan's economy is a dynamic force in the Asia Pacific region and it is in both of our interests to continue strengthening our trade and investment ties. We should continue to expand trade through a Bilateral Investment Agreement, a Free Trade Agreement, and an expanded Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Taiwan is a member of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation and if admitted to the TPP, a great U.S. ally such as Taiwan would be an even more important economic player.

Taiwan has recognized that joining the TPP would be the best way to diversify its market and improve competitiveness in the region. I encourage my colleagues to support Taiwan's inclusion into TPP, which would further strengthen U.S.-Taiwan trade and investment dialogues and would likely increase other TPP member countries' willingness in engaging Taiwan in vigorous and ambitious trade negotiations. The United States should actively seek ways with its TPP member nations to include Taiwan in the partnership, allowing Taiwan to play an even more important role in the regional economic integration in the years to come.

Finally, I encourage more high-level diplomatic visits between our two countries to increase bilateral interaction on matters such as security, trade, investment, cultural exchange, and education. Just as our economic partnership continues to improve, Taiwan is one of our most valuable allies and is a nation we can truly depend on. That is why I introduced the Taiwan Policy Act with my colleagues, the co-chairs of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, Representatives MARIO DIAZ-BALART, ALBIO SIRES, JOHN CARTER, and GERALD CONNOLLY, to strengthen our political, security, economic, and trade relations. I was proud to see this legislation pass in the Foreign Affairs Committee in August and am looking forward to its swift passage here in the House soon.

I wish a very happy Double Ten Day to the people of Taiwan. While we are already close partners, it is my firm belief that our best days are still ahead.

CONGRATULATING OTSEGO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce for being named the winner of The Business Council of New York State's Chamber of the Year award. As the Representative of New York's 19th Congressional District, I have the great honor of working with the Otsego County Chamber and know first-hand the good work they do for Upstate New York.

Each year, The Business Council Chamber of the Year Award is given to a Chamber of Commerce that displays a positive commitment to pro-business activities within their community and state. In awarding this honor to the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce, The Business Council of New York has recognized Executive Director Barbara Ann Heegan's leadership and the entire Otsego County Chamber's work on behalf of the business community. Their commitment to quality programs and services, fiscal responsibility and membership growth makes them an example for Chambers of Commerce across New York and across the Nation.

In these tough economic times, it is more important than ever that we have strong organizations dedicated to economic growth. Located in Oneonta, N.Y., the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce works to improve the overall business climate in Otsego County and create an atmosphere which attracts investment by building a positive, forward-thinking business community through partnerships with government, individuals and private institutions.

Of particular interest to me was the Otsego County Chamber's partnership with local education institutions. These efforts included coordinating with the SUNY Cooperative Ed Initiative to create a college intern program, developing a partnership with Broome Community College to provide courses to county residents, expanding networking opportunities for community members, and providing seminars and educational programs. At a time where unemployment is hovering around 8 percent but around 4 million jobs remain unfilled in the United States, it is more vital that job creators and educators work together to build the workforce our country needs to remain competitive on the international front.

It is an honor to represent Otsego County in the United States Congress and I am proud to stand today in recognition of the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce. I look forward to continuing to work with Executive Director Heegan and her award-winning membership at the Otsego County Chamber to grow the economy and bring jobs to Upstate New York.

RECOGNIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM WON KYUN HWANG AS PRESIDENT OF THE WASHINGTON CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL UNIFICATION ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Mr. William Won-Kyun Hwang for his appointment as President of the Washington Chapter of the 16th Session of the National Unification Advisory Council (NUAC) for the Republic of Korea. The Council was established in 1980 under the Constitution of the Republic of South Korea to advise the Korean President on policies that promote a democratic peaceful reunification of Korea, including the views of Koreans living domestically and abroad.

A successful Northern Virginia businessman, Mr. Hwang is a resident of Oakton in the 11th Congressional District, and he has been an active member of the Fairfax County community. He is the president of three companies involved in trade and property development, and he serves on the Fairfax County Park Foundation Board.

He served from 2008 to 2010 as President of the Korean-American Association of Virginia, which provides a multitude of services to help Korean immigrants adjust to life in America. In addition to being a past chairman of the Board of Directors for the KAAV, Mr. Hwang also has chaired the 14th San Francisco Korean American Olympics Washington Team in 2007, the Vocational School of the Korean American Association of Northern Virginia, the Korean American Business Association, and the Korean American Sports Association of Greater Washington. He was the 2006 delegate for the Washington, D.C., and Seoul City Sisterhood, and Seoul City, along with Dan Kook University of Korea, recognized him as an honorary ambassador in 2008.

As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I am pleased to have worked with KAAV and other Korean-American organizations on promoting cultural awareness and addressing issues within the community, and I

am pleased to join them in celebrating Mr. Hwang's appointment. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hwang for his service to the local Korean-American community and in commending the NUAC for its efforts to promote peace and unity on the Korean peninsula.

HONORING THE CAREER OF CLARA THOMPSON

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Clara Delle Thompson of Rock Island, Illinois.

Clara Thompson will be retiring at the end of this month after almost 45 years serving Rock Island as a court reporter. Her friendliness, unmatched style and love of her "bling" will be greatly missed in the Rock Island County Courthouse by the many judges, bailiffs, attorneys and others who love and respect her. Thompson is a legend in the 14th Judicial Circuit in Illinois where she has continued to use her notebook and shorthand to take notes on court proceedings, even while the rest of her colleagues turned to electronic steno-machines. She jokes that if the power goes out, her pen still works.

