United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013 No. 142

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

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. Petty partisanship and ever-politicizing rhetoric should have no place at all when men and women of goodwill come together to serve the common good.

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

We ask again that You 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 pro tempore. 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.

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 pro tempore. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

LET'S GOVERN RESPONSIBLY

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, in July, I stood at this same podium arguing it shouldn't take a government shutdown threat each year to force Congress to do its job. I voted against Congress adjourning for the month of August, insisting that Congress remain to complete critical business.

The work of the people remains unfinished. Today is day 11 of the government shutdown. Thousands of workers stay home, without a paycheck, and yet Congress has not done its job.

This shutdown has failed to will Congress and the administration to the finish line, and we have seen a cycle of crisis management rather than responsible governing.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is broken. This is not governing. This is not what our Founding Fathers intended.

I urge Congress and the leadership in Washington to return to regular order of business. Instead of governing by crisis, let's responsibly govern, by getting the people's business completed on time.

END THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(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, as we slug through the second week of the government shutdown, American families and small businesses are hurting. Every day of the last 10 days I have been contacted by constituents who cannot operate their stores, pay tribute to their loved ones at a Federal memorial, or secure a small business loan.

These unnecessary hardships damage our economy, and could have been

Printed on recycled paper.

avoided if House Republicans were not obsessed with taking away health care benefits from the public we serve.

Government has the duty to keep its doors open, provide vital services, and pay its bills. These items should not be considered a Democratic Party wish list. They are basic functions of government and should not be used as an opportunity to secure political points or hold America's economy hostage.

It is well past time to vote to end the government shutdown, pay our bills, get the Nation back to work, and grow our economy.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a picture is worth a thousand words, and I felt like it was appropriate today because so many of our colleagues say, Why do we want to discuss ObamaCare when we talk about the budget or talk about the continuing resolution?

And here is the reason why. It is a program that is too expensive to afford.

Take a look at this graph. We all know that, supposedly, when ObamaCare started out—by the way, as an insurance access program for the nearly 40 million that didn't have insurance—it was to be under $1 trillion, exactly $863 billion.

So now we look at what has happened to the growth of this program. CBO shows us, looking at this, when you address $1.4 trillion, 1.7, we are now at $2.6 trillion in costs over a 10-year period of time.

So to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I say, this is why we have to put this program on the table and discuss it. It is now a nationalization of 17 percent of our Nation's economy and has gone from under $1 trillion to $2.6 trillion. Let's get the spending under control.

THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the House Republicans continue to shut down our Federal Government, I rise to draw attention to the impact it is having on our labor markets and job creation in this country.

The House Republican shutdown has prevented even the Bureau of Labor Statistics from releasing the September jobs report, and the Bureau is down to just three employees from its usual number, while the Republican shutdown is, in effect, making it impossible to compile the data for a jobs report for our country.

All we know is that our labor market, the number of people applying for unemployment benefits, increased somewhere between 66,000 and 300,000 people. We don't know what the unemployment rate actually is because we don't know how many people are looking for work, and we can't find the data. So we don't know what actually happened completely in September and this month.

This is creating needless uncertainty in our markets and makes it harder for businesses to know what is actually happening in our economy.

Before the House Republicans shut down the government, what we did know about our labor market was we still had 11 million people looking for work following the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Republicans to bring the clean continuing resolution to the floor that has their budget number in it, and let's reopen the government.

IT IS TIME FOR DEBT SOLUTIONS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is time for solutions. We're 11 days into a Federal Government shutdown and days away from exhausting government's $16.7 trillion credit limit. Both parties need to be committed to opening government and getting our debt under control.

House Republicans want to reopen the government, pay our bills, and defend America's credit rating. So let's keep talking and work to build common ground.

It doesn't matter if you are a Republican or a Democrat. Each side can see the mathematical writing on the wall. In 10 years, discretionary spending will grow 17 percent. Meanwhile, mandatory spending on our debt drivers will grow 79 percent.

Let's agree to start there. Let's reopen government, and let's reform what's driving our debt. Let's talk about making our Tax Code fairer and more competitive. Let's do the responsible thing to make sure we don't find ourselves in this situation year after year.

REPUBLICANS DON'T WANT TO REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans don't want to reopen the government. If they did, all they have to do is bring up the Senate clean resolution and pass it here on the floor today. It'll go back to the Senate—I don't even know if it has to go back to the Senate—and the President has already agreed to sign it.

They are keeping the government closed as hostage because they want to negotiate—I don't even know what anymore. Initially, it was because they wanted to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act. I'm not sure it is even that anymore.

I think sometimes they just want to keep the government closed to show that they can. Clearly, the budget numbers are there. We have agreed to their budget numbers, so that is not the issue.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, please bring up a clean resolution today. The impact on the economy is getting to be more and more devastating every day. As my colleagues have mentioned, more and more jobs are being lost.

Instead of losing jobs, Speaker BOEHNER, we should be here trying to create jobs and use the government to work with the private sector to create jobs and grow the economy.

Don't continue to keep this government shut down. It is 2 weeks now, and the longer it goes on, the more it is going to have an impact on the economy and make it more difficult to create jobs. We will continue to lose jobs.

Bring up the clean resolution, Mr. Speaker.

LET'S GET OUR SPENDING AND DEBT UNDER CONTROL

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it has been a while. I know the American people are frustrated with the shutdown, and a week from now, the country will default if action is not taken.

How we got into this situation is not that complicated. You can only continue to spend so much of the public's money, and then you run out of the public's money.

After years, 4 years of unchecked spending, when the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, it has caught up with us. We put the brakes on 2 years ago, and this is a difficult way to put the brakes on now.

No one likes it. The American people don't like it. But we have got to get our spending and we have got to get our debt under control. You continue to spend, you incur debt.

Next week we'll go from $17 trillion to probably a request for another $1 trillion. That's not sustainable. We must work together to resolve this in the long-term interest and national economic and financial security of our Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled joint resolution was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, October 10, 2013:

H.J. Res. 91, making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

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 National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the 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 projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) of the National Nuclear Security Administration that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or in the Pay Our Military Act of September 30, 2013, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

(1) ''Weapons Activities''.

(2) ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation''.

(3) ''Naval Reactors''.

(4) ''Office of the Administrator''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''National Nuclear Security Administration 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 New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 materials on House Joint Resolution 76, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present critical legislation that will ensure our Nation's nuclear security, the Nuclear Weapons Security and Nonproliferation Act, the joint resolution just mentioned.

This legislation continues funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration at the current level provided in fiscal year 2013 until December 15, or until full-year appropriations have been signed into law. There are no new anomalies and there is no special treatment, but continuing these activities without interruption is vital to our national defense.

The National Nuclear Security Administration is responsible for maintaining our nuclear deterrent, securing vulnerable nuclear materials around the world to keep them out of the hands of terrorists, and supporting our Navy's nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers.

Funds will be used to keep the doors open so our scientists and engineers can keep our nuclear arsenal at the ready and our nuclear fleet operating efficiently.

□ 0915

These vital programs keep our country safe and secure and require well-trained, dedicated personnel.

So far, these high-priority national security missions have been sustained during this shutdown by operating off prior-year funding. While most of the Department of Energy's science and energy laboratories have enough carryover funding to operate through November, the national security laboratories and stockpile production sites of the NNSA are not in that same position.

This week, the NNSA sites began notifying workers that they would be shutting down as early as October 17 to preserve remaining funds for essential functions like protecting nuclear materials. By the end of the month, 90 percent of the personnel at our nuclear weapons sites may be laid off, halting work to keep our nuclear weapons reliable. Once laid off, some of these vital workers may never return.

Suspending an ongoing nuclear production operation is no simple task. That interruption will lead to higher costs and only make it more difficult to maintain an aging stockpile. We must act now to prevent disruption of these important nuclear security activities.

We must also sustain the critical work the NNSA's nonproliferation experts perform overseas. Despite hopeful press reports, Iran has not turned off its centrifuges; North Korea may have restarted its reactors to make more plutonium; and the Russian and Chinese Governments continue to build nuclear-armed ballistic submarines.

The technical expertise provided by our nuclear security experts is essential to our Nation's ability to monitor and respond to international developments such as these. We simply cannot afford to lose this oversight of nuclear weapons and their potential for proliferation.

Finally, our nuclear deterrent relies on the mission of our submarines, the very capable assets of which are maintained by the Naval Reactors Program at the Department of Energy. We must ensure they have adequate support to perform their mission across the globe.

Colleagues, I do recognize that this bill will not solve the larger funding problem. We must enact full-year annual appropriations to meet today's requirements, as voted on earlier this year, and not rely on continuing resolutions to keep the government open.

In this regard, my thanks to Ranking Member KAPTUR for her leadership and support of our annual appropriations process. Until we get back to regular order, this bill will provide critical funding to our Nation's security, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, for his comments though, obviously, I have serious reservations about this bill because our country has been the world's shining example in how a democratic Republic can actually work efficiently, successfully, and democratically. Yet, today, we continue with the shenanigans from a minority of the majority, wasting God's good time.

For my colleagues who are listening, and for the country, let me say this bill should be coming to the floor at a level of $31 billion to meet the national security, energy, and water needs of this country. The measure before us today contains $10.6 billion and only deals with the nuclear security portion of the legislation. That is simply not sufficient for this great country.

We cannot continue to be governed by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis, and the folly—some would say madness—of what is going on here must be stopped. It is creating great uncertainty inside this economy, and it is harming us globally with our trading partners and with countries who simply can't understand what is happening here.

Over the course of the last several weeks, my Republican colleagues have loudly called for compromise. They have said, Negotiate to reopen the government, but, all the while, changing their demands daily and moving the goalpost. They moved it up the field, down the field, off the field. We start the day and never know exactly where we are.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members of this House have agreed to a total spending level that is the Republican level of $986 billion for all of our bills. That is not a number I personally agree with. It will not meet our Nation's needs, but it is a compromise offered in good faith to move our country forward.

My advice to all those who are listening is to bring that clean continuing resolution with the Republican budget number in it to the floor. Let's reopen the government, and we can deal with our tangential issues that have nothing to do with operating the Government of the United States.

Our economy is still in the process of recovering from a horrible Great Recession. We have still not come back to the preemployment levels in this country that were so deeply harmed by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis. Shouldn't we be debating ways to spur economic growth, not continuing to debate a shutdown that is slowing economic growth?

Under the Obama administration, we have had 42 consecutive months of economic growth. We are crawling out of a mammoth hole. The American people view the disarray here as very, very destabilizing to their own security because they are worried about their futures, and what is going on here adds to their anxiety.

For the entire country, the Republican shutdown is already having real and negative consequences. Over 800,000 workers have been furloughed. They are having to borrow on their credit cards because they don't know how they are going to make their mortgage payment. They have to put their kids in school. They have to buy groceries.

From coast-to-coast, we know—although we don't have people in place at the Department of Labor right now—that over 66,000—up to 300,000—more unemployment claims have now been filed in the country because of what is going on due to these 800,000 more people that have gotten some form of a pink slip.

For the entire country, this shutdown is wrong and unnecessary. The impacts will be felt across this economy—and already are—in the services that the American taxpayers pay for and that the Federal Government has, up to now, provided. As we continue to shortchange critical energy and infrastructure investments so vital to a strong economy, we will witness, as dusk follows dawn, the slowing of economic growth and the hindering of American competitiveness.

Let me turn to what is not funded by the piecemeal approach that this bill represents. Our bill should be coming to the floor with all the parts of the Department of Energy and Army Corps of Engineers and National Nuclear Security Administration in it. The bill should be coming to us at a level of $31 billion. The bill is but one-third of that. At a level of $10.6 billion, it is two-thirds underfunded.

Let me turn to what is not funded in the bill that is before us.

First of all, the Corps of Engineers, one of the most important instrumentalities in our government to create jobs, is not even in this cynical bill. Communities across our country will continue to feel the consequences of this decreased investment. We should be doing more to prevent flooding, to build infrastructure, to create jobs, not less.

For those of you who have been yelling from the rooftops about the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, this bill does nothing—zero—for your ports and harbors.

This bill does not fund any of the energy technology accounts so critical to our Nation becoming energy independent again. As our foreign competitors double down to develop 21st century technology—look at the Chinese stealing our solar technology—and undermine our markets through illegal dumping and intellectual property poaching, our choice in this bill: do nothing.

So, renewable energy will receive cost competitiveness by whom? Which countries will succeed? Who will develop it and own that technology? According to this, we are ceding the turf to them, ceding the field to them.

If you look at U.S. trade accounts, you don't have to be a mathematical genius. What is the number one category of trade deficit of this country? Imported energy. And what is the number two category of trade deficit? Automotive and automotive parts. It is all connected. If America doesn't heal those accounts, we become weaker as a country; we have fewer jobs here at home, less wealth creation here at home.

And this particular bill is absent any forward thinking about new energy systems for our country. The United States has spent $2.3 trillion importing petroleum just since 2003.

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we have a $17 trillion debt that we have to pay off. We sure do. And where do you think it has come from? It has come from the lack of wealth creation inside this country for a quarter of a century, starting with imported energy.

This represents thousands and thousands and millions of jobs across this country lost and dollars out of the pockets of working-class Americans who see their purchases of fuel transferred to build giant hotels in Dubai, supporting universities in Dubai, all across the Middle East, while we see companies close, communities shut down, Detroit go bankrupt; and all these problems because we are not energy independent and we are not transportation independent.

These are dollars spent not in much-needed job creation but siphoned off overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures, not our own.

Is it any wonder that America has a debt? It is rooted in very major holes inside this economy. You could start with two wars. What did those cost us? Probably $4 trillion to $6 trillion—unpaid for. There wasn't any war tax imposed when President Bush took us to war.

I remember Donald Rumsfeld saying, Well, you have got to go to war with the military you have. Well, they borrowed to do that, and now this President has begun to keep his promise to the American people. We are out of Iraq and we are moving out of Afghanistan, as we try to hold those sad places together with our allies.

The housing crisis of 2008, it is anybody's guess what that cost us, but we know it hollowed out money creation in this country. We have the largest transfer of wealth and loss of equity in modern history. Do you think you crawl out of that in a month or 2 months? It takes years. We have had 42 months of steady job creation.

The trade deficit, America hasn't had a balanced trade account in three decades. Since 1975, the cumulative trade deficit of this country was $8.4 trillion. There was more petroleum coming in here from abroad than American energy exports out, more cars and auto parts in here from abroad than cars and auto parts out, and more electronics components coming in here than American electronics exports out.

So if you add up $8.4 trillion of trade deficit, $6 trillion of war expenditures,

if you take the cost of the meltdown on Wall Street—only God knows how many trillions that cost us—is it any wonder that the United States has a budget deficit and debt and the Federal Government is trying to hold the Republic together and our 50 States from coast-to-coast? It is pretty clear to me what is going on here.

So we look at this bill. Our Republic will not compete in the 21st century and beyond if we further reduce investments in energy and cede our energy future to other countries. The bill before us today does nothing about that. In fact, in one of the most important related sectors to us, manufacturing, this bill does nothing in manufacturing.

One of the reasons we don't have as much economic muscle in this country is because every community you go to, what do you see? Shuttered factories. Every product you pick up, what does it say? ''Made in China.'' Anytime I go to the store and find anything made in America, I buy it in hopes that it will help somebody somewhere along the way.

This bill does nothing for manufacturing. We have lost 15 percent of our manufacturing jobs. And it isn't just because of technology; it is because they have been shipped out, outsourced, made in China, not made in the USA, made in countries some of my constituents don't even know where they are, and these goods come in here. And every time American jobs get displaced in the manufacturing sector, 8.8 million manufacturing jobs disappear.

□ 0930

Manufacturing is one of the most important drivers in our economy, and yet we have a huge trade deficit in manufacturing. There is little merit in using Federal dollars to foster technological advances or breakthroughs for products that are not ultimately manufactured domestically in our country. This bill usually provides a means for us to do more to reverse the trend of domestic firms shifting manufacturing overseas because, to put it simply, domestic manufacturing drives domestic innovation, and that drives wealth creation and job creation in our country. This bill does nothing in the advanced manufacturing sector—off the table.

How sad. How sad for those people across our country who know the value added from manufacturing.

This bill does nothing for science or advanced science and energy. Return on investments from our publicly funded research and development ranges from 20 to 67 percent. What a bang for the buck. With this rate of return, we should be passing a bill that invests in science and high sciences, but that is not happening inside this bill. In fact, across this country, at all of our major labs, the workers are furloughed or have the threat of being furloughed hanging over them—at Livermore, at Sandia, at Argonne. The brain power of this country is being put on the shelf while they watch this charade here inside this Chamber.

This bill does nothing to address the funding for the Office of Environmental Management, whose mission is to complete the safe cleanup of what they call an ''environmental legacy'' and that I call a ''nuclear mess,'' brought about by five decades of nuclear weapons development and government-sponsored nuclear energy research.

So what do we do to clean up nuclear mess around our country in this bill? Zero. We do nothing.

What about our promises to the people who live near those communities? What about those who sacrifice so much for America's nuclear superiority? We shut the door. So long. Nothing. There is nothing in this bill.

This energy and water bill is one of the most critical investments we can make in this country. It should promote job creation. It should ensure national security. It should protect and promote our vital infrastructure and advance American competitiveness through energy independence and through strengthening manufacturing and scientific capability right here at home, right here in the good old USA. Unfortunately, a minority of the majority of Republicans is choosing to ignore all of these critical investments in order to execute a blatantly political stunt that is already harming our country, upsetting our people, and tamping down on job growth.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together. We as a people can solve the serious challenges facing our country; yet here we find ourselves today again, wasting time on a lopsided bill which only extends the GOP-driven shutdown. We should be spending our time passing a clean continuing resolution, not holding the entire country hostage to a reckless political stunt that some must get great pleasure out of but that is such a sadistic approach to the governing of this country. We ought to work together toward a long-term solution, not continue to award a faction of one party which has no interest in governing this country.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Nuclear Weapon Security and Non-Proliferation Act.

Yes, it is a narrow scope, but it is a terribly important piece of the government. Like the bill we passed yesterday, this legislation addresses matters of critical importance to our national security. The National Nuclear Security Administration maintains our nuclear deterrents here at home, but it also helps to ensure that nuclear weapons and materials don't fall into the wrong hands—those of terrorists and other enemies of our Nation.

H.J. Res. 76 provides funding for the NNSA to continue this vital work—to keep our nuclear arsenal at the ready and our Navy ships powered—and, ultimately, to keep this country safe and secure and protected.

This is particularly important at a time when we face multiple threats from unpredictable nations and groups. When our government shut down, it did not also shut down nuclear power reactors, research and testing in Iraq, Iran, or North Korea. Funding is provided at the current annual rate of $10.59 billion to sustain the national labs, to continue the work of skilled workers and scientists, to conduct ongoing nonproliferation intelligence operations, and to maintain the safety and readiness of our nuclear stockpile.

As with the prior 14 mini-CRs this House has passed in the last week, this language is essentially identical to what was included in my initial short-term continuing resolution. So this is a clean bill, Mr. Speaker, adhering to the Senate's demands in that regard. Also, as with the prior bills, this funding will last until December 15 or until full-year appropriations are enacted. It is my hope that the latter is what happens.

Our Nation deserves the certainty of an adequately funded government with appropriations bills that reflect current needs but also current fiscal restraints. To achieve this, we must come together with our Senate counterparts and have a meaningful discussion that establishes a single, common, top-line number for discretionary spending that Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress can work toward.

The ongoing standoffs are not productive. They aren't getting us any closer to reopening the government. While it is not the ideal path forward at this time, passing this funding bill does get us a step closer to ending the shutdown, which I know is the goal of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

So far, this House has voted on a bipartisan basis to reopen critical government functions, including the support for those who serve the country in the Department of Defense. Our nuclear security efforts are equally important to our defense and should have ongoing funding to keep the country safe and sound. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on this side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, our esteemed ranking member.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown.

Of course we support funding for nuclear weapon security and nonproliferation activities, but this bill does nothing to address a number of other critical energy and water priorities, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, ARPA–E, and the Office of Environmental Management, which is responsible for cleaning up five decades' worth of weapons development and nuclear energy research.

Even if House Republicans' irresponsible, piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government would be fully up and running.

We could end this shutdown today if Republican leadership would just allow a vote. The claim that Democrats won't negotiate is a farce, my friends. Throughout the year, we have pleaded with Republicans to sit down and negotiate a broader budget agreement; and dozens of times Republicans have refused. Now, after wasting the first 10 months of the year and after shutting down the government as they steer the country towards economic catastrophe, they claim they want to negotiate. Democrats and the President have already agreed to the Republicans' funding level. If only Republicans would allow a vote, we could have the government reopened tonight.

Vote ''no'' on this bill, and let's vote to immediately end the Republican shutdown.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

To all of my colleagues in this great United States House of Representatives, I want to ask each and every one of you to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the Third District of Tennessee. In the Third District of Tennessee is a very special city. It's called Oak Ridge. At one point in time, it was called the Secret City. That's where we had the Manhattan Project and brought World War II to a close because of the efforts of the men and women who worked there and who succeeded there. We won the Cold War there.

Today, this bill does one very specific thing: it honors the almost 5,000 workers who work every day at the Y–12 National Security Complex for our nuclear deterrent.

Let me be clear: this is not a matter of partisan politics; this is a matter of national security. So I stand here, putting a very human face on this for the workers who work hard every day, who have toiled for years. They deserve better, and this bill does that.

Again, let me be clear: Y–12 is going through an orderly shutdown. We cannot allow this to happen, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. The Nation's security is at risk. This bill keeps Y–12 open, and this is exactly what we need to do.

Let's put aside the partisan rhetoric, and let's honor the hardworking men and women of Y–12. Let's keep them working, and let's keep the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth safe and secure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York, Mr. HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is day 11 of the reckless Republican shutdown of the United States Government, and you have still failed to provide a way out of the mess that you have created.

The communities that I represent in Brooklyn and Queens are still struggling from the devastation of Superstorm Sandy; yet this bill fails to fund the Army Corps of Engineers.

This was a wholesale government shutdown, and all that is offered is a piecemeal reopening. You have burned down the entire house, but offer only to rebuild the kitchen. That is a shameful dereliction of duty and a woefully inadequate remedy. This shutdown is hurting the American people. It is undemocratic, unconscionable, unnecessary, unreasonable, and unjust.

It is time to get back to doing the business of the American people. Let's reopen the entire government. Vote ''no'' on this piecemeal approach.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership and for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill the gentleman brought to the floor on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, passed the House, passed the Senate, and it was signed into law by the President last night. So the argument that you can't fund any of the government unless you fund all of the government is, obviously, not true. Every single Member of the House voted for the bill that the gentleman from New Jersey brought to the floor that was dealing with military death benefits.

We have set priorities. We have said the military has to be paid, and this bill also sets priorities because the nuclear deterrent is absolutely central to our national security just as the military is.

For 60 years, the centerpiece of our country's security has been the nuclear deterrent that has helped keep us secure. These are aging weapons, however, and so that means there are maintenance issues, there are safety issues, there are reliability issues, which a very highly skilled, dedicated workforce must address every single day.

So that's what this bill does. This allows that work to continue, as well as the very important work in dealing with nonproliferation, as well as keeping our nuclear-powered ships operating. All of those things central to our country's security are empowered by this bill.

□ 0945

Mr. Speaker, it is the easiest excuse any of us can use to oppose a bill because of what it does not do.

What we ought to do is look at what a bill does do. What this bill does do is keep the central part of our country's security operating even as we sort out our other budget woes.

I think it deserves the support of all Members of the House, and I encourage them to vote for it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the esteemed gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, funding for the NNSA is critically important to my State of New Mexico, for we are home to both Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs. However, this bill denies these national security labs the funding they need as it locks in the deep cuts of sequester for 2 more months.

There is not a Member of this body—Democrat or Republican—that says they like the sequester, Mr. Speaker, but my Republican colleagues refuse to lift it. They say they want to keep the government open, but they place conditions on it.

This piecemeal approach in this bill to the Department of Energy and to the NNSA is picking winners and losers with employees that are going to be furloughed. This is a shame, and it is a sham—this Republican charade that is going to go home to my State of New Mexico and direct the Directors of the labs to tell employees who is going to go home without a paycheck and who will not—because there is still not assurance that the Secretary of Energy, through the Department of Energy, will make these employees whole through allowable costs that will be accepted. Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shame. Let's do the right thing and open the government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), also a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for bringing this important measure to the floor.

Since the start of this partial shutdown 11 days ago, the House has focused on one of our core constitutional functions: funding key portions of the Federal Government.

We have come together in a bipartisan way several times over the past few days to pay our troops, provide benefits for the families of fallen soldiers, reopen the NIH, provide money

for disaster relief efforts, and fund other crucial governmental departments and operations.

These are the types of tough spending choices the American people, and people in my district, demand we make. When you are nearly $17 trillion in debt, you have to prioritize, just like any business or family does when funds are tight.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we turn our focus to a critical issue of national security and public safety. That is ensuring that the National Nuclear Security Administration has the funding it needs to secure our nuclear stockpile and materials.

Recent reports indicate that the Department of Energy may begin furloughing employees and contractors at the eight NNSA sites around the country starting October 21. Sites such as the Nevada National Security Site, which is home to approximately 2,500 employees and contractors, will reduce staffing to levels sufficient to maintain ''minimally safe operations.'' This situation presents a threat to national security, public safety, and our economy.

The Nevada National Security Site is charged with supporting our national stockpile. Additionally, the Security Site oversees the administration of training for first responders in the prevention of, protection from, and response to possible terrorist use of radiological or nuclear material. With critical functions such as these, ''minimally safe operations'' is simply not an option.

The same is true at NNSA sites around the country. The men and women who work at these sites not only have critical duties, but they are also critical to our local economies.

In fact, contractors at NNSA sites may reduce their workforce by as much as 80 to 90 percent. Such attrition would take a great deal of money out of the economy at a time when States like mine, with an unemployment rate of 9.5 percent, can ill-afford to lose jobs.

H.J. Res. 76 maintains our national security and prevents harm to our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about our being the ''greatest Nation in the world,'' but Republicans are running it like a banana republic. People who ran out of this Chamber gleeful that the government was going to shut down have suddenly discovered that there is 20 percent of the government that they want to operate.

There is a simple way to resolve this impasse. If you want to negotiate truly, appoint the conferees to the Budget Committee. The Republicans have refused to do that for 6 months. If you want to control spending, bring your own appropriations bills to the floor and see if your people have the fortitude to slash government spending further.

Remember, they stopped operation on the Transportation-HUD bill 2 months ago. It can be brought up today. But they refuse to do so because their spending levels are so unrealistic their own Members won't vote for them. They would rather deal in the abstract. They would rather hold America hostage. It is shameful. It is unnecessary.

Bring a continuing resolution to the floor and put the government back to work.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, for yielding. I am very grateful for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, funding our national security interests within the Department of Energy must be a priority in order to protect every American family. Today, the House will pass an important measure that will fund the National Nuclear Security Administration. The NNSA will provide necessary resources that are critical and allow our country to continue operations for dozens of vital national security missions.

I am fortunate to represent the Department of Energy Savannah River Site in Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina. I especially appreciate its personnel, as the only Member of Congress who has actually worked at the site.

The passage of this bill is essential, as it will provide our dedicated workers who are handling these operations the security they need to complete their vital missions. Our Nation is a much safer place because of ongoing tritium operations and the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility currently under construction at SRS. These missions are essential to our Nation's national security, as they allow us to service our nuclear stockpile and honor international nuclear obligations of nonproliferation.

Additionally, the Savannah River Site, which established victory in the Cold War, has thousands of committed employees working on Department of Energy environmental management projects. These professionals also provide crucial services to our country through their nuclear nonproliferation and environmental cleanup efforts.

Although I am encouraged by today's legislation, I remain hopeful that Congress can work together to provide necessary funding for these projects as well.

I appreciate Chairman HAL ROGERS for bringing this bill to the floor today and urge all of my colleagues of both parties to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his dedication and commitment to the important issue of our strategic assets.

When we look at the NNSA, they have had for a number of years difficulty in getting support from this administration for the important efforts of modernizing our nuclear weapons infrastructure and ensuring the strategic assets that are so essential to our Nation's security.

This issue also is one that represents, I think, a great analogy to the difficulty that we are having in resolving this conflict. We have the President of the United States, who openly states that he will have negotiations with Russia on our strategic assets, on our nuclear weapons. He will even have secret negotiations—as we saw in his open mic incident—with his secret deal with the Russians concerning our missile defense systems; yet, the President openly says he will not negotiate with the legislature. He will negotiate with Syria, he will negotiate with Iran, but he won't negotiate with the legislature.

Also, this issue illustrates some of the difficulties that we have in this House itself. We are putting on House bills that should have 100 percent unanimous support. Yet when these bills come to the House, these bills predominantly have been divided on a partisan basis because people want to say, Well, it doesn't fund everything.

Everyone knows when you have a disagreement, you start first upon the things you agree. The bills that have been coming forth on this House floor should be the things that we agree on, but partisan politics continues to divide us where, instead of the House coming together on all of these bills and saying, yes, these are the things that we agree on, and we will put aside the things we disagree on for later, we have difficulty in getting even the important things done, and this is an important one.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his commitment to ensure the safety of our nuclear deterrent, the workers, and the important work that is being done at the NNSA.

This is a discussion, though, that needs to go beyond just this stopgap bill and even the issue of a CR. This administration has continually cut the resources for our nuclear deterrent in ways which jeopardize the future of our strategic assets. We need to make certain that this conversation continues.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. KAPTUR, do you have any further speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio's time has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the chairman for that courtesy and just say that I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this particular piecemeal continuing resolution. Hopefully, others will come to their senses and we will be able to vote for a clean continuing resolution, which I think the majority of members of our subcommittee would appreciate, so we can reopen the government and deal with all of the responsibilities that we have under this particular bill and meet our responsibilities to energy and water across this country.

I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, and I hope to reciprocate sometime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with Ms. KAPTUR.

In closing, Robert Spalding wrote in The Washington Post recently an article called ''Nuclear Weapons are Instruments of Peace.'' In his close, he wrote:

> The sensible path to peace starts with the realization that peace can be secured only through strength. Nuclear weapons represent that strength. We must embrace it through funding and rhetoric.

Indeed we do. Nothing is more important than the reliability of our nuclear weapon stockpile, as is obviously our responsibility to the world to prevent nuclear proliferation, and one of the ways that we protect America and provide for a strong national defense is to have a strong naval reactor program so that our aircraft carriers and subs can truly do the work of freedom.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1025

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Ms. Kelly of Illinois moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76 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.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

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

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is a long-overdue commonsense improvement that has bipartisan support in this House and has the majority of support of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this costly and irresponsible government shutdown and reopen the entire Federal Government so that we may once again appropriately serve the American people.

As written, the bill before us offers the men, women, and children we represent little comfort. This piecemeal approach to funding the government is hurting folks in all of our districts. How can we commit to protecting nuclear security but not commit to the security of our Federal Government by completely funding it? How can we protect nuclear weapons but furlough our intelligence personnel who serve on the front lines in defending us from terrorist attacks? Why are we paying hardworking Federal employees, who want to get back to work, to stay at home and not to do the job our Nation depends on them to do?

As we sit here voting to fund bills bit by bit, our constituents are being dealt the full blow and consequences of this shutdown. They can't afford for this shutdown to drag on as we mull over whether it is more important to get our food inspectors back on the job or for America's veterans to have their benefits claims processed.

The piecemeal approach isn't working. The gimmicks must stop.

As we discussed nuclear weapon security, I was reminded of the movie ''War Games.'' This was the eighties movie with Matthew Broderick as the slacker hacker facing off against a supercomputer that was programmed to go to war when it doesn't even know what it is fighting for.

I will allow a quick second for a ''spoiler alert'' and summarize: after several failed attempts at starting a global nuclear war, the computer runs through all the possible scenarios—all of which end in stalemates—before it discovers the concept of mutually assured destruction, the very simple concept that the war it was trying to launch was an exercise in futility because it would destroy the U.S. in the process.

''A strange game,'' the computer says. ''The only winning move is not to play.'' And that is where we find ourselves as a Nation, heading toward a mutually assured destruction at the hands of an ideological few, programmed to go to war when they don't even know the risk of the game they are playing and the consequences of their fight.

We have had a week go by without the lessons resonating that there are no winners in the funding scenarios that have been brought to the floor, and the American people are losing out worst of all.

But this isn't a game. This is reality. This isn't a fictional eighties movie. This is the United States of America in October of 2013.

For the past week, we have pursued a fundamentally inept method for reopening the government. Today we need to pay particular attention to one number, 79. That is how many different appropriations bills the House and Senate will have to pass to fund the full nondefense portion of the Federal Government, given the rate of funding and the bills passed or announced in the House of Representatives so far.

The men, women, and children in my district—in all of our districts—are dealing with the taxing reality of a shut-down government. We can't cherry-pick who to fund and who not to fund bit by bit.

I ask all of you to vote ''yes'' on this motion because Congress has a duty to offer the security of a functional government to our families, our veterans, and our economy. Vote ''yes'' on this motion. Vote ''yes'' to open up all of our government right now.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 most recently ruled on October 10, 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 the gentlewoman from Illinois wish to speak on the point of order?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized to speak on the point of order.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits that the taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open up all of the government instead of just a portion of the government? 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 gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the National Nuclear Security Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 10, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. KELLY of Illinois. 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 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

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
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
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
Lucas
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 (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
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—195

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
Clay
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
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
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
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
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
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

Coble
Crenshaw
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Rush
Whitfield
Young (FL)

□ 1055

Messrs. GARCIA and RICHMOND changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. KAPTUR. 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 248, noes 176, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

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
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
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)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
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—176

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
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
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
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
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Coble
Crenshaw
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Young (FL)

□ 1106

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.

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 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1359

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–244) on the resolution (H. Res. 380) relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 11, 2013 at 10:15 a.m:

That the Senate passed S. 1276.

That the Senate agreed to with amendments H. Con. Res. 58.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1400

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Pitts of Pennsylvania or his designee and an opponent.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 380 provides for a motion to go to conference with the Senate on H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, also known as the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule authorizes House Agriculture Committee Chairman FRANK LUCAS to make a motion to go to conference with the Senate on the farm bill and provides for consideration of two resolutions expressing the sense of the House regarding specific provisions in the farm bill.

Conference committees are a crucial step in resolving policy differences between the House and Senate, and I am encouraged that the House is taking this step to provide certainty for farmers across this country by reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy.

The House proposal is not perfect, but it moves Federal agriculture policy in the right direction; and my hope is that during a conference committee with the Senate, we can find common ground.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the consideration of two resolutions that express the sense of the House on crop insurance and the U.S. sugar program. The first resolution expresses the sense of the House that conferees should agree to limit crop insurance based on average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000. This commonsense proposal ensures that crop insurance is appropriately targeted to those who need it most.

The second resolution instructs conferees to advance provisions to repeal the administration of tariff rate quotas and, thus, restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices. I strongly support this resolution, as it restores free-market principles to the U.S. sugar program.

This rule provides for the business of legislating and resolving differences between our two Chambers to find common ground and move forward in reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, the motion to go to conference, and the motions to instruct provided by this rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are finally going to conference on the farm bill. I believe strongly that we need to reauthorize a 5-year bill to provide some clarity and provide some certainty not just for our farmers, but also for the millions of Americans who rely on nutrition assistance to feed themselves and their families.

I need to just say a few words about the process. I do not think I have ever seen a motion to go to conference with two motions to instruct conferees to the majority party in the House as all part of one rule. This is kind of an odd precedent, Mr. Speaker; but there are a lot of odd things going on around here during these last few days. We see major pieces of legislation, appropriation bills, coming to the Rules Committee that have never even been considered on the floor; and all of a sudden, they are brought before the House under a closed process. But anyway, I think it is pretty clear that regular order has been discarded in this House.

But putting that aside, let me say that I would like to take most of my time here to talk about the issue of hunger in America because this bill is very relevant to that subject.

After a $20 billion cut to the SNAP program was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership sadly decided to double-down on the cruelty with a nearly $40 billion cut. That bill also narrowly passed, and I want to thank the brave Republicans who stood with us, who listened to their own constituents, and who listened to their consciences and joined with us in voting ''no'' on that $40 billion cut.

Supporters of those cuts say it is all about ''reform.'' Well, this is not about reform, Mr. Speaker. It is about trying to destroy a very important part of the social safety net.

I am happy to talk to anyone and everyone about how we can improve SNAP. Where there is waste or there is fraud or there is abuse, we should crack down on it; but the House bill takes a sledgehammer to a program that provides food—food, Mr. Speaker—to some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

The CBO says that the nearly $40 billion cut would throw 3.8 million low-income people off SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion. People who work or who don't make enough to feed their families would be cut from this program.

Well, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families will also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. Now, we all stand up here and tell our constituents how much we care about our veterans and how much we honor them; but to throw 170,000 of these veterans off this food program because they can't find work, that is unbelievable. That is unbelievable, and it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is $1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, child care costs—they all add up.

Fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson working with George McGovern and Tony Hall.

I am hopeful that once we get to conference, we can resurrect that bipartisan spirit and work together to strengthen our Nation's food assistance programs.

