

States, who at least at one point in his career recognized the serious and the longstanding threat to this Nation that our rising debt is.

We have the opportunity to work together now to fix this problem; and if we can't fix it, at least we can take a meaningful step forward. I hope the President will work with us to address what he used to believe was a serious problem, but I believe it starts with one thing: sitting down together and talking in order to work it out.

The American citizens—all of us—deserve a President who is willing to lead. The American people deserve a President who is willing to talk. Yes, we live in a day in which there are policy and political differences, but that has always been the case. From the birth of our Nation, it has always been such. We are a Nation in which ideas and principles sometimes conflict, but the American people deserve a President who understands that negotiating is part of the process.

I pray that the President will sit down and talk with us now.

MR. SPEAKER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple message: let your people go.

The American people are very frustrated by what we are doing here. They want us to end this shutdown. In fact, some 70 percent of them do not like the way you or the Republican majority is handling this crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, if you will just let your people go and allow us to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor, we can end this. Despite your claims to the contrary, it is clear to everyone that we have at least 17 votes required from your side of the aisle to pass the continuing resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, why don't you just let your people go?

I have a simple question for you: If you think to the contrary that their votes are not there, then why not put your cards on the table and allow a vote?

The American people cannot afford more rounds of betting their economic futures on politicians' betting on a pair and thinking they have a full house. The American people think it's time to call your bluff. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

We can reopen the World War II Memorial and the VA today. We can ensure that all military families receive death benefits and can travel to Dover Air Force Base to receive their loved ones' remains. We can end what Senators on the other side of the aisle have declared "shameful and embarrassing."

We can end this today, Mr. Speaker, if you let your people go.

Holding back on a vote prevents the opening of lifesaving clinical trials at the NIH. It prevents the opening of na-

tional parks and museums for use by families everywhere. The shutdown is costing taxpayers \$12.5 million each and every hour you refuse to vote, and it is costing the American people already \$2.5 billion.

Don't listen to me. Listen to your own caucus Members: Enough is enough, said one Republican in the House. Let's get on with the business we were sent to do.

Another Republican agreed with him: The politics should be over, he said. It's time to legislate.

Another said: I'd vote for a clean CR because I don't think this strategy is working.

Many more echo these sentiments, Mr. Speaker: let your people go. Instead, you seem to be listening to a small faction in your caucus that says they want to "win at any cost." They say they won't be disrespected and that they need to get something out of this, but they don't know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will see what is clear to everyone around the world who is watching this spectacle: there are no winners. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

It's blackmail to shut down the government because you don't like the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, listen to those blunt assessments from your own caucus who call the followers of this strategy "lemmings with suicide vests."

Traditional allies of the GOP, like the Chamber of Commerce, have said this is "not in the best interest of the U.S. business community."

The Wall Street Journal has called it a kamikaze mission, and in fact, in their editorial headline, they said: Are the Republicans nuts?

Another Republican Senator said: This strategy isn't good for America.

This last comment really says it best, that this is not good for America. Mr. Speaker, let your people go, and bring a clean CR to a vote.

THE DEFINITION OF "FAIR"

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I was elected—and so were a lot of my classmates—in what we termed a very fair election. I think the issue that we all need to be concerned about right now is that it is truly unique in America that everybody is treated fairly. It doesn't matter what the color of your skin is; it doesn't matter how you worship; it doesn't matter if you even worship or don't worship—you are treated fairly. The President has said many times that this is a country in which everybody deserves a fair shot, in which everybody deserves a fair opportunity to rise to whatever level he can. Every single American deserves to be treated fairly. I hear that term. I hear it batted back and forth.

So what is the real definition of "fair"?

I went to Webster's Dictionary. It says "fair" is treating people in a way that does not favor some over others. It does not treat one person in a favorable way over somebody else.

That is truly, uniquely American because there are very few places in the world where everybody does get treated fairly.

When I look at the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, I ask myself: Is this really fair?

If you look at this definition, it goes farther down and gives the antonym, or the opposite meaning. I would say that, if you were to look at what is not fair, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, would be one of those things that would be the direct opposite of what fair is.

Is it fair to give 1,200 waivers to some and not to others? Is it fair to say to employers, do you know what, this is a very complicated law, and it has grown so complicated that you need another year to give you a fair chance to understand what's in it, so we're going to give you a year's delay. Now, if you're an individual, no, you're not given that.

So my question is: Is it fair? Is it fair to give one group something and the individual not?

I don't know. I don't know that that meets anybody's definition of what fair is.

Also, I heard Secretary of Health and Human Services Sebelius asked that very same question by a journalist:

So, Secretary Sebelius, is it fair to go ahead and give employers 1 year to figure it out because it's so hard to understand that it's not really fair to put that kind of pressure on them; yet, with the individuals, they have to do it today?

She says: No, no, no. They can opt out if they're not ready to do that. Now, you have to pay a fine if you want to opt out. You have to pay a fine if you don't want to participate at all.

You are held to a different set of standards than another group, so I don't know how that fits under the definition of fair.

We can talk about this and go back and forth all day long, but this is a gift. This Affordable Care Act—this ObamaCare—is a gift that keeps giving. It's a law that, while it's giving, it's also taking. It is driving our debt to an unbelievable level. The President says it's going to reduce our debt over the long run. The truth of the matter is in 10 years it adds \$1.8 trillion, and that's a pretty fairly heavy debt for the people to absorb.

Now, back home—and I don't know if this lady is a Republican or a Democrat—Melissa had written to me from Hermitage, Pennsylvania. I want you to understand how this is. This is an individual. She has two degrees, one in criminal justice and one in teaching, but she couldn't get a job, so she started her own business.