Thompson has lived in the Quad Cities since her family moved to Rock Island when she was nine. She worked for Deere and Co. and Dohrn Transfer before becoming a court reporter in her late 30s. Along with her work, she is very involved in her community, supporting the Figge and the Putnam museums and the Quad City Botanical Center among other organizations.

While the Rock Island County Courthouse will not be the same without Clara Delle Thompson, I wish her the best as she continues to serve the people in her community, play bridge and I hope she will be able to keep travelling the world.

FIREFIGHTER BRAD LUCZAK

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Brad Luczak from my district. I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating him on his nomination for the Saginaw Firefighter of the Year Award. This award speaks highly of his consistent dedication and commitment to excellence. Mr. Luczak has worked hard to earn this opportunity, and I am proud to have him protecting the people of Saginaw.

As a demonstrated leader, among not only his fellow firefighters, but also his city, Mr. Luczak exhibits what a true hero looks like. His drive and determination are truly inspiring, and he is a role model for the town. It is a true honor, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Luczak represents Michigan and I thank him for his service to our country.

I applaud Mr. Luczak's efforts, and I look forward to following his progress in the future.

IN HONOR OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ZION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the rich heritage of Zion Missionary Baptist Church whose members are celebrating its 150th anniversary. In 1863, shortly after President Abraham Lincoln gave the Emancipation Proclamation, thirty-six freedmen founded a church at the Pepperton Community in Jasper, Georgia. Since then, Zion Missionary Baptist Church has become a thriving fellowship, dedicated to ministry and service in the African-American community.

It is worth noting that before there were African-American mayors, governors, or even a president, Black churches, like Zion, thrived with leadership from African-American Sunday school teachers, deacons, and pastors. As with many churches, over the years the members of Zion were seen as community leaders, who helped mentor, educate, and counsel many in the Black community. Today, Zion serves not only as a place of worship, but as a people with a mission to serve as a source of encouragement, inspiration, and pride for members of the community for more than a century.

The 150 year history of Zion Missionary Baptist Church includes many pastors, challenges, and changes, but its unwavering commitment to being a place where the community gathers to help and support one another is to be commended. No matter the cause, event, or activity, God has used Zion to influence its community. Therefore, I close by asking you to support and pray for what God is doing at Zion Missionary Baptist Church. May it continue as a pillar of strength for the residents of Butts County for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month and the countless contributions of Hispanic individuals and organizations to the outstanding quality of life enjoyed by Northern Virginians. In 1968, Hispanic Heritage Week was established by President Lyndon Johnson; 20 years later in 1988, it was expanded by President Ronald Reagan to cover the 30-day period between September 15 and October 15 of each year.

This period includes several dates of great significance to the Hispanic community. September 15 is the anniversary of independence for the Latin American countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16 and September 18, respectively. October 12 is Columbus Day or Día de la Raza, and is celebrated in the in United States as well as in many Latin American countries.

Each year since 1994, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors has recognized Hispanic Heritage Month. Prince William County also celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month with events in schools and libraries. Of course, Hispanic individuals and organizations remain active year round to improve our community. Both the Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Prince William Chamber of Commerce support active Hispanic Business Councils that promote and improve the Hispanic business community and forge strategic partnerships with local businesses, community organizations, governments, and elected officials. The annual Dulles Regional Chamber Council's Hispanic Business Reception welcomes hundreds of guests from the Greater Washington Metropolitan Region and attracts corporate executives, diplomats, elected officials and non-profit partners, who meet and develop working partnerships while enjoying Hispanic culture.

Northern Virginia is blessed by its diversity and is enriched by our vibrant Hispanic community. Approximately 16% of Fairfax County residents and 21% of Prince William County residents are Hispanic or Latino. In the 11th District of Virginia more than 130,000 of my constituents identify as Hispanic or Latino.

A growing number of small businesses are Latino-owned; and MicroTech, one of the 10 Fastest Growing Hispanic-Owned Businesses in the nation is located here in the 11th Congressional District. The Fairfax Hispanic Firefighters Association, FHFA was established in the spring of 2003, to assist the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department in the delivery of bilingual Life Safety Education programs. In Prince William, the "Panorama Latino TV Show" serves as a vital link between local governments, first responders, service providers, non-profits, and the Hispanic members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and thanking the Hispanic-American community for their contributions to our community.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3230 AND H.J. RES 72

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to both H.R. 3230 and H.J. Res. 72, two bills which claim to fund our veterans and our National Guard and Reserve but are nothing but a political ploy and a piecemeal approach that do nothing to address many of the crucial services relied on by our military and veterans.

Let me be clear. Every member of Congress fully supports our National Guard and Reserve and our veterans. Yet neither of the two bills we considered today actually accomplish this objective.

Although H.R. 3230 does provide for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the reserve component who are in inactive status, it does not fund other essential programs and services to support our military, like equipment needed for readiness; military maintenance and procurement; and research and development for technological superiority of U.S. forces.

H.J. Res. 72 also neglects to fund several critical programs for veterans, including the

delivery of veterans' health care services, grants to state veterans homes, and funding for the VA's Office of Inspector General. In fact, this bill represents a $6.2 billion reduction in funding for the VA compared to the bipartisan MilCon/VA appropriations bill passed overwhelmingly earlier this year.

So H.J. Res. 72 is not a vote to fund our veterans; it is a vote to cut veterans funding. In addition, it would leave their children and grandchildren behind without funding for programs like Head Start or medical research to cure the diseases that harm our veterans and every other citizen. Taken together, these two bills fail to equip and train our troops or build housing for their families.