I would also note that we are approaching November 1, a day of reckoning for my Republican colleagues. Automatic cuts to SNAP are already scheduled to take place. If they do not end the Republican shutdown, we are going to see even more terrible, terrible consequences for the hungry in this country. We have already seen some assistance delayed or denied. If this shutdown isn't ended, SNAP, WIC, Meals on Wheels, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program will all be devastated.

I would say to my colleagues, you can't approach the budget in a piecemeal way, and you can't approach the social safety net in this country in a piecemeal way. If you miss a part of that net that makes up the social safety net in this country, then people fall through the cracks; and people are falling through the cracks because of this ridiculous shutdown that my Republican friends have thrust upon this country.

We shouldn't be here talking about a shutdown or about whether we are going to default on our debt come October 17. We should be talking about how we create jobs for people or how we strengthen programs to end hunger in America and how we make life for people in this country better, not worse. And yet here we are, as we are about to go to conference on the farm bill, dealing with this shutdown that is making hunger worse in America.

I would urge my colleagues to, once again, come to the floor with a clean continuing resolution. Bring up the Senate bill, the Senate bill that is at Republican numbers, the budget numbers that my Republican friends said they wanted, the sequester numbers that I think are awful; but let's bring it up and have a clean vote.

I am willing to compromise and cooperate with my Republican colleagues to pass a short-term continuing resolution at their numbers to keep the government going. I think that is the least we could do. And I would urge my colleagues, before the day is out, to bring that kind of resolution to the House floor.

So I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution and remove the sword hanging over the heads of the hungry in this country. I would also urge all of my colleagues, as we go to conference, to insist that in that conference we fix this terrible, terrible mistake that this House of Representatives made when they passed a $40 billion cut in the SNAP program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1415

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule to consider my resolution to reform the sugar program. At the time we passed the farm bill this summer, opponents of sugar reform were telling us that the program didn't cost taxpayers a dime. Now, just a few months later, the program is costing taxpayers $250 million.

Sugar is the only commodity program in the farm bill that had no reform. Even as other commodities were modified to put more risk on farmers, sugar continues to get its sweet deal. Cotton, peanuts, dairy farmers will all see changes in the coming year, but not sugar farmers.

It is a sweet deal that is sour for consumers, for taxpayers, and for businesses across the country. For consumers, those who use sugar, high prices mean they are paying an additional $3.5 billion a year. For taxpayers, low sugar prices mean bailouts rising to hundreds of millions of dollars. For businesses, for those who use and consume sugar in the food industry, high sugar prices place them at a distinct disadvantage to foreign competition.

The Department of Commerce estimates that 127,000 jobs were lost in food industries between 1997 and 2011. There are 600,000 jobs across the country at risk.

My resolution does not repeal the sugar program. It is very modest reform, modest reform that would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize the price of sugar. Stabilizing the price isn't just good for consumers, it is good for farmers who can rely on a more constant price and not be subject to wild swings in the market.

With the truth about the sugar program even more clear now, it is time we had an honest debate about fairness in our agriculture programs. This does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar. It gives the Secretary flexibility to meet domestic demand.

So I urge Members to support the resolution and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to oppose this motion because we have been trying to get this farm bill resolved since May of 2010, back when I was still chairman of the committee, so we have been working on it this long and we need to get this resolved. But what is being done here today is unprecedented as far as I can tell in the history of the House, where we are giving these two sense of the Congress resolutions to the majority.

From what I can tell, this has never been done before, and we are re-litigating issues that were settled on the floor of the House when we debated the farm bill. These motions take a contrary position to the position that the House took, so we are going to be voting to go against the position that we took here just a couple of months ago. So that is my problem with this.

Historically, the minority gets a motion to instruct, and that has been the way it has been. In all the years that I have been here, that is the way it has been. But there's never been a situation like this. I think it is a bad precedent. It is going to be confusing to people, and we need to get to conference to get this resolved.

Given the way this conference appears it is going to be put together, I am not so optimistic that it is going to work because you are bringing people from outside of the committee into this process, which is what blew this thing up in the first place in June. And it's not going to make anything easier.

We are going to work together and try to get this resolved, but the way all this is coming down is making our job a lot harder, rather than a lot easier, which is the wrong direction, as far as I am concerned.

So I encourage Members to oppose this rule. This is unprecedented. It is apparently being done because that is the only way they can get the votes. And we are doing a lot of things around here because of that, and that is not the way we should do things.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2642 makes commonsense, market-oriented reforms to agricultural policy, which is why it is time to begin conversations with our Senate colleagues on a path forward that ultimately gets these important reforms enacted into law.

This bill isn't perfect, but it puts us on a path to provide certainty to America's farmers and ranchers by adopting a 5-year farm bill that will actually become law.

This measure is the result of more than 3 years of debate and discussion, including 46 hearings and a 2-year audit of every farm program. The bill repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, including direct payments.

It eliminates and streamlines duplicative and overlapping conservation programs and trims traditional farm policy by almost $23 billion. The bill eliminates direct payments and ensures no payments are made to those who do not actually farm.

The bill also provides regulatory relief for farmers and ranchers. It eliminates a duplicative permitting requirement for pesticides and prohibits the EPA from implementing the unjustified and unscientific biological opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service until there is an unbiased, scientific peer review of those opinions.

The bill requires regulatory agencies across the government to use scientifically sound information in moving forward with their regulatory initiatives. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to advocate on behalf of the

farmers and ranchers as other agencies move forward with regulations affecting food and fiber.

The bill also eliminates duplicative reporting requirements for seed importers.

Finally, H.R. 2642 repeals the underlying 1949 permanent law and replaces it with the 2013 farm bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because without reauthorization farm policy will revert to permanent statutes established in the 1938 and 1949 laws which are drastically different from current programs.

The permanent statutes exclude many commodities such as rice, soybeans, and peanuts; set support prices much higher than current levels; and prevent new enrollment in various conservation programs.

Permanent agriculture law established by the Agriculture Adjustments Act of 1938 and the Agriculture Act of 1949 does not reflect current farming and marketing practices, trade agreements or market circumstances.

Farmers, as well as taxpayers, will benefit from a modernized bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member on the Ag Committee, Mr. PETERSON, when he talks about kind of how unusual this process is with the sense of Congress resolutions that are put into this rule, basically, to instruct conferees on what to do.

It is highly unusual that the majority gives itself two of these sense of Congress resolutions. But this whole process has been really strange.

I would just say to my colleagues, I come to this floor every week and I talk about the issue of hunger and food insecurity in America. There are 50 million people who are hungry; 17 million are kids. I think it is something we all should be ashamed of.

I am on the Agriculture Committee, as well as being on the Rules Committee. I am on the Subcommittee on Nutrition. I was anxious to get on that committee so I could talk about the importance of a social safety net, about the importance of making sure that people in this country have enough to eat. Much to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Nutrition held a total of zero hearings on SNAP. The full committee held no hearings.

Then, even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, was that the nutrition title wasn't even written in the Agriculture Committee. It was written in the majority leader's back room somewhere by God knows who wrote this thing. But it never came to the Agriculture Committee.

It was never brought up for a hearing. There was no markup. There were no amendments that were to be offered. And then it showed up at the Rules Committee magically and was brought to this floor, a $40 billion cut that would throw 3.8 million people off the program, that would throw 170,000 veterans off the program.

No hearings, nothing. Nothing.

And my colleagues like to talk about regular order. That is not regular order. That is blowing up the whole process.

If my friends have concerns about the SNAP program, which, by the way, is the most efficiently and effectively-run Federal program we have, with one of the lowest error rates—I wish the Department of Defense had those kind of low error rates—then you hold a hearing.

You talk to the people who are on the program. You talk to the people who administer the program. You do this thoughtfully. You do it so that people who don't deserve to get the benefit don't get it, and people who deserve to get it get it.

But my friends come to the floor with this sledgehammer approach, this mindless approach of just gutting the program, close to $40 billion.

We are slowly but surely getting out of this terrible economy, and as we do, fewer and fewer people will be on the program.

That is the way it works. When the economy is good, fewer people need the benefit. When the economy is bad, more people need the benefit.

But to pull the rug right from underneath people who are still struggling—my friends say all we want to do is make sure that able-bodied people who can work, work. Well, most of the people who are able to work, work, who are on SNAP, but they earn so little that they qualify for this benefit.

If my friends want to help lift people off the program, raise the minimum wage. But there is something wrong in this country when you have got people working full time and earning so little that they are still in poverty. That is what we should be addressing.

But rather than going through regular order, rather than having the Agriculture Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, come up with a proposal, the majority leader takes this in his own hands and does it on his own and brings it to the floor, and we are all supposed to just take it.

I want to, again, thank the handful of Republicans that had the guts to stand up and do the right thing and vote against it. We came very close to defeating it.

But I will tell my friends right now that people like me are not going to support a farm bill that makes more people hungry in America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague from Massachusetts, and it is obvious that every time we have anything on this floor or in the Rules Committee where we are dealing with the subject of hunger that he is extraordinarily passionate about the issue.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans care about Americans who are hungry. We care about hunger issues. He makes it sound as though we are heartless people. We are not.

What we are doing here is our best to preserve the program for the truly needy and those who are hungry in this country.

My colleague says it is the most efficiently and effectively-run program in the country, with low error rates. That is not what the research shows. It isn't even what TV programs find out on their own with very little research.

They go out and they find the terrible abuse with the program, the SNAP program, which used to be called the food stamp program, but it was given this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program name some time ago to get away from the term ''food stamps.'' But that is what it is. It is a food stamp program.

Almost everybody in this country knows of people who have abused the program. Now, we don't want to deny help to truly needy people. If we can make these reforms in this program, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to preserve the entire program for those who truly need it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, as I said, is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program, or food stamps for families, and especially for children who rely on food stamps. Its cost-saving reforms are a step in the right direction and are long overdue out of respect for needy Americans and taxpayers.

This bill makes the first reforms to the program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, and these reforms were strengthened during a rigorous amendment process on the House floor.

Despite media reports to the contrary, House Republicans are not cutting SNAP for individuals who currently meet the program's eligibility requirements. Instead, our reforms focus on eliminating fraud and abuse that exist within the program and remove from the programs individuals who do not qualify for the benefits.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I think that bears repeating. What we are doing is eliminating fraud and abuse and removing from the program individuals who do not qualify for benefits. That is what the American people expect us to do in our oversight processes here.

Because of several well-documented and legally questionable efforts by President Obama's Department of Agriculture and by the individual States that administer the program, SNAP benefits have been extended to a number of recipients who would not otherwise qualify. The growth in SNAP spending caused by such expansion efforts will strain the safety net until it breaks, necessitating much higher taxes and indiscriminate cuts that would hit the poorest Americans the

hardest. From a moral perspective, such an outcome would harm the very people programs like SNAP are intended to help, and that is unacceptable. That is why I voted for H.R. 3102 when it passed the House on September 19.

The bill ensures benefits are reserved for legal recipients and aren't directed to illegal immigrants.

The bill closes the ''heat-and-eat'' loophole related to electricity bill assistance, gives States the authority to require drug testing for recipients, and prohibits felons from receiving SNAP benefits.

H.R. 3102 reinstates work requirements for all able-bodied adults, without dependents, receiving SNAP benefits.

An overextended, unchecked SNAP program won't be capable of serving the citizens it is purposed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and to provide a safety net for the needy.

For the first time, the House separated farm policy from the food stamp program, which is only appropriate, as 80 percent of the so-called ''farm bill'' in the past was spent on providing nutrition assistance to needy families. The farm-only portion of the farm bill authorizes farm programs through fiscal year 2018; however, H.R. 3102 authorizes appropriations for SNAP only through fiscal year 2016.

If enacted and if the two bills were addressed on 5-and 3-year intervals, respectively, this would decouple SNAP from the authorization of farm programs until 2031. Considering agriculture and nutrition programs independently, going forward, will help take politics out of the equation and allow for reforms that will sustain both categories of programs in years to come.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I strongly disagree with the gentlelady's statement—strongly disagree. My friend talks about oversight. There were no hearings—none.

She talks about research somehow shows that there is lots of fraud, waste, and abuse. What research? The Government Accountability Office and the USDA have all documented fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program, and it is minimal—a little over a 2 percent error rate—and much of that is underpayment. People are not getting what they are entitled to.

Enough of this demonizing poor people; enough of diminishing their struggle. We ought to do the right thing and make sure that people in this country have enough to eat. That shouldn't be a radical idea.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I could not agree more with my friend from Massachusetts, who has actually spent the time getting inside this program. In fact, if the Republicans really care about hungry people in this country, these legislative efforts are a strange way to show it.

They are restricting the ability of Governors to grant waivers in places where people have no access to jobs. Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, have requested these waivers because people need help, and the system couldn't meet their needs.

If they are concerned about fraud, waste, and abuse, look at the Crop Insurance Program, which has a higher rate of abuse than the miniscule amount with the food stamp program. And yet they are in the process not of reforming crop insurance, but enriching it and putting in another provision, the so-called ''shallow loss'' provision.

They are cutting benefits for poor people, increasing payments for wealthy farmers, and not dealing with simple, commonsense reforms that would give more value to the taxpayer—and not at the expense of the neediest Americans.

This is kind of a through-the-looking-glass situation. There are two proposals on the floor—''sense of Congress''—that I will probably support.

I have worked on a bipartisan basis to try and reform the egregious sugar program and to try and move in a modest sense to reform crop insurance, but we can do far more. And I note that these have bipartisan support.

It is outrageous that we are giving more money to farmers who need it least, shortchanging farmers and ranchers in States like mine in Oregon, cutting into the benefits for poor people who have no alternative, and taking away the right of the Governor to provide waivers for them.

It is an Alice-in-Wonderland situation that exemplifies the weird space that we are in today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we would return to regular order, if we would have honest debate on this floor about getting more value for taxpayers, we could come forth with a farm bill at a fraction of what it costs now. It would be better for farmers and ranchers. It would be better for hunters and fishermen. It would be better for the environment and better for the taxpayer.

I strongly hope that we will stop this Alice-in-Wonderland experience, reopen the Federal Government, and get back to doing our job right.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the $40 billion in disastrous cuts to the food stamp program that the House Republican majority is trying to make law.

This is a cut of $40 billion from the food stamp program. It goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It is a reflection of how extreme today's Republican Party has become. Even former Republican Senator Bob Dole has called these egregious cuts ''an about-face on our progress fighting hunger.''

If these cuts become law, over 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens—children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled—would go hungry in the United States of America, the most bountiful Nation in the world. This is even as Republicans continue to give $90 billion in crop insurance subsidies to some of America's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

For food stamp recipients that include a family of four, if their income is $23,000 or less, that would give them eligibility for food stamps.

Let's talk about the Crop Insurance Program. You have got 26 beneficiaries of that program today who get at least a million dollars in a subsidy from U.S. taxpayers. They do not have any income threshold. They can get the money under any set of circumstances. And the top 1 percent of most farm operators in the Nation each get $220,000.

You want to talk about the most needy? These are not the most needy. Cut out the $90 billion in the subsidies to the richest people in the Nation.

The cuts are awful enough, but the majority's plan also includes cruel, mean-spirited restrictions. For instance, it encourages Governors to slash families from the food stamp rolls who cannot find work or a job training program for 20 hours a week. It rewards these Governors with half of the savings and allows them to use the money for tax cuts for the wealthy or whatever else they want.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Even if the food stamp recipient, including parents with young children and those with disabilities, is actively searching for a job, the House majority would end their benefits.

This is immoral. It goes against the values that we hold dear in the United States of America. Cutting 4 million Americans who live on the edge while providing subsidies for the wealthiest is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the cruelty that this rule embodies.

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

Mr. Speaker, the rule and this legislation underlying it is not designed to abuse or demonize poor people. What we are trying to do is to save these programs for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not simply doing oversight on the farm bill and on agriculture issues. The House has been doing its job of oversight throughout the Federal Government. We have been

doing that throughout this entire session. We are looking to find fraud, abuse, and waste in every program. It just happens that today we are talking about this program.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, almost every day we bring forth legislation that will help us identify waste, fraud, and abuse and do everything we can to protect hardworking taxpayers in this country who are providing the funds to take care of the truly needy in this country and to allow us to help those people, and that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, the work of making these improvements and reforms to longstanding Federal policy is not easy. I commend Chairman LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee for their thoughtful work. I was pleased to work with them and to have three commonsense amendments included in H.R. 2642 when it passed the House.

The spending safeguard amendment will cap spending on the Farm Risk Management Election program at 110 percent of CBO-predicted levels for the first 5 years in which payments are disbursed.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amendment passed with bipartisan support, as did most of the amendments to that legislation.

In the event government's cost projections prove completely wrong, the amendment will ensure taxpayers are not forced to automatically pay the difference between Washington's mistake and reality.

My second amendment, the Sunset Discretionary Programs amendment, will automatically end discretionary programs in the 2013 farm bill upon expiration of the bill's 5-year authorization period. Many programs authorized by the farm bill are authorized indefinitely. This amendment will require Congress to justify a program's continued existence and funding through regular reauthorization efforts.

As our national debt approaches $17 trillion, Mr. Speaker, Congress simply cannot afford to add to the number of costly Federal programs that are on autopilot. This was really an excellent amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, my Democrat colleague, and I offered the crop insurance transparency amendment, which will require the government to disclose the names of key persons or entities receiving Federal crop insurance subsidies. Specifically, disclosure would be required for Members of Congress and their immediate families, Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families, and entities in which any of the preceding parties are majority stockholders. This information is already recorded, but members of the public have to petition the government under the Freedom of Information Act to acquire the data.

□ 1445

It shouldn't take a 4-year request for the American people to figure out whether their leaders are receiving government farm subsidies. This bipartisan amendment makes this information available to the public without a FOIA request.

Mr. Speaker, we want transparency, and my amendment takes us much closer to that. I appreciate Chairman LUCAS' willingness to work with me on these amendments, and I look forward to seeing them maintained during the conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from North Carolina that I look forward to the day when she and her Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill to go after fraud, waste, and abuse in defense contracting; but, instead, they have chosen to go after poor people and are not even giving them the benefit of a hearing. There has been no hearing, no markup on this at all. This came out of thin air in the majority leader's office. This wasn't even brought to the committee of jurisdiction. This is astounding. My friends are talking about reform. This isn't reform. This is a joke.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlelady who is managing this legislation and indicate that I wish we did have, Mr. MCGOVERN, a bipartisan mission like Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson. If anybody remembers those late Members, they founded the Select Committee on Hunger in order to stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had the kind of passion that drew Robert Kennedy to Appalachia to show America that the hunger that existed in this Nation was not a respecter of race or region—or maybe even the sensitivity of Martin Luther King in the same year. Tragically, they both lost their lives in 1968. He was galvanizing poor people to come to Washington because they wanted jobs, because they wanted to eat.

Here we are on the floor of the House, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I read from the statement made from the gentleman of Iowa last night on the floor that we need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class. Who is in the dependency class? There are charges that President Obama has put 48 million people on food stamps. How has President Obama put 48 million people on food stamps?

People are hungry, and 16 percent of the poor people in America are children. What our friends want to do with regard to reform is if you get a school lunch and a school breakfast, that is not evident that your family needs food stamps. So maybe this family is dysfunctional. Maybe these mothers and fathers are desperate, so now you are going to put them through another maze. You haven't documented that they are fraudulently taking food stamps, but you are going to drop them off food stamps and say, Guys, if you want to get out of your hospice bed or if you want to get out of your sick bed or if you want to get out of your disabled bed and if you have these children who are getting lunch and breakfast, you have got to come and reapply, because there is something ingrained about those who are getting a hand up or who are in the dependency class.

I didn't say that. Robert Kennedy didn't say that.

Let's put a clean CR on the floor, by the way, to open the government, and let's stop talking about the idea. I just can't understand. We need a clean CR, and let's get it to the floor.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who is the ranking member on the Nutrition Subcommittee on the Agriculture Committee. It is the subcommittee that should have held a hearing on this SNAP bill, but it never did.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just had the opportunity with 10 of my colleagues to go to a community shelter today to serve lunch to some of the poorest people in our community. The community shelter is So Others Might Eat, and I listen to my colleagues talk about waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am disappointed and embarrassed to serve in a House in which we would not want to take care of the poorest people in this Nation. Some of the poorest people in our Nation, many of them children, seniors, and veterans, depend on SNAP. SNAP puts food on the tables of struggling parents who need to send their children to school properly nourished. It also gives low-income working families—by the way, who represent nearly half of all SNAP recipients—and seniors the necessary support they need.

Last month, this House passed a bill that cut nearly $40 billion in food stamps. It is both inappropriate and inexcusable to cut food assistance when more than 7 percent of the Nation remains unemployed and when we will not pass a jobs bill. Our economy is struggling to produce enough jobs so that families can eat without needing this assistance; and we all know that, beginning on November 1, SNAP recipients will see a reduction in their benefits when the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefits end. According to the CBO, benefits will be reduced by as much as $300 per year. This cut will result in less food for more than 47 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we have to be honest with ourselves. We either have to believe that we are doing our jobs by taking care of the people of this country or that we are only taking care of a few.

So I say to those of you who believe that all of this is about fraud, waste,

and abuse: go to the same shelter that I went to today. Go into your neighborhoods and your communities, because we all have them. There are poor people and hungry children everywhere. I want you to go and tell them that it is okay for you to cut $40 billion in food stamps.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader on this issue of food security and on so many other issues to combat poverty.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his determination to eliminate hunger, not only in our own country, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are 46 million Americans living in poverty, 16 million of whom are children. Instead of focusing on serious ways to lift people out of poverty and into the middle class, Republicans have insisted on placing a larger burden on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable, effectively kicking them while they are down. That is what the Republicans' farm bill nutrition title did when it was passed on September 19. It would have decimated the anti-poverty SNAP program and would have left hundreds of millions of veterans, children, seniors, and millions of working poor hungry and with nowhere to turn for a meal. SNAP has one of the lowest fraud rates amongst government programs.

House Republicans were unsuccessful in their attempts to pass a farm bill this summer, so the Republican leadership doubled down on this immoral stance, surrendered the governing of the House down to the extreme Tea Party fringe of their party, and passed $40 billion in cuts, which means cutting 24 meals a month for a family of four. This would be in addition, I might add, to SNAP cuts already scheduled to go into effect on November 1. This means about $29 less per month for food for a family of three. These cuts to the SNAP program are really heartless. Let me tell you that I know from personal experience that the majority of people on food stamps wants a job that pays a living wage, and SNAP provides this bridge over troubled waters during very difficult times.

In my own congressional district, for example, over 22,000 households would have been impacted in more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty, including 2.1 million children. In addition to feeding the Nation's hungry, SNAP is vital to our economy. For every $1 increase in SNAP benefits, we have received back in economic activity $1.70.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Without SNAP, millions of families would fall into poverty while millions more Americans would suffer extreme hunger and our economy would create even fewer jobs.

Let me remind you that millions of people on food stamps are working. Their wages are stagnant and low. Many make less than $8 an hour; yet they are working every day to feed their families. Paying billions in farm subsidies and cutting SNAP benefits for the most vulnerable is not a value that a majority of Americans embrace. Cutting SNAP benefits is not the American way.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me inquire of the gentlelady if she would be willing to yield us a few minutes on this side because we have a lot of speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I remember one time when I lent the gentlewoman a couple of minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans continue to demonstrate just how far out of whack their priorities are.

Here we are in the 11th day of the Republican government shutdown—a shutdown for the sole purpose of denying health care to millions of Americans. I guess America shouldn't be surprised. After all, last month, the majority pushed through severe, painful cuts to the nutrition programs for hungry families. We are now moving toward going to a conference with the Senate on these damaging cuts. By insisting on these nearly $40 billion in cuts, the Republicans have made clear where they stand, even clearer where they don't stand.

Now, understand. I know that the gentlelady talks about the truly needy, but what she is really saying is that the somewhat needy, the sorta needy, the kinda needy, the ''needy'' needy need not apply because they are not in need of food stamps. When you look at the number of $20 billion, it was the original number, which is a block number, and it was without consequences to who they would hurt.

When that failed, they said, What would work? Let's use $40 billion. Yes, $40 billion will do it—a nice, neat number without any consequences to who might get hurt. Someone had a bright idea on the other side and said that this number will work, and it was without a rationale for the number and without any understanding of what the impact would be.

So we know where they stand. They don't stand with 900,000 veterans who receive food assistance each month. They don't stand with 2.1 million children who have been kept out of poverty by the food stamp program. They don't stand with the seniors who have to choose between food and medicine—or with the families of disabled children or with our military families who turn to food stamps to stretch their budgets. Heaven forbid we suggest taking away subsidies from Big Oil or tax breaks from owners of corporate jets.

What does that say about Republican priorities and their vision? The fact is that their vision leads to a world in which millions more go hungry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. In New York City alone, the Republicans' cut would result in 130 million fewer meals. That is unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The fact that it is not unacceptable tells us something we need to know about our Republican colleagues' view of struggling families in this country: they don't care about their struggles. They wouldn't recognize a needy person if they tripped over him on the street outside the Capitol.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in terms of whether we recognize poor people or not. Some of us probably grew up poorer than anybody on the other side of the aisle. I am one of those people. I have great empathy for people who are poor, but I am so pleased that we live in the greatest country in the world in which we have the opportunities to overcome poverty because of the great opportunities that are given to us in the country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of comity and goodness, I yield the 3 minutes that is requested of me to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts has an additional 3 minutes to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her graciousness in allowing my side a few more minutes. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today and end this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of goodness, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we would end this idiotic government shutdown and not go on recess later today. The American people expect us to act today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we may end this irresponsible Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this unnecessary Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can finally end this Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, a request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, so that we can go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the idea of the House and Senate reconciling their differences on the farm bill and going to conference. It is certainly long overdue.

I caution, however, that I will not vote for deep cuts in the SNAP program or the food stamp program, nor do I believe that Democrats will vote to take food away from those Americans who suffer from food insecurity. They have shut down the government, and now they want to shut down food assistance to the most vulnerable, many of whom live in my congressional district.

Open up the government, open up food banks, open up Meals on Wheels for seniors, and give a hand to those who are hurting. It is good for families, and it is good for farmers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished Member of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill because I have worked very hard over the years helping to put together various farm bills, and this is one that I felt very, very good about from the outset. I even felt okay when the bill came back from the Senate. Although I had some issues with the Senate version, I thought that what we were doing made some sense.

But we have reached a point with this bill—$40 billion in cuts to the food stamp program—that will not only impact negatively those people who would receive those stamps in fighting off poverty or hunger, but it would do tremendous harm to various community outlets—stores, family-owned markets—where so much of the income of small businesses depend upon this program and what it will do to help further the economy in various communities.

I am also very concerned that in this legislation, we treat the recipients of food stamps as if they are responsible for what may or may not have taken place with respect to drug addiction to children or to siblings. I think there is something erroneous about drug testing in order to receive food stamps. I

think that if you are going to have drug testing to get Federal assistance, then we ought to test all those people who get farm subsidies and see whether or not they are deserving of such assistance from the Federal Government.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Then I saw some reference as to whether or not people who may have been convicted of a felony, what it would do to their qualifications, as well as their family qualifications. At one instance—I hope this is out of the bill—we talked about barring for life a person who may be convicted of a felony. That is not the kind of treatment our society ought to be visiting upon anybody who may or may not have made a mistake early on in their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there is much in this farm bill that ought to be supported, but I really believe these extraneous things ought to be taken out of this bill. We can't do it now, but I would hope when it gets to conference that those cooler heads will prevail, and we will have a compassionate piece of legislation that all of us can support.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several unanimous consent requests have been offered and have been ruled out of order because they have not been pre-cleared by bipartisan leadership. It is my understanding that they have, in fact, been pre-cleared by the Democratic side.

Would it be in order to ask the Republicans if they would pre-clear the unanimous consent requests so that we can vote up or down on a clean CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining, and whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlelady from North Carolina has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding us additional time. It is important, I think, that we be heard on these issues.

One of the reasons why we are so passionate about reopening the government is because this government shutdown is hurting people, and it is hurting the most vulnerable people in our society the most.

One of the things that has troubled me about the direction the Republican leadership has taken in this Congress is that it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor and the vulnerable in this people's House of Representatives. Time and time and time again, my friends seek to balance the budget by cutting programs that help the most vulnerable. The $40 billion cut in SNAP will throw 3.8 million poor people off the program, it will throw children off the program, it will throw working people off the program.

A lot of the people—contrary to what my friends say—who are on SNAP work for a living, they work full time. If you are earning minimum wage working full time, you still qualify for SNAP.

There are people in this country who are hurting, who are depending upon us to be there, to make sure that there is a social safety net that will make sure that people don't fall through the cracks.

One of the reasons we object to this nutrition provision in the farm bill is because it will hurt people—it will hurt people. We were sent here to help people. This used to be a bipartisan issue. Democrats and Republicans need to join together on this.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to see the government reopen also. We have sent many pieces of legislation over to the Senate, but the Senate has refused to act on them. We hope very much to get the government open again.

We are not opposed to helping the truly needy in this country. We want to help those people. We believe by reforming the legislation related to food stamps that we will be able to save the program for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are an absolute necessity in a divided government, and conference committees provide an avenue for the House and Senate to meet and resolve policy differences.

□ 1515

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule, to provide a motion to go to conference on the farm bill so we can move the reauthorization process forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

Sec. 4. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 4 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle have stated their preference for, as the gentlelady from North Carolina said, opening the government. They want to open the government as soon as possible and would vote for a clean bill.

Mr. Speaker, we can have that vote right now. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to be heard right now in this Chamber and show the American people whether they want to reopen the government today or not.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I request that this vote be conducted by a rollcall under clause 2 of House rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

In response to the gentleman from Maryland, under clause 2(a) of rule XX, a record vote is conducted by electronic device unless the Speaker directs otherwise. This vote will be conducted by electronic device.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Does that mean if you ruled that we would take the vote in the manner in which I requested, that we would do so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Speaker's discretion, and the Chair advises that this vote will be conducted by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
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
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
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
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
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 (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
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—193

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
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
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
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
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

Bachmann
Clay
Coble
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Gohmert
Granger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Jeffries
Jordan
McCarthy (NY)
Pelosi
Runyan
Rush
Scalise
Slaughter
Young (FL)

□ 1540

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

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MEEHAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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 223, noes 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
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
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
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
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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 (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
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)

NOES—189

Andrews
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
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
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
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
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
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

Bachmann
Clay
Coble
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Gohmert
Granger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Jeffries
Jordan
McCarthy (NY)
Pelosi
Runyan
Rush
Scalise
Slaughter
Young (FL)

□ 1551

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.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during roll No. 544, on agreeing to H. Res. 380. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents in a third-party civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL,
Chief Administrative Officer.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peterson moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) be instructed to (1) recede to section 1602 of the Senate amendment (relating to suspension of permanent price support authority) and (2) recede to the Senate position in title IV of the Senate amendment providing at a minimum a five-year duration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other nutrition programs.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1600

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

This motion contains two instructions for the farm bill conferees. One is to support the permanent law provisions in the Senate farm bill and what we currently have and have had for years and years. The second is to support the Senate position of a 5-year reauthorization of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

To be clear, this motion keeps intact the longstanding alliance needed to pass a strong farm bill.

America's two largest farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union, both wrote in opposition to the House's original consideration of H.R. 2642, the ''farm only'' farm bill.

Farm Bureau president Bob Stallman wrote:

> It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of the COMPLETE farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides in this country, or for the customers ranchers and farmers serve.

The Farm Bureau joined a broad coalition of 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance groups that expressed their opposition to splitting the nutrition title from the farm bill and urged House leaders to pass a 5-year farm bill.

When such a large group of organizations, most with different if not conflicting priorities, can come together and agree on something, we should listen to them. Doing the exact opposite of what everyone with a stake in this bill recommends does not make sense, and it is not the way to achieve success, in my opinion.

I will insert both the Farm Bureau and coalition letters into the RECORD.

The farm bill's nutrition program needs to be on the same timeline as the bill's other provisions. It makes no sense to de-couple farm and food programs; they go hand in hand. I worry that separating the two of them sets us on a path to no farm bill in the future. The Senate farm bill preserves the partnership between farm and food programs, and we should defer to that approach.

As Farmers Union president Roger Johnson wrote:

> Repealing permanent law would remove the element of the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers and ranchers and the food insecure in this country, and protects our Nation's natural resources.

I will insert the Farmers Union letter into the RECORD.

The permanent law provisions are important to ensuring that Congress revisits farm programs every 5 years. These are farm laws from 1938 and 1949 that, if Congress does not pass a new farm bill, would go into effect. Actually, because we have not passed a farm bill at this point, and it expired on October 1, we actually are operating under permanent law right now.

Obviously, farming has changed a lot since then, and everybody knows these programs don't make a lot of sense today, but that's the point of permanent law. It is the reason that we work together and we pass a new farm bill, because the alternative is not very acceptable.

Farm bills are traditionally a compromise, and there are things that some people like and things that some people don't like. Permanent law encourages both groups to work together because no one wants to go back to the outdated and unworkable farm programs of 1938 and 1949.

Without these permanent law provisions, it will make it more difficult to make changes, improvements, and reforms over time as we discover that they are needed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
July 11, 2013.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: National Farmers Union (NFU) strongly urges you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642, a bill that divorces the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill and repeals permanent law.

The two largest general farm organizations in the country have spoken out multiple times in opposition to separating nutrition programs from the farm bill. Splitting the bill is a shortsighted strategy that would effectively undermine the long-standing bipartisan coalition of rural and urban members that have traditionally supported passage of a unified bill. We are also very concerned that including a provision that would repeal permanent law did not receive any outside scrutiny or ability to weigh in through hearings. Repealing permanent law would remove the element in the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers, ranchers, the food insecure and protects our nation's natural resources.

Last week, NFU led a coalition of 531 other organizations in writing a letter calling for the House of Representatives not to split the bill. This broad-based coalition, composed of agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations is now being undermined by extreme partisan political organizations that do not represent constituents affected by the farm bill.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. We urge you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642 and encourage leadership to bring a unified bill to the floor as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,
President.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

The Hon.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP.: The American Farm Bureau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36–10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The ''marriage'' between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

JULY 2, 2013.

The Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, H-232 The Capitol, Washington, DC

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: America's agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations strongly urge you to bring the Farm Bill (H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013) back to the Floor as soon as possible. This important legislation supports our nation's farmers, ranchers, forest owners, food security, natural resources and wildlife habitats, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conservation, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for the House to try once again to bring together a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for farmers, rural America, the environment and our economy in general and pass a five-year farm bill upon returning in July. We believe that splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing, and urge you to move a unified farm bill forward.

Thank you for your support. We look forward to our continued dialogue as the process moves forward and stand ready to work with you to complete passage of the new five-year Farm Bill before the current law expires again on September 30, 2013.

Sincerely,

1st Farm Credit Services, Advanced Biofuels Association, Ag Credit, ACA, AgChoice, AgGeorgia, AgHeritage Farm Credit Services AgriBank, Agriculture Council of Arkansas Agriculture Energy Coalition, Agricultural Retailers Association AgriLand, Agri-Mark, Inc., AgCarolina, AgCountry, AgFirst, AgPreference, AgSouth, AgStar Financial Services, ACA AgTexas, Alabama Ag Credit, Alabama Cotton Commission, Alabama Dairy Producers, Alabama Farm Credit, Alabama Farmers Cooperative, Alabama Farmers Federation.

Alabama Pork Producers, Alaska Farmers Union, American AgCredit, American Agriculture Movement, American Association of Avian Pathologists, American Association of Bovine Practitioners, American Association of Crop Insurers, American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Bankers Association, American Beekeeping Federation, American Biogas Council, American Coalition for Ethanol, American Cotton Shippers Association, American Crystal Sugar Company, American Dairy Science Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Farmers and Ranchers Mutual Insurance Company, American Farmland Trust, American Feed Industry Association, American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, American Forest Foundation, American Forest Resource Council, American Forests, American Honey Producers Association.

American Malting Barley Association, American Pulse Association, American Public Works Association, American Sheep Industry Association, American Society of Agronomy, American Sugar Alliance, American Sugar Cane League, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, American Soybean Association, American Veterinary Medical Association, Animal Agriculture Coalition, Animal Health Institute, WAArborOne, Archery Trade Association, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona BioIndustry Association, Arizona Wool Producers Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau, Arkansas Farmers Union, Arkansas Rice Federation, Arkansas Rice Producers' Group, Arkansas State Sheep Council, Associated Logging Contractors—Idaho, Associated Milk Producers, Inc.

Associated Oregon Loggers, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Veterinary Biologics Companies, Badgerland Financial, Bio Nebraska Life Sciences Association, BioForward, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Bongard's Creamery, Boone and Crockett Club, Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Calcot, California Agricultural Irrigation Association, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, California Association of Winegrape Growers, California Avocado Commission, California Canning Peach Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Farmers Union, California Forestry Association, California Pork Producers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Calvin Viator, Ph.D. and Associates, LLC.

The Campbell Group, Can Manufacturers Institute, Canned Food Alliance, Cape Fear Farm Credit, Capital Farm Credit, Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Catfish Farmers of America, Central Kentucky, ACA, Ceres Solutions LLP, Chrisholm Trail Farm Credit, CHS, Inc., CoBank, Colonial Farm Credit, Colorado BioScience Association, Colorado Farm Bureau, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Connecticut Forest & Park Association, Connecticut United for Research Excellence, Inc., The Conservation Fund, Continental Dairy Products, Inc, Cooperative Credit Company, Cooperative Network, Cora-Texas Mfg. Co., Inc.