The fact is that we do have a way to solve this issue today. If we take up the Senate's clean continuing resolution, we can send it to the President for his signature tonight. The clean CR also provides $6 billion more in funding for the VA and veteran's programs compared to the piecemeal bill offered today. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the clean CR so we can end this shut down and pave the way for full and immediate funding for our National Guard, our military reserves, and our veterans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETE P. GALLEGO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 527 on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I am not recorded because I was absent due to attendance at the funeral of Deputy Sheriff Billy ''Bubba'' Kennedy from Upton County who was killed in the line of duty after 14 years as a committed peace officer. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 528 on H.J. Res. 77, the Food and Drug Safety Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to attendance at the funeral of Deputy Sheriff Billy ''Bubba'' Kennedy from Upton County who was killed in the line of duty after 14 years as a committed peace officer. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CLARIFY CERTAIN DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SERVING IN SENSITIVE POSITIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, as hundreds of thousands of our federal workers face furloughs and a third year of pay freezes, I introduce a bill to clarify certain due process rights of federal employees serving in sensitive positions. The bill would overturn a recent, unprecedented federal court decision, Kaplan v. Conyers and MSPB, that strips many federal employees of the right to independent review of an agency decision removing them from a job on grounds of ineligibility. The case was brought by two Department of Defense (DOD) employees, Rhonda Conyers, an accounting technician, and Devon Northover, commissary management specialist, who were permanently demoted and suspended from their jobs after they were found to no longer be eligible to serve in noncritical sensitive positions.

Specifically, the decision prevents federal workers who are designated as ''noncritical sensitive'' from appealing to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) if they are removed from their jobs. Noncritical sensitive jobs include those that do not have access to classified information. The decision would affect at least 200,000 DOD employees who are designated as noncritical sensitive. Even more seriously, most federal employees could potentially lose the same right to an independent review of an agency's decision because of a pending rule by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) that would permit agency heads to designate most jobs in the federal government as noncritical sensitive.

The Kaplan decision undercuts Title 5, section 7701 of the Civil Service Act, which ensures due process rights for federal workers required by the United States Constitution. Stripping employees whose work does not involve classified matters of the right of review of an agency decision that removes them from their jobs opens entirely new avenues for unreviewable, arbitrary action or retaliation by an agency head and, in addition, makes a mockery of whistleblower protections enacted in the 112th Congress. My bill would stop the use of ''national security'' to repeal a vital component of civil service protection and of due process.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

COMMEMORATING AUGUST 2013 AS THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST KOREAN IMMIGRANTS ARRIVING IN AMERICA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with Korean-American immigrants in my district and through the nation in celebrating August as the 110th anniversary of the first Korean immigrants arriving here in the United States. The Institute for Corean-American Studies (ICAS) is hosting its summer symposium on this very topic: The Korean Diaspora: Challenges facing the Korean-American Community.

The first Korean immigrants—102 men, women, and children—arrived in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1903 to work as laborers on sugar plantations. Since then, Korean Americans have settled across America, which is now home to the second largest Korean population outside of Korea itself. More than 80,000 Korean-Americans live in the National Capital Region, making this the third largest Korean community in the United States. In the 11th Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent, is home to a thriving Korean-American community. Asian-Americans comprise the largest ethnic group in our District, which is more than 40% minority and in which more than 1-in-4 is foreign born.

Earlier this spring, I was pleased to join my colleagues in welcoming President Park Geunhye of the Republic of Korea, who addressed a joint session of Congress. She spoke eloquently about her long-term hope for restoring trust across the Korean peninsula and fostering a shared sense of economic vitality across Asia. As a co-chair of the Congressional Korea Caucus, I and my colleagues are committed to preserving and further growing the strong relationship we have enjoyed with South Korea for the past 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the countless contributions of Korean-Americans and in commemorating the 110th anniversary of the arrival of the first Korean immigrants here in America. I wish ICAS success with its upcoming symposium.

KEVIN O'DONNELL, CAN DO, INC.

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Kevin O'Donnell for 40 years of service with CAN DO, Inc. in Hazleton, Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'Donnell joined CAN DO in 1973 as assistant director. CAN DO, Inc. is a private, non-profit industrial/economic development corporation serving Greater Hazleton in Northeastern, Pennsylvania. Mr. O'Donnell quickly rose through the ranks of this organization, becoming a project manager for the area's first synthetic fuels plant in 1974 and in 1984, becoming director of the organization. In 1995, that title changed to president, the position he has held since that day. Under Mr. O'Donnell's leadership, CAN DO received the Arthur D. Little Environmental Excellence in Economic Development Award in 1993, the U.S. Green Building Council's Energy and Environmental Design Award in 2006, and the Pennsylvania Economic Development Association's ''Large Agency of the Year'' title in 2007.

A native of Greater Hazleton, Mr. O'Donnell's success extends beyond his work with CAN DO. In 1984, he was selected by the Pennsylvania Economic Development Association (PEDA) as the first-ever ''Developer of the Year.'' In 2006, he was awarded the Ben Franklin Innovation Award ''Special Achievement'' for his contribution to the creation of the Great Valley Technology Alliance (GVTA). In 2009, Mr. O'Donnell was inducted into Northeast Pennsylvania's Business Hall of Fame for his numerous achievements and contributions to Greater Hazleton and Northeast Pennsylvania. Locally, he has received numerous awards for his work as a former officer and member of several educational institutions and community and civic groups.

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years Kevin O'Donnell has served as an integral member of CAN DO, Inc., bringing thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars to the Greater Hazleton economy. Therefore, I commend him for his service to the economic development of Pennsylvania's 11th District.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOYCE BLACK

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Joyce Black, who passed away on Friday, October 4, 2013. I wish I could be at the funeral today to be with her husband Stanley and the rest of her family, but my congressional responsibilities keep me in Washington.

Joyce lived a truly remarkable life. She was involved with numerous charitable and civic organizations, including the American Diabetes Association, City of Hope, Stop Cancer, Vista Del Mar, Israel Bonds, the Jewish Federation, the L.A. Jewish Home, the L.A. Opera, Cedars Sinai Medical Center, and the Temple of the Arts. In fact, earlier this month, Joyce and Stanley made a special donation to Children's Hospital Los Angeles that will fund research and clinical care programs at the hospital. Joyce was devoted to providing the best medical care to our children.

I extend my sincerest condolences to Stanley, her son Jack, and daughters Jill and Janis. Married for 57 years, Stanley and Joyce's partnership was truly inspirational. Joyce leaves behind a remarkable legacy of kindness and generosity that will impact not only those who were lucky enough to meet her, but future generations to come.

RECOGNIZING MARTY WHITE FOR HIS FORTY YEARS OF RADIO EXCELLENCE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Northwest Florida's Marty White for having spent forty years on the radio, over thirty of which have been spent waking up the people of the greater Pensacola area. I am pleased to acknowledge his success and great achievement.

Mr. White grew up in Northwest Florida and attended J.M. Tate High School in Cantonment. After graduation, he joined the United States Air Force where he served our Nation before he ever thought about a career on morning radio. Following his military service, Mr. White used his connections to secure an interview at a local radio station in 1973. He landed the job and has been on the radio ever since, entertaining the people of the Gulf Coast.

The radio industry has changed drastically over the years that Mr. White has been on the air. Many radio personalities have come and gone in the wake of advancing technology and station buyouts. Mr. White, however, has adapted to these changes and remained a local radio mainstay due to his massive popularity.

Over twenty of his years on the radio have been spent on 102.7 WXBM. What once started as a small station in Chumuckla has moved to Pensacola under the umbrella of the second largest radio station operator in the country, Cumulus Media. Whereas this change could have resulted in the hiring of a new staff altogether, Mr. White has remained as the voice that the people of Northwest Florida enjoy waking up to in the morning or listening to during their drive to work.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I congratulate Marty White for reaching forty years on the radio. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to Mr. White, his wife Donna, and their son Cody. We look forward to many more mornings listening to Marty on ''Your Hometown Morning Show'' in the years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LILLIAN BERNICE VARNADO WATKINS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of educator and homemaker, Mrs. Lillian Watkins, a beloved educator and homemaker.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins passed away on Sunday, October 6 at the age of 96. While I am deeply saddened by her passing, I am comforted in knowing that her legacy is one that will live on through her involvement in public education, the values she instilled in her children and the foundation of her husband's success.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins was born on March 13, 1917 in Canton, Mississippi as the fourth of Reverend Willie L. Varnado and Mrs. Etta Pearl Varnado's five children. She attended elementary, primary and secondary schools in Canton and Jackson, Mississippi. Mrs. Watkins earned her bachelor's degree from Lane College in Jackson, Tennessee where she graduated cum laude.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins taught civics and home economics at Burt High School in Clarksville, Tennessee following graduation. She later married one of her fellow teachers, Mr. Levi Watkins Sr. After marrying in 1940 the couple moved to Parsons, Kansas where she gave birth to five of their six children. In 1948, the family moved to Montgomery, Alabama where the sixth child was born.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins raised six children, all of which have broken racial barriers in the South by holding leadership positions in the arts, business, education, government and medicine.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' husband is known for his transformational leadership as the president of Alabama State University. He took the university from a small teacher's college to a destination university accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools upon his departure in 1981. Although her husband is highly respected for his legacy at Alabama State University, Mrs. Watkins' children give her the credit for their successes in life. She was the personality of the family giving her children the rock-solid confidence they would need to achieve their goals.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' son, Dr. Levi Watkins, Jr. was the first African-American graduate of Vanderbilt University and the first cardiac surgeon in the country to perform a human implantation of the automatic implantable defibrillator. Another son of Mrs. Watkins' is a retired surgeon while one of her daughters is a concert pianist.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' son Donald Watkins, Sr., Esq., was Montgomery's first black city attorney and one of the first African-Americans on the City Council. Watkins describes his mother as the ''rock'' of the family. He said that because of the love and respect she provided to all of her children they never had to look outside of the home for validation.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' daughter Doristine Minott was the principal of Southlawn Middle School until her retirement in 2007. Mrs. Minott remembers her mother for teaching her children to be humble and ''to see beauty in the simplest things.'' She remembers, ''My mom was the quiet giant behind my dad's success . . . It was she who quieted the storms during the difficult times.''

Mrs. Lillian Watkins is remembered as one who fully embraced her roles of wife, mother and homemaker and later, as aunt, grandmother and great-grandmother.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins had a passion for music, sewing, art, decorating and traveling. In her later years, she developed a gift for writing poetry. She participated in poetry readings at Art Festivals in her community and at church while living in Ohio with her daughter. Several of her poems were later published in two books.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' legacy will live on through the lives of her six children. All six of her children have broken tremendous racial barriers not only in Alabama but across the country. The success of her children is only a reflection of the integrity and humility that she instilled in each of them.

Saying thank you to Mrs. Lillian Watkins seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant, educator, mother and homemaker. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Lillian Watkins.

HONORING SMITHSONIAN SECRETARY WAYNE CLOUGH

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Smithsonian Secretary Wayne Clough for his long and distinguished career in Academia, and as caretaker of the Smithsonian legacy since 2008.

Secretary Clough announced this month that he would retire in October, 2014 after what will be six unforgettable years at the helm of this historic institution.