Corn Producers Association of Texas, Cotton Growers Warehouse Association, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, Crop Insurance and Reinsurance Bureau, Crop Insurance Professionals Association, Crop Science Society of America, CropLife America, Dairy Farmers of America, Dairy Farmers Working Together, Dairy Producers of Utah, Dairylea Cooperative Inc., Darigold, Inc, Delta Council, Delta Waterfowl, Deltic Timber Corporation, Ducks Unlimited, DUDA (A. Duda & Sons, Inc.), Eastern Regional Conference of Council of State Governments, Empire State Forest Products Association, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Family Farm Alliance, Family Forest Foundation—Washington, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, Farm Credit Banks Funding Corporation.

Farm Credit Council, Farm Credit Council Services, Farm Credit East, Farm Credit MidSouth, Farm Credit of Central Florida, Farm Credit of Central Oklahoma, Farm Credit of Enid, Farm Credit of Florida, Farm Credit of Maine, Farm Credit of Ness City, Farm Credit of New Mexico, Farm Credit of North West Florida, Farm Credit of Southern Colorado, Farm Credit of SW Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Arkansas, Farm Credit of Western Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Oklahoma, Farm Credit Services of America, Farm Credit Services of Illinois, Farm Credit South, Farm Credit Virginias, Farm Credit West, Farmer Mac, FarmFirst Dairy Cooperative, FCS Financial.

FCS of America, FCS of Colusa-Glenn, FCS of East/Central Oklahoma, FCS of Hawaii, FCS of Illinois, FCS of Mandan, FCS of Mid-America, FCS of North Dakota, FCS of Southwest, Federation of Animal Science Societies, First District Association, First FCS, First South Farm Credit, FLBA of Kingsburg, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, Florida Sugar Cane League, Forest Investment Associates, Forest Landowners Association, Forest Products National Labor Management Committee, Forest Resource Association Inc., Fresno-Madera Farm Credit, Frontier Farm Credit, Fruit Growers Supply Company, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, Georgia Forestry Association.

Georgia Pork Producers Association, Giustina Resources, LLC, Global Forest Partners LP, GMO Renewable Resources, Great Plains Ag Credit, Great Plains Canola Association, Green Diamond Resource Company, Greenstone, GROWMARK, Inc, Growth Energy, Hancock Timber Resource Group, Hardwood Federation, Hawaii Farmers Union, Hawaii Sugar Farmers, Heritage Land Bank, Holstein Association USA, Idaho Ag Credit, Idaho Dairymen's Association, Idaho Farmers Union, Idaho Forest Group, Idaho Forest Owners Association, Idaho Grain Producers Association, Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization—iBIO®, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Farmers Union.

Illinois Pork Producers Association, Independent Beef Association of North Dakota, Independent Community Bankers of America, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indiana Farmers Union, Indiana Health Industry Forum, Innovative Mississippi—Strategic Biomass Solutions, Intermountain Forest Association, Intertribal Agriculture Council, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Iowa Farmers Union, Iowa Pork Producers Association, Iowa Sheep Industry Association, IowaBio, Irrigation Association, Irving Woodlands, LLC, Izaak Walton League of America, John Deere Crop Insurance, Kansas Cooperative Council, Kansas Dairy, Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Farmers Union, Kansas Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Kansas Pork Association, Kansas Sheep Association.

Kentucky Forest Industries Association, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Land Improvement Contractors of America, Land O'Lakes, Land Stewardship Project, Land Trust Alliance, Lone Rock Timber Management Co., Longview Timber LLC, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Louisiana Forest Association, Louisiana Rice Growers Association, Louisiana Rice Producers' Group, Louisiana Sugar Cane Cooperative, Inc., Lula-Westfield, LLC, Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative, Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., Maryland Grain Producers Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders' Association, Inc., Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Massachusetts Forest Alliance, MassBio, MBG Marketing/The Blueberry People, Michigan Agri-Business Association, Michigan Farm Bureau.

Michigan Farmers Union, Michigan Pork Producers Association, Michigan Sugar Company, Michigan-California Timber Company, Mid-West Dairymen's Co., MidAtlantic Farm Credit, Midwest Dairy Coalition, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Midwest Food Processors Association, Milk Producers Council, Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative, Minnesota Canola Council, Minnesota Corn Growers Association, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Minnesota Farmers Union, Minnesota Forest Industries, Minnesota Grain & Feed Association, Minnesota Lamb & Wool Producers, Minnesota Pork Producers Association, Minnesota Timber Producers Association, Mississippi River Trust, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Missouri Dairy Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Missouri Farmers Union.

Missouri Pork Association, Missouri Sheep Producers, Missouri Soybean Association, The Molpus Woodlands Group, Montana Grain Growers Association, Montana Farmers Union, Mule Deer Foundation, National

Association of Counties, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National All-Jersey, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association for the Advancement of Animal Science, National Association of Clean Water Agencies, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of Farmer Elected Committees, National Association of Federal Veterinarians, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of FSA County Office Employees, National Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils, National Association of State Conservation Agencies, National Association of State Foresters, National Association of University Forest Resource Programs, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research, National Conservation District Employees Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Cotton Ginners' Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Farm to School Network, National Grange, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., National Milk Producers Federation, National Network of Forest Practitioners, National Pork Producers Council, National Renderers Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Sunflower Association, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Woodland Owners Association, Nebraska Cooperative Council, Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Nebraska Farmers Union, Nebraska Pork Producers Association.

Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New England Farmers Union, New Jersey Farm Bureau, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, New Mexico Sorghum Association, New York Farm Bureau, Inc., New York Forest Owners Association, Nexsteppe, North American Grouse Partnership, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, Inc, North Carolina Forestry Association, North Carolina Pork Council, North Dakota Farmers Union, North Dakota Lamb & Wool Producers, North Dakota Pork Producers Council, Northarvest Bean Growers Association, Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Northeast States Association for Agricultural Stewardship, Northern California Farm Credit, Northern Canola Growers Association, Northern Forest Center, Northern Pulse Growers Association, Northwest Dairy Association, Northwest Farm Credit Services.

Novozymes North America Inc, Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc., Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Ohio Farmers Union, Ohio Pork Producers Council, Oklahoma Agribusiness Retailers Association, Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council, Oklahoma Farmers Union, Oklahoma Grain & Feed Association, Oklahoma Pork Council, Oklahoma Seed Trade Association, Oklahoma Sorghum Association, Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, Oregon Association of Nurseries, Oregon Cherry Growers, Inc., Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Oregon Farmers Union. Oregon Sheep Growers Association, Oregon Small Woodland Association, Oregon Women in Timber, Orion the Hunter's Institute, Panhandle-Plains Land Bank, Partners for Sustainable Pollination, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, Pennsylvania Farmers Union.

Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Pheasants Forever, Plains Cotton Cooperative Association, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Plum Creek Timber Company, Pollinator Partnership, Pope and Young Club, Port Blakely Tree Farms, LP, Potlatch Corporation, Prairie Rivers Network, Premier Farm Credit, Puerto Rico Farm Credit, Quality Deer Management, Association, Quail Forever, Rayonier Inc., Red Gold, Inc, Red River Forests, LLC, Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers Association, Renewable Fuels Association, Resource Management Service, LLC, Rhode Island Sheep Cooperative, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Ruffed Grouse Society.

The Rural Broadband Association, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Select Milk Producers, Inc., Seneca Foods, Shasta Forests Timberlands, LLC, Sidney Sugars, Inc., Sierra Pacific Industries, Society of American Foresters, Soil and Water Conservation Society, Soil Science Society of America, South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, South Dakota Biotech Association, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Pork Producers, South Dakota Wheat Growers, South East Dairy Farmers Association, Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southeast Milk Inc., Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative, Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association of Texas.

Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Southwest Council of Agribusiness, Southwest Georgia Farm Credit, St. Albans Cooperative, Staplcotn, State Agriculture and Rural Leaders, Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida, Sustainable Forest Initiative, Sustainable Northwest, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, Tennessee Forestry Association, Tennessee Renewable Energy & Economic Development Council, Texas Ag Finance, Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council, Texas Farmers Union, Texas Forestry Association, Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, Texas Land Bank, Texas Pork Producers Association, Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group, Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers' Association, Timberland Investment Resources, Timber Products Company, The Amalgamated Sugar Company.

The Bank of Commerce, The Nature Conservancy, The Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trust for Public Land, United Dairymen of Arizona, United FCS, U.S. Animal Health Association, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Canola Association, U.S. Cattlemen's Association, U.S. Dry Bean Council, U.S. Pea & Lentil Trade Association, U.S. Rice Producers Association, U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, USA Rice Federation, Utah Farmers Union, Utah Wool Growers Association, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Grain Producers Association, Virginia Pork Industry Board, Virginia Nursery & Landscape Association, Virginia State Dairymen's Association.

Washington Biotechnology & Biomedical Association, Washington Farm Bureau, Washington Farmers Union, Washington State Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington State Dairy Federation, Welch Foods Inc., A Cooperative, Wells Timberland REIT, Western AgCredit, Western Growers, Western Pea & Lentil Growers, Western Peanut Growers Association, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Western Sugar Cooperative, Western United Dairymen, The Westervelt Company, Weyerhaeuser Company, Whitetails Unlimited, Inc., Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Wildlife Mississippi, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Paper Council, Wisconsin Pork Association, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Women Involved in Farm Economics, World Wildlife Fund, Wyoming Sugar Company, Yankee Farm Credit, Yosemite Farm Credit.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am so overjoyed to rise today to be at this point in the farm bill process, where we are on the verge of sitting down with our friends in the other body and beginning to put the final bill together. This has been a long and challenging process for both myself, the ranking member Mr. PETERSON, and all members of the House Agriculture Committee.

We have touched on many subject matters. We have had the most amazing open markups in committee, with amendments almost beyond galore. Twice we have been across the floor of this great body in, essentially, an open process, considering literally 100-plus amendments almost every time it seems.

From that process we are now, with a product, ready to go to conference with the other body. This motion, and the next two sense of Congress resolutions, address several things that were decided on the floor of this House.

While I appreciate mightily the opportunity to reassess the judgments of the body, I would just simply say this, looking at the various points: my good friend the ranking member is exactly right. This motion would restore 1938 and 1949 law as the permanent base farm bill.

Franklin Roosevelt was President, of course, when the 1938 law was signed into place. President Truman signed the 1949 law into place. Those laws were designed at a time when I suspect the average tractor was 55 horsepower. I suppose the average dairy might have been 40 cows.

They were put in place on the assumptions of parity and production controls and allotments and production history, a lot of things that have long since faded away in subsequent farm bills.

I know my friend and a number of groups, in good faith, advocate that we keep that 1938 and 1949 law in place. But I would suggest to my colleagues, the open process we have been through, the open process we are about to have in conference, if we can come up with good language that a majority of both bodies can agree on, that a fellow down at the White House will sign if it is good policy, maybe the conference should be given the option, as is now the case within the farm bill language, of using the 2013 farm bill as base.

The Senate retains the old permanent law from 1938 and 1949. At present, we don't do that in the House draft, so we have got the ability to discuss it. We have got the ability to work on it. I, personally, think that's a good thing.

Now, the other portion of this motion, and this reflects, again, some very serious, sincere differences of

opinion, both in committee and on the floor, about how to address the fundamental nature of the nutrition title. This House decided that the reauthorization should be for 3 years instead of what would be the more traditional concurrent authorization with the rest of the farm bill. I think every Member has to vote their own conscience on that issue.

But, understand: the motion, as structured, would take away the potential option for moving permanent law from the Roosevelt-Truman administration to the present day, and it would also restore that 5-year authorization on nutrition programs, things my colleagues have to take into consideration and factor.

Mr. Speaker, I note to my colleague I am my only speaker on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as the chair from Oklahoma.

I rise to support this motion to instruct, and let me tell you why.

The farm bill traditionally, around this place, has been one of the most bipartisan efforts that we engage in. Unfortunately, for over the last year, it hasn't seemed that way.

I think that the importance of maintaining the permanent law of 1938 and 1949 is not to suggest that farming today is as it was then. Of course it is not.

But the fact is that it has always provided, in the past efforts, back in 2008, and back in the last three or four decades, the sort of incentive necessary to come together, in a bipartisan fashion, to put together a bill that reflects not just current farming needs throughout this great country of ours today, but also to focus on the necessary importance of the nutrition programs that go to so many of those in our society that are in need.

Now, that brings me to the second point that is reflected in the Senate measure, that is reflected in this motion to instruct, and that is, bifurcating the nutrition programs. It makes absolutely no sense.

There has been a tradition here that I think has worked well in maintaining the incredible amount of cornucopia of food that we produce in this Nation and also never forgetting those in our society who are most in need. That marriage between the nutrition programs, which have benefited from the food that our farmers and ranchers and dairymen produce, and those who need a helping hand has worked well.

So, therefore, why should we separate it?

Why should we have a 3-year nutrition program instead of the 5-year that marries and complements the ongoing farm programs?

So, for all of those reasons, I support this motion to instruct.

And let me finally say, the time has come. The time has come to put away the posturing, go to work, go to conference, and pass a farm bill that reflects America's needs.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the FARRM Act, which is H.R. 2642, reauthorizes Federal farm, rural development, and agricultural trade programs through fiscal year 2018, or 5 years.

However, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, which passed last month, reauthorized nutrition programs for only 3 years. This separation is problematic, and it needs to be addressed.

Farming and feeding go hand in hand, and a comprehensive farm bill recognizes this connection. We can restore this connection by ensuring a 5-year reauthorization for all programs that come under the farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the link between nutrition and farm communities. Support a farm bill that meets the nutritional needs of all Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion and thank the ranking member for his work. Reauthorizing nutrition programs for 5 years is sound policy and the right thing to do.

The farm bill has always been built on a successful coalition of rural and urban communities and Members of Congress who come together in a bipartisan way to create responsible farm and food policy.

By authorizing farm policies for 5 years, but only extending nutrition programs for 3 years, we are leaving millions of working families, seniors, and children with great uncertainty when they need our help the most.

Let's be honest. Changing the authorization for nutrition programs reduces the likelihood of Congress passing a bipartisan farm bill that works for our farmers, food producers, and families. So, too, does repealing permanent farm law, as the current House bill does.

For the last 2 years, Congress has failed to act. Why are we making it even harder to pass a final farm bill?

SNAP helps nearly 47 million Americans, including over 22,000 in my district, afford nutritious food and not go hungry. It has proven to be efficient and effective with error rates at historic lows. It helps Americans at every district across the country by preventing them from falling into poverty and lifting them up through job training and education programs.

I am proud that I was able to include a SNAP employment and training pilot program modeled after a program from my home State of Washington in the nutrition bill that will go to conference.

Even at the height of the recession, 60 percent of those in Washington's programs found employment, and more than half were off assistance in 2 years. This is a commonsense policy to increase education and job training while decreasing the number of people who need SNAP.

This bill has been hijacked long enough. Let's get back to the bipartisan, cooperative process in which the House Agriculture Committee drafted the farm bill. Let's not make things more difficult than they need to be.

We were sent here to do our jobs, to govern and pass policies that will grow our economy, and it is no secret that Congress has been failing at fulfilling this basic responsibility.

So I urge my colleagues to support this motion to authorize both farm and nutrition programs for the full 5 years. Let's get to work and pass a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a new member of the committee—well, an old member. He was a member of the Ag Committee back in the 1970s.

□ 1615

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the work that has been done here in this bill. I want to commend Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON for the tireless work that you and your staffs and your subcommittee chairs put into writing this legislation. It is the product of many years and a wealth of experience that has brought consumers and producers together, that has brought urban and rural people together, and that has produced an abundant supply of food for people here in this country and all over the world.

American agriculture is just absolutely one of the wonders of the world. I believe that this motion helps to keep that great success and progress moving forward.

Last but not least, I want to say how refreshing it was to be part of that committee markup. As you know, I was on a 32-year hiatus—the longest in history.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NOLAN. I have been asked time and time again how things are different from the way they were then. Believe me, there are a lot of differences, big and small; but one of the most refreshing things was to be a part of that Ag Committee open, bipartisan, freewheeling markup, where anybody and everybody got their moment, got an opportunity to offer their resolution, got an opportunity to have a vote on it.

I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for that kind of spirit. That is the kind of spirit that has moved this country and accounted for so much of our great success over the years.

I urge adoption of this motion.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the conference committee to reauthorize America's nutrition and antihunger programs for 5 years.

At the moment, the majority's farm bill extends crop insurance and other agricultural programs for 5 years, but the nutrition portion only reauthorizes food stamps and other programs for 3 years. This 2-year discrepancy would allow for all kinds of shenanigans the next time these programs are up for debate. We should stop that from happening now.

When this majority severed the nutrition title from the farm bill, they broke a longstanding bipartisan compact on antihunger initiatives that goes back decades, connecting the programs that help farmers produce and the programs that help poor families escape hunger. This arrangement separates farm programs from nutrition programs on a permanent basis. They break the coalition that supports this bill. Quite honestly, it is being done to put food stamps at risk. Indeed, this is a shell game.

The critical antihunger programs have been supported by Republicans and Democrats all across the country—the east coast, the west coast, the heartland—because hunger is not a partisan issue. We all have a vested interest in ending hunger in our country. But with this farm bill, the House Republican majority has betrayed this fight. By cruelly cutting $40 billion from food stamps, our most important antihunger program, they are telling over 4 million of our most vulnerable citizens—children, seniors, veterans, the disabled—you may not know where your next meal is coming from.

The majority is making this $40 billion cut, robbing poor families of food, even while continuing to dole out over twice as much—$90 billion—in crop insurance subsidies, taxpayer dollars, to some of the Nation's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

In the Crop Insurance Program, there are no income eligibility requirements. You can be a billionaire and still collect the subsidy. In the food stamp program, you can only make up to $23,000. With that, you can only spend almost $1.50 on a meal. That's the inequity we are talking about here.

There should be a condemnation of what that House majority is trying to do to hunger and nutrition programs—and there is. It has been near universal. Nutrition, agriculture, homeless, seniors, education, and health care organizations—even Republican leaders like former Republican Senator Bob Dole—all have announced their opposition to this reckless and extreme plan.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Let us understand what the cuts to nutrition programs that the majority is suggesting mean in terms of our children.

Roughly 20 percent of these households that receive the benefits have children under the age of 18; 23 percent have children that are 4 years old and under. The damage that hunger does to children is irreparable. If they go to school hungry, they cannot learn; and if they cannot learn, they cannot succeed.

I only ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the data. Read the report in The Lancet journal just in the last week or so that tells you what the scientific data is that shows what the impact of hunger is on children's brains and their ability to learn.

We know that the learning period for children is from zero to 3. Why would we want to do irreparable harm to the children in this Nation by cutting off food, of which the United States has a great abundance—and overabundance—and yet we want to cut $40 billion from the food stamp program? It is reckless and it is extreme.

I just say to my colleagues, if the farm programs are being reauthorized for 5 years, the nutrition programs should be reauthorized for 5 years, just like they have in the past, with that coalition that is coming from all over the country, region by region, Democrats and Republicans, in one unified farm bill. I urge my colleagues to go in that direction.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow on the remarks of our colleague from Connecticut.

The SNAP program is in jeopardy, which means children's health is in jeopardy, and we should extend the ARRA-created benefits as well as to fully fund, not cut, the SNAP program.

My colleague referred to the article this past week in The Lancet, the prominent medical journal. Allow me to quote from that.

> Many studies have shown positive associations between receipt of SNAP . . . and a lower risk of anemia, obesity, poor health, hospital admission for failure to thrive, and reports of child abuse and neglect. Children aged 5–9 years of SNAP-participating families have better academic outcomes and less obesity than children in nonparticipating families.
>
> Between 1961 and 1975, the program was implemented county by county, thus, allowing for comparison across counties that differed only by SNAP availability. In SNAP-available counties there was . . . a significant increase . . . in mean birthweight for both Black and White Americans, compared with those counties where SNAP was not available.

As the Speaker knows, that is an important measure associated with infant health.

> Children of low-income women in SNAP-available counties were less likely to have metabolic syndrome [ill health such as diabetes] in adulthood, and women who had received food stamps during early childhood were more likely to be economically self-sufficient.

These are children who had the benefits of SNAP. As adults, they were healthier. This seems, to me, to be a very important point.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOLT. The societal benefits of food stamps extend far beyond a temporary reduction of hunger pangs. The benefits last for years—even into the next generation. Why on Earth would we consider reducing support for such an important humane and, yes, economically beneficial program?

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

I would note to my colleagues that many of the points of great merit offered over the course of the discussion of this motion were points debated and discussed on the floor and in committee. I respect the sincerity of all of my colleagues, but we need to remember this motion has two key central points:

Number one, the 1938 and 1949 law remain permanent. We take away the conference's ability to negotiate that point with the United States Senate. Take it away, take it off the table is the goal of this motion to instruct.

The second point, of course, deals with the authorization on SNAP. Should it be 3 years? Should it be 5 years? That is the question you have to decide in this motion. Do you take away the House's ability to have the option of making whatever we can all agree on permanent law? Do you insist that we continue to have the food program, SNAP, run concurrently with the rest of the farm bill? It's a very simple set of issues to consider.

From my own perspective, I would ask the House to allow the conference committee as much flexibility as possible in negotiating with the other body—as much flexibility as possible—and that would require rejecting the motion to instruct.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I look forward to the joys of hopefully not quite as challenging a conference as this first 2 years of this process has been but, nonetheless, an acknowledgment that we need to get our work done in a timely fashion and bring a product back that a majority of this body can accept and support.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I just say that we have had a way to deal with this for the last 40-some years

that has worked pretty well. I think it is a big mistake, as most groups that are involved in the farm bill feel it is a mistake, to eliminate permanent law and to have a situation where one part of the bill is authorized for a different length of time than the other. People that have been involved in this for a long time think this is a mistake. I think it is a mistake.

I ask my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance my time.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. PETERSON. 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.

□ 1630

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 378

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should advance provisions to repeal the Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas language as added by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and thus restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the marketing year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I rise in support of the resolution and call on the House to support reforming the sugar program in upcoming negotiations on the farm bill.

Just a few months ago, I offered a reform amendment to the farm bill that gained unprecedented support and which made modest, but essential, reforms to our government's sugar program. Today, we debate this resolution, one that is even more modest but just as critical to bringing stability and balance to our sugar market. As a matter of fact, my resolution is even more timely. Following our debate on this program, the government began shoveling out money to support sugar growers—$250 million worth in 4 months. We were told by the opposing side that it operated at no cost. We need to address this wasteful practice.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of us has a small food business in his district. Sugar is an essential ingredient even in many foods that aren't necessarily sweet. We all know how hard it is on small businesses right now. We know how critical these jobs are to our economy. Shouldn't we do everything we can to help them grow strong?

Today, millions of American families are on tight budgets. They watch their spending carefully, especially when it comes to buying food; and when they walk down the grocery aisle, they may not realize the costs that go into the products that they buy for themselves and their children. Very few of them know that they are paying significantly more for these products in order to ensure the profits of a small handful of sugar producers. They don't realize that, altogether, Americans are paying an additional $3.5 billion a year because of a government sugar program that makes little sense.

Tens of millions of Americans are looking for jobs. Many don't understand why there isn't more work available right now. What they don't know is that a nationwide industry is suffering because we have a sugar program that favors the few over the many. There are more than 600,000 jobs in sugar-using industries today. However, that industry has seen tough times. More than 127,000 jobs have been lost since the late 1990s. The Department of Commerce estimates that, for every one job the sugar program saves, three are lost in sugar-using industries. The sugar program is a bad deal for businesses, for consumers, for job seekers, and for taxpayers. When the House passed a farm bill this summer, every single commodity program was reformed except for one—the sugar program.

The sugar program is probably more in need of reform than any other commodity. The program controls prices to ensure that at all times sugar farmers and producers profit. When prices are high, as they were for 4 out of the last 5 years, producers do very well. When prices are low, the government buys sugar and makes sure that farmers and producers make their money back. This isn't a functioning sugar market. It is a nonstop bailout.

Meanwhile, the world price for sugar is typically much lower than here in the United States, and this is a big advantage for foreign competitors. In fact, Canada even advertises their access to the world sugar market as a reason for American companies to relocate or to build new facilities in their nation. Mexican food companies also have lower and more stable prices and the advantages of importing products to the U.S. under NAFTA. Simply put, we are handicapping our food industries at a time when they face intense competition. Good jobs are flowing out of the U.S. into other nations.

In the farm bill we sent over to the Senate, every single commodity program was reformed except for sugar. Dairy farmers, peanut growers, cotton growers, and many more will all see changes to their programs. The resolution on the House floor today proposes a modest change to the sugar program.

Currently, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to manage imports of sugar for 6 months out of the year. The other 6 months of the year, he can do nothing even if prices spike unreasonably high. The Secretary basically has to make an educated guess about how much sugar should be imported. The way the statute is written, the Secretary must err on the side of the growers and producers. This means that, if the guess is wrong, Big Sugar benefits and consumers get fleeced.

It is time that we put an end to a policy that makes little sense—a policy that didn't even exist until the 2008 farm bill. This is a failed experiment that has hurt lots of people and has helped only a handful.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this resolution is on the floor today. I believe that the House should make a strong statement—that our conferees should work to get good reform to the sugar program in this year's farm bill. I am also grateful for the bipartisan support for this measure. At a time when it seems like Democrats and Republicans can't agree on much, we have a very strong bipartisan group working across the aisle to stand up for consumers, for job seekers, for businesses, and for taxpayers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to oppose this resolution and to say that we have very strong bipartisan opposition to this resolution. Frankly, I don't know why we are doing this, because we settled this issue when we had the debate on the floor earlier in June. This is a sense of the Congress, and there is no requirement that the conference committee pay any attention to this, so I don't quite understand why we are going through this process; but in any event, we are here.

We have a sugar policy that supports $20 billion in economic activity and 142,000 jobs. The reason we have it is that every country in the world that produces sugar subsidizes those industries or supports them, in most cases substantially more than does the United States. So if we change this program or give up what we have put together here, what you are going to do is give this industry away to countries that subsidize and support their industries more than we are doing here in the United States. I don't know why we would want to do that, but that would be the effect of this.

The Government of Mexico owns 20 percent of the industry in its country; and with NAFTA, we gave Mexico open access to our market. This is in spite of the fact that they own the industry down there. President Reagan once said that unilateral disarmament has never worked, that it only encourages aggressors. Reagan had it right. So whether it is defense policy or economic policy, you don't give something away for nothing to people who are doing more than what our opponents claim we are doing.

The United States is the largest sugar importer in the world. We bring in 1.5 million tons of sugar from 40 countries. Nobody else does that. This is sugar we could make here in the United States, but we gave away 15 percent of our market to help other countries. We have been doing that for a long time, and we have had pretty good prices. All of a sudden, because Mexico had a good crop, I guess, the prices have collapsed. If you think that the loan rate—the bottom price that we have in the sugar program—is giving us some kind of a profit or some kind of a ''fat cat'' deal, I invite you to come up to American Crystal's annual meeting in December in my area and in Representative CRAMER's area, at which they are going to be reporting that they have lost money this year because the sugar prices are at loan rates. So the loan rates that are in the bill are not guaranteeing anybody a profit. They are just putting a floor under it, trying to keep us in business until next year.

There is no good reason to be doing this. We settled this issue before. The reason for the April 1 date is that, in the past, the USDA has made mistakes in terms of where we were with the market. So by having an April 1 date, we can make it less likely that these mistakes are going to happen in the future. That is the main reason that we have got it in there.

The sugar program has operated at no cost for a long time. During that time, the opponents claim that the prices were too high. Now the prices have collapsed, and they are saying the safety net costs too much. So they are still complaining about the prices being too high. I will guarantee you that you could get the price down to almost nothing, and it wouldn't change the price that people charge for candy bars. You could probably give it away, and they wouldn't lower the price.

This has been a good policy. It keeps sugar stable. There was a time in this country when we got rid of the sugar program. What happened? We had prices go up to 50 cents a pound, and we had the candy companies and the sugar users come in and ask for the government program to be put back in place so they could get the prices down to a more affordable level. I will guarantee you, if you get rid of the sugar policy, what you are going to have is a feast or famine situation. You might have low prices for a while, but you are going to have a time when high prices are going to do a lot more harm to you than this sugar program does.

This is a bad idea. It doesn't need to be done, as we have already settled this issue. I ask my colleagues to reject this for any number of reasons.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, DANNY DAVIS, the cochair of the Sugar Reform Caucus.

□ 1645

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased to work in a very bipartisan way with Representatives PITTS, GOODLATTE, BLUMENAUER, and others as we have shaped H. Res. 378.

The domestic sugar program is an outdated system of strict government controls that cost consumers $4 billion a year in higher prices. Historically, the sugar program not only hurts consumers but it also costs us jobs. High sugar prices were responsible for the loss of 112,000 jobs in sugar-using industries in the last decade. While growers of all commodities, including those for cotton, rice, peanuts, corn, soybeans, and wheat, have seen their benefits cut and their programs reformed, for some inexplicable reason sugar growers and processors continue to get a free ride and keep their program without any reform.

No other crop has a program like sugar, which restricts both domestic production and imports. Peanut and tobacco growers once had a quota that limited production, but Congress reformed those programs a long time ago.

Now we are only left with the sugar program, where it remains permanently in the 2013 farm bill to continue to cause higher consumer prices for food products containing sugar. This program is designed to benefit a few at a tremendous cost to many. Our current sugar policy offloads the program's cost onto consumers and food companies, entices U.S. companies to relocate overseas, destroys U.S. jobs, and limits export market opportunities for the rest of the economy.

It is time for Congress to finally reform this relic of a program of the past and put an end to sugar's special status. We can now correct a specific aspect of the 2013 farm bill by supporting H. Res. 378.

The 2008 farm bill directs the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to manage the overall U.S. sugar supply, including imports, so that market prices on average can stay higher in the United States compared to the overall world price of sugar. We need to eliminate this same provision in the 2013 farm bill that would limit the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to allow sufficient sugar imports into the country so that consumers can pay their prices.

All that we are asking is to give the Secretary of Agriculture some flexibility to adjust.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the relevant subcommittee in the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment for a number of reasons.

First of all, we have already voted on the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment provisions during the farm bill, and the House voted to reject it. I am not sure why we are here again today to retread all of these issues. Even if this resolution were to pass—which hopefully it doesn't—I hope our Members remember how they voted in July and understand why they voted the way they did in July and stick with that this week. But because the provisions in both bills in the House and Senate are the same this has even less effect than for the conferees to ignore it.

Our trade laws allow a lot of sugar to be imported in this country. We can and do grant extra access above and beyond the commitments if, in fact, we do need more.

But the farm bill simply says, let's wait to see how much Mexico is going to send us before we grant others extra access. Remember that Mexico has 100 percent access to our market. They heavily subsidize their sugar, and the Mexican government owns 20 percent of that industry.

The Pitts resolution would ignore market forecasts and start granting extra access to Mexico and other countries right off the bat before the growing season. Mr. Speaker, that is reckless. The effect of this would glut our market with foreign subsidized sugar, depress our prices, and make it impossible for our farmers to repay our loans, resulting in forfeitures and additional taxpayer costs that shouldn't be there. How good is that for taxpayers?

Sugar farmers are currently experiencing a 57 percent drop in sugar prices. I would argue that not one consumer in this America has benefited from that drop. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle argue that sugar costs way too much money. Yet with a 57 percent drop, where are those savings going to those consumers that you

want to protect? Where are those reduced soda prices? Where are those reduced candy bar prices? It is nowhere to be seen.

I would argue that the policy works when prices are high, at above the levels. There is no cost to taxpayers. Then when prices are depressed, like they are now because of extra access from rural markets which are all subsidized, then prices are depressed and the safety net steps in. You either have a safety net or you don't. The argument that this one was not adjusted in this farm bill is specious on its face.

Simply to say we change it for the sake of change makes no sense. If there is a legitimate change that you want, fine. But that is not what these folks are proposing. They are saying change it just because everybody else got changed. This program worked for 10 years without any cost to the taxpayer directly, and it would continue to work that way going into the future.

They picked a great year to pick this price because prices are down. The safety net is supposed to kick in. I would argue that we need to maintain the sugar program because it works for American sugar producers.

Confectioners cannot argue that prices in Canada are less. Prices in Canada right now are 29 cents a pound. So where are all those jobs coming back to the United States because sugar in America is 26 cents a pound? Where are the jobs that went to Mexico because sugar was cheaper there? Oh, it is not cheaper; it is 28 cents a pound there. Where are all those jobs coming back?

You cannot argue with a straight face that sugar prices drive all those jobs out of this country.

Reject the Pitts amendment, and let's move forward with a farm bill that we can make for American farmers.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois for their leadership on this issue.

A few months ago, we offered a reform amendment to the House farm bill that would have saved taxpayers money, kept American jobs at home, and ended special treatment to one farm commodity at the expense of all others.

This farm bill makes major policy changes that leave no commodity untouched, except one. The farm bill makes absolutely no change to the sugar program. In fact, the sugar program wasn't even given the scrutiny of a hearing as the Ag Committee was constructing the current farm bill.

Since 2008, manufacturers across the country have been struggling to run their operations due to the uncertainty created by the sugar program. In fact, for every job that proponents of this horrendous policy claim is maintained by the current sugar program, the Commerce Department estimates that the sugar program eliminated three jobs in food manufacturing.

Although I wish we could be here debating even greater reform, what we are debating today is quite modest.

This motion to instruct simply restores to the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility to manage sugar imports, an authority the Secretary had prior to the 2008 farm bill. To be clear, this language will not allow a pound—a pound—more sugar to enter the U.S. unless the Secretary authorizes that it can come in upon a finding that is needed.

Many of you may be wondering why we are discussing sugar again. Since the House last debated the farm bill, the negative effects of the sugar program have only gotten worse. While proponents of the current sugar program claim it is ''no cost,'' nothing could be further from the truth. The sugar program has cost American taxpayers more than $250 million since July.

To put this in perspective, in less than 3 months this broken policy has cost American taxpayers $250 million, which is almost as much as the amount of money available for an entire year for The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, the USDA program that purchases commodities for food banks. It is nearly $50 million more than the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for our Nation's senior citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Comedian Jay Leno recently joked—"The Department of Agriculture wants to use our tax money to buy 400,000 tons of sugar to limit supply and boost prices so sugar producers can pay back government loans that they could default on. You follow me here on this? We loaned them money and now we're giving them more money so they can pay back our loan. You still wonder why we're 16 trillion dollars in debt?"

Sadly, this is no longer a joke. This is the reality of the sugar program and it is the American taxpayer who is saddled with the cost of this program.

Since this government shutdown began we have been intensely debating the spending priorities for our country. I don't know how we can justify this horrendous program at all!

While I wish we were able to go further in reforming the sugar program, today we have the opportunity to return a small bit of sanity to the program

Please join me in supporting the Pitts sugar reform resolution to restore common sense to America's sugar policy.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that for the 12 years before July there has been no cost at all, and the food stamp part of the farm bill had no hearings either.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am here today on behalf of our farmers in Minnesota and the midwest.

My State is number one in sugar beet production. That means my State's economy and the State's rural economy take a direct hit because of this resolution. This resolution hurts our farmers, small businesses, hospitals, schools, the lives of real people in rural communities.

American-grown sugar creates more than 142,000 jobs in 22 States and nearly $20 billion in annual economic activity. We have farmers in the beet fields right now finishing up harvesting. This resolution sends a message that this House wants to shut down sugar production, which will shut down jobs here at home.

But some jobs will be created—in Brazil. Let's defend U.S. jobs, defeat this resolution, and stand with sugar beet farmers in Minnesota and across the United States.

The Republican majority has shut down the Federal Government. I am not going to stand by and shut down the sugar program. So let's protect U.S. communities and U.S. jobs and vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, JACKIE SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of uncomfortable being on this side of the aisle, but it is also, I guess, a recognition that this is truly a bipartisan effort, and I am really thrilled to be joining in it.

Imagine that when the farm bill was debated here, every single commodity program in the farm bill was amended, was reformed, with the exception of sugar. Now, why would that happen? Well, maybe it is because of some sweet-talking sugar lobbyists that made that happen.

But nonetheless, let's be clear about what this resolution doesn't do. It does not undermine the sugar program in this country. The sugar program that exists in terms of price support remains, the domestic marketing allotment for sugar remains, and it does not eliminate sugar import quotas.

What does it do? It basically says that the Secretary of Agriculture can make sure during the entire year, and not just 6 months, that the market supply is appropriate.

What do we know about research that has been done on the cost to consumers? It is said to cost consumers $3.5 billion. Now, this figure doesn't come from the candy manufacturers; this figure comes from a number of studies by the Government Accountability Office, by OECD, by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Now, what has happened since July? Since July, the taxpayers of this country have spent $250 million because they are guaranteed as sugar producers to 17 cents per pound. When they couldn't get 17 cents per pound, the U.S. had to buy the sugar and then try to sell it to ethanol producers.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to reform the system.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our current U.S. sugar policy maintains that sugar will not become a solely foreign-grown product for the United States. When we weaken our sugar and our sugar growers, it hurts America but it helps Brazil, it helps Mexico—the biggest competitors for the United States.