Since Clough's tenure began, his unprecedented leadership has taken the Smithsonian in new directions—setting bold new educational goals that built on the institution's core strengths. As a part of this process, the Smithsonian has now become a world leader in new digital communications and imaging technology. To reach new audiences, Clough oversaw the first-ever online branding and advertisement campaign across all 50 states, and has put renewed emphasis on collaborations with universities and outside organizations. More than 400 exhibitions have been

opened across the system under Clough's name, many of which are permanent.

Before coming to the Smithsonian, Clough was a valuable leader on the staffs of many commendable institutions of higher education across the country. In particular, he served as the president of my own alma mater—Georgia Tech—for 14 years.

During his time at these universities, he's been recognized with many formal academic awards. Among them, are his induction into Georgia's Technology Hall of Fame, Georgia Tech's Joseph M. Pettit Alumni Distinguished Service Award, election to the National Academy of Engineering, the 2008 NAE Bueche Award in public policy, and nine national awards from the American Society of Civil Engineers—including the 2004 OPAL lifetime award and 2012 President's award for his efforts in education.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest thanks for his lifelong devotion to education and his procurement of one of America's longest standing protectors of its history. I wish him a joyous—and well-deserved—retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT D. YOUNG

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former State Senator Robert D. Young in honor of his dedicated service to our country and the people of the State of Michigan in light of his recent passing. Senator Young's devotion to his community and this nation is something that is to truly be admired.

Senator Young's career began in Spaulding Township where he built homes and managed a large farm. In 1974, Young won the election to the State Senate where he served for the next eight years.

Upon leaving his successful career in State politics, Young took a position as the Executive Vice President of the Great Lakes Sugar Beet Growers Association. From this position, he advocated agricultural policies in Michigan, and Washington DC for thirteen years.

Senator Young's career was dedicated to public service and the betterment of the state of Michigan. I stand here today to honor Senator Robert Young for his many accomplishments. On behalf of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District, I offer my appreciation for his years of service and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family upon their loss.

HONORING THE BALL STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishment of the Ball State University football team.

Ball State's football team recently traveled to Charlottesville, Virginia where they defeated the University of Virginia Cavaliers by a score of 48–27.

A day before the game I had the privilege of meeting the team and coaching staff when I led them on a tour of the Capitol. In the short time we spent together, it was obvious that the team is full of great young men who are learning lessons that will not only make them successful on the field, but also in life.

The Cardinals victory over Virginia was unquestionably one of the biggest wins in the history of the program. It also marked another in a long line of major upset victories for Mid-American Conference teams in recent decades.

Ball State quarterback Keith Wenning completed 23-of-41 passes for 346 yards and two touchdowns in the victory. He also became the Cardinals' career passing leader with 9,250 yards. Running back Jahwan Edwards ran for three touchdowns, marking the sixth game in his career with three rushing scores and setting the Ball State career touchdowns rushing record at 35. Late in the game Wenning completed a 72 yard touchdown pass to Jordan Williams. The reception was the longest of Williams' career and gave the Cardinals a 41–27 lead. The Cardinals also finished the game with no turnovers.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Ball State Cardinals, their head coach Pete Lembo, Ball State President Jo Ann Gora and the entire Ball State University community for their impressive victory.

RECOGNIZING THE PRIDGEN FAMILY AS THE 2013 WALTON COUNTY FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Pridgen family for being selected as the 2013 Walton County, Florida, Farm Family of the Year.

Steve Pridgen, a born-and-bred third generation farmer, takes to heart the value of hard work, stewardship of land, and the love and support of his family. If you ask Steve how he feels about farming, he will tell you it has been a dream come true, and it has grown to become his life's passion. Ever since he was a young boy, Steve dreamed of farming just like his father and grandfather. In 1983, while only a high school junior, he took over operations for his father's 430-plus acre farm, which is located in the Liberty Community.

The Pridgen family farm boasts 65 head of beef cattle, 120 acres of pasture land, as well as 300-plus acres of pine trees. In addition to Steve, his wife, Ronda, and their children, Stephanie, Chase, and Madison, along with Steve's mother, Martha, all contribute to the overall success of the farm. The Pridgen children are especially willing to help out on the family farm; Chase can often be found driving around a tractor, while Stephanie gladly gives up her free time when home from school to assist her father and brother.

The recognition bestowed upon the Pridgen family is not the only accolade they have been given with regards to their efforts in agriculture. In 2007, the Pridgen family was named Florida's Outstanding Tree Farmers of the Year by the Florida Forestry Association.

Steve Pridgen is extremely grateful for the opportunity he and his family have been given to devote their lives to cultivating God's earth. His gratitude goes out to the Walton County farming community, of which he is thankful to be a part, as well as, the Walton County Extension Service.

Mr. Speaker, our great Nation was built by farmers and their families. The Walton County Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Pridgen's tireless work and their dedication to family, faith, and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Pridgen family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF AGAR JAICKS

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary progressive leader in San Francisco, Agar Jaicks, who celebrates his 90th birthday today. Jaicks is a central figure in the founding and growth of progressive organizations and neighborhood groups that greatly influenced San Francisco's political life from the 1950s to the present day. He is one of the most beloved and admired figures in our City's great history, and I join my constituents in honoring five decades of his tireless service to the people of San Francisco. Agar Jaicks has been a relentless advocate for social, economic and environmental economic justice. Above all, he is a loyal friend, with a gentle grace and modesty so rarely seen in the world of politics.