Brazil's yearly $2.5 billion subsidy has led them to controlling 50 percent of the global sugar exports.

Mexico has already unlimited access to the United States. And who is the biggest sugar producer and exporter in Mexico? The Mexican government. Mexico owns and operates 20 percent of the Mexican sugar industry. On top of that, Mexico already owes Texas 300,000 acre feet of water out of the Rio Grande. It is improperly taking that water out of the Rio Grande River—water that should go to Texas sugar growers, but it is not.

House Resolution 378 will weaken the U.S. sugar industry, giving advantage to Mexico and Brazil. By allowing more foreign sugar into the United States we create unnecessary and hurtful competition. We prefer, if we pass this legislation, foreign farmers over American farmers.

□ 1700

Weakening our sugar program is not reform; it is crippling. It is crippling to the United States market, to the 140,000 sugar industry jobs. Once again, it only leaves us dependent on other countries for our sugar.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to become dependent on foreign countries for our energy; it is another thing if we start moving into the area of becoming dependent on foreign countries for what we eat. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), a leader in sugar reform.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about this issue, as are many of my colleagues. I strongly support this resolution by Messrs. PITTS, DAVIS, GOODLATTE, and others for a whole host of reasons, but let's be very clear about a few things here.

This country consumes more sugar than it produces. We must import sugar, whether we like it or not. We also have to deal with some other very basic facts.

I listened with intensity to the gentleman from Minnesota, a good friend, who talked about American Crystal losing money. Well, the answer is not to bail them out with our tax dollars. We have seen enough of that around here. It is time to stop those types of unnecessary bailouts.

We also heard my good friend from Texas, who, I was relieved today, did not complain about sugar companies making money or confectioners making money, as if profits are something that is evil. We want these companies to make money. We have had 4 years of high sugar prices, and that simply incentivizes more Mexican imports. It provides more incentives for those imports.

But let's look at the numbers. The current program is a remnant of the Depression era. It puts 600,000 American jobs in the food industry at risk. Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industries that use sugar in their operations. And, yes, Hershey is located in my district.

The current sugar program hits American consumers and businesses with $3.5 billion of extra costs every year. The CBO projects that the Sugar-to-Ethanol Program, known as the Feedstock Flexibility Program, will cost taxpayers $239 million over the next several years, including $51 million this year alone. Some analysts project costs of up to $100 million this year and $250 million over the next 2 years combined.

When sugar prices drop below a certain level, the Federal Government buys that sugar and then sells it at a loss to the ethanol producers. The taxpayers are abused twice. When is enough enough? It is unacceptable and wrong to call on the American people to support the current sugar program, not only with their hard-earned consumer dollars, but with their tax dollars as well.

Yes, we are having debates around this place right now about the government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The point is we need to get on with this. Let's protect the American people, show them we can do our jobs. I ask my colleagues to reform, not repeal, the current sugar program, but reform it. Let's save the American consumers money in the midst of this tough economy. Let's show the American people we can act responsibly on their behalf.

I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to correct the RECORD. We do not need to import. The farmers in my district could easily produce that 15 percent. We gave those markets to these countries out of the goodness of our heart.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the ranking member, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. Again, it is nothing but an attack on thousands of family farms in this country and in my district.

If it were the sense of Congress that it was right to end the successful sugar program, the House would have done that last June. Instead, we did the opposite. We defeated this same attack, clearly indicating that this program should be preserved.

The district that I represent is home to Michigan Sugar. And I hear these references—I heard them on the floor earlier, and I just saw it again—to Big Sugar. These are family farms that have banded together in cooperatives. You can call that Big Sugar if you want. It is a term I suppose that is intended to elicit certain thoughts about who these farmers are. That is a shame. These are family farmers who work hard every day and are forced to be in competition with multinational corporations.

We talk about the price of sugar. The price of sugar in a candy bar in 1985, there was 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar and it cost 35 cents. Today, that same candy bar is $1.39, and there is 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar.

Let's deal with the facts here. This is a struggle between companies that want to marginally increase their profit because not enough profits are going to these companies. They are among the highest, most profitable companies in the country, and they should be. That is good. But when is enough enough? Why is it that the family farmers are always the ones that are asked to give more, to potentially risk their livelihood, generations of livelihood?

This is wrong. It was wrong when we defeated it in June, and it is wrong again today.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another leader in sugar reform in our Nation.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I don't want to get into the crosshairs of my friend from Minnesota, and if I had sugar beet farmers in my district, I suppose I might have a different position; but I would like to talk about jobs because that is why I support restoring the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to keep sugar prices at a reasonable level year-round, not just during the arbitrary 6-month period dictated by the 2008 farm bill.

Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industry that use sugar in the products they make, while employment actually rose in food industry segments that don't use sugar. Today, there are an estimated 600,000 Americans directly employed in the food manufacturing industry. It is an enormously important industry. The U.S. Department of Commerce says that for every one sugar production job saved, our current sugar program eliminates three jobs in food manufacturing. That is a loss of manufacturing jobs at a rate of 100,000 per year.

And the fiscal impacts of our sugar policies are just as disturbing. Since this issue was debated on the House floor only 6 weeks ago, the sugar program has cost the taxpayer $90 million. And I am informed that the total cost to the taxpayer this year alone will exceed $150 million. The Congressional Budget Office projects another $239 million in the outyears of the bill.

We don't need to be hitting up the taxpayer for this money. We can make modest reforms to U.S. sugar policy while still leaving a safety net in place for U.S. sugar farmers and processors. This motion strikes the right balance. It is modest and commonsense policy. It is scaled back to include just one of the reforms that the House considered 2 months ago.

Madam Speaker, I think this should be supported. It is a modest, important reform. I think it is appropriate in light of the context of our farm policy. We are making reforms in other areas, and this is one area where we really do need to reform on behalf of the American consumer and on behalf of the need for more manufacturing jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of things today. We have heard from those of us who think that it is a good program, that it has been efficient, and that it hasn't cost the taxpayers money for the last 10 years; and we have heard from the other side that it is not efficient. We have heard conflicting numbers of jobs, about potentially what jobs may have been lost. But what is not debatable are the jobs that are created by the sugar industry, including 142,000 nationally and 12,000 jobs just in Florida alone.

We are going to continue to hear conflicting sides here, but let me tell you what is not really debatable. What is not really debatable is that this is an industry that, around the entire planet, is subsidized. And what we are talking about here is a unilateral disarmament of the U.S. industry that creates, again, 142,000 jobs.

I keep hearing, also, the fact that consumers here are struggling. Wait a second. Sugar here for consumers is among the lowest prices on the entire planet.

And then I have heard, again, that it is affecting the food manufacturing industry. By the way, now we are getting to the real substance of the issue. But let's ask the question: prices of sugar have dropped dramatically this year. Have you seen a dramatic shift, the lowering of prices in the food manufacturing industry? By the way, let me not get that dramatic. Have you seen a dramatic lowering of prices of diet sodas versus ones that contain sugar? No.

Look, if that was the case, if the price reductions were going to be passed on to the consumers, then you would see, obviously, products that don't contain sugar would be a lot less expensive than the ones that do contain sugar.

Again, we are going to hear a lot of conflicting issues, but let's not forget the basic principle here: We have thousands of jobs that depend on this industry, including in Florida. We have, again, some large manufacturers that want lower prices, and I don't blame them. But please don't say they are going to pass them on to the consumer, because they never have. Just look at the price of Diet Coke versus regular Coke.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I spoke earlier on the floor today, and I think it is wonderful that we are having this great debate in this great Chamber. Obviously, this is a bipartisan issue, and I am so glad that some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have joined me in this great debate for sugar reform.

I represent the great Third District of Tennessee, and I have spent a lot of time in my district in manufacturing plants where I believe, and I would argue, that we manufacture the best baked goods in the country, some of the finest candies in the country, and we distribute these goods all over our great Nation. We use sugar. We use a lot of sugar.

But as we have been involved in this great debate and since the last time on the farm bill, I have noticed a couple of things. It is just not working. Since we had that last vote, it has cost the American taxpayer over $250 million. In addition to that, I have made a commitment to the workers in these plants that I am going to fight hard to keep their jobs in the United States of America, in particular in the great Third District of Tennessee. In order to do that, we have to stop this madness. This is not a radical change to sugar reform. It is a modest proposal that allows the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion to help the American consumer against skyrocketing costs and potential skyrocketing costs in the price of sugar.

Let's face it; sugar is a commodity, plain and simple. And if you use it and the price goes up, and if it is kept artificially high, it drives the price up and you become uncompetitive. I believe in the free market. I fervently argue for the free market, but the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment does a couple of things. It protects American consumers; it protects American jobs; and it is the right side of the argument for good, free-market Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to put all this in perspective. U.S. sugar policy from the 2008 farm bill has been very, very successful. As a matter of fact, the committees of jurisdiction both on the House and Senate side decided not to alter the sugar provisions in the 2013 farm bills passed by both the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, this has been argued, as we have heard, again and again. This amendment and amendments similar to this have been rejected each time.

This would be a very damaging amendment at a time when American farmers are already hurting. This is exactly the inappropriate time to go after American jobs. These guys would end up going bankrupt, and I don't think you want to sacrifice existing American jobs with the hope that some new jobs might be created.

The other thing that is missing here is the acknowledgment that the Secretary of Agriculture already has the authority to increase U.S. sugar imports if there is an emergency. So why do we need this instruction? I don't get it.

The other point, if we are going to get back to some semblance of regular order in the conference process, since the House and Senate farm bills are identical here, this should not even be conferenceable at the end of the day. I think it is out of order and inappropriate.

Right now, Mexico, as has been stated, is well subsidized. Twenty percent of their production is outright subsidized, owned by their government, is driving sugar prices in the tank for Americans. That is not right. This should be WTO conferenceable at the end of the day.

This is the wrong time to go about trying to end a policy that has worked great for the last 12 years and finally is paying off for those sugar producers, sugar farmers, and all the sugar beet seed growers in my district that need a little help in this tough, tough time. I think if you are in favor of supporting a good balance of trade, supporting American agriculture, supporting the American taxpayer, at the end of the day, you do not want to vote in favor of Pitts amendment. I urge its defeat.

□ 1715

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Pitts amendment on the House resolution on the farm bill.

The sugar program included in the 2008 farm bill that became permanent in the 2013 House farm bill, contains a harmful restraint on trade and sugar between the 6 months of October and April, which makes it so that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot allow an increase in sugar imports, even if the marketplace needs it.

This detrimental restriction led to record-high prices for both the sugar producers and consumers alike. The higher costs resulted in many manufacturing companies, some are located in my district, struggling or having to even shut down because they are unable to sustain these high costs, killing good manufacturing jobs in the process.

This resolution ensures that the U.S. will not be forced to face higher sugar prices that are two times the world

price because of an erroneous restriction in the current law. These high sugar prices have unfairly cost consumers $3.5 billion a year.

Simply, the U.S. should be able to control these costs and adjust accordingly so that we do not impose unjust costs upon our consumers, especially in these economically trying times.

The bottom line is this: the problem is not Mexico. The problem is an outdated anti-taxpayer, anti-consumer, anti-business sugar-reform program. The Pitts resolution will help restore some balance to the program and remove artificial pressure from the current government intrusion into the marketplace, which is what we are looking for here.

What will the Pitts resolution do? It will help fix our broken sugar program by, one, allowing sugar farmers to retain their commodity program; two, to help ensure taxpayers will be less likely to have to pick up the tab for this program; and, three, help to ensure that hundreds of thousands of good manufacturing jobs and sugar industries will be less threatened.

I urge support of the Pitts resolution. It is a commonsense approach.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I oppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania's resolution, H. Res. 378.

Sugar is the only commodity where the U.S. is a net importer. This puts U.S. producers at a disadvantage. Our sugar farmers have to compete with sugar-producing governments and countries that heavily subsidize their farmers' production. Yes, this year this program did cost our government, but it is because Mexico is allowed to dump their sugar on our market because of NAFTA. This is a trade issue that we need to look at deeper.

U.S. farmers would gladly give up their safety net as long as every other country discontinued their heavily subsidized programs as well. U.S. sugar farmers can compete with any other foreign sugar farmer and we can outperform them, but they can't compete against a foreign government and subsidies. At the end of the day, this is a jobs issue. There are over 142,000 jobs in the domestic sugar industry, with over 12,000 in Florida alone. Many of these jobs would move to Brazil or Mexico if the intent of this resolution becomes law. There again, another industry would be weakened by our government policies.

We in government should work to keep America stronger and more competitive, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 378.

The current U.S. sugar program is uncompetitive, outdated, it stunts American job creation, harms U.S. confectioners, and forces food manufacturers and families to pay a higher cost for any product made with sugar. Recent data suggests that without reform, the program puts 600,000 jobs in the sugar-using industries at risk. I am all too aware of these negative economic impacts during a recent visit to a leading confectioner in my district.

Headquartered in Bryan, Ohio, Spangler Candy Company is a family-owned business that has been providing consumers with Dum Dums, Saf-T-Pops, Circus Peanuts, candy canes, and other confections since 1906. This company currently has over 400 U.S. employees; but if it could purchase sugar at world-market prices instead of U.S. prices, that number would be closer to 600. That's a difference of 200 highly skilled manufacturing jobs in a single small midwestern town. Imagine the positive economic growth that would result from sugar reform nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. Reforming the U.S. sugar program will restore fairness in the sugar market, encourage U.S. investment, and spur job creation in our local communities.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, listening to the debate here this afternoon, I am reminded of a statement from an old University of Minnesota law professor who once said that ''all political decisions revolve around who you're for.'' And I've heard both sides of this issue castigating one side or the other; but it becomes rather clear, as you listen to this debate, that the supporters of this resolution are in support of those multinational corporations and foreign corporations and foreign governments that stand to benefit from a change in our U.S. sugar policy.

On the other side, the side that I choose to stand with, we have the producers such as the cane growers, the beet growers who put their crops in the field at risk every year, the men and women who work in the fields, who work in the plants processing sugar, and the consumers who benefit from a stable supply of reasonably priced sugar to satisfy our food needs here in this country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge that we defeat this resolution and stick with the sugar program that has worked so well in this country for so long. In Minnesota alone, we have 32,500 people working in that industry. There are 142,000 people working throughout the country in this industry.

Madam Speaker, this was a jobs bill. This was an American manufacturing and production bill. Let's defeat this resolution. Let's support the farmers. Let's support the workers. Let's support the consumers. Let's defeat this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I ask for support of my colleagues on a resolution in support of making a simple correction to the House-passed farm bill during the conference with the Senate.

The 2008 farm bill overreached in limiting the USDA's ability to allow sugar imports if there is a shortage in domestic supply. This misguided policy has resulted in extreme shortages and now surpluses, adding unnecessary volatility to the marketplace and creating uncertainty for our manufacturers. Because of these policies, we have been losing food manufacturing jobs at the rate of almost 10,000 per year. We cannot afford these job losses.

The district I represent in Illinois is home to a number of food manufacturers, including Jelly Belly, TruSweets Confectionery, Cornfields, Ford Gum, and Long Grove Confectionery. These companies employ hundreds of people and support hundreds of families in the 10th District. These are economic drivers of our community.

In addition to costing our manufacturers and workers, this policy is costing taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Since July, this policy is estimated to have cost more than $250 million. Keep in mind that we were told this program would operate at zero cost.

The reform called for by this resolution would make a modest change to U.S. sugar policy while still maintaining a safety net for U.S. sugar farmers and processors.

Please join me in supporting this commonsense resolution. Express support for this reasonable reform.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), my good friend and the clean-up hitter on our side.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my neighbor for yielding the time and for his leadership on this very important issue that supports the sugar farmers of the Red River Valley of the north, and I am very pleased to confirm that there is, in fact, plenty of room for all of our colleagues to attend American Crystal Sugar's annual meeting; so I appreciate his invitation, as well.

How many Federal programs only cost money every 10 to 12 years? We hear that this program has cost $250 million since July. Yeah, since July of 2002. That's all it has cost.

I want to speak less, perhaps, to the merits of the program because they have already been so eloquently illustrated and speak more to an issue of unity. At a time when unity is so rare, it is unfortunate that some of our colleagues have chosen to attempt to dismantle one of the very few, frankly,

successful achievements of this Congress.

The committee work on the 2013 farm bill began years ago before many of us were even elected to Congress. An anti-sugar amendment was thoughtfully debated on this floor, including the provisions in this resolution, and the House killed it. At that time, a sense of the House was reached and a farm bill was passed.

The Senate passed the exact same language pertaining to the sugar program that is making today's action not only divisive, but a total waste of time, as House rules prohibit the conferees from even considering its language. This maneuver undermines the very integrity of this great institution, and it ignores the unifying achievement of this farm bill by dismantling the support system for our sugar farmers who are facing a 57 percent collapse in prices as we speak.

We don't need more division, Madam Speaker. We need accomplishments. Let's not impose division where there is unity. Let's vote ''no'' on this amendment. Let's allow our conferees to do their jobs, bring back a report that a majority of us can vote for and a farm bill that we can all vote for, that the Senate can agree to, that the President can sign, and demonstrate our functionality once again.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 378.

The current sugar policy in this country is outdated and this year will cost American taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars. It is time for us to recognize that there is a global supply of sugar that American manufacturers need to be able to access, and the world price for sugar futures consistently trades lower than domestic futures. If it weren't bad enough that our policy causes food prices to be artificially high, this year taxpayers will pick up the bill to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars when the USDA purchases the excess supply. We will be converting our excess sugar into ethanol to support an industry which does not need any more taxpayer help. In fact, that is another discussion for another day of bad policy.

At a time when we are all taking a hard look at every dollar we spend, we need to take a hard look at this sugar program. Every Member of Congress should ask themselves: Is this the best way we can use limited taxpayer dollars?

Taxpayers are paying for the current sugar program when they write their checks to the IRS, and they are paying for it when they write their checks to the local grocery store. We need to support this resolution, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

□ 1730

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the importance of this resolution.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent a decade working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington; and during that time, it was my job to go and meet with employers and find out how to keep jobs and try to grow jobs in our area.

One of the first meetings I had was with a company called Brown and Haley, a confectioner that has been producing the legendary and, if I might add, delicious Almond Roca since 1923. In discussing the economic challenges facing that company, the number one issue that they raised was the competitive disadvantage they faced from the high cost of sugar.

We are a northern border State. From where I grew up, on a clear day you could see Canada. For a region that is struggling to grow jobs and keep jobs, the threat of businesses in my district moving across the border isn't a theoretical policy conversation; it is a real threat.

The current program puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk in all 50 States. Since the 2008 farm bill, the U.S. cost of sugar has skyrocketed to almost two times the world price. That price increase is passed directly on to our confectioners, who have to make tough operating adjustments to sustain their business.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KILMER. Our neighbors realize how expensive U.S. sugar is and how high the prices are; and in the case of Brown and Haley in my district, those north of the border have already explicitly approached and advertised the cheaper sugar prices across the border.

This current sugar program doesn't just affect large corporations. It impacts small family-owned businesses like Brown and Haley in Tacoma, Washington, that have been in our communities for generations. So I ask for support for this resolution to help American small businesses and American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues this afternoon to support this resolution, to further reform a harmful and unnecessary sugar program that puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk.

Back home in Indiana's Third Congressional District, companies like Aunt Millie's, small candy maker Plyleys Candies in Lagrange, Indiana, and Edy's Ice Cream in Fort Wayne are forced to pay artificially inflated prices, thanks to Washington's top-down control. This kind of price-fixing should be a bygone relic of the Soviet era and has no place in free-market policies. Today we have an opportunity to make commonsense reforms to help protect these jobs.

I would also like to urge this body to protect the victory for limited government when the House split the farm bill and ended the unholy alliance between food stamps and agricultural policy. These policies are completely different and must be considered separately, just like we are doing now in debating sugar policy.

For the first time in 40 years, we gave taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends their money. We took a commonsense approach and considered food stamp policy and traditional ag policy separately.

Today the House sent to conference a bill that keeps these policies separate. We can make sure that, going forward, we keep our commitment to transparency and limited government.

I urge the conference committee to adopt this resolution, protect these jobs, and keep food and farm policies separate.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would just reiterate that we, in sugar-producing areas, we, who are in the sugar production business, would happily give up the sugar program if everybody else in the world gave up their sugar programs. That is the problem; and as I said in my opening statement, as President Reagan said, when you unilaterally disarm, you are asking for trouble.

We are bringing in 15 percent of our market in imports that we don't need to do. We could easily produce that in the United States.

So I would say to these other countries, you give up all of your support for your sugar industry, you bring in 15 percent in Brazil and Thailand and these other big sugar-producing areas, and we would be happy to compete because we will run them out of business.

The problem is, that is not the real world. So if you want to maintain these jobs and this industry in the country, the way to do it is with this current program. That is why it was put in in '08. That is why it was supported on both sides, in both the House and the Senate in 2013. And it works.

One of the speakers had said that we have these high consumer prices in the United States. That is not true. We have the cheapest, most affordable, most abundant, and safest food supply in the world in the United States, including sugar. And one of the reasons is because of the policies we have in place. One of those policies is the sugar policy.

So I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this resolution. As it was

stated, it is unnecessary. It is not something that is going to be considered by the conference committee anyway. I don't know why we are doing it, but it should be defeated in spite of that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, in conclusion, again, this is reform. It is not a repeal of the sugar program. It is a very modest reform, simply going back to what the Secretary had before 2008 with the ability, the flexibility to allow sugar imports, when necessary, to meet domestic demand.

It allows sugar farmers to retain their price supports. It helps save American taxpayers and consumers money, about $3.5 billion per year. It helps protect hundreds of thousands of good American manufacturing jobs. It does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar, and it reduces market manipulation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Madam 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should—

(1) agree to provisions relating to a limitation on premium subsidy based on average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000;

(2) agree to provisions relating to a requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation, as specified in paragraph (1); and

(3) not agree to provisions relating to a delayed effective date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 379.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman LUCAS for his work on passing a farm bill through the House. It was not an easy task.

And the farm bill got a lot right, in my judgment. It eliminated direct payments. It made reforms to the food stamp program, which are in desperate need of reform. It consolidated duplicative programs, and the Agriculture Committee has started to implement very needed reforms of these programs. Unfortunately, I don't think it went far enough, which is why I am offering this sense of the House.

I think that we should accept what the Senate did—and they did it in a bipartisan fashion—to impose limits on premium subsidies going toward the wealthiest of farmers.

What this sense of the House does is it simply says, let's agree to the Coburn-Durbin amendment which said, for those making above $750,000, the sense of the Congress is that their premiums for crop insurance should not be as generous as everybody else's. In fact, their premiums should be subsidized by 15 percentage points. This is hardly draconian. In fact, I would support going much farther than this, as I have voted consistently in the past.

But what this says is, if you are a farmer and you make more than $750,000, all you will get is a crop insurance subsidy that is not as generous as everybody else's. It will be 15 percentage points less.

Let me give you an example. If you have protection for 50 percent of your yield, right now the Federal Government will subsidize 67 percent of that. Under this, if you make over $750,000, you would be subsidized by 52 percent of your crop insurance. Hardly draconian.

So what we are simply saying is, we had a vote that was 59–33 in the Senate to limit the subsidy for crop insurance for very wealthy farmers. That is 1 percent of all of our agricultural producers in the country, and what we should do is concede to that. We should agree with that in conference, and that is what the sense of this House resolution encourages.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

First, I would note, again, to my colleagues that this is one of the final stages of this long, challenging process of putting a comprehensive farm bill together.

With the conclusion of this debate on this sense of the Congress resolution and the votes that I suspect will come sometime later today or tomorrow, we will begin then with the appointment of conferees, the formal process of working out the differences between House and Senate bills. That is no small accomplishment, considering how many years Ranking Member PETERSON and I and the members of the House Agriculture Committee have put into this effort. As a matter of fact, when we started the process of gathering information and putting the hearing record together, I was the ranking member, and Mr. PETERSON was the chairman. So this has been a long, long process.

Now, I must say that I am obligated to rise in opposition to the resolution. I think the world of the author of this amendment, and in his role as chairman of the House Budget Committee, not only is he well-intentioned in this amendment and his many other efforts, but let's be honest, our friend has a tremendous amount of work on his plate, addressing everything from the issues about how we work our way out of this debt ceiling matter, how we address funding the Federal Government, how we finally put a budget resolution together. I know he is a busy, busy man; but I must say the committee focused very hard for literally years on all of these issues.

I won't pretend that with all of the things going on right now, not that many weeks after some very intense debate on the floor of this House, the goodly number of our Members are not focused on particular nuances of the farm bill, but on everything else going on.

But I would remind my good friends, the perspective of the House Ag Committee and the perspective of the majority—yes, maybe I have had too much fun with farm bills in recent years—of this process has led us to believe that it was important that we encourage participation in crop insurance. Crop insurance is like other insurance. It is about creating a pool of risk and spreading it out as far as you possibly can, having as many participants as you possibly can to share adversity, to contribute more premiums into that pool so that when you have that inevitable loss somewhere, you are better able to address it. And that is the perspective the committee took and I believe the House, as a whole, took. Get as many people involved in

utilizing and expanding the insurance pool as is possible.

Now, this sense of the Congress language is, in many ways, similar to the Senate language and would restrict the number of people based on AGI that would be able to participate, taking people out of the pool, shrinking the pool. These are, in all fairness, some of the most efficient farmers.

I will just simply ask my colleagues, remember the work of the committee and the work of this body. Help us keep this program as viable as possible.

□ 1745

Help us make sure that all farmers have the tools to mitigate their risk.

Now, there is one other perspective here, and we have talked about this many times, and it is the perspective of, what is the farm bill about? Is it about raising food and fiber? Is it about meeting the nutritional needs of our citizens in this country and having our surplus available to consumers around the rest of the world?

Or is it about deciding who a farmer should be, and using policy decisions within the farm bill to pick people who we want to farm, and to deny resources to people we don't happen to like who want to farm also?

I reject that also. Farm bills are about farming, raising food and fiber, meeting the needs.

I would ask again, very respectfully, of my colleagues, honor the decisions of the full House not all that long ago. Reject this sense of the House resolution.

Remember that you are helping us build on something that is kind of amazing in this session of Congress, a bill that came out of committee with $40 billion in mandatory spending reform, with a bipartisan vote, a bill that left the United States House with a total of $60 billion in mandatory spending reforms.

I can think of no other committee in this session of Congress that can lay claim to that—$60 billion in mandatory reform.

Let us go to conference. Let us have as much flexibility as possible. Let us finish our work. Let us finish our good work, and we will bring a product back to you from conference that you can judge on its merits.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this issue and so many others and for allowing me to join him on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, under our current system, every farmer buying crop insurance gets a subsidy. The question is, How big should that subsidy be? Should all farmers receive a 62 percent crop insurance subsidy or more? Or should 1 percent of the most successful folks in agriculture receive a 47 or a 48 percent subsidy, which is exactly what this resolution would do?

While I support many of the reforms found in the House versions of our farm bill, unfortunately, no provision has been included which would limit crop insurance subsidies, and this resolution rectifies that glaring oversight.

This commonsense resolution will save the taxpayers nearly $1 billion by instructing conferees to implement an economic test for those farmers with adjusted gross incomes over $750,000. Those with incomes which exceed $750,000 will see their crop insurance premium subsidy reduced by 15 percentage points.

We all understand and recognize the need for having a safety net in place for our Nation's farmers. This resolution does nothing, nothing, to undermine that safety net.

We all know the need for serious reforms also to our crop insurance programs. Last year, it cost more than $14 billion, and without reforms, it is projected to be more than twice as expensive as the conventional commodity subsidy programs over the next decade.

So agreeing to this resolution would put into place the same provisions put forward as were mentioned in the Coburn-Durbin amendment in the Senate. That passed the Senate with significant bipartisan support earlier this past summer.

Currently, Madam Speaker, 4 percent of farmers receive 33 percent of the benefits of crop insurance. A stunning 73 percent of subsidy dollars goes to the top 20 percent of agribusinesses. That just doesn't make sense.

In a time of fiscal challenge, programs like crop insurance need serious modifications, and this is a step in the right direction. Though an incremental step, and a small one at that, it is, indeed, a step in the right direction.

Also, at a time when there is little bipartisan agreement in this town, this is just such an opportunity to enhance bipartisan cooperation.

Now, most folks on our side of the aisle, this side of the aisle, have been strongly supportive of an economic test for most taxpayer-subsidized programs. More actions like this are necessary in order to avoid this Nation's fiscal ruin.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of our primary subcommittee on the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the chairman for allowing us time to talk.

Madam Speaker, it is a bit surreal on a couple of levels, one, to be speaking from this side of the Chamber, and two, to be speaking against two of my colleagues who it is rare in my term here in Congress that I have been on a different side of an issue from—my good colleagues from Georgia and from Wisconsin. But on this one I stand in strong opposition to the Ryan-Price amendment.

I just wanted to say how weird this feels to talk against something that my good colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are proposing to do.

One point that was just made was that there was a $14 billion payout last year in disaster insurance losses to farmers in America. That's a cherry-picked year. Folks, remember, 2012 was historic droughts throughout most of ag production America, and so, consequently, last year was a much higher year than would have normally been the case. It is normally about $4 billion a year in that regard.

I would also remind our colleagues that we fought this fight in July. Just like the Senate went one direction with the vote, we went the other direction, with a 208–217 vote on this floor. So we have had these conversations already and won this argument already.

This effort will punish success, will punish efficiency. It is hard to farm using $300,000 tractors if you have got a small farm. It takes 3,000 acres to be able to support the implements and the tools needed to farm as efficiently as American farmers produce. And so we are punishing the folks who are the best at what they do.

Also, Madam Speaker, I would argue that this is a risk tool. This is not an income support tool. Income support tools, as some of our approps have gone, clearly means-testing those makes sense. We have had those in place for quite some time. But this is a risk management.

Risks at big farms are no different than risks on small farms, and to limit crop insurance, to restrict crop insurance this way is, in my view, wrong-headed.

I would also argue that using AGI at this stage in the development of the broader issues going on in this country creates several unknowns.

Both my colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are working very diligently on the Ways and Means Committee to, in effect, have a fundamental tax reform. That fundamental tax reform will have the impact of eliminating deductions and credits and, in effect, raising AGI. They can't tell us today where that AGI number is going to go to, so that creates one of the additional unknowns.

A second unknown is in their bill itself. Their resolution says they don't know what the impact is going to be. We heard the Budget Committee chairman say one percentage. We heard Mr. PRICE say a different percentage. So even on their side of their arguments, they are not clear yet on what the impact will be for folks who go above the $750,000 AGI.

But their amendment itself, or their resolution says, in paragraph 2, agree with the provisions relating to the requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation that this is going to impose.

All of my colleagues who will speak in favor of this are generally much more rational and logical about how they want to do things. Creating this new test would be like the fellow who dove into some unknown waters. As his feet left the bank he's saying, Wow, I wonder how deep it is going to be, and I wonder how cold it is going to be.

We don't know, they don't know exactly what impact this is going to have. So I would argue that, until we can fix a number on the AGI—and again, let me make sure that everybody understands. I am not saying anything whatsoever in opposition to the fundamental tax reform work that is going on. That has nothing to do with my comments.

They are going to change the number that they want to use. That, they cannot argue against. They cannot tell us yet where that is going to be. They are going to raise it, I know, because you can't lower and limit deductions and not raise folks' AGIs because business deductions will be involved in this. So they can't tell us where that is going to be for normal farmers.

So you can't look at a farmer today who might be making $500,000 AGI—lowering the rates the way they are going to do may raise that farmer's AGI to something in excess of 750.

That person is in the exact economic circumstances they are now with respect to crop insurance and the risk management tool that that has provided, and yet they are going to be fundamentally impacted by this.

So I think this is ahead of its time. Wait on the study that the Senate bill calls for. I suspect my chairman will agree on that study that is going on.

But do not put this economic limit on crop insurance at this point in time. We have won this fight once with our colleagues. I would expect us to win it again. And I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan-Price amendment that would have the impact they don't know yet on crop insurance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Wisconsin, and I am pleased to join with him on the floor this evening debating this issue. It is something we have done over the years, working with Mr. KIND, with now Senator FLAKE, trying to inject a little more rationality and fiscal responsibility into this debate.

Madam Speaker, it is true that the House rejected a proposal during the debate on the farm bill, but 208 of our colleagues voted for a much more ambitious proposal. In fact, I believe that there were more votes for that crop insurance reform than were available for the first iteration of the farm bill itself.

This is a very modest step, and I appreciate it being brought forward, not because I think it is where we need to go ultimately, but I think that this is the sort of thing we ought to be doing on the floor of the House because there are, in fact, areas of agreement to do a better job for the taxpayer, do a better job for more farmers and ranchers, protect the environment. The farm bill is replete with these opportunities.

I find the rhetoric about somehow picking winners and losers and shutting down the richest farmers ironic. The proposal that is offered by my friend, Mr. RYAN, does not deny the richest 1 percent of the farmers crop insurance. It just says, your subsidy is going to be about 50 percent. You have a 15 percent reduction.

That's not picking winners and losers. That's not denying them the use of this tool. But what we should be doing is actually doing a deeper dive.

Crop insurance right now is so lucrative that it, in many instances, actually pays farmers to plant ground that they know is going to fail. They can make money off of it because of how lavishly the crop insurance program is subsidized.

The premiums, the people who sell it, insure it against loss—I mean, study after study from independent, outside agencies suggests that there is a lot that we could do.

In fact, it is ironic that there has been this attack on food stamps, the SNAP benefit, which has a lower percentage of abuse than the crop insurance program. We are on board now, the next 10 years, to have crop insurance likely to be pushing up against $100 billion.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But the fact is that this is an expensive entitlement in need of reform, with more areas of identified abuse than the food stamp program, which gets whacked, and we have a farm bill that is going to provide more lavish benefits for the wealthiest farmers.

I appreciate this discussion this evening. I hope it is the beginning of a more ambitious effort to do what needs to be done with crop insurance. But I think it is healthy to have it here.

I am pleased to join with my friend, Mr. RYAN, to agree with everything TOM PRICE said. Now that hasn't happened, I think, in any speech that he has given on the floor to this point. I am sure I am making him nervous agreeing with him.

But it illustrates the opportunity that we could have if we would take the time to work together on areas where there is bipartisan agreement and there is a clear need.

I appreciate the gentleman giving me the time. I appreciate him bringing it forward, and I urge support.

□ 1800

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 19 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding the time and for his long-suffering and persistent leadership on this important issue.

I rise to ask my colleagues to please oppose efforts in this House to punish success and vote ''no'' on the Ryan resolution.

The viability of any insurance instrument requires broad participation. To maintain and foster improvement to our farm base and the stable food supply it provides, proper risk mitigation is essential. Although attacking the ''wealthy'' may appear to be noble, AGI limits for crop insurance will drive out large-risk pool participants, making the program less affordable for the farmers least able to do without it.

In North Dakota, the average farm is markedly different than the farm in Wisconsin. North Dakota family farms are thousands of acres involving multiple generations. The proposed AGI limits ignore this reality. They not only include income from farm operations, but other wholly unrelated earnings. USDA research shows average off-farm income greatly exceeds on-farm income, making the targets of this provision more collateral than intentional.

American farmers largely support the major policy shift that eliminates direct payments, relying solely on this cost-sharing arrangement with the Federal Government, resulting in 10 percent taxpayer savings. Unlike previous subsidies, farmers pay for this protection by contributing around 40 percent of the premium. The other 60 percent is not even expended by the government unless a claim is made.

The increasing role of Federal crop insurance as the foundation of the family farm safety net in recent years has diminished the need for crisis appropriations. Absent the stability of an actuarially sound program, future catastrophic disasters will result in greater ad hoc disaster payments. Let's not lose the momentum to shift from direct payments to crop insurance by compromising the financial soundness of this important program.

As the world population grows, the demand for food will increase. We should herald efficiency and increased productivity. Neither is achieved by punishing our most successful farmers.

Please oppose the Ryan sense of the House resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank Chairman RYAN for putting this resolution together. I also want to take time to recognize and thank Chairman LUCAS. In his tone and tenacity in putting together a farm bill, I think he has served as an example in this House of how to be a chairman and bring together divergent groups. I was very

supportive of what we have done, but I am also very supportive of this resolution here today.

Implementing a 15-percentage point reduction in crop insurance for producers with an adjusted gross income exceeding $750,000, or $1.5 million for joint filers, just like the Senate amendment, seems to be common sense, in my mind. However, this resolution calls for the elimination of delayed implementation in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment delays this. We are simply getting rid of the delay of this implementation. This means test proposal would save roughly $1 billion over 10 years, something I think is very worthy for this body to consider.

On average, taxpayers are covering about 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. This proposal would reduce that to be about 47 percent, roughly, for high-income producers. It is still a very generous deal for very profitable producers. We encourage profitability. We want them to be as prosperous as they possibly can be. That does not mean that we have an unlimited amount of money that we can continue, as taxpayers, to cover some of those risks.

This reduction impacts roughly the top 1 percent of producers. There are other government assistance programs, such as Pell Grants and food stamps and earned income tax credits, that have some sort of means test to them. The least we can do is implement a modest means test for crop insurance subsidies for those making more than $750,000 or, again, $1.5 million for joint filers.