Agar Jaicks was born in Chicago in 1923 and raised in the exclusive North Shore suburb of Lake Forest, Illinois, an affluent, upper-class, conservative community. At the age of 20, Jaicks joined the U.S. Marines and fought valiantly in the South Pacific during World War II. After the war ended, he attended George Washington University under the newly implemented Veteran's GI Bill, where he met Diana Roosevelt, the niece of First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, who would become his wife. Their first date was a Senate hearing on Capitol Hill, portending a life together in political and public service.

After graduation in 1950, Agar and Diana Jaicks moved to San Francisco to build a life and raise their family. Jaicks' first job in San Francisco was pumping gas for Chevron, but his interest in news and politics led him to a longtime career working for the next forty years as a director for KGO TV.

Agar's political life began with the 1951 campaign of Helen Gahagan Douglas for the United States Senate against Richard Nixon. In 1953, he and his wife joined the San Francisco Young Democrats, a group of progressive activists, where he befriended many future political leaders, including U.S. Representatives Phillip Burton and John Burton, Mayors George Moscone and Willie Brown, all whom he would staunchly support.

Jaicks was elected to the San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee in 1962 where he would serve as Chair and be a stabilizing force for sixteen years. In this position, he ran the United Democratic Campaign that

led voter registration efforts and 'get out the vote' mobilizations.

Jaicks' greatest friendships were with San Francisco Supervisor Jack Morrison and U.S. Representative Philip Burton.

Agar and Diana and their Haight Ashbury neighbors, Jack and Jane Morrison and Sue Bierman, stood on the progressive front of important San Francisco battles, from stopping the central freeway that would destroy San Francisco neighborhoods and Golden Gate Park neighborhoods to fighting unrestricted downtown development.

Agar was a devoted husband to his late beloved wife of 64 years, Diana, and remains a loving father to his children, Lisa and Scott, and his grandchildren.

I am proud to call Agar Jaicks my friend and thank him for his leadership, his devoted friendship, and his wise counsel.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF EVELYN LOWERY

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Civil Rights Activist Evelyn Gibson Lowery, a beloved civil servant remembered for her remarkable display of leadership and civil rights activism.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery passed away on Thursday, September 26 at the age of 88. While I am deeply saddened by her passing, I am comforted in knowing that her legacy is one that will live on through her involvement in the Civil Rights Movement at local, regional, national, and international levels.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery was born in 1925 in Memphis, Tennessee to activists Rev. Dr. Harry and Evelyn Gibson. She attended Clark College and Youngstown University. In 1948, she married Rev. Joseph Lowery. Evelyn dedicated her life to the cause of justice.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery and Rev. Lowery participated in the 1965 Selma-to-Montgomery march in Alabama and stand as an inspirational couple as pioneers in the Civil Rights Movement. Upon the death of his wife, Rev. Lowery was quoted, "My beloved Evelyn was a special woman, whose life was committed to service, especially around the issues of empowering women. She was a wonderful mother and wife and I thank God. . .that I was blessed having her as my partner, my confidante and my best friend for almost 70 years."

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery founded the SCLC/Women's Organization Movement for Equality Now Inc. in 1979 as the sister organization of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference which was founded by Rev. Lowery and other Civil Rights Activists. Her decision to found this organization was prompted by her weariness of seeing the rights of women, children and families ignored. Through Evelyn's inspiring leadership and guidance, the SCLC/W.O.M.E.N Inc. has more than accomplished its mission of reacting and responding to the plight of marginalized people. The organization has grown into an international association with programs offering education and mentoring in addition to HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns throughout the world.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery not only participated in the Selma-to-Montgomery march in 1965 but she and Rev. Lowery have been instrumental in the commemoration of Bloody Sunday nearly every year since. She also contributed to the erection of the Civil Rights Freedom Wall at the Brown Chapel AME Church in Selma, Alabama.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery founded several prominent programs including the Drum Major for Justice Awards Dinner in 1980 honoring those who contribute to social justice in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and the Evelyn G. Lowery Civil Rights Heritage Tour honoring civil rights movement icons. In 1988, she founded the Women's Empowerment Training Center for GED/computer training. In 1995, Evelyn founded a mentoring program for young girls.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery has been described by several in the civil rights community as a champion in the civil rights movement and a "drum major for justice in her own right." Her legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of all of those who benefitted from her contributions to justice and equality.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery received many awards and recognitions for her tremendous contributions to the cause of justice. Evelyn was appointed by Atlanta's former Mayor Maynard Jackson to arrange clothes for missing or murdered children for burial. She was the recipient of the Rosa Parks Award, the APEX Museum's Tribute Award, and the YWCA Academy of Women Achievers Award. Evelyn was recognized as one of the 100 most influential women in Atlanta by the Atlanta Business League's Women of Vision. She was honored in 2004 at the International Civil Rights Walk of Fame at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site in Atlanta, Georgia.

Evelyn's instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement has made an indelible mark on this nation. Today we honor her for her role in the story of the Civil Rights Movement. As the first black woman elected to Congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share her story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Mrs. Evelyn Lowery seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Evelyn Lowery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 2, 2013, I attended the funeral of a good friend and constituent, Mrs. Evelyn Lowery, in my congressional district. Consequently, I was unable to make votes for a portion of the day.

Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: on rollcall No. 509, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 510, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 511, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall 512, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, it is an honor for me to recognize the National Day of the Republic of China, which is celebrated every year on October 10, also referred to as Double Tenth. The Republic of China, more commonly known as Taiwan, continues to be an anchor for peace and security in the Asia Pacific region and one of the United States' most trusted allies.

Taiwan's National Day is a time for celebrating and commemorating its establishment on January 1, 1912. Since its establishment, Taiwan has established itself as a stable democracy; one whose leaders are democratically elected and where civil and human rights of the citizenry are respected. These shared values serve as the foundation for the U.S.-Taiwan alliance. I have had the pleasure to meet with Taiwan's Representative serving in Washington, DC, Ambassador Pu-tsung King and his family. I have witnessed firsthand their kindness, grace and dedication to their home country. Ambassador King and his family are eloquent representatives for the people of Taiwan.

The friendship between Taiwan and the U.S. is long-lasting and all facets of the U.S.-Taiwan bilateral relationship—cultural, economic, and strategic—have expanded and grown stronger since the signing into law of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) in 1979. A strong, prosperous Taiwan serves both our nations' interests. In 2012, Taiwan was the United States' 11th largest trading partner, and the 7th largest export market for U.S. agriculture. For my home state of Indiana, Taiwan is one of its top export markets in Asia. Hoosier farmers and my state's economy have benefitted greatly from trade agreements with Taiwan.

There is no denying that Taiwan's contributions to the global community are immeasurable. It is a membership of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). On July 12, 2013, President Obama signed into law legislation that calls for the Secretary of State to endorse Taiwan's entry into the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). This will help strengthen the safety of air travel between the United States and Taiwan.

I congratulate Taiwan on its National Day and I look forward to many years of continued cooperation between our two countries.

HONORING LT. COL. JAMES DABNEY

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a true American hero, Lt. Col. James Dabney, retired, for his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame for his service to this great Nation during the Vietnam War.

In the Spring of 1968, James Dabney was 25 and an Army captain; he was the officer in charge of the 123 men of Delta Company, 4th Battalion, 12th Infantry, 199th Infantry Brigade and medics, forward observers and soldiers with the 17th Armored Cavalry.

His men were teenagers and had been drafted to serve. They were stationed about 15 miles outside of Saigon to block the enemy's entry into the city.

Lt. Col. Dabney describes the conditions: It was hot and humid and there were torrential downpours. One night, he says, it rained so hard that the men were in foxholes sitting in water up to their chest. The soldiers were eating rations left over from Korea. They were spent. They were hungry. They were tired from being constantly on alert. Most of the guys had just been through the Tet Offensive.

On May 5, 1968, the company of 123 men engaged 2,000 North Vietnamese soldiers. Over the next four days a fierce battle ensued. But the crew of young Americans held their ground and, in the end, the enemy retreated. For their bravery, the company would later be awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

Forty-five years later, Lt. Col. Dabney doesn't reflect on his own accomplishment; he remembers the six young men of his company that didn't return home.

He says he got the recognition, but they were the real heroes.

In addition to his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame this summer, Lt. Col. Dabney has also been awarded the Presidential Unit Citation, Distinguished Service Cross, a Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, three Purple Hearts and the Legion of Merit for his actions in Vietnam.

But his greatest award, he says, is an eagle figurine with an inscription from the men in his company thanking him for his leadership.

In 1984, Lt. Col. Dabney retired from the Army. He and his wife, Jeanne Marie, celebrated their 25th anniversary last year and have five children, Jill LeWallen, Lynn Raper, Jeannie Pilgrim, James Winch and Marrianne Mazurowski.

IN HONOR OF TAIWAN'S 102ND NATIONAL BIRTHDAY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, Taiwan, a dear friend and close ally in Southeast Asia, is celebrating their 102nd birthday on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan and the United States have a good relationship because we have so much in common. We both believe that human rights, democracy and the rule of law are critical to maintaining stability. Both nations do not just speak of these as theories but create environments in which they can be fulfilled. It is a shame that Taiwan is not given the recognition they deserve in the international community, as they have attempted to uphold the same values that the United States holds dear. This commitment to similar ideals should bring our two countries closer together.

There are a few areas that I would like to address that could further this friendship and enhance our cooperation and understanding.

I would like to see an expanded trade relationship with Taiwan. Taiwan is one of our largest trading partners, and my own state of Michigan exported nearly $200 million worth of goods to Taiwan in 2012. An expanded trade relationship with Taiwan would certainly be beneficial to the United States, and also to the state of Michigan. A bilateral trade agreement is something that should be explored.

It is also hard to understand just how much Taiwan has advanced over the previous decades. Their shift to democracy in the 1990s was truly an amazing event, especially given their location and external pressures, but this event is hard to understand without actually visiting the island. Many Members of Congress have visited Taiwan, but it can be hard to convey the importance of such travels to other parts of our government. I have encouraged high-level visits from the United States, and also have encouraged allowing high-level Taiwanese officials to visit with executive departments. In this way, we can more accurately assess our relationship with Taiwan, their importance to stability in the Asia-Pacific region, and the power of democracy in Asia.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ARLAM CARR, JR.

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Montgomery Civil Rights pioneer Arlam Carr Jr., a beloved Alabamian remembered for his role in the desegregation of Montgomery public schools.

Arlam passed away on Thursday, September 26 at the age of 62. While I am deeply saddened by his passing, I am comforted in knowing that his legacy is one that will live on through his contributions to the desegregation of Montgomery's public schools and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama.

At the age of 13 Arlam was the plaintiff in the 1964 lawsuit before the Supreme Court against the Montgomery County Board of Education. He played an instrumental role in desegregating Montgomery's public schools. In 1965, he became one of the first African-American students to enroll at Sidney Lanier High School.

Arlam has been remembered by his colleagues and friends as having ''a quiet courage that was reflective of his character.'' Others remember Arlam as ''gentle, yet tough.''

Arlam believed in the human decency of all people claiming that once white students were given the chance to interact with black kids, they would realize all are human, all the same. When asked to recall the days before integration, he focused on the positive side, recalling those who supported him and reminded his audience of the progress that has since been made.