To be clear, nobody is kicked out of this program. Nobody is eliminated from this program. Contrary to the opponents' claim, this will not harm the insurance poll by driving out low-risk producers. Even with a 15-percent point reduction, the subsidy would still be huge and would be a good deal for high-income producers, since about half of the premium would still be subsidized.

I encourage passage.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the good gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the chairman. I want to also commend him for his hard work on the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know this has been a long and drawn-out process. Obviously, there are a lot of changes in agriculture, and also with the food stamp policy and with the economy. I know that this has been very difficult.

But I do want to rise in opposition to this sense of the House. As a farmer from Indiana who uses the crop insurance program, I understand a little bit about how this does affect farmers.

First of all, I would say that I think it is the right thing for us to do to eliminate the direct payment program. I think that is the right policy. That is in the bill, and I would continue to support it. I do think that we have some work to do on the crop insurance program, but this is not the answer. If we are trying to limit or put a means test on those whom you would define as the wealthiest farmers in the country, I don't believe this is the correct way to do it.

Look at agriculture across the country. You have corn farmers in the Midwest, soybean farmers in the Midwest. You have specialty crops, whether it is green beans, strawberries, carrots, or potatoes. All of these have different variables in the amount of income that comes in per acre. So whether it is 10 acres or whether it is 10,000 acres, I believe that the risk is still great to American farmers and producers.

Let's also remember that the premium support is not a cash subsidy to farmers. Farmers don't all of a sudden open the mailbox and get a check in the mail, with premium support, which I think is an appropriate system for our insurance programs that the Federal Government can participate in; but I don't believe that using the AGI is the correct way to measure whether farmers should be participating at certain levels or not.

If we really wanted to means test, we would use taxable income, where farmers would be reporting certain incomes. AGI can vary from crop to crop, from farm to farm, and so taxable income would make much more sense if we are going to talk about any sort of means testing.

Also, I believe that it undermines the important landlord-tenant relationship. I have specifically been involved in this. Whether it comes to direct payments, obviously, with the increased cost of farmland over the past several years, those relationships are very, very important and very valuable.

Almost half of the farmland in this country is rented. I know that on our farm we rent almost three-quarters of the land that we farm. If land owners can no longer afford crop insurance, they can simply transfer that risk to tenants through cash leases. You end up hurting the smaller farmers that rely on rented farmland.

So I don't believe that this particular idea is ready for us to move forward on. I think that it needs more work. I think that the intentions by the author are sincere in trying to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer; but, at the same time, let's not hurt the American farmer and create, basically, a system that can treat a farmer in the South differently than a farmer in the Midwest or a farmer in the North.

Let's go back and reevaluate the system. I think that if you talk to the farming industry, you talk to farmers, they will come to the table and will try to find a reasonable way.

At this time, I would oppose this sense of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ryan sense of the House resolution which would improve the 2013 farm bill by reducing insurance subsidies for the wealthiest producers, saving taxpayers almost $1 billion.

The Senate bill includes a provision authorized by Senator Richard Durbin and TOM COBURN to reduce the level of crop insurance premium subsidies for participants with an adjusted gross income over $750,000 by 15 percent. The amendment was approved in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 59–33. During the House consideration of the farm bill, I offered a companion amendment which was, unfortunately, not made in order.

By supporting this sense of the House, our Chamber now has an opportunity to go on record to support this modest, very commonsense reform. The limitation is expected to impact only 1 percent of the wealthiest farmers in the entire country. The vast majority of farmers in our district will see no change in the level of premium provided by the Federal Government.

Last year, the Federal Government spent $7 billion to cover 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. A 2012 GAO study found that 4 percent of the most profitable farmers accounted for nearly one-third of all Federal premium support. Now is the time to include modest means testing to reforms in crop insurance programs.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Ryan sense of the House to protect taxpayers in the new farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you, Chairman RYAN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be on the floor on this bipartisan issue, which we certainly don't have enough of today, and I am happy to be here as well with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, whom I have had the privilege to work with, even though we possibly don't agree on this issue.

I, too, was pleased to offer a similar amendment during the farm bill process and was glad to see Mr. HANNA speak on that earlier. That amendment was actually called the Hanna-Pingree amendment. I digress for a minute because I was particularly sentimental about that amendment since my daughter is named Hannah Pingree. Unfortunately, that amendment met its demise. I am just pleased to see we are back here discussing this topic.

The sense of Congress is a very small step toward a basic, commonsense reform: modestly reducing premium payments for the most successful farm businesses in America. Don't let anyone tell you otherwise—99 percent of crop insurance holders will see absolutely no change in their premium payments; but for a very few, the absolute richest, they will see a very small increase in their premiums. We are just

asking those few to pay something a little closer to their fair share.

To put this in perspective, crop insurance is the only farm income support program that is not subject to some form of payment limitation or means testing. Honestly, I would like to see a much stronger crop insurance reform; but for now, for this farm bill, for today, this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense reform.

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

This debate is coming to a conclusion. I appreciate that greatly. The civil tone, the nature of the discussion, is something that we should do more of in this body; but I would note a couple of quick thoughts to my colleagues.

There have been many references made to the historic crop insurance payments made in the 2012 crop year. One of those amazing circumstances was huge amounts of the Midwest, some of the most productive corn land in America, simply didn't produce a crop—or not much of a crop. That is no fault of the farmer involved. That is Mother Nature's decision not to provide the right amount of moisture or, in other places, too much moisture.

□ 1815

But, you see, that is what crop insurance is all about. When I first came here, we had a system that worked around—not crop insurance, which didn't work very well and wasn't subscribed to by a lot of people. We had a system of ad hoc disasters. If you had a problem here or a problem there, then you would have a special appropriations bill to fund that disaster. Those special bills tended to grow and expand; and over time, they became a huge drain on the Treasury.

That is why, starting aggressively in the '96 farm bill—pushed even harder by then-Chairman PETERSON in the 2008 farm bill—the focus became: no more ad hoc disasters bills. Have a crop insurance program that works. Make it clear to producers that, if you have a problem, you have to have insurance, that you have to participate, that you have to pay the premiums.

Now, over the course of approximately the last decade, setting the 2012 year aside, this has become an amazingly orderly system. Many Members in this room don't remember ad hoc agricultural disaster bills because this has worked that well. I would challenge you in most—in more than in the majority of the years—that the resources coming into the program have been greater than the payments going out, but that is the way insurance is supposed to work—you pay in in good years, and you hope you never use the product; but in bad years, the assistance is there. Call it crop insurance. Call it life insurance. Call it fire insurance on your house. It is the principle behind the concept.

Now, the specific language we address here.

There has been much discussion about the draft that the United States Senate has adopted in its farm bill. It is the same 750 number, and he does include a study; but one of the main differences between what we are addressing today and what the Senate has in its language in going to conference is that the study, in effect, requires the USDA look at the effect of this limitation on the participation in the program and determine if that affects the viability of the program. Does it change the dynamics? Does it suddenly become a greater expense as you shrink the pool? It gives the Secretary the authority, if that study determines that this will be negative to crop insurance, to suspend the provision. That is not in this sense of Congress. It says, ''You shall.'' ''You will.''

One other passing thought: there has been a lot of discussion about reducing the numbers, the percentages, from 65 to 50. I will just simply note to you that in many cases that, in effect, is not just a 15 percent move; that is a 40 percent move. Think about that. If you are a farmer—who is a businessperson—assessing the cost of your inputs and trying to match that up with a potential return on your outputs, you are going to make those hard business decisions.

Again, I think the world of my colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee. I know he has a lot of things on his plate, and I know he has had a great many challenges in his tenure as chairman of the House Budget Committee; but I will tell you that I think the Ag Committee has worked very diligently to craft language that we are now about to send to conference in order to work out the ultimate bill that reflects a lot of open process—in committee, on the floor, in a lot of input with motions to instruct today, and in another sense of the House resolution. We have acknowledged and responded to that input.

You have battled as Members of this body—and debated and discussed and voted—on all of these issues before. I would just ask my colleagues to remember what this body decided not all that long ago and that, also, as we go to conference with the Senate, it is going to be a very difficult thing to protect our $60 billion in mandatory spending reform that you have directed us to do. Give the committee, give me, give the ranking member as many tools and as much flexibility as you can so that we may prevail from the House's point of view in accomplishing common policy with the Senate that meets not only the goals of this Chamber, but the needs of this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for a very civil debate. He and I have talked about so many of these issues. We have worked so well together, and he has done the yeoman's work on moving these bills to the floor. On this particular issue, we don't agree. He may not think that I am helping, but I think I am helping by passing this. The reason is that this passed 59–33 in the Senate. If we pass it here, that just takes off the table one contentious issue that they don't have to negotiate in conference, making it easier to focus on the other things that you have yet to reconcile in conference. So we are actually trying to help the Ag Committee out here. That is one way you can put it.

On a more serious note, I want to talk about a few of the criticisms.

Pooling. My friend from North Dakota mentioned that it is important to have crop insurance with these people with very, very high adjusted gross incomes in the pool to make the cash flow. That is an actuarial argument that works with health insurance—healthy people subsidize sick people—but that is really not an argument that, I think, flows with this kind of insurance.

Point number two: no one is saying that a person who has a high net worth, who has a high adjusted gross income can't get crop insurance. All we are saying is just don't subsidize him as much as everybody else. That is really not asking a lot. What we are saying is, if you are a farmer and if you make $750,000 of adjusted gross income or higher, you don't get subsidized by the taxpayer for your crop insurance as much as everybody else. Your subsidy is 15 percentage points lower than that of the people who make less than $750,000. You still get crop insurance. You can still buy it. You will still get a subsidy, just not as much as everybody else.

Look, if you buy insurance on 50 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying for 67 percent of that insurance, it will pay for 52 percent of your insurance. If you buy insurance to cover 65 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying 59 percent of the cost, it would pay 44 percent of the cost. If you buy insurance on 85 percent of your acres, instead of the government subsidizing 38 percent of the cost of that coverage, it will subsidize 23 percent of the cost of that coverage. So there is still a subsidy.

You are not penalizing or punishing success by not subsidizing people as much. If we were having a tax debate—if we were talking about raising taxes—then you are penalizing success. If we are talking about taxing and taking money from producers—from successful people, from businesses making any amount of money—then you are penalizing success. What we are saying is just don't subsidize people as much because this subsidy is taking money from hardworking taxpayers—from their taxes—to give to somebody else. What we are saying is let's not take

money from hardworking taxpayers to give as much to farmers who are making more than $750,000. We just don't want to subsidize them as much. That is not punishing success.

The other point is that this is one of those rare moments in which I think there is bipartisan agreement that a farm bill really ought to be for family farmers. The purpose of the farm program is to make sure that individual families can stay farming, and that means the safety net needs to be there for that family farm. I know in Wisconsin most of our farmers don't make $750,000, so it probably doesn't affect many of the corn and bean or dairy farmers whom I represent. Maybe in North Dakota and in other States there are people with thousands of acres who make that kind of money. I think that is great—I think that is wonderful—but I still think that our taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize them as much as the family farmer.

This is one of those opportunities in which I think Congress can speak with a bipartisan voice. I really believe, if the Hanna-Pingree amendment or the Blumenauer-Mulvaney amendment had been made in order, it probably would have passed. So this is our chance here in the House to speak with one voice on a bipartisan basis. Let's not subsidize folks at the high end as much, and let's protect that family farmer. Let's agree with the Senate and take this issue off the table as one of those contentious issues because we are agreeing bipartisanly and bicamerally that we ought to have a farm program for the family farmer and somewhere limit these subsidies. That is all we are asking for.

With that, I ask for its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE DEMOCRAT VOICES MUST BE HEARD

(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, more Democrat leaders are finding their voices and courage to speak out against the continued shutdown of government services by Senate Majority Leader REID. This was evident on Wednesday as District of Columbia Mayor Vincent Gray crashed a Senate Democratic press conference near the Capitol.

Mayor Gray took the opportunity to ask a simple and logical question of the Senate: Would the Senate vote on the House-passed measure to permit the District of Columbia to utilize tax revenues it collects to fund municipal services during this shutdown?

This measure, H.J. Res. 71, passed the House more than a week ago with support from Washington Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and other Democrats in the House. This targeted appropriations bill, like the many others the House has passed with bipartisan support, still languishes in the Senate.

When the Mayor approached Senator REID to discuss the funding for the District of Columbia, the Senate Majority Leader replied: I am on your side, okay? Don't screw it up.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whose side the Senate Majority Leader is on, but it has not been on the side of the American people.

A WEEK IN REVIEW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

OBAMACARE

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about accountability.

Normally, the way it works is that Congress can consider a piece of legislation. Maybe it passes. Maybe the President signs it. You implement it. Then the voters can decide whether they like it, whether it lived up to its billing, so to speak.

With ObamaCare, it was interesting because this was rammed through Congress at the beginning of 2010; yet it is just now really being implemented. I am starting to get a lot of people in my district contacting my office who are really shocked at some of the stiff premium increases they are seeing. So I think it is useful just to review some of the promises that were made and whether any of those promises have been kept. I think what you will find is that this is a law not only that the public opposed, not only that was rammed through with no bipartisan support, but a law that in many ways is resting on false pretenses.

Promise one, the President made this: it will lower premiums by up to $2,500 for a typical family per year.

I have not seen that true anyplace. In fact, people are seeing $2,500 increases. There was a family in California, it was reported, who saw an increase of $10,000. So I think, right here, as this is being implemented, we know that that is just not going to be the case.

□ 1830

Promise number two, the President said this: ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan.'' Period.

Well, we know that that is not true. We see spouses losing spousal coverage. We see people with major companies losing their employer-provided insurance, getting pushed into some of these exchanges.

So the idea that ''if you like your plan, you can keep it'' is absolutely not proving to be true for thousands of people throughout the country.

This is just beginning. People who have looked at this from the Congressional Budget Office to other groups say you could have anywhere from 7 to 30 million Americans who actually lose their employer plans because of ObamaCare.

Of course, if you are losing your plan and you are getting pushed into an exchange, you may not be able to keep your doctor because that doctor may not be in the network, may not be available based on the plan that you are having to take because you have lost your original plan.

Promise number three—this is the President: ''I can make a firm pledge: under my plan no family making less than $250,000 will see any form of tax increase.''

Well, we know that the individual mandate he said wasn't a tax. Then when it got challenged in the Supreme Court, his administration was saying, yeah, uphold it because it is a tax. That is eventually what the court did, saying that it is a tax. That is a tax that hits blue collar ''salt of the Earth'' people, forcing them to buy a product that essentially they may not even be physically able to obtain because the Web sites don't work, and if not, they are going to tax you. That certainly hasn't been true.

But there are a whole bunch of other things in the law that hit middle-income and lower-income people. There is a cap on flexible spending accounts. It is actually harder under ObamaCare to deduct medical expenses from your income taxes. Even a tax on indoor tanning salons. I think there are a lot of people who make less than $250,000 a year who are doing the tanning salons.

Then, of course, there are a whole bunch of other taxes—over a trillion dollars—that may not be directly levied on somebody making less than $250,000, but the costs will end up being passed on. For example, the employer mandate, the tax on health insurance plans, the medical device tax. Those taxes are on companies, but those costs are going to get pushed to individuals, and they are going to have to bear the cost of that. And, oh, by the way, certain good health care plans that a lot of union members have who are not making $250,000 a year, those are considered Cadillac plans, and those will be taxed extra going forward.

Finally, the President said: ''I will sign a universal health care bill into law by the end of my first term as President that will cover every American.'' It is interesting—people on the other side of the aisle will say, oh, you

Republicans, why don't you want everybody to be covered? The most recent analysis from the Congressional Budget Office said that in 10 years from now—so after 13 years of ObamaCare being the law—you will still have in this country 31 million Americans that don't have any insurance. Of course, we know ObamaCare is causing people to lose the insurance that they have.

So this is not something that is a universal health care bill, by any stretch of the imagination. There are going to be a lot of people who aren't going to have any insurance.

The point I just wanted to make with this is, there has got to be accountability in government. People want to have a redress of their grievances. These issues were not necessarily teed up in the election, and so now people are coming to terms with what has happened. So the point I would just make is, at a minimum when you are dealing with the broken promises of ObamaCare, we have got to communicate to the public that this has got to be based on some semblance of fairness.

For example, the Members of Congress who wrote this law must live under the exact terms of the statute. They should not be granted any extra legal relief from the burdens of ObamaCare. The fact that businesses have had the law delayed for them—and, of course, Members of Congress have gotten special treatment as well—I think individual Americans have got to be given the same deal. It is just wrong to have the IRS tax people to buy something from Web sites that aren't functional—and buy products that they may not like.

So accountability is key. This is a law that was passed. There were specific promises made over and over again. What we are finding now, unfortunately, is those promises are not being kept.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much my friend from Florida. I am always greatly appreciative and thrilled when I find somebody who attended an Ivy League school that got a good education.

The points are well made by my friend from Florida. There were many promises made and promises not kept. Go from top to bottom:

''If you like your insurance, you can keep it.'' Not remotely true.

''If you like your doctor, you can keep them.'' Not remotely true. So many stories are coming forward.

''It is actually going to be cheaper for Americans under ObamaCare.'' Not remotely true, unless perhaps you are in New York. There is a small part of the country, a small group of individuals, who were already paying so much because of a massive amount of waste or laws that allowed for a great amount of waste or abuse; in those there may be some people that actually saved money. But for most Americans, they are not only going to have to pay more, they are going to pay dramatically more.

As we have seen the government shutdown play out, it has been interesting to note the things that have been open and the things that have been closed. We were told that only essential government services would be provided.

We had also passed immediately before the shutdown and sent to the Senate a military pay bill. Now, that military pay bill was intentionally left broad enough so that it could take care of the need to take care of the death benefit, broad enough to take care of the needs of the family that are always provided by the military, by the Department of Defense, for those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in losing a loved one in the course of combat. And lo and behold, even though that was made clear, it also was made clear in the bill that civilian employees could be included. Even independent contractors under that law were allowed to continue working that were supporting the role of the military. So it was a very broadly worded act in order to give the Obama administration, and particularly the Defense Department, great latitude to make sure important things got done.

Now as we have seen, the Secretary of Defense has laid off hundreds of thousands of civilian workers, though the bill gave him latitude to leave them working and they supported the military. It was only after about a week that they finally said, okay, we are going to let a whole lot of those employees come back now that we have made the determination that the bill gives us enough latitude to allow them to work.

We told him it did. The bill gave him that kind of power. Perhaps he had talked to President Obama and they decided, yeah, let's put lots of people out of work, or perhaps he had not talked to the President. We don't know.

But as Peggy Noonan pointed out recently, talking about things that have gone on here in the last couple of weeks, she reminded us of Harry Truman's sign that was on his desk: ''The buck stops here.''

They didn't have to hurt all those civilian employees. They could have left them working. But they chose to send them home, creating more hardship. They chose not to pay the death benefit for families who were entitled to it after losing a loved one who is a patriot. They chose to do those things.

They have chosen to close parks, farms, different things that don't cost the Federal Government a dime, don't cost anything. But they have strategically chosen to close things that create suffering, some chaos, different problems for people. It is as if the park rangers, who were quoted recently, were exactly right in saying that they were told: make life as difficult as possible for people, because that is what the administration has done.

But there is good news. This story was published by FOX News:

National Parks Are Closed, the IRS Call Centers Have No Staff.

And I insert parenthetically here:

The IRS is still getting your money in, the money is still flowing in, they are just not helping people as it flows in.

The article says:

Countless government Web sites have been taken down.

We know even the panda camera was turned off, even though it required no monitoring.

Yet despite these changes, which range from inconveniences to major headaches, a number of not so essential government operations are still up and running. Here are a few that have evaded the partial government shutdown:

The Denali commission.

You have probably never even heard of the Denali Commission. But the tiny Alaska-based economic development agency gained some notoriety after it emerged that the group's inspector general was petitioning Congress to defund it.

But guess what agency survived the shutdown? According to its own contingency plan, because the Commission's staffers are paid under the prior year's budget, all 14 employees are exempt from furlough, and ''reporting to work.''

That is a commission that its own inspector general petitioned Congress to defund.

Another government function that was left up: ''The White House Twitter.'' Oh, sure, there were plenty of government help Web sites that would have made life easier for people having to deal with the Federal Government. They were shut down because they would have helped people. But the White House Twitter was left up and rolling. As the article says:

Right as Congress missed the deadline last week to pass a spending bill, First Lady Michelle Obama's office informed its Twitter followers that: ''Due to Congress' failure to pass legislation to fund the government,'' updates to the official First Lady Twitter account would be limited.

But the White House Twitter account is alive and well.

The account has blasted out a series of tweets calling on Congress to end the budget impasse.

Another item that has been left up and running despite all of the government Web sites and help call centers and all that have been shut down, and that is ''Let's Move.'' The article says:

While a number of government Web sites have been temporarily taken offline, and the First Lady's Twitter account has been largely abandoned, not so for Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

The Web site for the First Lady's healthy-living initiative remains operational—though it doesn't appear to have been updated much since September. The top of the site displays the message: ''Cheers to Water!''

Another thing left up was the ''Park Rangers on Patrol.''

Despite national parks and monuments being shuttered across the country for lack of funds, the National Park Service is devoting considerable resources to putting up barricades and patrolling them.

An innkeeper along the Blue Ridge Parkway who was forced to close his business due

to the partial shutdown told FOXNews.com that park rangers have set up a ''24/7 blockade'' outside his inn—to prevent would-be customers from coming in.

Another thing, the ''Obama Campaign Stop.''

President Obama canceled a long-planned trip to Asia over the budget impasse.

But he, nevertheless, ventured outside the beltway last week for a rally in nearby Rockville, Maryland, to pressure Republicans to pass a budget bill.

□ 1845

The article says budget bill, but actually we are past the budget time. Now it is appropriation time, and that is what we need.

The Patent Office. If you happened to invent something during the stalemate, good news. The United States Patent and Trademark Office is open for business. According to the office, it is using fees from the prior year to keep running and should be able to for roughly 4 weeks.

The IRS is taking but not giving. IRS call centers are closed. The IRS is not issuing refunds during the partial shutdown. The agency, though, will gladly accept tax payments during that time. The IRS says in a statement on its Web site:

The IRS will accept and process all tax returns with payments, but will be unable to issue refunds during this time.

Another article from the Right Scoop had talked about the Amber Alert Web site being taken down. Although some have been kept up, the Amber Alert Web site was allowed to go down. And, thankfully, the administration realized there was enough pressure. For heaven's sake, it is for children who are kidnapped, lost. So, thankfully, the administration finally decided after enough pressure to bring the Amber Alert Web site back up.

It has been amazing to me, and I saw it again today in some of our memorial sites, memorials that are down on The Mall, the Iwo Jima monument, or the memorial, we have spent—this administration, that is, has spent more money keeping people out of open-air memorials than it ever spends just to leave them open. They are open 24/7. I have been up to the Iwo Jima, the U.S. Marine Corps monument so many times since I have been in Congress, again, all hours of the day and night. I don't sleep that much while I am here on the Hill.

Although we have some park rangers who don't know the parking laws and give tickets to people who are lawfully allowed to be there—apparently not enough training for our rangers—but they have gone to the trouble to get barriers to make life difficult for veterans, World War II veterans that fought to secure Iwo Jima, being kept out of seeing the Iwo Jima monument. Why? Because they put barricades in the way to keep people from going up and being able to drive up there.

One of the times I went up there during the last couple of weeks, there were probably 200 people up there, but they had to park over by the townhouses, go over rails, down steep embankments and get in there. Unfortunately, as this administration knows, our World War II veterans in their eighties and nineties that I have been with and that I have helped and pushed wheelchairs for, they are not able to climb over rails and go down steep embankments, although they sure did while fighting in the Pacific, European theater, and North Africa. But they cannot do it now. And for anyone to keep putting up the barricades at that Iwo Jima monument just to screw over our veterans is outrageous. I don't know who is doing it, but shame on the people who are doing it.

I was gratified last weekend, on one occasion I went up there, and there were plastic barricades that had been filled with water to hold them in place, make them too big for a person to push over, and yet there were three busloads of World War II veterans up at the Iwo Jima monument, and someone had rammed those plastic barriers, knocking them over, spilling the water everywhere. Once the water was dispersed, pushed them out of the way. A wooden barricade looked like it had been run over so the buses could go up there. I don't know if those buses did that or not. I like to think they did, that those World War II veterans were not going to have some mean-spirited person in the administration up there to prevent them from seeing the Iwo Jima monument for one time before they left this world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people in this administration that keep trying to punish the American people so that they can get the money that they are demanding, that S&P and Moody's has said you guys have to get responsible about the money you are spending, the money that American taxpayers gave the Republicans, the majority, in 2010 to do something about. My friends across the aisle are constantly saying elections have consequences. That is right. The American people didn't like ObamaCare, and so they voted the Democrats in the House out of the majority with people running on that main issue. We will do everything we can to get rid of ObamaCare.

It is true that the President won reelection. Many of us still believe that if we had had a candidate that could challenge the abuses of ObamaCare before the last election last year instead of one that gave a prototype for it in his home State, the President would not have been reelected. But Republicans chose a very nice man, a philanthropic man, a great businessman, a very caring American, but somebody who had already shown he supported a type of socialized medicine in his home State.

ObamaCare, as it was passed, as it was originating in the Senate and then passed in the Senate, sent down to the House as bill H.R. 3590, should have originated in this House because it raises revenue, called penalties. It is called penalties throughout the bill. The Supreme Court noted that. In a very hypocritical opinion, the Supreme Court went to page 15 and noted that Congress called it a penalty. It only is applied if people don't do what is required. That makes it a penalty. Clearly, it is a penalty because the anti-injunction act makes very clear that if Congress passes a tax, then no Federal court can take it up and make a decision on it until the tax is actually imposed and the person suing has standing by virtue of having the tax actually imposed on them. That is a nutshell.

So if the Supreme Court had found that ObamaCare contained a tax and not a penalty, then it would not have jurisdiction. But the Supreme Court opinion at page 15 decided it is a penalty; it is not a tax. If it was a tax, we couldn't go any further on the opinion. The opinion would be over. We would have to dismiss and wait for the tax to actually be assessed. But since it is a penalty, like Congress called it through the bill, and since it is a penalty, as President Obama made very clear to the American public—it is not a tax; it is a penalty—the Supreme Court went on. Eventually, after determining that ObamaCare, as written, based on what the proponents said was the interstate commerce clause that gave it the authority to pass ObamaCare, the Supreme Court said, no, it doesn't. The interstate commerce clause does not give authority to Congress to pass a bill that takes over health care. That is not constitutional.

Then eventually they got over and took up the issue of exactly what was involved in the individual mandate, the business mandate, and the Court concluded that actually, despite Congress calling it a penalty, the President assuring America it was a penalty and not a tax, the Supreme Court ends up saying it is a tax, and, therefore, it is constitutional. So we, as the Supreme Court, will rewrite the law and uphold it as we have rewritten; because as it is written, it is not constitutional, but we will rewrite it. Though that would be legislating and it would be unconstitutional, they did it anyway.

So when I hear people say it has been upheld by the Supreme Court, no, the bill that was passed was not upheld by the Supreme Court. It was struck down as violating the interstate commerce clause, but the Supreme Court did them a favor. They rewrote it legislatively, violated the Constitution in doing so, and then sent it back.

And now Americans across the country, by the millions, are suffering as a result of a tax the majority of Americans did not want, that all Americans promised was not a tax, and now it is taking away their insurance. It is taking a way their doctors. It is taking away, really, quality health care that most Americans had.

So it would seem if the idea behind ObamaCare was strictly to help those who are uninsured, we should have dealt strictly with those Americans.

But that is not what ObamaCare was about. It was about the G-R-E, the government running everything.

I am amazed at how many friends across the aisle who have screamed and hollered about we don't want the government in our bedroom voted for a bill that puts the government in your bedroom, in your bathroom, in your kitchen, in your closets. It puts the Federal Government everywhere. And you combine that with what the all Democratic majority House and Senate passed with President Obama at the helm, that created a bureau under the guise of making sure that credit card companies were fair, and now that bureau is gathering everyone's credit card information and debit card information under the guise of making sure they are playing fair. This Federal Government has seized more private information. They have been more vindictive through weaponizing the IRS, and we are finding out about other agencies and departments. It is more than any administration has ever done, and American people will ultimately pay the price.

I hope and pray that the Supreme Court will take up the origination clause litigation because that bill did not originate in the House; and the origination clause says any bill that raises revenue must originate in the House, and the only single thing in that bill that was left was the number. Even the title about being a change to the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for first time home buyers who were in the military or veterans, they didn't leave a single word of that bill; and they brought in something completely ungermane to that bill for veterans and military members.

□ 1900

And instead of taking care of the millions they said were uninsured, that was the whole purpose of ObamaCare, they have done tremendous damage across the country to so very many.

As the shutdown has gone on that was brought on, not by the House Republicans, who passed a bill, we said, Look, Americans are being devastated by ObamaCare. The health care industry is being decimated.

Since a majority of the American people didn't want it, gave us control of the House as a result of it, let's get rid of it. We have got to start acting responsibly about the money we spend. Taking away Americans' rights to decide whether they should have knee surgery, back surgery, get a pacemaker, taking away the right and the ability of Americans to determine what kind of treatment they should get is not something, when we are in financial difficulty, we should be doing. That was struck down. It shouldn't have been a surprise. HARRY REID didn't want to pass it. The President didn't want to.

Then the House began sending down one compromise which was turned down. Okay, let's just suspend it for a year. That would be the fair thing to do. As so many have said, Republicans and Democrats across the country, it was not ready for prime time. It was a train wreck. It was a nightmare. Let's just suspend it for a year. We know the President wants it, so we are not talking about getting rid of it like a majority of Americans want to do. Let's just suspend it for a year.

When that didn't go and the Senate said, No, we want a shutdown, we are not doing this, then we sent down a further compromise to basically suspended for 1 year the individual mandate just as businesses had gotten, as the President rewrote the law. The Constitution doesn't allow him to do it. Congress is supposed to step up, as happened in past generations where I'm told no matter whether a Democrat or Republican President, no matter who controlled the House and Senate, when a President overstepped his constitutional authority this far, usually there would be a trip down Pennsylvania from leaders of the House and Senate, both parties, that would privately tell the President, You overstepped your bounds. Back off, or we are going to defund everything that you are trying to push through on this, and it would get worked out.

Unfortunately, at the other end of the Hall in the Senate, they are not bothered by the fact that the President, by a stroke of the pen, wrote legislation and undid what the law said and made up his own law. That is not supposed to happen under our Constitution, but it did. We were bothered by it in the House, so we said, Look, let's work this out like gentle people. Let's just postpone it for a year. When that didn't work, we said, Let's at least suspend the individual mandate. You have suspended it for the business community. Let's do it for individuals. They wouldn't even do that.

Then when that didn't work, we sent a bill to the Senate that said, Okay, we are not trying to push anything on you. Just sit down and talk. Here are our negotiators. You appoint your negotiators. That is what the Constitution, law, and the rules require, and we will have this worked out probably by the time people get up in the morning; and they would not even appoint negotiators. Why? Because I believe they believe the conventional wisdom from the last 3 years that if the Democratic Senate and President forced a shutdown, the Main Street media would blame Republicans. It would enure politically to their benefit, and it would be worth causing the pain of a shutdown. So they refused to even negotiate at that point. It was not until the polls showed that the President had dropped to 37 percent from a favorable rating of 53 percent to an unfavorable rating that we finally had a willingness to sit down and talk.

During those times that so many things have been shut down, including the Normandy Cemetery—this story emerged yesterday from Marketplace.org:

Coming Soon to Your Favorite TV Shows: Plot Lines About the Affordable Care Act.

Hollywood Health & Society, a program with the USC Annenberg Norman Lear Center got a $500,000 grant this week from The California Endowment to help TV writers tell better stories about the new health insurance law.

That is $500,000 to Hollywood for propaganda to tell people who are suffering from the ravages of losing their insurance, losing their doctors, losing the ability to make decisions under new policies as they once did, telling them how good they had it. That $500,000 would have paid to open a lot of memorials and parks. It would have kept the Moore farm going for years that doesn't get a dime of Federal money and hasn't since 1980, but may lose the farm because of the outrageous actions of the National Park Service in forcing it closed; as the park Ranger said, making it as difficult as they can for people.

Here is an article from Ken Blackwell:

When President Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on March 23, 2010, it was the starting gun for a massive Federal effort to get the new system up and running. The administration had deliberately allowed for 3½ years for the launch, October 1, 2013.

That's a long time. It's 1,288 days. You would think, in that length of time, we could have brought a system online that would not be bedeviled with glitches. And more glitches.

By comparison, FDR had 912 days from the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, to D-day, June 6, 1944, the Allied invasion of Normandy. The D-day Museum at Portsmouth, England maintains a Web site that offers some idea of what was involved in mounting the invasion.

It says further down:

Today, Obama administration officials are making the rounds of TV talk shows touting the millions of Americans who have logged on day one of ObamaCare. They are not able tell us how many of those millions have actually signed up for ObamaCare. But that, of course, may be due to the fact that 85% of Americans already have health insurance and the rest, primarily healthy young adults, may have reasons for not having health insurance.

It's interesting to hear administration spokespersons dodging and weaving about how many Americans actually are eager to give all their personal data to the IRS and then be guided about by navigators chosen by Mr. Obama out of his compassionate concern for his people. Obama Cares was an inspired idea for a bumper sticker last fall. It helped the incumbent easily gain a second term in the White House.

It's odd, though, that after 4 years of major liberal legislation, the FDR comparisons have largely disappeared.

Americans today can judge how warm-hearted President Obama is. His administration has ordered the closure of the World War II Memorial in Washington. Ninety-year olds on Honor Flights faced barricades as they made that last trip to see the monument to their heroism on D-day and a thousand days.

White House spokesman Jay Carney raced to tell reporters that it was not the intent of the Obama administration to deny death benefits to families of soldiers recently killed in Afghanistan. It just seems to have

been another glitch. The Obama spokesman's efforts to avoid responsibility were strenuous. But he might have consulted another veteran of that great WWII generation. Harry Truman kept a plaque on his desk in the White House: The Buck Stops Here.

That was the article I was thinking of earlier.

Here's another article from October 10 by Jocelyn Maminta from New Haven, Connecticut.

In the midst of major changes in health care, UnitedHealthCare has sent thousands of pink slips to Connecticut doctors.

Termination letters went to physicians caring for Medicare patients. Those letters were sent out to doctors caring for ''Medicare Advantage'' patients. It's a plan, marketed to seniors to provide additional services through UnitedHealthCare.

A mix of primary care and specialty doctors are affected by it. And it comes at a questionable time.

Open enrollment for Medicare starts next Tuesday, and it's still not clear at this time as to which doctors are still in the United network.

The Connecticut State Medical Society is fighting back. The biggest concern is patient access to healthcare.

''What the government is looking for is to manage better care by adding a patient-centered medical home so that you have a doctor who is totally invested with taking care of every aspect of the patient and coordinating it. This is clearly not a patient-centered decision,'' said Dr. Michael Saffir, president of CT State Medical Society.

Perhaps that is Connecticut Medical Society.

Anyway, it has an update at the bottom:

In an email statement, UnitedHealthCare spokesman Ben Goldstein told News 8, ''With the many changes happening in health care, we are building a network of health care providers that we can collaborate with more closely to have the most positive impact on the quality of care for our members.

And what a lot of people didn't realize, but they soon found out, ObamaCare, the so-called ''Affordable Care Act,'' actually cut over $700 billion in Medicare reimbursements. It took money that was going to be used for senior citizens' health care and put it towards trying to get this horrendous, this unworkable bill to the American people.

May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. In an article from WND Radio published October 10, they wrote:

Sticker Shock! Americans Floored By ObamaCare Cost.

The technical problems with the ObamaCare insurance exchanges are no surprise, are further evidence the whole program should be delayed or scrapped and Americans will be even more horrified when they can get somewhere on the Web site, according to health care policy expert Grace-Marie Turner.

The first 10 days of the ObamaCare insurance exchanges have been a technological and public relations mess for the administration. Many Americans have suffered through hours of stalled or crashed Web sites, no reporter has yet been able to navigate the site, and many people have entered personal information that online security experts believe could make them targets for identity theft.

□ 1915

When WND spent hours online and on the phone trying to get a cost estimate for an ObamaCare plan, it was told to expect a quote by January 1. As WND reported, anecdotal evidence on the government's own health care Facebook page suggests both problems are significant factors.

A few users seemed simply confused, but the overwhelming number of comments were critical, and many of those were scathing. Complaints about the application process had three recurring themes: long waits, glitches, and sticker shock. There was also much ridicule of the site's ability to handle ''tremendous demand.''

Information technology experts told The Wall Street Journal the Web site ''appeared to be built on a sloppy software foundation.''

Another article from WND published yesterday—I am not sure I like the title, '''Pulling Out Hair' Over ObamaCare Web Site 'Nightmare.'" Sometimes people look okay with their hair out. Sometimes they don't.

The article says:

Forget, for a minute, all those arguments about the new health care law's ''death panels,'' the forced cancellation of existing coverage, the violations of religious liberty, and the transformation of full-time jobs into part-time work. Even people who want to sign up for ObamaCare are finding it impossible.