Arlam didn't ignore the work that remained and the injustices that persisted however. One colleague evokes, ''When it came to discussing injustices in the community, you could hear and feel the steel in (his) voice.''

Arlam was a lifelong Montgomery resident working for almost forty years at WSFA–12, where he served many roles, ultimately as Director of Newscasts. He helped launched Today in Alabama. He was the longest tenured member of the WSFA News Team.

Arlam was active in many community and civic groups, including the Laubach Literacy Council and Leadership Montgomery. He was devoted to his family and his community. Arlam served as a deacon in his church. This was a position he wore with the utmost pride as a servant of God.

Arlam's instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement and the integration of Montgomery Public Schools has made an indelible mark on the City of Montgomery and the State of Alabama. Today we honor him for his role in the story of Alabama. As the first black woman elected to congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share his story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Arlam seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Arlam Carr Jr.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7275–S7309

Measures Introduced: One bill was introduced, as follows: S. 1569. **Page S7308**

Motion to Instruct the Sergeant at Arms: By 84 yeas to 14 nays (Vote No. 214), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. **Page S7283**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination was discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor, which was sent to the Senate on July 18, 2013, from the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S7309**

Messages from the House: **Pages S7307–08**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S7308, S7309**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7308**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7308**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S7308**

Additional Statements: **Page S7307**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S7308–09**

Quorum Calls: One quorum call was taken today. (Total—3) **Pages S7282–83**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—214) **Page S7283**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:55 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 9, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7309.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported 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.

SECURITY AND GOVERNANCE IN SOMALIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs concluded a hearing to examine security and governance in Somalia, focusing on consolidating gains, confronting challenges, and charting the path forward, after receiving testimony from Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Amanda J. Dory, Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, and Andre Le Sage, Senior Research Fellow, National Defense University Institute for National Strategic Studies Center for Strategic Research, both of the Department of Defense; Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development; Abdi Aynte, Heritage Institute for Policy Studies, Mogadishu, Somalia; and E.J. Hogendoorn, International Crisis Group, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after the nominee, who was introduced by Representative Norton, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3273–3278; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 89–91; H. Con. Res. 59; and H. Res. 374 were introduced. **Pages H6411–12**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6412–13**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 373, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–243). **Page H6411**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Massie to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6345**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:33 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6358**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H6358**

Head Start Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 84, making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 530. **Pages H6362–70**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Capps 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 226 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 529. **Pages H6369–70**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on Friday, October 4th.

Recess: The House recessed at 1:57 p.m. and reconvened at 3:20 p.m. **Page H6370**

Question of Privilege: Representative Grayson rose to a question of the privileges of the House and offered a resolution. The Chair ruled that the resolution did not constitute a question of the privileges of the House. **Pages H6381–83**

Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 89, making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 535.

Pages H6370–81, H6383–84, H6397–98

H. Res. 373, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 89) and (H.J. Res. 90) and the bill (H.R. 3273) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 532, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 531.

Pages H6383–84

Pursuant to section 3 of the rule, in the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, the Clerk shall (1) add the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.J. Res. 89; (2) conform the title of H.J. Res. 89 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment; (3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and (4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment. Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3273 to the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 shall be laid on the table. **Pages H6384–89**

Deficit Reduction and Economic Working Growth Working Group Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 3273, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 534. **Pages H6370–81, H6383–84, H6389–97**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Brownley (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 533. **Pages H6395–96**

H. Res. 373, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 89) and (H.J. Res. 90) and the bill (H.R. 3273) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 532, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 531.

Pages H6383–84

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6369–70, H6370, H6383–84, H6384, H6396, H6396–97 and H6397–98. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10 p.m.

Committee Meeting

DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT; AND FEDERAL WORKER PAY FAIRNESS ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3273, the ''Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013''; and H.J. Res. 89, the ''Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a closed rule for H.J. Res. 89. The rule provides 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule also provides a closed rule for H.R. 3273. The rule provides 40 minutes of debate equally devided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. In section 3, the rule directs the Clerk to, in the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, add the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, as a new matter at the end of H.J. Res. 89 and make conforming modifications in the engrossment. The rule provides that upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 shall be laid on the table. Finally, the rule provides a closed rule for H.J. Res. 90. The rule provides 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Crenshaw; and Representatives Van Hollen; and Serrano.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D947)*

H.R. 527, to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers. Signed on October 2, 2013. (Public Law 113–40)

S. 793, to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States. Signed on October 2, 2013. (Public Law 113–41)

H.R. 3233, to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas. Signed on October 4, 2013. (Public Law 113–42)

S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act. Signed on October 4, 2013. (Public Law 113–43)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

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, 10 a.m., SD–538.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Haiti: Is U.S. Aid Effective?'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the IRS's Role in Implementing and Enforcing ObamaCare'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, 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.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Effect of Government Shutdown on VA Benefits and Services to Veterans'', 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, October 9

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1457
Bentivolio, Kerry L., Mich., E1461
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E1456
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1456
Camp, Dave, Mich., E1459
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1453
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1451, E1452, E1453, E1453, E1454, E1455, E1456, E1457
Gallego, Pete P., Tex., E1457
Gibson, Christopher P., N.Y., E1455
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1458
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E1453
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1451
Kildee, Daniel T., Mich., E1456
Lewis, John, Ga., E1460
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1459, E1460
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E1460
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1458, E1459
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1452, E1457
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1459
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1454
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1451
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E1455
Ross, Dennis A., Fla., E1454
Sanford, Mark, N.C., E1451
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E1451
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1458, E1460, E1461
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1458
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1453
Sires, Albio, N.J., E1452
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1456

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.