Digital Trends reports the healthcare.gov Web site already has ''shut down, crapped out, stalled, and misloaded so consistently that its track record for failure is challenged only by Congress.'' That is even though taxpayers paid ''more than $634 million'' for ''the digital equivalent of a rock,'' the report said.

The site itself, which apparently underwent major code renovations over the weekend, still rejects user logins, fails to load drop-down menus and other critical components for users that successfully gain entrance, and otherwise prevents uninsured Americans in the 36 States it serves from purchasing health care at competitive rates—healthcare.gov's primary purpose,'' the report said.

It goes on to talk about the massive nightmares of the people that are trying to sign on to it.

Here is an article from Peggy Noonan from The Wall Street Journal: ''Now is the Time to Delay ObamaCare'':

The Obama administration has an implementation problem. More than any administration of the modern era, they know how to talk but have trouble doing. They give speeches about ObamaCare, but when it is unveiled, what the public sees is a Potemkin village designed by the noted architect Rube Goldberg. They speak ringingly about the case for action in Syria but can't build support in the U.S. foreign policy community, in Congress, among the public. Recovery summer is always next summer. They have trouble implementing. Which, of course, is the most boring but crucial part of governing. It is not enough to talk; you must perform.

There is an odd sense with members of this administration that they think words are actions. Maybe that is why they tweet so much. Maybe they imagine Bashir Assad seeing their tweets and musing: ''Ah, Samantha is upset—then I shall change my entire policy, in respect for her emotions!''

That gets us to the real story of last week, this week, and the future, the one beyond the shutdown, the one that normal people are both fully aware of and fully understand, and that is the utter and catastrophic debut of ObamaCare. Even for those who expected problems, and that would be everyone who follows government, it has been a shock.

They had 3.5 years to set it up! They knew exactly when it would be unveiled, on October 1, 2013. On that date, they knew millions could be expected to go online to see if they benefit.

And it goes on. It is an excellent article. She says:

A quick summary of what didn't work. Those who went on Federal and State exchanges reported malfunctions during login, constant error messages, inability to create new accounts, frozen screens, confusing instructions, endless wait times, help lines that put people on hold and then cut them off, lost passwords and user names.

After the administration floated the fiction that the problems were due to heavy usage, the Journal tracked down insurance and technology experts who said the real problems were inadequate coding and flaws in the architecture of the system.

. . . The founder of McAfee slammed the system's lack of security on Fox Business Network, calling it a hacker's happiest nocturnal fantasy. He predicted millions of identity thefts. Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius—grilled, surprisingly, on ''The Daily Show''—sounded like—and that is unkind, but—she failed to justify why, in the middle of the chaos, individuals cannot be granted a 1-year delay, just as businesses have been.

More ominously, many of those who got into the system complained of sticker shock—high premiums, high deductibles.

She goes on to say, talking about Republicans:

They would make a mistake in dropping ObamaCare as an issue. A few weeks ago, they mistakenly demanded funding—a move to please their base. They will be tempted to abandon even the word ''ObamaCare'' now, but this is exactly when they should keep, as the center of their message and their intent, not defunding ObamaCare but delaying it. Do they really want to turn abrupt focus to elusive Medicare cuts just when it has become obvious to the American people that parts of ObamaCare (like the ability to enroll) are unworkable?

The Republicans should press harder than ever to delay ObamaCare—to kick it back, allow the administration to at least create a functioning Web site, and improve what can be improved.

There is an article from CNN from today about Utah's national parks will reopen despite ongoing government shutdown.

Utah will reopen its five national parks by Saturday, as well as three other nationally run locations. Utah's Governor Gary Herbert made the announcement Thursday, saying a deal had been reached with the U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell. ''Utah agrees to pay the National Park Service up to $1.67 million—$166,572 per day—to reopen eight national sites in Utah for up to 10 days.''

The sad thing is, they don't have to do that. We passed the bill to keep them all going. We did it at a rate, at an amount the Senate already agrees to. All they have got to do is pass it, send it to the President, and it will be taken care of.

I have an article here from the Mercatus Center, George Mason University. It is a research summary.

Before I mention that, I want to mention something about one of our Senators, a Senator from Arizona. Some people have tried to take things I said in an inappropriate way.

I know that Senator from Arizona. We owe him a great deal for what he endured on our behalf in North Vietnam. There is no question about it. And I know that Senator would never intentionally hurt this country. But he has made mistakes that have hurt it but certainly it was never intentional.

Let me mention this Mercatus Center, George Mason University research summary. It says, ''The Debt-Limit Debate 2013: Addressing Key Myths.'' Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important the people understand that there are a lot of myths about the debt limit.

One myth is this:

> Standard & Poor's U.S. credit rating downgrade in August of 2011 was caused by Washington's brinkmanship over increasing the debt limit. Congress must, therefore, avoid attaching spending cut demands to the current debt limit increase if they want to avoid jeopardizing the Nation's fragile economy.

The reality, it says, is:

> Washington's failure to deal with unsustainable Federal spending mostly related to entitlement programs and debt caused the 2011 S&P downgrade and is spurring warnings of another downgrade by the credit rating agencies.

Of course this administration went after them through the judiciary system—after they got a bad rating, they got a downgrade. But they point out that in June of 2011 that:

> S&P reported: ''If the U.S. Government maintains its current policies, it is unlikely that S&P's ratings services would maintain its AAA rating on the U.S. Government. From the same report: ''One contributing factor in our negative outlook decision is our view that there has, as yet, been no significant progress in addressing these long-term cost drivers nor any consensus developing among the Obama administration, the Senate, and House of Representatives regarding the specifics of a comprehensive plan to address the long-term budgetary challenges.''
>
> On July 14, 2011, S&P warned it would downgrade U.S. debt if ''Congress and the administration have not achieved a credible solution to the rising U.S. Government debt burden and are not likely to achieve one in the foreseeable future.''

So the downgrade was because we did not adequately address the massive debt that had been building up.

Another myth—and there are plenty more to back up their contention about that, just facts: ''Had Congress and the administration failed to raise the debt limit by the Treasury's stated deadline in 2011, the Treasury would have been forced to default on the Nation's debt.'' Make it very clear. The reality, ''had the 2011 agreement to increase the debt limit been postponed, the Treasury could have met Federal Government obligations, including Social Security benefits and interest on the debt until the end of the fiscal year, possibly longer.''

And then it goes into the options that the Treasury Department had. Another myth: ''If Washington agreed to significant spending reforms and cuts—and then actually followed through on them—it would cripple the recovery and devastate the economy.'' The reality is that ''the most dangerous thing Washington can do is continue on its current course. The economic literature is clear: Chronic overspending and its result, chronic excessive debt, lead to economic harm. Washington must agree on meaningful spending reforms—and begin implementing these policies immediately to satisfy markets about the credibility of spending cuts.

''Myth number four: The real problem with the last debt limit deal was that it failed to apply a 'balanced approach' of spending cuts and tax increases.'' The reality is, ''Replacing borrowing with higher taxes does not solve the fundamental problem: Federal spending—including Social Security, Medicaid, and especially Medicare—is unsustainable.

''Fiscal reform that focuses on large revenue increases and modest spending reductions is likely to inflict the most damage on the economy. A study of 21 countries looking at 37 years of data representing 107 episodes of fiscal reform, shows that reform efforts that focus on a package of both spending and revenue reductions''—that is, tax decreases—''tend to be much more effective than those that have modest spending reductions but continue to increase revenue.

''Of more than 100 attempts to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio in all developed countries over the past 30 years, some 20 percent succeeded. They had two common components: one, a focus on spending cuts; and two, policy reforms that increased competitiveness.'' And that is the truth.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MULLIN (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1930

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SHUTDOWN AND ITS IMPACTS ON OUR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order, the Federal Government's Shutdown and Its Impacts on our Department of Energy National Laboratories.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also want to thank Science Committee Ranking Member JOHNSON for her support of national laboratory employees.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress knowing that in the policies I helped and worked to enact and the legislative agenda that I would work on that I could either help people or hurt people. And the decision for me was quite easy, Mr. Speaker: I came to Congress to help people. I came to Congress to think big.

I was very excited when I was told prior to being sworn in that I was going to be serving on the Science Committee. I was even more thrilled when I learned that I would have the opportunity to serve as the lead Democrat on the Energy Subcommittee, knowing that the Energy Subcommittee would have partial jurisdiction over two national laboratories which are in my congressional district in Livermore, California: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory.

These two national laboratories, with about 6,500 employees at Livermore and 1,500 at Sandia, work every day to uphold our national security mission to maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile and also provide for energy security for citizens in the United States.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I had the opportunity multiple times as a city council member in Dublin to visit these national laboratories. And since being elected to Congress, I have had opportunities to visit the laboratories and also interact with their officials here in Washington.

What I have learned about these employees, these scientists, these engineers who work at our national laboratories is they care deeply about our country, but they also care very deeply about the science and the research that they work on every day and the laboratory environment that allows them to do that. So you can imagine how hard it is right now. We are in day 11 of a government shutdown, and laboratory employees were told about 2 days ago that, effective next week, they will be furloughed, too.

As you all know, Federal workers across our country from almost every agency have been furloughed or are working without pay. But at our national laboratories, which operate as GOCO facilities, which stands for government-owned/contractor-operated, these workers are not Federal workers but they are government contractors. They are scientists.

It is estimated that Livermore, California, has more Ph.D.'s per capita than any other city in the world because of the approximately 7,500 employees at our national laboratory. It was one of the hardest phone calls I have had to take since being sworn in to Congress when both laboratory directors called and said that in an hour they were going to tell their employees that they were going to be furloughed, and that they needed me to do anything I could in the Congress to help to get the government up and running and make sure the United States pays its bills so that their workers can continue to do the great things they are doing at our national laboratories.

This evening, I look forward to talking about what caused our shutdown, the truth behind what has caused the shutdown. I look forward to talking about the effect that the shutdown is having on people inside and outside of government—employees who are Federal workers, people who depend and rely on government services, people outside who work as government contractors—with a particular focus on what is happening at our national laboratories.

I also want to offer what I see as a way forward and a way that we can get out of this government shutdown, a way that we can get the Federal workforce working again, a way that we can make sure that our laboratory experts, our scientists, are able to go back to work and do great things to keep us safe and secure and move the ball forward on our energy policies.

I also want to tell all laboratory employees that today we submitted to Secretary Moniz, Members of Congress from the California delegation and Senator FEINSTEIN, a letter asking Secretary Moniz at the Department of Energy to allow our national laboratory employees—and there are about 30,000 of them across the country who have been furloughed—to be paid backpay for the time that they are furloughed.

I am honored to be joined on that letter by Bay Area House Members ZOE LOFGREN and also JERRY MCNERNEY, who will join me tonight. I am going to yield in a moment to both of those Members and allow them to talk about the national labs and the shutdown.

Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, who has represented the Tri-Valley area prior to redistricting back in 2010, knows greatly about our national laboratories. He is a Ph.D. serving in the Congress. He has a Ph.D. in mathematics and is somebody who worked as a wind engineer and has worked at our national laboratories. He will talk about the effect on our national laboratories.

Another champion of our national laboratories is Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, who also serves on the Science Committee with me. She is somebody who has been a champion for our national laboratories, and particularly Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. Although they are not in her congressional district, I am grateful for her constant support on every issue, knowing that she and I share a vision and a goal that one day we will realize fusion ignition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague Representative SWALWELL has pointed out, the government shutdown is causing serious damage to our country. The shutdown is putting Americans out of work and hurting the economy—not only the jobs of Federal employees, but the thousands of small businesses who provide goods and services to the government and to government employees who are not spending money that they no longer are getting in paychecks.

This harm is being felt across the country by millions of people. The closures impact thousands of important programs and services. We know parks are closed, stopping travel plans. We know that the Small Business Administration is not lending to the tune of a billion dollars a month. Federal business statistics are not being released, leaving us essentially flying blind when it comes to how the economy is doing. Army Corps of Engineers projects are halted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is not reviewing products to keep us safe. The VA is not able to decide claims from veterans. We saw the horrifying news earlier this week that death benefits for members of our armed services and their families were impacted. Meals for seniors are not being served, and children are being thrown out of Head Start. These are real issues. The economy is being held hostage.

But what we want to talk about this evening is not just those impacts that have been so well covered in the press, but how our economy's future is being held hostage by this government shutdown and by a lack of funding for science.

We were very proud in the San Francisco Bay area that we had three Nobel laureates just this week—Stanford's Michael Levitt and Thomas Sudhof and UC Berkeley's Randy Schekman—for terrific success. They were funded not through the labs but through the National Institutes of Health.

However, it is worth noting that this government shutdown is resulting in the furlough of 13,000 researchers. It is blocking hundreds of projects. The amazing thing to me was that their partner, James Rothman of Yale, who shared in the Nobel Prize, because of budget cuts and sequester, the research that actually got him the Nobel Prize was cut. Because of the sequester, the funding was cut for the research that got him the Nobel Prize. So there is an issue here not just on the shutdown holding the economy hostage, but also the underlying poor funding.

But let's talk just a minute about the national labs. A lot of people don't really know what the labs are. Those of us who are close to them do.

They were founded in 1943, and they were really meant to address the need to mobilize the Nation's scientific assets to support the war effort. Subsequent to that, they were utilized to bring the smartest people in the country together to focus on things that would keep us safe. As a matter of fact, they have helped keep us quite prosperous. Out of the lab have come things such as optical digital recording technology that is behind all music video and data storage, communications and observations satellites, advanced batteries now used in electric cars, supercomputers that as a society we would be lost without. So much from the national labs.

But one of the things that I think is enormously important and, unfortunately, has not received the kind of publicity it should have is the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

At 5:51 a.m. on September 29, there was a leap forward in the fusion experiment underway at that national lab. That Saturday shot was the latest in a series of carefully designed and incremental ignition experiments that have increased the yield. But here is the interesting thing. For the portion of the target, the 192 lasers that went into that target, there was more energy coming out than was put into the target. That has never happened before. So this is not the end of the quest to finish that science, but it is a major, major step forward. It is something that is actually threatened by this government shutdown.

I just received a copy of a notice that is going out to Lawrence Livermore tomorrow, and here is what it says, from the management at the lab to all the scientists:

> This is to remind you that beginning today, October 11, the lab will begin shutting down normal operations. Only essential functions necessary to assure safety and security will be ongoing.

The lab is shutting down. The employees are furloughed, as we have just gotten the most important step forward on this most important experiment going on in the United States. How can that be possibly be good for the United States of America?

Of course, Lawrence Livermore is not the only national lab that is adversely impacted. Just up the road from my home in Santa Clara County, we have the Stanford Linear Accelerator Laboratory, with their fabulous Linac Coherent Light Source. It is the world's most powerful x ray laser. Its focused beam, which arrives in staccato bursts a few quadrillionths of a second long, is allowing researchers to probe complex ultrasmall structures and freeze atomic motions. They will be able to see what is going on at a molecular level in real-time.

What is happening at the Stanford lab? The same cutbacks that are afflicting the Lawrence Livermore lab.

Look at some of the things that are coming out of these fine science facilities, like the wonderful corkscrewing lasers that can be the key to unlimited bandwidth that was recently devised at the Stanford Linear Accelerator, and the national lab at Livermore that has developed a safe and versatile material known as DNA Tagged Reagents for Aerosol Experiments. It is going to be a critical tool for protecting the United States.

All of these things are at risk. And for what? For a stupid, foolish partisan fight.

We could change this this evening, tomorrow morning. All we need is to have a bill on the floor to vote to reopen this government and to allow these scientists to continue to move forward to change the world and to create a brilliant future for our economy and for our safety and security.

So I thank my colleague, Representative SWALWELL, who does such an excellent job of representing the two labs in his district, as well as all the other constituents who are so proud of him here in his service in the Congress and for standing up for them—not just for their jobs, but for America's future.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who has been a tireless advocate for our national laboratories and is a fighter on the Science Committee day in and day out as we wage these battles and try and think big and challenge our colleagues to do everything we can to move the ball forward so that we can reach that point where we have clean energy fusion, where we have a renewable source that is safe and reliable and does not require us to look across oceans and time zones to provide our country's energy.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague, my former Congressman, my friend, who today is honoring Bow Tie Friday as well, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. I certainly want to thank my friend and colleague from Dublin, California, EROC SWALWELL, for bringing this topic up tonight. I want to thank my friend, ZOE LOFGREN from San Jose, for being an advocate and a champion of the labs long before I got here and carrying on that great tradition.

□ 1945

What I would like to do tonight is talk about my experience at the lab.

When I first got my Ph.D.—and I won't tell you how long ago it was—I started working for Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. I will tell you that there were a lot of great things about that experience. My colleagues were Bill Sullivan and Don Lobitz. There was Paul Veers. They were tireless; they were very well educated; they worked hard; and they were very inspirational to me as a young Ph.D. Our boss, whose name was Dick Braasch, went out there and delivered us the resources that we needed in order to carry out the research that was ahead of us.

In using that money and in using those tools and in using that resource, basically we developed wind energy technology from the very ground up. We were working on vertical access windmills, and we understood and worked very hard on the aerodynamics in order to understand exactly how to design blades to best maximize power and how to best maximize energy production from windmills so that wind turbines could be designed economically and make money. Now we see wind energy is a tremendous success. We see new windmills going up by the thousands—giant windmills that are 2,3, 4 megawatts. If you drive underneath them, they are just an incredible sight to see.

I just loved the experience, and I hope that we can continue to provide the resources for young scientists and young engineers who understand and who have the passion to go out there and make a difference and discover new technology and develop new energy sources and develop new health technology so that we can move forward.

The United States of America is truly the leader in this kind of technology. We lead in health care. We lead in health science. We lead in energy development. We lead in all kinds of sciences. Our universities are tremendous resources, but our laboratories are where the seasoned scientists go and produce real technology that can be transferred to the public sector.

Right now, if you look in Livermore, which is right outside of my district, there is a technology transfer operation. There is a cooperative organization between the laboratories—Sandia National Laboratories; the Livermore National Laboratory in the city of Livermore; in the city of Davis; Berkeley National Laboratory; Berkeley University; and so on. All of these institutions are working together with private companies to develop this technology and to transfer it into the private sector to give our businesses and our companies the edge they need to become successful and to create jobs and to lead our Nation.

One of the things they are doing in Livermore that is so exciting, which my colleague ZOE LOFGREN talked about, was the National Ignition Facility, the fusion facility there in Livermore. If you don't know about fusion, I will back up a little bit. ''Fusion'' is when you break apart a uranium or a plutonium atom to create energy. It is a source of what you call the atomic bomb nuclear power, but fusion is the other side of the scale at which you actually fuse nuclei together to form bigger nuclei, and even more energy is released. The prototype is the hydrogen bomb. What they are doing in Livermore is actually trying to understand how to contain fusion energy. There is an unlimited amount of fusion fuel out there. The ocean. It's heavy water. The ocean contains heavy water. It contains tritium.

So it is a matter of understanding this basic force of nature and controlling this basic force of nature. As ZOE LOFGREN mentioned a few minutes ago, what happened in Livermore just this last month was that they were successful in creating more energy in the fusion reaction than was put into the energy. It was put in the reaction.

So we see progress being made month by month, year by year. I've been out there to that facility. I've met with these scientists. I've met with the leaders. I can tell you that they have the same exact environment of just encouraging young scientists to do their best to make a difference, to understand science. It is very exciting for me to see that, and I would love to see that operation, that type of research continue at our national laboratories.

Los Alamos Laboratory, in Albuquerque, is also another fine institution like Sandia National Laboratories, like Livermore National Laboratory, and like Argonne Laboratory. There are several across the Nation. They do basic research, and they do basic development. My understanding is that the United States, with the NIP facility, have about a 5-year lead over other countries—over China—which are desperately trying to catch up with us.

When we furlough those scientists, when we stop that process, we set back our scientists for not just the amount of time they are laid off, but we stop the infrastructure. When you develop the technology that they have developed, this is several years of lead time to get the mirrors, to get the amplifiers that they use for this equipment. When you tell your suppliers, Well, we are not going to be using you for the next few months, those suppliers go away.

It takes years to develop the new technology, the new infrastructure, for these scientists to be able to purchase these items that are right now available. As we furlough these scientists and shut down that program, those people are going to go away. Maybe they will find customers in China. I hope not. So this is very, very critical for our national energy security and for our national security to keep on top of that and to not let that lapse.

The labs do other very useful things, like nuclear arms reduction. Some of the nuclear inspectors are from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. We have chemical weapons inspectors. I would bet some of the inspectors who are getting ready to go to Syria right now are from these laboratories. I would bet a bottom dollar on that. If you are worried about cybersecurity, if you know the threats that we may face in our country with cybersecurity, then you are going to want to know what they do at the Livermore National Laboratory and at the Sandia National Laboratories. They have some of the top—I don't want to call them ''hackers''—they have some of the top

folks who really understand how to get into computer systems and how to protect them and how to attack if they need to attack. We have some of the very best people in the world at these laboratories who are working on cybersecurity. We want to make sure that we continue to employ those folks and to get the best we can out of these folks who have so much passion on this subject.

Now, ZOE LOFGREN also mentioned the Stanford Linear Accelerator, SLAC. They have an x-ray laser. X-rays are incredibly hard to control, and designing an x-ray laser which makes laser beams which are monochromatic and coherent is an unbelievable achievement. The things that they are going to be able to do with that are beyond what we can imagine today. So keeping those types of operations in progress are absolutely essential.

We don't want to be laying these people off. We don't want to be giving them the message that their work is not essential. We don't want to be giving them the idea that, Well, maybe I would be better off in the private sector; maybe I would be better off making big dollars instead of working on things that are so important to our national security.

If you have watched in the last few months, I have been doing 1-minute presentations on science achievements in this country, science achievements that are funded by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. We have seen things like the Boltzmann equation move forward, which explains how gases behave, how they expand and contract. We have seen how statistics are used in neuroscience, how differential equations are factored to get new insights into the behavior of nature. These are ideas that are funded through grants from the National Science Foundation and also from the National Institutes of Health. They fund things on cancer, on understanding epidemics in order to keep us safe. If you understand what is happening in the biological world, there is always a threat of a new virus.

These folks are understanding that. They are giving us the tools to protect ourselves, and I think it is absolutely essential that we restore funding to the pre-sequester levels for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health.

We see our colleagues—well meaning, I know that—who want to reduce the size of government. They want to reduce funding for science for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health, and they think there are no consequences. There are consequences. The consequences are going to be that we see less science in this country and that we see more science in other countries. So we need to work together to find a solution.

Yes, we are absolutely willing to negotiate. Just don't hold a gun to our heads. Don't hold us hostage. Don't make this extortion. Come to us with reasonable ideas. We will sit down with you at any time, at any place, and if you want to demand that we eliminate the medical device tax, we will even be willing to talk about that but after we get the government functioning, after we pay our obligations. Then we can talk about things that we want, like funding for the National Science Foundation, like funding for the National Institutes of Health. Those are the things that we want to see. There are so many other things that have been reduced, like food stamps and the WIC program.

We want to make sure that our voices are heard and that the extortion sort of tactics that we have seen from the leadership and from the far right wing do not hold sway so that we can negotiate fairly, so that we can use the rule of law, so that we can use the traditions of this tremendous body—the House of Representatives—and the United States Senate within the standard practices of bringing bills to the committee, of negotiating, of adding amendments, and then of voting on them, and moving those forward to the Senate to agree and then to the President. That is the regular order. That is the order we want to use. That is the order that has been used in this country. If you decide that that isn't the way to do it, then we are going to fight you tooth and nail.

I want to thank my colleague again, ERIC SWALWELL. I see another colleague who represents Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, which is where I used to work. I appreciate the true effort tonight.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentleman from California. His passion for our laboratories, for science really shows. I am so glad he talked about what the Democrats have already done as far as compromising. That is really important here because I had a town hall last weekend. I went home on the one day we didn't have votes, and I went to the City Hall Chamber in Dublin, California, the council chamber there.

A number of folks rightfully asked me, What are the Democrats willing to give up in these negotiations?

I think it is important for folks to know that the Democrats have already made concessions, that we have made very, very difficult concessions. The best way to describe those concessions is with that ugly, terrible word called ''sequester,'' which has been across-the-board cuts, and they have hurt our national labs with these deep, deep cuts.

This chart here demonstrates it better than anything I have seen, which is that you have the President's budget, which is about $1.2 trillion. Then you see the 2011 debt limit deal at $1.6 trillion. You see PAUL RYAN's budget at $967 billion. Then, across the Capitol, the Senate passed a budget at $986 billion. To get a budget to keep the government running, you need what I call the Holy Trinity. You need the Senate, the House, and the President to all agree on one number.

You have the President, who wanted something in the low trillions. You have the Senate that compromised at $986 billion. The House has said that we will take $986 billion, and the President has now agreed that he would take $986 billion. The House has one very, very harsh exception. It will take $986 billion, but it started with wanting to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The Democrats have compromised. This chart shows that we have made deep and hard concessions during this budget negotiation. The biggest one, as I mentioned, is this mindless, across-the-board cut called ''sequester.'' Now, sequester is not targeted cuts. We are not going after bad programs. Rather, we are taking good programs, and we are taking bad programs, and we are seeing across-the-board cuts. It is indiscriminate.

At our laboratories, they have programs called LDRD, Laboratory Directed Research and Development. In the private sector, many companies allow their employees, especially in high-tech and innovation, about ''20 percent time,'' is what they call it. Google calls it ''20 percent time.'' So, for one day a week, effectively, an employee is allowed to work outside his assigned area—his subject matter, his expertise—on something that he thinks can move the ball forward in his industry. So ''20 percent time,'' they call it. At the laboratories, they call this ''LDRD.'' They are given about 8½ percent. So it is an over 50 percent less cut than what you are seeing in the private sector. It is 8½ percent that they are getting at our national laboratories. Because of these sequester cuts, that 8½ percent has been cut by more than half. Now they are below 4 percent for their LDRD, and the LDRD work at our national laboratories has produced some tremendous results in science.

□ 2000

I just want to go through some of them.

The gentleman from California talked about nonproliferation and what the research has done at the National Laboratories as far as reducing the stockpiles across the world.

Well, because of the LDRD work, what we have seen is that we are able to better test nuclear weapons and verify countries in the numbers they are claiming they have for nuclear weapons across the world because we have this LDRD research.

Also, we are able to provide cleaner energy vehicles because of LDRD research. The Volt, the Chevy Volt, for example. The Chevy Volt would not be able to cruise on battery power were it not for the advanced cathode technology that emerged from a National Laboratory.

Also, airport security. We are all so thankful and grateful that at the airport they are able to detect many of

the explosives that terrorists would seek to use to take down an airplane. LDRD we can thank for much of the research that has come out that makes our airports so much safer.

I was a prosecutor for 7 years. In so many cases, whether it was homicides or sexual assaults, we were able to put perpetrators away because of DNA research that was conducted at our National Laboratories. To DNA testing we can now add human antibody detection, a precise method of catching suspects and attaching them to crime scenes. This was something I was able to use in a courtroom to great effect. That science is so powerful when you have so many questions of who committed the crime that all jurors can accept the scientific research that has come out of LDRD and the DNA advances that we have seen there.

I want to yield now to a colleague of mine from New Mexico who represents the Albuquerque area and the other Sandia laboratory, our sister over there in New Mexico. I have Sandia and Livermore and the gentlelady from New Mexico has Sandia in New Mexico. I am going to yield to her and have her tell us about this shutdown and what effect it has had on our National Laboratories, particularly in her district.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Thank you very much to my friend and colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the hard work of the men and women at New Mexico's National Labs who protect our Nation's security and help grow our economy.

Sandia National Labs in my district is home to 9,000 of those dedicated public servants. These are the best and brightest physicists, chemists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians. They have chosen to serve our country instead of taking more lucrative jobs in the private sector because they are passionate about the lab's mission.

Sandia is a national security asset that uses technology to find solutions to the most challenging problems that threaten our Nation. Their work supports numerous Federal, State, and local government agencies, companies, and organizations.

During the BP oil spill, Sandia employees were called in to help cap the well. The work they do is absolutely remarkable.

Since 1976, Sandia has received 101 coveted research and development 100 awards, often referred to as the ''Oscars of invention'' or the ''Nobel prizes of technology.''

While New Mexico's National Labs have been able to use carryover funds to stay open during the shutdown for the past 11 days, that money is quickly running out. Within the last week, employees at both Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs received letters informing them that they would face furloughs if the government doesn't reopen soon.

Despite the fact that they play a crucial role in our Nation's security, the employees at New Mexico's National Labs are technically not Federal employees. As a result, the legislation we passed to provide back pay to furloughed Federal employees, which I was proud to support, unfortunately does not protect employees at these labs.

Earlier this week, Congressman LUJÁN and I, along with Senators UDALL and HEINRICH, sent a letter to Energy Secretary Moniz requesting that he allow the labs to use their funding to back pay any employees furloughed because of the shutdown.

I remain hopeful that the furloughs can be avoided because I have heard stories about the damage that they can do, and I have seen firsthand the damaging and devastating effect that the other Federal furloughed employees and their families have suffered in Albuquerque, my district, and the entire State of New Mexico.

In fact, last Sunday in Albuquerque, I hosted a roundtable meeting with lab employees, furloughed Federal employees, and members of the business community. They told me that any missed or delayed paychecks would prevent them from paying their mortgage payments, household utility bills, car loan payments, and credit cards on time.

But they are not just worried about their pay; they are also worried about their careers. Lab employees who hold security clearances are in danger of losing their clearances if their credit scores are impacted because they cannot pay their bills.

After the meeting, I reached out to community partners to see if they would be able to help us in any way. Several credit unions, banks, utility providers, and other community partners reached out because they all want to help.

If nonprofits in the business community can step up, then it is time for Congress to step up too. We need to do our job, we need to pass a funding bill to keep New Mexico's National Labs open. National Labs should not be forced to operate under the threat of shutting down just because a few dozen reckless Tea Party Republicans decided that destroying the Affordable Care Act was more important than keeping the government open.

New Mexico's National Labs deserve and require the certainty and stability of a full funding bill and so does the rest of the country. We need to vote on the Senate passed clean funding compromise right now.

I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership in protecting our national security interests and the labs in my home State.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentlelady from New Mexico. I am glad she brought up the examples of the toll that this shutdown is taking on our National Laboratory employees.

We are hearing back at Livermore, at Sandia, and at Lawrence Livermore so many examples like what the gentlelady mentioned with security clearances. You wouldn't think about it. But when thousands of employees have security clearances that depend on them continuing to have financial stability, that stability is threatened when our National Laboratories furlough them and they are unable to meet their debts and obligations and pay their bills and keep their families running.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) also talked about the effects of furloughing these scientists. When you furlough scientists, you also furlough scientific progress.

I mentioned the town hall that I had last weekend in Dublin, California. Lab employees from Sandia and Lawrence Livermore showed up for that town hall. I am going to fly home this Sunday, and we are going to host another town hall at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. It is going to be at 1:30 on Sunday. We have alerted laboratories to that town hall, and I look forward to talking to them. I hope to have a more positive update than what I can provide today. I hope that I can tell them that the shutdown will not continue; that they will be able to continue their work at our great National Laboratories.

Now, I talked a little bit about how we got here. That we had a budget from the President and the Senate at $986 billion, but the House's budget wouldn't accept only $986 billion; it wanted to repeal and defund the Affordable Care Act.

The reason I am so hopeful that we hold firm in the Senate, and that the President continues to hold firm and insist that we pass what is called a clean budget at $986 billion, is because of the dangerous, dangerous precedent it would set should we allow either side to try and seek concessions or seek a ransom for simply doing their job of providing a budget.

Our job being here in Congress and working under article I of the Constitution requires us to pass a budget that funds the government to pay the debts and obligations of the United States.

It would be a dangerous precedent if we had an environment where every 45 days, 60 days, or if we ever got back to passing a budget on an annual basis, that one side in one Chamber attempted to use that budgeting process to revisit and try and resettle scores that have already been settled.

That is so obviously occurring here with the Affordable Care Act. This is a provision that was initially brought up and contemplated in the 2008 campaign for the Presidency, where one person, one candidate, said that if he was elected he would seek to bring our country for the first time in over 100 years since it was first proposed affordable health care for all. That person was overwhelmingly elected to the Presidency—Barack Obama.

In 2010, the Congress, the 111th Congress, passed the Affordable Care Act. It was signed into law by the same President who campaigned on it.

In 2012, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, who was appointed by a Republican President who served before President Barack Obama, wrote a majority opinion that said that that law, the Affordable Care Act, was constitutional.

That same President who ran on the Affordable Care Act in 2008, who signed into law congressional action in 2010, who saw it upheld in 2012 by a Republican-appointed Supreme Court chief justice, ran for reelection, and again was overwhelmingly elected.

The Affordable Care Act will do many great things to provide affordable, quality health care to many Americans. But like every government program, it will not be 100 percent perfect. It too will require fixes and updates.

Just recently, Social Security celebrated a birthday. It is in its late 70s now. Social Security is not the same program that it was over 70 years ago. It has gone through different modifications and changes through the years. Just as the Affordable Care Act, we owe it to the American people to look at it as it is implemented, to look how it is helping people, to look at where glitches are and what we can do to make it work.

We must mend any problems with the Affordable Care Act, but not end it. We must not use the Affordable Care Act as a way to hold up a budget that provides so many jobs for the Federal workforce, so many services that come from the greatest government that presides over the greatest democracy in the world, so many services being held up for so many people across our country.

It would be a dangerous, dangerous precedent if we allowed either side to do this. Let me just offer an example: if we were to make concessions on this budgeting process—say at the very best buy us a 45-day continuing resolution where the government would be funded for another 45 days—what would the other side ask for next? Would it ask for us to privatize Social Security, something they attempted to do in 2006 but weren't able to do? Would they ask us to turn Medicare into a voucher system, something that they are not able to achieve because of a majority in the Senate and a Democratic President who has vowed not to let that happen?

But also think and reverse the situation: imagine if you had a Republican in the White House, a Republican-controlled Senate and a Democratic majority in the House. Imagine if that Democratic majority tried to use the budgeting process to achieve what it couldn't achieve at the ballot box. You can imagine the different scenarios where we can try and do this—whether it is passing background checks, something that has frustrated so many House Democrats that we couldn't get that passed in the Senate; whether it is passing an assault weapons ban, something that so many House Democrats would like to see renewed, as we had back in the '90s. It could be comprehensive immigration reform, something that our country is calling for. People are coming to our capital asking to have a roadmap to citizenship in reforms and work visas. We can't do that legislatively right now. But imagine if Democrats had a majority here and a Republican in the White House, and they said: No budget; we are shutting down the government until we get what we want because we couldn't do it at the ballot box.

We have never operated that way, and I hope we do not continue to operate that way, and that more reasonable minds come forward and allow us to put our National Laboratory employees back to work, allow us to put our Federal workforce back to work.

This shutdown is affecting and hurting real people. I mentioned in the beginning of this hour that I came to Congress to help people, but right now it is hurting innocent Americans.

Even though the Federal Government is closed, essential services must continue so hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are being forced to work but with no paycheck. How can we treat such dedicated public servants this way?

We saw just last week as an erratic driver tried to drive through the barricade on Capitol Hill that our brave men and women of the Capitol Hill police force rushed to protect the doors of democracy. And what thanks did we give them in return? We told them to keep working, keep protecting this House, but we are going to hold your paycheck.

Many more aren't even allowed to work in the Federal Government, denied the chance to do the jobs they love, serving on behalf of the American people, and they are left worrying if they will ever get paid or if they are going to be lost.

□ 2015

The loss also ripples throughout our economy, affecting businesses throughout the country. It is estimated that this shutdown is costing the economy $300 million a day. And so you can see, people are asking across the country: Will I get paid this month? Will there be enough money for food? Can I pay my mortgage this month? I am a first time home buyer; some of those FHA loans look very good for me, but they are delayed, they are on hold. Will I be able to pay my child's college tuition? All of the questions that folks in our Federal workforces, folks who are working at our national laboratories are asking.

Small businesses can't get SBA loans. Small business centers which help women and veterans are closed. Our national parks are closed. Technology updates for all of our Federal programs are being delayed. And mentioned earlier, our cybersecurity centers, employees there are going to be furloughed, the cybersecurity centers that work to protect our Nation's networks, that work to ensure that nation-states and individuals who wish to do us harm aren't able to do so.

I would like to now yield to the greatest champion in this House to end and reduce the effect of poverty on our community and somebody who has the honor of representing Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, which has over 4,000 employees. I have visited that facility, and they are doing such great work to advance the progress of science.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but also for your tremendous leadership on this issue and on so many other issues. It is a pleasure to serve with you. You have really hit the ground running as a new Member of this great body. I also want to thank you for your work on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. As a fellow member of the Bay Area congressional delegation, you have made such an impact and your work is so important for our entire California delegation, so thank you.

My district is California's 13th Congressional District, right next door to your congressional district. As you said, it is home to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Let me just say first how proud I am to represent one of the most esteemed centers for scientific research and technological advancement in the world. I have had many, many opportunities to visit the lab where I have met some of the most brilliant scientific minds on our planet. The employees, the scientists, all of those who work at the lab are phenomenal individuals, and it is just amazing to see how the scientists and engineers especially use our Federal investments in our national laboratory system to make unbelievable leaps in every field, from nanotechnology and supercomputing to energy efficiency and astrophysics.

The history of the lab is unbelievable. It was established in 1931 by Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ernest Orlando Lawrence. The lab has been associated with 13 Nobel Prizes. Fifty-seven of the lab's scientists are members of the National Academy of Sciences. Thirteen have won the National Medal of Science, our Nation's highest award for lifetime achievement in the field of science.

Over the years, Berkeley Lab scientists have discovered 16 elements; made the world's smallest motor, 100,000 times smaller than a human hair; used ultraviolet technology to bring safe drinking water to thousands across the world; and helped decipher the human genome.

I could go on and on, but we are not here today to laud the accomplishments of the national labs in our district, but I think it is very important to do that even in this very difficult environment.

We are here because these institutions of innovation are under a real

and immediate threat, thanks to the Republican shutdown of our government. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory employs over 4,200 scientists, support staff, and students in my congressional district. Its economic impact is even greater, creating 5,600 local jobs and 12,000 jobs nationally, with a total economic impact estimated at $1.6 billion a year.

If this shutdown continues, the Berkeley Lab will be forced to furlough its employees in waves beginning in late October. Not only does the shutdown threaten the livelihood of my constituents, the scientists, the administrators, and the support staff that keep the lab running, it also threatens to stall projects that could be the next scientific breakthrough that changes how our world works or produces the next Nobel Peace Prize winner. So this is really an absurd price to pay for the Republican insistence on keeping people from receiving affordable, quality health care. That is where all of this started.

For the life of me, I don't understand why my Republican Tea Party colleagues are continuing these cynical ploys that threaten our Nation's competitiveness and force our Nation's most brilliant minds out of their labs. We need to end this shutdown. We need to fund the entire energy and water bill, which provides funding for our national laboratories through the Department of Energy's Office of Science. We need an up-or-down vote on a clean budget bill to reopen this government.

Democrats have already—and I know you have heard this over and over again, Mr. SWALWELL, because you know we have already accepted a short-term budget bill to reopen our government even though we don't believe its funding level is nearly adequate.

The American people deserve a functioning government, and they deserve affordable, quality health care. They deserve both. I hope more people are listening and more people understand that we know how to open the government. We know how to begin to negotiate on a real budget that makes our entire government, including our national laboratories, whole.

And so hopefully this alarm that we are sounding tonight, Mr. SWALWELL, will continue to wake up the country and continue to ensure that people know that we have their backs and that we know how to open this government and we want to shut down this shutdown immediately. Thank you again for your leadership.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentlelady from California. She is absolutely correct. Democrats have compromised. We have accepted a $986 billion sequester budget, which the gentlelady and I do not accept. When you cut those programs, we are cutting the opportunities to lift people out of poverty. I agree with the gentlelady, we have made deep, deep concessions when it comes to a budget. We are ready to open up the government and turn the lights back on, but we are doing so at a painful price with the budget we are accepting.

With that, I will close. I want to say to what my colleague from Berkeley and Oakland was saying: Keep our national labs open. Keep those great scientists at Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, keep them on the job, moving the job forward on science.

It was alluded to earlier that the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, as the government that funds it was unraveling 2 weeks ago, at the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, they achieved something they had been attempting to achieve for the past 3–4 years. That is fusion. For the first time, they have been able to get more energy out than what they have put in. This is a remarkable achievement. They have achieved fusion, and they are knocking on the door of ignition at the National Ignition Facility. They are closer than they have ever been. They are closer now to meeting the 84th milestone. They have 84 milestones they have to meet. They have met 83 of them. They are so close to providing this renewable energy resource which will change the game on how every person in the world receives their energy, no longer requiring us to be dependent on foreign sources of energy if we can achieve this and then transfer this technology to the private market.

The data achieved at NIF is critical for understanding nuclear fusion, which we need for keeping a reliable stockpile of nuclear weapons. So this is a critical energy issue and a critical defense issue. Understanding fusion, as I mentioned, allows us to get closer to the goal of civilian fusion energy. And nuclear fusion energy, unlike what we currently use, nuclear fission essentially would produce no waste or carbon emissions. It is the ''holy grail'' of clean energy, and I want to make sure that the scientists at Lawrence Livermore are able to accomplish it.

Sandia also has a facility called the Combustion Research Facility. This is a partnership, a public-private partnership with our automakers and those who are making automobiles in Detroit. What they are trying to do is make the American automobile engine more efficient at the Combustion Research Facility. There are important, remarkable achievements going on at our national laboratories.

With the furlough at our laboratory, all of their exceptional work will be put on hold. So what does that mean in relation to the National Ignition Facility and the Combustion Research Facility? It means that work will stop that is being done to maintain our nuclear stockpile; the great fusion energy project I mentioned; efforts to understand climate change will stop; all while we stand still, other countries like Russia and China will zoom past us in science, math, and renewable energy.

And this isn't just what happens today. If these highly skilled, highly intelligent employees are prevented from working, they will go somewhere else. These people are Ph.D.'s. They will find somewhere else to go.

At the beginning of the hour, I said I would not only tell us how we got here, what it means, I would also offer a way forward. The way forward, as I see it, is for the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, to allow this House to have an up-or-down vote on passing the same budget that the Senate has agreed to, the same budget that the President of the United States said he would sign. We know the votes are there. Twenty-five to 30 Republicans have said they would pass that vote.

So let's get the government back to work. Let's end the partisanship games, the obsession with defunding the Affordable Care Act, and let's get the government back to work. In the meantime, a short-term solution I have offered is that Secretary Moniz allow furloughed employees at all of our national laboratories, at all 17 sites, all 30,000 employees, to receive back furlough pay.

I have also worked since January with a small group of freshmen, about 30 of us, Republicans and Democrats evenly divided. It is called the United Solutions Caucus. We have been meeting almost every week since sworn into office, pledging that we will work together and build the foundation of a bipartisan relationship. In these trying times and dark days over the last 2 weeks, we have met nearly every other day, talking about what we can do to work together to turn back on the lights of the government for the greatest democracy of the world. This group gives me hope.

Just yesterday, the group met with two senior members, a Republican and a Democrat, from the Appropriations Committee. Nobody in that group and neither of those senior members want to see the government continue to be shut down, so I am hopeful that we can continue to talk. I am hopeful that this group can continue to work together, the United Solutions Caucus, to provide a way forward, a way that ensures that the Federal workforce is back to work; and for my district, ensures that those hardworking scientists who want to think big, just like I did, the same reason I came to Congress, that want to move the ball forward on our nuclear and energy security, that they can go back to work and they aren't ever furloughed.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Did you come here to help people or did you come here to hurt people? I think you came here for the same reason I did, to help people, and so I hope you will prove it to the American people. Allow an up-or-down vote; allow us to pass a clean resolution; and together, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, can help the American people.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy's National Laboratories are vital to our national security, our economy, and our environment. They have often been called "crown jewels" of our federal research and development infrastructure, and for good reason. This is why I am extremely concerned about the impacts of this senseless government shutdown on these important facilities—and this is on top of the harmful cuts that they have already had to endure under budget sequestration.

It is worth reminding my colleagues here today that we have seen how our past investments in the national laboratories have paid off when it comes to energy development. DOE labs were key to the development of high-efficiency gas turbines for coal plants, nuclear reactors, and the directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing practices that have led to the shale gas boom of today.

I think it is also important to note that DOE's Office of Science—which oversees most of these national laboratories—is actually the largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences in the nation, and it operates more than 30 national scientific user facilities whose applications go well beyond energy innovation. Our nation's top researchers from industry, academia, and other federal agencies use these facilities to examine everything from new materials that will better meet our military's needs, to new pharmaceuticals that will better treat disease, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe. I believe that this stewardship of unique scientific research, including the nation's major national user facilities, is another very important role that the Department plays in bolstering our national competitiveness today and in building the industries of the future.

It's no secret that Congress's inability to date to come to an agreement on a sensible budget plan has led to some devastating cuts to many of these important facilities, with serious impacts to our nation in both the short-term and the long-term. Until we resolve the current crisis, even more of our nation's best and brightest will be forced out of work and some of their most critical research tools—for which the U.S. taxpayers contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to build—will have to cease operations. I believe that we are doing damage to the seed corn of our future, and as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I believe that ending this shutdown and reversing these drastic cuts need to be our highest priorities going forward.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and October 12 on account of family obligations.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 11:30 a.m. and for October 12 on account of a family medical emergency.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1276. An act to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 91. 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 12, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3277. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's intention to expand the assignment of female Field Artillery Officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3278. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3279. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3280. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Neosho Mucket and Threatened Status for the Rabbitsfoot [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0031] (RIN: 1018-AX73) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3281. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Florida Bonneted Bat [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0078] (RIN: 1018-AY15) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3282. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Threatened Status for the Streaked Horned Lark [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0080; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY18) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3283. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistance Appeals [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0015] (RIN: 1660-AA79) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3284. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0671; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-17547; AD 2013-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on four Agency's Drug-Free Workplace Plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Appropriations.

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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 380. Resolution relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agricultural through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance (Rept. 113–244). 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. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3285. A bill to make technical corrections to the Pay Our Military Act to include midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are appointed as midshipmen in the Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COOK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 3286. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse States that use State funds to operate National Parks during the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3287. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans service organizations with the same access to Department of Veterans Affairs facilities during the Government shutdown as such organizations had immediately prior to the shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to exempt expenditures or obligations of funds derived from user fees from certain limitations under the Antideficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289. A bill to provide funds during the lapse of appropriations for the payment of military death gratuities and funeral and related transportation and housing expenses through the transfer of unobligated amounts in the Health Insurance Reform Implementation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3290. A bill to provide that all Federal employees shall be deemed to be employees excepted from furlough for purposes of the Government shutdown commencing on or about October 1, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that financial institutions should work proactively with their customers affected by the shutdown of the Federal Government who may be facing short-term financial hardship and long-term damage to their creditworthiness through no fault of their own; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 378. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 379. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 381. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Latino AIDS Awareness Day'' on October 15, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. GRIMM:

H.R. 3285.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 3286.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3287.

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

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3288.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further,

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289.

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

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law''

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States''

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3290.

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: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . .to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 22: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 383: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 460: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 541: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 647: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 669: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 679: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 713: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 724: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 961: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1094: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1146: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1150: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1281: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1317: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1355: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1501: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GERLACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HALL, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1645: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1732: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1775: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1821: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1827: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1918: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1998: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2000: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2101: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2241: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2286: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2350: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2502: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2509: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2540: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2578: Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2585: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2591: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2697: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2772: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2785: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2807: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2810: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2839: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2866: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2925: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2932: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LONG, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2939: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2967: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2988: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2997: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3002: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3043: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3077: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3090: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3097: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3103: Mr. COHEN and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3111: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BENISHEK and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3121: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 3128: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3189: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3211: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3218: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3276: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3279: Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3284: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH and Mr. BECERRA.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CHU, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 254: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 375: Mr. CONYERS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Global Union of Scientists for Peace, Iowa, relative to a letter regarding the prospect of ending the violence in Syria through a scientifically proven approach; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013 No. 142

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, JR., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we desperately need Your steadfast love to sustain us during this difficult time. Lord, give our lawmakers the wisdom to distinguish between truth and error and the courage to act upon those insights. Help them to avoid the shortcuts that lead away from Your will, as You make them Your eyes, ears, feet, and hands to bring solace to those who suffer. Give them a hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and shame, as they seek to replace them with gentleness, patience, and truth.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2013.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a Republican special caucus meeting with President Obama.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is my opinion. If we allow the United States to default on its debt for the first time in our glorious history, it will be a black mark on our reputation, and that is a gross understatement. There will be a financial disaster, and it will spark a global recession.

As I indicated when I began, this is my opinion, but this is not my opinion alone. If we listen to the economic leaders of this country, respected economists, bankers, and business leaders, this is what they say.

For example, yesterday the chief executive officer of the American Express, whose company is valued at almost $80 billion, said this about default:

What's important to understand is if the United States hits the debt ceiling and is unable to pay its debts, the consequences will be immediate and dramatic. . . . If the U.S. defaults, the [global financial] system literally unwinds.

So no one misinterprets what he said, I will read it again.

What's important to understand is if the United States hits the debt ceiling and is unable to pay its debts, the consequences will be immediate and dramatic. . . . If the U.S. defaults, the [global financial] system literally unwinds.

His dire warning has been accepted and echoed by reasonable Members of Congress, including many Republicans. Even Speaker BOEHNER admitted in 2011, the last time Republicans forced this country to the brink of default, that failing to pay the bills would be catastrophic. He said:

Not raising the debt limit would have serious—very serious—implications for the worldwide economy and jobs here in America.

But this year Speaker BOEHNER seemed willing to risk default day after day, holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to extract extreme political concessions.

Yesterday it was very good to see my Republican colleagues, some at least, come around to the idea of a clean bill to avert default. Think about that. They are talking about extending the debt ceiling for 2 months—for 6 weeks. Please.

But some have admitted the clean bill to avoid default should be the standard. I certainly agree with that.

I repeat, we do not believe a 6-week delay of a catastrophic default is enough to give the economy the confidence it needs to continue growing and recovering. Using their theory, we would have another one of these periods of bedlam in Washington before the most important purchasing season at any time during the year, Christmas, right before Christmas, when people are beginning to buy things for Christmas.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

We will vote tomorrow on a 15-month measure to ensure the United States lives up to its obligations, giving the economy certainty and stability over the long term. But Congress's work to restore faith in government won't end with avoiding default.

The Federal Government is still closed for business, causing hardship and heartbreak for millions of American families, such as the Trowbridge family in Reno, NV. They have a 17-year-old son Austin who was scheduled to receive an experimental bone marrow transplant at NIH in Washington. Without the transplant, he could die, just as his brother did 5 years ago from the same disease.

But the National Institutes of Health are shuttered, along with the rest of the government and the Centers for Disease Control. The assistant Democratic leader has laid out 79 different programs that would need to be reinstated to open the government, and we are getting them piecemeal—piecemeal.

In the meantime, people are suffering, not only Federal employees but the people who depend on them. We have four States that are trying to work something out with Secretary Jewell to have the States pay for opening national parks.

It is time for Republicans to give the Trowbridge family and others some relief. Reopen the government, the whole government, so kids such as Austin can get the treatment they need. Families of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty can't get the death benefits they deserve. Why? Because the government is closed. Every American family who relies on the Federal Government can't get the help and services they need.

Reopen the Federal Government, let's pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a sensible budget solution that secures our country's long-term fiscal leads.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. McCONNELL. Shortly I will join my Republican colleagues at the White House. It will be a good time to engage in a frank exchange of ideas with the President, if that is what he is looking for. But if all the President wants is to drag us over there to say he won't negotiate, that won't be particularly productive.

Throughout this crisis, the President has taken what you might call an unorthodox approach to governing. His basic position could be summed up in basically three words: He won't negotiate.

I think that has left many Americans scratching their heads. I know the President and the Democratic leaders in Congress want to borrow more money without any strings attached. But the rest of us actually want to enact some commonsense reforms to get our debt under control, and we want to keep our commitments to the American people.

A key point is: Nobody wants a default. That is why, in 50 years of negotiations over multiple debt ceiling increases, we haven't had a single default, not a one. We have negotiated over debt ceilings for 50 years and never had a default. Let's put this hysterical talk of default behind us and instead start talking about finding solutions to the problems.

There are a variety of ways to get debt and spending under control, a lot of innovative reforms we should consider. But we need to talk to each other if we are going to make any of that happen.

I will bet that some of my Democratic friends have spending-cut ideas as well, and we would like to hear them. Let's sit down and talk this out. Members on both sides of the aisle in Congress are discussing solutions, and these discussions will continue as soon as we get back from the White House.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:40 a.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 1:15 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KAINE).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we are in the 11th day of the government shutdown. We have caused great harm to the people of this country. We have already caused harm. We have hurt the United States on the international front. The President, as I mentioned previously, was absent at the Asian economic summit. The Asian economic summit was the opportunity for America, the President of the United States, to be the headliner. Instead, the President of China, President Xi, became the headliner. There were questions asked about whether America is ''open for business'' with our trading partners. We have been hurt by this shutdown, make no mistake about it.

Our economy has suffered. Just the threat of defaulting—of not paying our bills—has hurt consumer confidence. Consumer confidence measures whether consumers are ready to go out and buy that car, buy that home, go on vacation. After the terrorist attacks on the country on September 11, 2001, consumer confidence dropped by about 8.8 percent. I could go over other calamitous moments in history, but the debt ceiling debate today is about twice as damaging to consumer confidence as the 9/11 attack. We are talking about paying our bills when we talk about raising the debt ceiling—bills that have already been incurred. We are just paying the bills.

Mr. President, we are hurting our country. We are hurting our economy. We are wasting taxpayer dollars. We all talk about dealing with the debt. But in the government shutdown, we have wasted over $2 billion of taxpayer money as a result of it.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in this region—Maryland, Virginia, the District—we have over 300,000 Federal workers who are on furlough of the 800,000 who are furloughed nationwide. That has a direct impact on families as well as our economy. These Federal workers are not buying in their local shops, they are not eating in the local restaurants. I stopped into a restaurant for a sandwich over the last weekend. I said: How are things going? The shopowner said: Terrible. Social Security employees are not here. I cannot keep my business open without their business.

We have seen the direct impact. I have tried to put faces on these numbers. We could talk about the statistics and the numbers. Let's talk about people, the individual people I hear from—I know the Presiding Officer has received calls from constituents in Virginia. It is the same story.

Over a week ago we brought in Amy Fritz who works at the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Adminstration (NOAA). She is a Federal worker who is furloughed. She tracks weather conditions and works on the computer models to predict how storms will behave. It is a pretty important position she has. She was telling of the hardship to her family. The Baltimore Sun reported today that at NOAA it is not just the Federal workers, it is the contract workers who are suffering. The Sun cited the example of Tiffany House, a person who lives in Hyattsville, MD. She is a single mom, a contract employee of NOAA, who has been laid off as a result of the shutdown. It is more than just 800,000 Federal workers; we have the contract workers who have been laid off as a result of the shutdown.

She said, ''Even though we're furloughed and we are not getting paid, the bills keep coming.''

There are a lot of hard-working families who live paycheck to paycheck. We are 11 days into this government shutdown. Families are wondering what they are going to do when it comes to paying their bills.

The Sun reported about Keith Tate from Hyattsville. He works for FM Talent Source in Silver Spring. Almost 30 percent of their contract employees, 92 people in total, have been laid off. He

was starting work on October 1—his luck. He was looking forward to it. He went to work on October 1 but then was furloughed as a result of the government shutdown.

The effect goes well beyond individual people that you would expect, like Federal employees and contractors. I have a friend, Hugh Sisson, who started Heavy Seas Brewery in Baltimore. It is one of America's great craft breweries. He is doing a great job and hiring people. You may say, ''How does this affect him? He sells beer.'' Well, beer sales are affected by furloughs and a drop in consumer confidence, but it's worse than that. The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) employees at the Department of the Treasury have been furloughed. They're the people who review and approve new breweries, recipes, and labels. Hugh told me, ''We have eight labels waiting for approval and 10 formulas we would like to start the process on but can't at this time.''

Craft brewers like Hugh Sisson are innovators, constantly introducing new beers and seasonal beers, fresh products. They are being hurt all over the Nation as a result of the TTB staff being furloughed. They don't just hire their own staff; they support jobs in agriculture for barley and hops and other ingredients; in manufacturing for stainless steel kettles and fermenters and bottling and canning lines; and in distribution and retail. These are blue collar jobs and white collar jobs. All across America. These are jobs that won't be outsourced overseas. And this shutdown is hurting America's craft brewers.

This shutdown is hurting our economy, hurting our country, hurting individuals, hurting taxpayers, hurting businesses. We can do much better. In my State of Maryland 10 percent of our workforce works for the Federal Government. The dedicated employees at these agencies do work that's important to all Americans, not just Marylanders.

As I pointed out previously, Harbor Point is one of the most important economic developments in downtown Baltimore, but it's RCRA site—that stands for the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act—which means it requires the consent of government, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), before this enormous economic development project can move forward. The people at EPA who would approve this project have been furloughed. This economic project now is on hold.

I could mention other examples of agencies that are critically important. I could also talk a lot more about private employment. It is not just government employment, it is private employment. Convergence Technology Consulting, located in Glen Burnie, MD, does cloud computing services for the Department of Defense. Twenty percent of the firm's 65 employees have been laid off.

TW Corporation in Hanover does cyber security work, and one-third of its 700 employees were furloughed. The list of the damages caused by the government shutdown goes on and on.

My message is pretty simple. We have to make sure government is open. We have to make sure we open government, and we have to pay our bills.

I understand we would like to have an agreement on a budget. I would like to have an agreement on the budget. For 6 months we have been trying to go to conference. The Senate passed a budget, the House passed a budget. They are different. The Senate budget, one that I supported, the Presiding Officer supported, would provide more resources for job growth by investing in infrastructure, by investing in education, by investing in research. Yes, we do provide more revenues by closing tax loopholes. We also start to rein in government spending and continue to do that. The House-passed budget has fewer of those investments. It does not close the loopholes in our Tax Code. That is what we have to negotiate between Democrats and Republicans. That is what we need to do. But the first order of business is to reopen government—all of it—and pay our bills, and then let's sit down and negotiate. We cannot wait. We must have government open.

I quoted before from the Baltimore Sun and the paper's analogy of negotiations. It is difficult when this is all one-sided. As Sunpapers said:

> 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.

Our message is clear to House Speaker BOEHNER: Put down the gun. Put it down. Open government. Allow us to pay our bills. And, yes, we want to sit down and work out our differences. Let the democratic process proceed. Open government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a fair and comprehensive agreement on the budget.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. 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. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to speak for about 10 minutes. I understand there may be other Senators coming to the floor. I wanted to express my concerns about a few issues that are really important to the people of Louisiana.

I understand that the meeting with the President and the Republicans in the Senate—our friends—has just concluded. I am hoping there will be some positive steps forward from that meeting so we can open this government, remove the threat of an economic collapse, and get to the bargaining table to which we have literally been trying to achieve for 6 months. We voted 21 times in the Senate to get to the negotiating table in the budget conference, which is the first starting point to agree on numbers and revenues and spending limits.

As an appropriator—I would know this as chair of the Appropriations Committee—the next step in regular order is for each individual committee to negotiate with our Republican counterparts about how we allocate the money given to us through that budget process.

None of that has been able to happen—none. It is not because Democrats have been unwilling to go to the negotiating table, but because some friends on the other side have taken hostage innocents—Federal employees, the economy generally—and demanded things that are way beyond their ability to use their political leverage. So instead of using it correctly, they have held innocent hostages. It is very troubling, and I think it is very wrong. Hopefully, we are going to find a way forward.

FLOOD INSURANCE

I wanted to spend my time this afternoon talking about what I am hearing from the people in Louisiana, such as: Could you all get back to work because we have some serious problems that need to be solved. One of the problems—Mr. President, maybe your State is affected by this because the Presiding Officer has a coastal area, as do we—is fixing this very broken flood insurance system. In our State it is referred to as Biggert-Waters. It was named after the two Members of Congress who led this ''reform effort.''

MAXINE WATERS has subsequently completely disassociated herself with the legislation and said it was not the right thing to do. She has made several public statements. She has urged, as the leader in the House, with Republicans and Democrats, to get this fixed.

For the people of Louisiana, this is our No. 1 problem and challenge right now because a year and a half ago the Federal Government passed a law that was supposed to cure something. But the cure is worse than the disease. The disease was we had a flood insurance program that spent more money than it had taken in. And, yes, premiums were probably too low to sustain the program, but it was giving people at least some option and hope when they had a flood, so they could get some of the equity in their home protected and recovered.

This bill came along and was never debated on the Senate floor. It was

stuck in a conference committee report, and now it is being implemented, and it is a disaster. We have 400,000 flood insurance policies in Louisiana, Texas has 700,000, Florida has over 2 million, Pennsylvania has over 75,000, and Virginia probably has between 40,000 and 50,000. I don't have the list in front of me.

The problem is that the law that passed had stated one goal: to make the program sustainable. But it left out an equally important aspect: to make it affordable. You can sustain a program all day long, but if nobody can afford to be in it, A, how long will it sustain itself? Not long at all. And, B, we are hurting the people we are trying to help the most.

A group of us have been working for quite some time on fixing this. These new regulations went into effect on October 1. We are going on 11 or 12 days—I forget the date, but we are past October 1. These new rates have gone into effect, and some people are seeing rates quadruple—or tenfold. Some of these rates are going up from $300 a year to $3,000. In some cases we have heard $1,500 to $30,000. I am not exaggerating or making this up. This is all in the record.

We have a way to fix it. The good news I wanted to share on the floor today is that we had 24 Senators, Republicans and Democrats, come together this week and send a ''dear colleague'' letter to our leadership—to the Republican leadership and the House leadership—to say that we are very close to a compromise that will do two things: It will give us time to get the affordability study that was supposed to be done actually done. It will allow FEMA to potentially—with some oversight from Congress—set rates that would keep the program functioning but not jeopardize people's equity in their homes.

It would, of course, remove the automatic trigger provision that has been very detrimental in the law, which basically says: The rates will stay low, but the minute people put a house up for sale or sell a house, whatever grandfathered rate they had is gone. And it doesn't go up 25 percent a year, it goes up to where it should be. In some cases that is a move from $1,000 a year to $30,000 a year. It makes their house worthless, and that is what is happening to thousands of people. They have lost equity in their home. It is one of many problems this Congress has to fix. We can't fix any of them if we can't get back to work. We need the officials that have been laid off at FEMA to go back to work.

One point I want to make today is let's find a way forward to negotiate. I hope part of the negotiation could potentially be a fix to Biggert-Waters. I want to thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Senator WICKER from Mississippi, and Senator VITTER from Louisiana. Senator ISAKSON has been giving us some good input. I want to thank the realtors and the bankers because they realized that we made a mistake and that the law we passed was not a good one. Sometimes that happens.

We have to fix it. We don't have to fix the whole of it, but we are working on some pieces that must be amended so that it accomplishes the goal of having a program and so that taxpayers do not have to pick up a big tab every year. It will allow real estate markets to function, people to be able to retain equity in their home, and to pay their fair share. It will also encourage smart growth and development.

Also—and very importantly, which is part of the problem with Biggert-Waters—the bill we are trying to fix didn't even recognize levees. I don't know if the Presiding Officer has a lot of levees in Virginia, but we have to have them in Louisiana because we are below sea level. We have been that way for 300 years. We moved there below sea level. We had to be there to create the Port of New Orleans.

Thomas Jefferson leveraged the whole Federal Treasury to buy us for 3 cents an acre, if I remember correctly—the bulk of 19 States. It was the greatest real estate purchase in the history of our country. Alaska may argue, but we think the Louisiana Territory is equally as valuable, if not more so, and our State is proud to carry that name. People understand the history of this.

Why would Thomas Jefferson leverage the whole Treasury of the United States to buy something that was not worthwhile. Of course it is worthwhile. It was worthwhile then, and it is worthwhile now.

People live there because we run the biggest port system in the world, and we need to continue to live there with all of the industries—oil and gas, and fisheries, et cetera.

This Biggert-Waters bill undermines our region's ability to function. We produce 17 percent of the GDP for the country, so this is not a small parochial issue to the Southern States: Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, et cetera—but it also affects interior states. We have seen what happened in Colorado. We have seen what happened to the east coast States, with New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, et cetera.

Let's get to the negotiating table. Let's work together, as we know we can, and let's put on the top of that agenda a potential fix for Biggert-Waters.

Again, I thank my colleagues for working so cordially together even in this difficult time.

Let me move to another subject for a minute and put into the RECORD, in the event that my colleagues—do I have to ask for an additional 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter that I received. I think all of the Members received this letter that was addressed to Senator REID, Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER, and Representative PELOSI from the National Governors Association that came yesterday.

Governor Mary Fallin and Governor John Hickenlooper signed the letter on behalf of all the Governors, and it says:

> The nation's governors urge Congress and the Administration to quickly reopen the federal government.
>
> The fiscal health of states is inextricably linked to the fiscal stability of the federal government, and while state economies have improved, a failure by our national government to secure a solution to the current government budget issues undermines our states' recovery and endangers the U.S. economy.

It goes on to say:

> States have thus far managed to avoid closing or suspending most programs and services by using carry-over funds or, in some cases, by using state spending to fill in missing federal dollars. However, states are not in the position to be the bank for the federal government.

As a former Governor, the Presiding Officer understands this. I was a former Treasurer. I most certainly understand that the budget of Louisiana is almost 70 percent Federal funding. So when the Federal Government cuts off that funding, it starts to affect the way States—and the 300-plus cities in my State—operate, and it affects our private sector partners that work with us to provide State-level and community services. It affects nonprofits such as Catholic Charities, who are running some of our low-income housing, our justice programs in some of our neighborhoods and communities.

This shutdown is just bad. It is bad all around. It should not have happened. We need to get this government open and operating, which will help our States and their economic recovery plans to start focusing on fixing things. We need to fix things like Biggert-Waters and repeal that old insurance reform bill so we can find a better way forward.

I might also mention two other things quickly. What is also happening in our State today—I got news this morning—is that permitting in the Gulf of Mexico for offshore oil and gas drilling is now shut down. Right at the time when America is about to overtake Russia as the largest domestic producer of gas and oil, right when we are about to take first place, the Republican tea party has shut the government down and shut down permitting in the gulf.

Ever since the Deepwater Horizon, we have been fighting to get that back up and going. Now we find it has been shut down again. The people I represent cannot take another shutdown of permitting.

We have levees to build. We have a big problem in our river parishes, as we call them, along Lake Pontchartrain. We have Morganza to the gulf, which is an important levee project for Houma, which is one of the centers for oil and

gas production. This not only helps the people of Houma and Terrebonne Parish, but it helps the whole region and the whole country. It is sort of like a little Houston, if you will. Houma is like a little Houston. We don't have all of the corporate structures, but we have all of the know-how, the goods and services, the providers, the boats, the planes, the ships, and the helicopters. They might have the gleaming office towers in Houston, but we have a lot of the hard workers in Houma.

The levee that protects them and their homes is now basically—the plans for it are shut down along with this tea party shutdown.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, SENATOR MCCONNELL, SPEAKER BOEHNER, AND REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI: The nation's governors urge Congress and the Administration to quickly reopen the federal government.

The fiscal health of states is inextricably linked to the fiscal stability of the federal government, and while state economies have improved, a failure by our national government to secure a solution to the current budget issues undermines our states' recovery and endangers the U.S. economy.

States have thus far managed to avoid closing or suspending most programs and services by using carryover funds or, in some cases, by using state spending to fill in for missing federal dollars. However, states are not in a position to be the bank for the federal government. As this impasse continues, we call on Congress and the Administration to commit to fully reimbursing states and territories for the federal expenses they absorb during the shutdown. These expenses include funding for programs, state employees who are paid through federal funds and any other outlays that would normally have been supported by federal funds.

As governors, our citizens expect us to work together to balance our budgets and make government work. We will do whatever we can to serve our citizens and deliver the core services they need and expect during this uncertain time. In return, we ask our federal partners to quickly find a path forward that reimburses states for incurred federal expenses; restores certainty in the federal budget process; creates long-term stability; and strengthens the fiscal condition of the nation for the benefit of all citizens.

Sincerely,

Governor MARY FALLIN.
Governor JOHN HICKENLOOPER.

It is time to open our government. It is time to get back to work, solve real problems, and negotiate in good faith without taking innocent hostages. There are too many innocents being harmed, whether it is children with cancer, whether it is businesspeople who have put everything on the line for their business and through no fault of their own now have no customers coming in the front door and can't pay their note—and the banks aren't going to wait until we get our act together.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I wanted to, if I could, take 1 more minute to speak on behalf of the people who don't have a Senator here; that is, the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is technically not a part of the Federal Government. They are not an agency of the Federal Government. They are not a department of the Federal Government. The District of Columbia is the district in which the Federal Government resides. Contrary to popular belief, they raise most of their money through their own tax revenue generated—about 75 percent local. Twenty-five percent of the budget of the District of Columbia—which has about 750,000 people, which is a pretty big city as cities go—comes from the people who live here. They have been caught up as if they were an agency of the Federal Government.

Let me argue on their behalf to my colleagues and suggest that they are a group of innocents—a city. Baltimore's budget is not shut down, Richmond's budget is not shut down, New Orleans' budget is not shut down, Chicago's budget is not shut down, New York's budget is not shut down, San Francisco's budget is not shut down, but the DC government is shut down because of this threat. They have gotten caught up. They should be let go, and we can then negotiate on all other things.

I think the President understands this. I know majority leader HARRY REID understands this. I am hoping minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL will give his support so this can be done in a bipartisan way, recognizing this is the Nation's Capital—not asking for any special preference for them, just allowing them to use their own money and operate their own city while we try to figure out how to get the rest of the government open and operating. I hope we can do that today. We have been working across the aisle.

I thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her leadership. The District of Columbia does not have Senators, so a few of us have to stand and speak for the people of the District, and I am happy to try to do that on occasion when I, of course, believe strongly in what they are asking.

I thank the Chair.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from Vermont.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, it is no secret to anybody that the American people are frustrated and they are disgusted with what is going on in Washington.

The Presiding Officer may have seen The Onion magazine, the satirical magazine that ran a story which says that at a time when 5 percent of the American people approve of what is going on in Congress, The Onion reported psychiatrists are deeply worried about the mental health of 5 percent of the American public. In other words, all over this country, regardless of political persuasion, people literally cannot understand what is going on, and they have every reason to be outraged and frustrated because so many people today are being hurt.

We can disagree about the Affordable Care Act. We as a nation can disagree about how we address Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, global warming, or any other issue out there. But what should not be happening is that this government and the American people should not be held hostage by an extreme right wing of the Republican Party saying: Well, yeah, we lost the election by 5 million votes, we lost two seats in the Senate, we lost seats in the House, but nonetheless, unless we get the agenda we campaigned on and lost, we are going to shut down the Federal Government. We are going to punish millions of Federal employees and tens of millions of taxpayers who paid for Federal services. Also, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we are not going to pay our bills and as a result perhaps thrust the American financial system and the world's financial system into a horrendous recession.

What the American people are saying over and over, regardless of political persuasion, is, yes, we can disagree on issues; no, we cannot bring the U.S. Government to a halt and default on our payments because a particular faction disagrees on certain legislation.

Interestingly enough, a couple of days ago I gathered that we had to bring the government to a halt and that we had to not pay our bills and bring the world's financial system into crisis because of the horrors of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That was the reason. Well, 2 days have come and gone and guess what. It is not the Affordable Care Act. That is no longer being discussed. Today, I gather—I haven't seen the news in the last 15 minutes, but the last I heard the reason we are shutting down the government and threatening not to pay our bills is that we are spending too much money and the deficit is too high. I gather that is the latest reason.

Clearly, a deficit of $700 billion and a debt of $16.7 trillion is too much, but let's make a couple of points about that issue.

First, in the last 3 years we have cut the deficit in half. A few years ago it

was $1.4 trillion, and today it is $700 billion. That is not an insignificant effort.

Second, and perhaps most important, we have to understand how we got to where we are in terms of the debt and in terms of the deficit. Do we have a large deficit because we are spending too much on Social Security? Well, actually not because Social Security is independently funded through the payroll tax and hasn't added one nickel to the deficit. So it is not Social Security. We will talk about Medicare and Medicaid in a moment. But the reason we have seen a spike in the deficit in recent years has to do with the fact that many of my deficit hawk Republican friends—and some Democrats—voted for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, but they forgot to pay for that war—just a slip; they just forgot about it—and those wars are going to cost between $3 trillion and $6 trillion. So I want everyone to remember that the great deficit hawks who are busy trying to cut every program that working families in this country need forgot to pay for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that will cost between $3 trillion and $6 trillion.

The third issue is that our great deficit hawks had no problem during the Bush era giving huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country.

Fourth, of course, is that as a result of deregulation and greed and recklessness and illegal behavior, Wall Street brought us to a financial collapse and a recession, with the result that revenue substantially declined.

I raise those issues, giving a little bit of history about how we got into the deficit today, because now, I guess, Congressman RYAN and others have decided that the reason we shut down the government is not because of ObamaCare, it is because there is too much spending, and that translates into their desire to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and to cut other vitally important programs for the middle-class and working families of this country.

Before we talk about the pain that would be caused by making savage cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, it is important to put this discussion in a broader context. If we go out to the American people and ask people in Virginia and people in Vermont and people all over this country and if we look at virtually every single poll that has been done in recent years asking the American people what they consider to be the most important issues facing them, do we know what they say? They say the deficit is important, but what is much more important is the issue of high unemployment and the economy in general. That is what every single poll shows. And the American people are right.

The deficit is important. What is even more important is addressing the reality that almost 14 percent of our workforce—if we count those people who have given up looking for work and are working part time, almost 14 percent of our workforce today is unemployed. What the American people are saying to Congress is create jobs, deal with unemployment.

The other issue out there that all across this country people are deeply worried about is that most of the new jobs being created—and this has been the case for a number of years now—most of the jobs being created are part-time, low-wage jobs.

How is somebody supposed to survive working for $10 an hour and getting 25 hours of work a week? You cannot do it, and we are seeing more and more of those types of jobs in the economy—by the way, jobs that provide little or no benefits.

What the American people are saying is raise the minimum wage. I cannot remember what the last poll was, but surely more than 70 percent of the American people have said: A minimum wage of $7.25 an hour is a starvation wage. We need to raise the minimum wage.

Anybody who has kids in college today understands it is harder and harder for working-class and middle-class families to send their kids to college. The American people are saying to us: Do something. You tell us what is true—that it is hard to make it into the middle class unless kids have a college education. Well, do something to make college affordable. Do not have my kid leaving college or graduate school $50,000 in debt or $80,000 in debt. Do something about that.

Anybody who drives anywhere in America, in Vermont or in Indiana or anyplace else, understands that our infrastructure—our roads, our bridges, wastewater plants, water plants, our rail system—is deteriorating rapidly, and they say: Do something about the infrastructure.

As global warming is perceived as more and more of a crisis, people are telling us: Do something about energy efficiency. Why are we emitting greenhouse gas emissions into the air when we can be a much more energy-efficient country?

On and on it goes. The American people are hurting, and they want us to address their problems.

The other point that needs to be made is that when we talk about the financial and economic problems facing this country, it is terribly important to take an overview of what is going on in the economy in general. There is no debate about this: The middle class in America today is disappearing. Median family income today is less than it was 24 years ago. Despite all of the increase in productivity and technology, median family income is less today than it was 24 years ago. That is rather extraordinary.

We have 46.5 million people in this country living in poverty—more than at any time in the history of this country; 22.5 percent of our kids live in poverty. That is the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. Poverty among senior citizens is increasing. So we have major economic challenges that we face.

Our Republican friends, who a few days ago were telling us they had to shut down the government and threaten not to pay our bills because of the horrors of ObamaCare, now apparently are no longer concerned about ObamaCare, and they are now concerned about the national debt and they are concerned about our spending.

Well, this is what I want to say: If we want to have a conversation or a conference or a discussion or a special committee—call it whatever you want—we cannot just look at cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, as Congressman RYAN and many others want. We have to put into that discussion how it happens that one out of four major corporations in this country does not pay a nickel in Federal income taxes.

Do you think that should be part of the discussion? I think it should be. We have to put into that discussion how it happens that corporate America is putting their money in the Cayman Islands and in other tax havens and avoiding paying tens and tens of billions of dollars in Federal taxes. Do we need that in the discussion? I think we do. If you are going to talk about a conference on the economy, the conference must include the need to create millions of jobs, it must include the need to raise the minimum wage, it must include pay equity so that women get the same wages men get for the work they are doing, and it must include rebuilding our infrastructure.

This discussion on the economy cannot simply happen on Republican terms. We live in a country in which the middle class is in rapid decline while the wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. Any discussion we have—after we reopen the government, after we pay our bills—has to include that important reality. We cannot and we must not—for moral and economic reasons—balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and low-income people. The wealthiest people and the largest corporations have to get involved, have to pay their fair share of taxes, and we have to create the millions of jobs this country desperately needs.

As I see the constantly changing agenda on the part of my Republican colleagues as to why they have shut down the government, I want to make it clear that the first thing that has to happen is they have to understand this government has to be reopened, and it has to be reopened with a strong budget that lasts for the rest of this fiscal year. And we have to pay our debts so this country and the entire global economy does not descend into financial chaos. We have to do that, and if Mr. BOEHNER were to give the Members of the House of Representatives a vote on that issue today, I expect it would win.

But as we go forward and we discuss broader issues, as we should, the agenda cannot simply be the agenda of the Republican candidates for President and Vice President who lost by 5 million votes. The agenda has to be what the American people want, and that is expanding the middle class, creating jobs, raising wages, rebuilding our infrastructure, pay equity, and making college affordable. Those are the issues that have to be on the agenda as well.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my friends in Vermont watch what is going on, and it is hard to explain it to them—especially people who are hard working, who rely one way or the other on government programs and they do not come through.

It was in the press today about the polls, saying how angry people are at the small group in the other body who has held things up. And I understand that. It is probably difficult for those people, who work hard every single day, pay their bills, trust in their government, and then see what is happening.

I appreciated the meeting with the President yesterday. The distinguished Presiding Officer was there. I know how much President Obama wants to have the shutdown end, have people go back to work, have the United States pay its bills. And I agree with him. I think the vast majority of Americans agree with him. Now he has to get a tiny minority in the Congress to agree with him. It is unfortunate—it is unfortunate—that they do not because ultimately we should be serving the best interests of our country, not what might work at a tea party rally or a fundraiser to get one's face on television.

I will give an example. When September 30 came and went, it was not just the Federal Government that shut down. The farm bill extension also expired. I can speak to this with some sense of knowledge of how that works. I have been able to serve on the Senate Agriculture Committee for 38 years. I have served as the chair of it. We have a superb chair now in DEBBIE STABENOW. But I have seen both Republicans and Democrats in that committee traditionally over the years come together, work closely together.

I think of two people who were nominees of their parties for President who were miles apart in political philosophy—Senator George McGovern, a Democrat, and Senator Bob Dole, a Republican; one a liberal Democrat, the other a conservative Republican—but on the farm bill, on the nutrition programs, they worked closely together for what was best for America, what was best for the country.

We passed an excellent farm bill, a bipartisan farm bill in this body, in the Senate. But because the other body would not take it up and either pass it or vote to improve it, the farm bill extension expired. This one-two punch of political reality is needlessly harming our Nation. It is leaving farmers with great uncertainty about the future of vital farm programs, all the while with no staff at USDA to answer farmers' questions.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer has a lot of agriculture in his State. His State is much larger than mine. But we also have a lot of agriculture in the State of Vermont.

There is a basic essential responsibility of Congress to fund the government. Why has that been ignored? Regular business is replaced by bumper-sticker politics. This shutdown is and was entirely avoidable. It is perpetuated by the reckless leadership of the House that is willing to imperil the economy and negatively impact every single American family.

They are not asking for compromise. Compromise has already happened here in the Senate. We conceded to the House terms. We adopted and leader HARRY REID had to fight to get the votes to give the House what they had asked for by adopting an appropriations bill at the funding level the House wanted, which maintains sequestration.

But even though he had been told by the House leadership that would get us back, that would have the government stay open, after we did it they said: Oops, we changed our mind. They moved the goalposts again.

You cannot run government like that. That is by whim. That is not by commitment. That is by changing your views by the moment. It is not by keeping your word. Anyone claiming that the Senate has been unwilling to compromise has conveniently ignored the fact that the Senate came forward and passed a continuing resolution at the level the House requested.

So I, like the American people, certainly like my fellow Vermonters, am tired of having a political process obstructed. It is time to reopen the government for business. Stop the silly season. Stop the games. Stop rushing to the TV cameras to get your face on there and say: I am the only person serving America, as I try to destroy America.

Let's reopen. For the farmers in Vermont who have found their local USDA office dark, they know the shutdown is even more troubling, because it has diverted attention from the now-expired farm bill. This manufactured crisis is making it next to impossible to reach compromise on this important agriculture, rural development, and nutrition legislation.

The bipartisan Senate farm bill would provide $25 billion in savings. This is a bill both Republicans and Democrats voted for in the Agriculture Committee and on this floor—$25 billion in savings that could be applied toward reducing the federal deficit.

But no; instead, the House forced us into the shutdown, which is costing the Federal Government hundreds of millions of dollars a day, $1.6 billion a week, for nothing. So they can go on television and say: Look at us. Rally to us because we are standing up for America.

No, you are costing American taxpayers $1.6 billion a week. That is straight to the taxpayers. But more and more of the damage of the government shutdown is spreading across the Nation. In every city and every community, with each passing day, the State governments, local governments feel the pinch and may go bankrupt.

We heard last week that the CME Group, the world's largest futures exchange, informed their customers that the shutdown and USDA furloughs could affect dairy and livestock contracts. While much of Wall Street is worried they will not have the Bureau of Labor Statistics employment numbers this month, on Main Street and our Nation's farms, our agriculture businesses, the concerns are growing about missing agriculture pricing information that impacts dairy and livestock futures contracts and options for milk, cheese, butter, and other dairy products. That may sound esoteric to some, but if you are one of those farmers who gets up before dawn, works hard all day long, until after dark, 7 days a week, paying your bills, paying your mortgage, being an integral part of the community, this is real. The farmers are doing their work and their job. We ought to do ours.

Let me give you an example of the uncertainty the shutdown is imposing on farmers and businesses from coast to coast. Vermont's own Cabot Creamery Cooperative, which makes some of Vermont's award-winning cheeses, could be hit by the missing pricing information. In recent years, Cabot, being good business people, has increased the use of futures contracts as an active part of its risk management effort. It makes sense. We have seen many farmers and food companies and dairy cooperatives across the country do the same after the disastrous collapse in milk prices in 2009.

But the USDA staff is furloughed, and farmers and businesses like Cabot can no longer have a daily or weekly report of cash prices for agriculture products. These are the benchmarks of these futures contracts that are used to hedge against risk and big price swings.

To make matters worse, the entire USDA Web site is shut down, keeping farmers from seeing and using previous agriculture reports from the agency. These are the same people who are working long hours. They are obeying the rules. They are doing what is expected of them. But suddenly they are

having their legs taken out from under them.

I have heard from the Vermont Economic Development Authority. We call it VEDA. It is Vermont's statewide economic development finance lender. They are focused on supporting Vermont industrial, commercial, and agriculture enterprises. Nearly their entire agricultural portfolio, $70 million—probably not much in some States, but a lot in my little State—intersects in some way with USDA. Their ability to service current loans and work on new agriculture loans is quickly freezing up. The list is growing for the number of customers that are going to be locked out in the cold because the shutdown is quickly causing the whole agricultural lending scene to seize up.

I am hearing from our apple growers in Vermont. We have a very short harvest this time of the year in Vermont. Fall harvest, and then it snows. They are in the middle of a fantastic, long-awaited harvest. They have to keep one eye on the weather forecast on how their crops are doing, and the other on the Department of Labor to ensure that their apple harvest workforce, which is a seasonal workforce, will actually be there.

Many of our farms use the Federal H–2A temporary worker program. I am starting to hear a litany of problems due to the tea party shutdown of the Federal Government. Farmers are unable to get their workers required Social Security numbers, because the Social Security Administration is not issuing new numbers and cards during the shutdown—during the tea party shutdown.

These farmers are Republicans, Democrats, Independents. They do not want to play politics. They want to play by the rules. They cannot understand why the tea party is playing politics with their business. It is resulting in farmers needing to pay huge amounts of backup withholding taxes, which they otherwise would not need to do if their workers would be able to acquire Social Security numbers.

Farmers needing new H–2A workers are being stymied in the application process since the Department of Labor is not administering the necessary parts of that process thanks to the artificial, made-in-Congress, tea party shutdown. The ripple effects of the shutdown are spreading ominously outward across Vermont and every other State.

I spoke about one aspect of agriculture. My colleagues represent all parts of this country and could talk about a whole lot of other aspects of agriculture. That is just one multi-multi-multibillion dollar industry across this country that is being hurt and ultimately being devastated. Some will go out of business, all because of the tea party shutdown.

All these problems could be solved right now. They can be solved this afternoon. So let's stop this shameful politicking. The House should end the shutdown. Vote on the Senate-passed continuing resolution. After all, it has the numbers the House asked for. All they have to do is keep their word. We in the Senate did. Now it is time for them to.

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. STABENOW. 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. STABENOW. Mr. President, there are two issues wrapped together right now that are causing dire consequences for people all across the country. The first, as we know and as we have been debating, is the government shutdown and all that has happened in terms of people being hurt, jobs being lost, small businesses not being able to get the loans they need, people not being able to complete their mortgage requirements to get the homes they want, the concerns about health and safety and all of the other issues, children, what is happening to so many people, senior citizens, veterans, and so on—very, very serious.

This is the 11th day of the government shutdown that is costing us jobs, slowing the economy, and hurting families all across the country. It is an absolute drag on the economy, on our markets and on, frankly, America's standing in the world, which we should all be concerned about right now.

It is, frankly, an embarrassment that in the greatest, wealthiest country in the world our government is shut down while a small minority tries to score political points. Unfortunately, that is what has been happening.

The second issue is also very important; that is, the lapse of a farm bill, the agriculture and food policy bill in this country. The farm bill has been actually expired for 376 days—376 days—because it ended on September 30 of 2012.

Last January there was a partial extension that extended subsidies that we all said should be eliminated as it did not include reforms and did not include deficit reduction, but there was a partial extension until September 30 and that has also lapsed.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer from Indiana, who is a member of my committee, fights very hard for Indiana. I am grateful he is a member of our committee. I know the Senator understands and shares my tremendous concern and urgency, both about the government shutdown and that we are seeing agricultural programs and rural economic development shut down because we don't have a farm bill.

Nowhere is this felt more strongly now than in South Dakota. The Presiding Officer and I are not from South Dakota, but we have colleagues in the Senate who have been speaking on the floor. I have talked to the Senators from South Dakota who are deeply concerned, as well as the Senators from North Dakota.

In South Dakota last Friday, October 4, an early autumn blizzard killed an estimated 75,000 head of cattle. This is one of the many pictures of what is happening as a result of this blizzard. Many producers lost half of their entire herd. Keep in mind that many thousands of these cows would have produced calves in the spring. These losses are huge for ranchers and families and will be felt for many years to come. These cattle ranchers and their families have no safety net, zero safety net. They don't receive direct payment subsidies. They now have zero safety net. They only had livestock disaster plans which expired on October 1, 2011, 741 days ago. Their losses are expected to reach into the tens of millions of dollars.

Our Senate farm bill, which we passed with strong bipartisan majorities last year and this year—we have actually done it twice—includes permanent livestock disaster assistance for these ranchers' families to make sure ranchers, such as those in South Dakota, don't go bankrupt, which is what is going to happen if we don't get this farm bill in place as soon as possible.

But there is no farm bill. Even if there were, those farmers wouldn't be able to get help because the farmers can't document their losses or get the answers they need from the Farm Service Agency offices because they are closed due to the shutdown.

These ranchers, such as many other ranchers across the country, are getting a one-two punch by not being able to go to their local FSA office to get the help they need, while at the same time not having the long-term certainty of agricultural policy and a safety net when there is a catastrophe.

Three things have come together to make this a major disaster for ranchers, such as the need for a farm bill with livestock disaster assistance, which we have. We have a great livestock disaster assistance program in our bill.

The good news is the House has one as well. If we can get a farm bill done, which could be done any day—we are willing to be a part of any agreement anyone does—and we will be able to help those South Dakota ranchers. Of the three items, one is that we don't yet have the final farm bill, even though the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, has done its job twice.

Secondly, we have a government shutdown that is not allowing these ranchers to get the help they need.

Thirdly, we have a blizzard.

Two out of three of these are self-inflicted. Think about it. Because there is no farm bill, because there is a government shutdown, somewhere ranchers are going to lose everything—their homes, their land, everything—because

of the freak blizzard in early October. We can debate the larger issues around that as well.

The irony is those ranchers in South Dakota have 3 days under the law to dispose of their dead cattle. They were just hit by blizzard, suffered unbelievable losses, and they have 3 days to clean it up. They don't get an extension. They can't kick the can down the road. They can't wait forever either. They can't wait any longer for us to get a farm bill done. This needs to be done right now. If there is the political will to do it and there is support from the Speaker to do it, we can get this done quickly.

Those cattle ranchers aren't alone. Producers in the Midwest, the Northwest, the West, and much of the South went through one of the worst droughts in a generation last summer. Many producers sold off most of their herds because there wasn't the grass for the cattle to graze on. Feed was scarce and expensive. As a result, cattle inventories dropped to their lowest levels in five decades, 50 years. For all of us who enjoy eating meat, we are seeing the consequences of the lowest level in five decades. Farmers all across the country suffered from this drought. In addition, fruit growers from my State suffered heavy losses last year from an early spring followed by a late frost, and our cherry growers were some of the hardest hit. In fact, they were virtually wiped out. Their crop was wiped out last year. They also don't have a safety net. Similar to ranchers, they aren't eligible for direct payment subsidies and they weren't able to get any crop insurance either.

We worked hard in this farm bill to make sure there were risk management tools, not only subsidies because a farmer grows something. As taxpayers, we can't afford to do that. It is not the right thing to do. We have a deficit we have to address, and it makes no sense. We work hard to make sure the risk management tools are available to help farmers and ranchers manage their risk when there is a disaster such as South Dakota, but there is no help until we get the farm bill signed into law.

For all the men and women, all the families—and the vast majority we are talking about are middle-class families—small farmers, medium-sized farmers who are working hard from sunrise to sunset, day-in and day-out with the riskiest business in the world, they can't kick the can down the road. When the crop is ready to be harvested, they have to do it.

They are looking at us and saying: Get the job done. Get the farm bill done now.

All of those middle-class families and 16 million people in this country have jobs because of agriculture. They are saying we have waited long enough. How many disasters have to happen without the right tools before this gets done? With 16 million people, the biggest bill we are going to pass this year is the farm bill. This is for rural economic development, energy, food-related industries, conservation efforts, our help for people who are caught up in their own personal economic disasters, which is so critical, and they are all counting on us.

The men and women who are working hard to bring in the harvest are counting on us to get this done. We did a farm bill. I am grateful to leaders on both sides of the aisle who came together. That is how I know we can stop this shutdown and pay our bills because we have done things together in the Senate. We need our colleagues in the House to be willing to step in and do the same.

People have waited long enough. It is time to get it done, and it is time to get it done now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been on this floor many times over the past 2½ years, and here we are again, talking about yet another fiscal cliff, another drama, another soap opera playing out before us.

The American people are wondering what in the world is going on down there in Washington? How come we can't get resolution to some of these problems? Why can't we remove the dark cloud of uncertainty about the fiscal future of this country? It is stifling economic growth.

We are growing at an anemic 4-to-5-year rate of less than 1 percent. That does not put people back to work. That does not solve our unemployment problem. It only makes it worse. That does not revive an economy. Even with all the new discoveries in energy and the lower cost of manufacturing and more competitiveness, we have not revived the economy for the American people—whether they have just graduated from school with a degree and can't find a job except at maybe a fast-food restaurant, or whether they are a middle-aged man or woman who had their hours cut back, or they have been laid off; whether it is a family trying to save for their children's education—people are hurting all the way up and down the line and it is frustrating. It is frustrating for all of us.

It is particularly frustrating for the people I represent in Indiana, and I think for all Americans, to watch the dysfunction taking place in Washington, this inability to come together to find a solution to our problems, and this careening from cliff to cliff, debt crisis to debt crisis; with people on edge and markets on edge, up 300 1 day and down 250 the next, waiting for any glimmer of hope for some solution—or, reacting with gloom and doom if we fail to come forward with a solution.

Now we have a government shutdown; now the clock is ticking toward the debt limit expiration, and we have not yet come to any resolution or solution to these problems. People are sick and tired of this broken process here in Washington, DC. I am sick and tired of it. My colleagues are sick and tired of it. Yet we have not been able to find a solution that addresses the problem.

Republicans just came from a constructive 2-hour meeting at the White House with the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Treasury. It is a step forward. It is not a Neil Armstrong step forward because it is not a giant leap for mankind. It is a baby step forward. And it is an important first step forward because unless you come to the table to negotiate, unless you are willing to open up where you are in the same room together sharing your concepts, your thoughts, and your concerns, you can't even begin to find a solution. So this was a step in the right direction.

The President met with House Republican Members yesterday and Senate Republican Members today. Our meeting was candid and transparent. Most everybody was able to say what was on their mind and talk about possible solutions.

I wish I could say we walked out and stood together, as has been done before in solving these types of problems between Presidents and Members of the leadership in both the House and the Senate. I wish I could say we were able to do that, but we weren't. But going from ''I will not negotiate, period, don't even bother to even think about it,'' to, ''Let's sit down and at least talk this through and see if we can come to a resolution'' is a step forward. So I take some hope from that.

I made the decision in early 2010 to come back to the Senate to try and solve what I thought were some of the most fundamental issues affecting the future of this country that perhaps we faced in a long time; namely, this continued deficit spending and plunge into debt, this accumulation of a debt that is so jeopardizing our future and our children's future and the future of America.

The passage of ObamaCare by one party without any bipartisan support, jammed through the Congress by a waiver of the rules, has turned into a nightmare—a nightmare of implementation. It is part of the fiscal problem. I didn't come here today to necessarily talk about that. I have been here before talking many times about what I think we need to do to address our health care problems—clearly in a different way than the Affordable Care Act.

We see unfolding before our eyes yet another dysfunctional piece of legislation that can't even be implemented, even though the party that passed this law has had 3½ years to implement it.

We hit the October 1 date when people can start to enroll, and the systems aren't even up and ready. Now if this law had been in effect for 3 or 6 months, we could say they rushed it. It has been 3½ years—actually 3¾ years, and they still don't have it right. There still are major questions. This is an issue we must continue to deal with. We haven't been successful so far because we have not gotten any bipartisan support to make any significant reforms. That is part of our fiscal issue, and that fiscal issue is eating up the promise of America which has been given to every generation in the history of this country, and stands ready to be denied to the next generation and succeeding generations because of our inability to summon the political will to do what we all know we need to do.

We cannot keep spending more than we take in. We cannot keep borrowing money to cover that difference. We have seen in just the last 4½ years of this administration a staggering increase in the amount of debt we have accumulated—from just a little over $10 trillion to now $17 trillion in the space of one administration, with 3 more years to go. It is unsustainable. I doubt there is a Member of this body—Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative—who could simply ignore it and say this is not a problem. It is a huge problem. Every day, every week, every month, every year we postpone it, the problem becomes worse.

We have made effort after effort—bipartisan effort, Simpson-Bowles, Domenici-Rivlin, laying out plans as to how to address this over a period of time to put us on a path to solvency, the Gang of 6, all the efforts of a Republican, SAXBY CHAMBLISS, and a Democrat, MARK WARNER, and those of us who supported those efforts to try to find a way to solve this problem, the supercommittee, the dinner group which I was part of, substantive discussions with the White House, with the Chief of Staff, with the President himself over a 7-month period of time—we have been unable to reach a resolution, unable to even come to the conclusion that this problem is so great it needs to be dealt with now, not pushed down later for some other administration. It has been too many Congresses and too many administrations simply saying, We can't get it done.'' We will have to push it off for yet another term, yet another election, yet another President.

Well, time is running out. So despite all these efforts, we have failed. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of most, the reason why we have failed is because we have not had Presidential leadership. The kinds of changes that are needed to address a problem this large, to bring parties together, to put us in the position where we are willing to risk our careers, willing to stand up and do what is right for America regardless of the political consequences, willing to stand together—Republican and Democrat—to basically say this problem transcends politics, and not use it against each other, but stand together and say this problem is of such magnitude that we have to stand together and have the will to go forward—that can only be accomplished, and only has been accomplished if you look to past history, by Presidential leadership.

I was privileged to be here as a Member of the House of Representatives when we faced not as great a problem, but still a significant a problem with entitlement spending—in this case Social Security. The trust fund was running dry. The case was made to the American people. A Republican President reached out to a Democrat Speaker of the House of Representatives—a divided government, Democrats in one House, Republicans in the other—reached out and said, We have a problem and it can only be solved if the two of us stand together in a bipartisan way. And that they did. It wasn't easy, but it was successful, and through it we made a substantial, meaningful change to our Social Security system, which bought about 35 years from insolvency.

Now we face an even more dire crisis than that, but the solution will be the same—and that is, we need to have Presidential leadership.

I have proposed a number of things. It looks as though we are going to be limited. I did not get any indication from the President that he is willing to take these kinds of risks to so-called go big.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am not going to wait to speak, but if I might ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana a question, and then certainly agree to however much time he wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COATS. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Indiana is very sincere as he has worked diligently and in a bipartisan way to tackle this budget problem. It is this Senator's hope we can continue those kinds of discussions we had a couple of years ago.

Would the Senator agree that the shutdown situation we find ourselves in, however—which started for a different reason than the budget questions. It started for the reason of people wanting to defund ObamaCare—that the shutdown creates a crisis atmosphere in which it is very difficult to have those budgetary discussions the Senator yearns to have, as does his colleague from Florida?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I answer to my friend from Florida, who did work with a group of us, Democrats and Republicans, in past efforts to address the larger question which I am addressing, I know he is as disappointed as I am that we were not able to come to a resolution.

Republicans do not want a shutdown. We want a solution. We have found in the past that the leverage of a financial situation often gives us the opportunity to raise the issues and hopefully reach at least a partial solution. That has happened in the past.

I stand with those who simply say: I want to find a solution to the larger problem, including the shutdown of the government. I was focusing my efforts on the debt limit we are reaching because it is very hard to make a case for asking the American people for yet another trillion dollars of debt loaded on their shoulders without some efforts to address why this debt is being accumulated and why it continues to go forward. Why has the Congress not stepped up to address this spending?

It is like having a credit card and the bank calls and says you have hit your limit. You have asked us several times in the past to raise that limit, and we have done so, but you keep reaching the limit and you keep asking for more credit. At what point are you going to amend your reckless spending so you do not have to keep coming in here and so we do not have to keep giving you more credit? How do we know you are ever going to pay this back? How do we know you are not just going to declare bankruptcy and insolvency because you have simply hit the point where you do not have the means to pay this back? We might be willing to give you some increase in your credit, but first you have to give us something back; that is, you have to get off your addition to spending that keeps driving you into this situation.

What I was trying to address here is, yes, a solution to get this government back to work combined, hopefully, with a renewed effort—by the Senator from Florida, myself, and others—to strip out the unnecessary spending, the duplication, the egregious misuse of taxpayers' dollars for nonessential functions of this Federal Government.

There is no disagreement between us that we need to fund our national security. There is no disagreement about some of the essential cancer research and a number of other things this government engages in that cannot be handled at the State level, cannot be handled at a private level, substantially. But there is a lot of concern about excessive spending that continues to push us more and more into debt.

In answer to the question from my friend, Republicans do not like this shutdown any more than Democrats. We want to have some solution to the underlying problem. The underlying problem is the merger of not only excessive spending but the debt limit that is the result of that spending.

I know my time is rapidly running out, down to zero here. Let me conclude by saying I believe we have a duty—a duty to the American taxpayer but beyond that a duty to the future of this country, which is not just our children and grandchildren but everybody's

children and grandchildren, all the generations to come. We have a duty and a moral responsibility not to so laden them with debt that they will not have the opportunities many of us enjoyed, simple opportunities of owning a home, saving money for our kids so we can give them a good education, getting the bills paid on time, and living the American dream. That is not to become a millionaire or billionaire—maybe for some, but for most, to live just a quiet, normal, peaceful life, passing on those values and giving our children those opportunities we have found for ourselves.

I suggest that until we summon the political will to do so and until, frankly, we have a President who has that same will, we will not solve that problem.

I will conclude with this. It is a story—maybe you heard it before. A man walks into the doctor's office and says: I don't feel well at all.

The doctor gives him all the tests and all the exams and calls him back in and says: The disease you have is terminal. It is going to kill you. There are two ways to address this. There is a cure. It has some pain attached to it. You cannot just ignore it. But if you will agree to this medicine we are going to give you and these procedures, we can save your life. If you are not willing to do that, if you do not have the will to go through that process to get yourself back to health, there is another alternative. The alternative is that we can transplant that disease into your children and into your grandchildren and then let them deal with it.

That is exactly what we are doing here by not having the will, summoning the will to do the things we all know need to be done to prevent this country from becoming insolvent, from denying and destroying the American dream. The future of this country rests with our decisions. To date we have not made those decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I see the great junior Senator from Virginia waiting to speak. I would like to make a quick statement.

I again want to remind the Senate and anybody who is listening what brought about the shutdown. It has been going on now for a week and a half, and we do not see any relief in sight. What started the whole thing on the shutdown is this: Shut down the government unless you agree to reverse a law that was passed and declared constitutional by the Supreme Court. By reversing that law, by taking the funding away from the Affordable Care Act—that is what started this a week and a half ago.

I have just come from the commerce committee, where Senator ROCKEFELLER had a hearing on everything from consumer finance and the consumer federation on how consumers are not being protected; everything from the National Transportation Safety Board and how all of these accidents that have occurred within the last week and a half of the shutdown cannot be investigated because all of their staff is on furlough; to the aerospace industry—they cannot deliver airplanes that are ready for delivery because they have to have their final FAA certificate; to, of course, the space program in NASA, and 97 percent furloughed; to over 60 percent of NOAA furloughed and all of the weather satellites we are trying to get going. Then you take all these government employees who are furloughed, and what about all the contractors to the government who are now laying off all the contractors?

We had an Alaskan captain talking about how he needs the government certificates so he can go to sea on the Alaskan crab catch. He cannot get that. Guess who is lurking out there. Russian captains, to come in and start supplying the world market, including the domestic U.S. market, with crab. You can go through the whole thing.

Then, of course, the other side says, in the midst of the shutdown, with the default of the credit rating of the government facing us, you are not negotiating.

That reminds me of a story. Two people are talking.

One says: Can I burn your House down?

No.

Can I burn your second floor down?

No.

Garage?

No.

How about your utility room?

No.

Oh, you won't compromise.

You cannot compromise over something that is hurting so many people's lives and is threatening the security and safety of people's lives. You cannot compromise on that. You cannot compromise on this Nation going into financial default.

Come on. Let's use a little common sense and get back into government functioning again and stop the nonsense about threatening a default of this country. Then let's do what the very sincere Senator from Indiana said. Let's continue those discussions about what we can do for the long-term financial integrity of this country.

I yield. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to deliver a status report on what the government shutdown has meant to Virginia this week. I gave one last week, and I am back on the floor to share some additional news.

I associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Florida. I will talk about some similar effects. These effects are felt everywhere. It is not just furloughed employees; it is contractors, it is local communities and nonprofits, and it is the housing market.

Let me talk a bit about Virginia. Some of the pages might have been on the floor last week when I talked about a tiny community in Virginia, Chincoteague, which is a barrier island off the eastern shore of Virginia. It is not the place you might think of when you think about where Federal shutdown effects would be felt in a very specific way. But Chincoteague's economy is oriented around tourism. There is a national seashore and national wildlife refuge there, adjacent to Chincoteague Island, and so these few thousand people over the years have built up an economy that is hotels, motels, restaurants, grocery stores, drive-ins, and other shops for visitors. The fall is a very busy time. The island gets about 1.5 million visitors a year, and they are coming to the National Wildlife Refuge and the National Seashore.

On October 1, when government closed down the seashore and wildlife refuge closed down, the visitors have stopped coming. All those businesses, all those small mom-and-pops—I can see the faces of Tommy and Donna, and Jack Tarr, who is the mayor, and Glenn and Jane, my friends over there—they have called me to say: We are hit so hard because this is a busy time for us and we are closed down.

Last weekend there was a huge festival. There is a historic lighthouse on the island, and they have been working for 6 years to restore it. The opening was last week, and they were expecting hundreds or even thousands of visitors. They had to cancel it because it is on the wildlife refuge.

This weekend there was another big festival. Some of you might have read the book ''Misty of Chincoteague,'' which is about the Chincoteague Island ponies. Children read this book about ponies, probably ponies that came there from Spain, swim across the sound twice a year to Chincoteague, get shots, get inoculated. In the spring, some are sold for population control so they do not overrun the island. This weekend was the fall pony roundup. They had to cancel it because the wildlife refuge is closed.

It is not just a tourism event. It hurts all the businesses, but it is more than that. It is a fundraiser for the volunteer fire department that keeps every home and business on Chincoteague Island safe. They do not have a fire department other than the Chincoteague Volunteer Fire Department. They have two fundraisers a year. This weekend was one of them. They have canceled it. The volunteer fire department put up on their Web site: ''The fall pony roundup is closed because of the childish and idiotic antics of our Government.''

The other main economy in Chincoteague is NASA. There is a facility at Wallops Island, 5 miles away, and over 80 percent of the thousand employees and contractors who work at NASA, 5 miles from Chincoteague Island, are furloughed.

So you pull the guts out of the tourism economy, which this community

relies on, and you pull the guts out of NASA, which the community relies on—this community has been devastated by the government shutdown, and why? Why?

Mark Wright is a retired lieutenant colonel from the U.S. Army who served in the Army for 23 years, including service tours in Iraq—a very solid veteran. We are so proud. One out of eight Virginians is a veteran—an amazing number of people. When he retired, he got a job at the Pentagon as a civilian, a DOD civilian. He got that job earlier this year. Mark Wright was furloughed earlier this year because of the sequester. He has a wife and two kids in elementary school. He was furloughed, days off work, less pay, he got through that furlough. Then October 1, furloughed again. So this veteran who served his country, put himself in harm's way, and fought in theaters of battle more than once has been furloughed twice this year.

Mark Wright and his wife and children live in an apartment in Stafford County—south of DC. They wanted to buy a home for the first time in their lives. They are in the housing market. They decided they can't buy a home now because he doesn't know if he will have a paycheck to make a mortgage payment. He will be lucky enough to keep making the rent payment every month. It hurts their family, but it also hurts the real estate market in Stafford County.

Just this week it was reported that foreclosures in Virginia are up 52 percent from August to September, the biggest jump since the start of the recession because of the effect of sequester and these kinds of foolish antics, as the volunteer fire department described. So what Mark Wright and his family are asking is why; why are we doing this?

I had an employee roundtable with about seven furloughed employees and contractors on Wednesday afternoon in my office. They shared their anxieties about their own finances. They shared their own anxieties about having kids at home and getting a paycheck and what it would mean to them. I said to one participant: Tell me about your family. He said: I am lucky. I don't have a family. Then he caught himself and he said: I wish I was married and had a family, but for now when I am not getting a paycheck and I don't know whether I will get a paycheck, I am lucky I don't have a family. This was a DOD civilian who was a West Point grad who served as an Active-Duty Army officer for 10 years and fought overseas.

Others talked about how it felt to be kicked around just because they are trying to serve their country. One said: I have gone on unemployment. I never wanted to go on unemployment, but I have to for my family. Even those who were financially secure said: I am looking elsewhere for a job. Why would I put myself and my family through this? I have other skills. Maybe I can't serve the public anymore if the Congress is not going to back me.

Why are we doing this to these people?

A Virginia business that I am going to leave nameless called me the other day. They have thousands of employees in Virginia. The shutdown caused their weekly revenue to fall by 85 percent immediately. They are still doing work, and they are still being told—because they are contractors—that they will get paid, they are just not told when they will get pay. But they are paying for office rent and they are paying for utilities and they are paying salaries of employees and they are paying monthly health insurance premiums. They don't know when they are going to get paid, but they are having to write checks to others every day.

The owner of the business said: A few more weeks of this, and we will be bankrupt and hundreds of people will lose their jobs.

Why are we doing this to these businesses?

Yesterday the Presiding Officer was with me in a hearing before the Armed Services Committee, and a woman by the name of Jo Ann Rooney was nominated to be Under Secretary of the Navy. I asked her a question about morale in the Navy and the Pentagon now. Her answer was interesting.

Jo Ann Rooney had been working in the Pentagon for quite a while and then left 1 year ago to be president of a women's college. So she has been away from the Pentagon for 1 year. Now she is back in the Pentagon as a nominee to be Under Secretary of the Navy. Her name is pretty important in Virginia.

She said the difference in the Pentagon and with the Navy folks she was working with from when she left 1 year ago to today is completely stark. In the year that she has been gone, the furloughs hit and now the shutdown has hit. She said she is walking around the halls and looking at how people are responding. They feel like they are not supported when they are doing this important mission. She had one question: Why are we doing this to people who are working for the U.S. Navy whom we count on to protect us every day. Why?

We know, as the Senator from Florida said, that the House pushed this shutdown through unwillingness to have a budget conference. We passed a budget in March. We wanted to sit down and find a budget compromise with a very different House budget. We were going to have to compromise and do that, but Senators and House Members have blocked a conference. With no conference, we don't get a compromise. With no compromise, we don't get a budget. With no budget, the government shuts down. They pushed this through a shutdown and only after the shutdown have they said: All right. Let's talk.

Yesterday they revealed a new plan in the House. Their plan was we need to make sure we don't default on our debt, but after 11 days of shutdown, we just want to keep the government shut down. We will make sure we pay our foreign creditors, but we want to keep the government shut down.

Why? Why cause this pain? Why hurt the economy? Why push businesses to the brink of bankruptcy? Why harm the housing market? Why degrade and devalue public servants, especially those who are veterans? Why jeopardize cities and towns such as Chincoteague? Why hurt nonprofits such as the Chincoteague Island Volunteer Fire Department? Why leave families vulnerable to unemployment and force them to go on unemployment for the first time in their lives? Why cause all this pain?

No one in this country is benefiting from the U.S. government being shut down. So why is the House continuing to insist that this government remain closed?

I am continually reminded of the words by the Founder of the Republican Party 150 years ago at Gettysburg—Abraham Lincoln. At the end of that amazing speech, he resolved, and we resolved, that government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth, not for a year, not for a month, not for a week, not for a day, not for an hour, not for a minute, and not for a second.

Why can't the House agree to open the government and stop all this unnecessary pain?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow morning—unless it has otherwise changed—we will be voting on the request from the majority leader and the President to raise the debt ceiling by more than $1 trillion. It will not actually be a dollar figure. It will be suspended for roughly 1 year—the debt ceiling, that is. So everybody understands what the majority leader and the President are asking us to do: America has maxed out its credit card. It is about $16.7 trillion.

I know we talk about millions and billions and trillions as if we could actually conceptualize what that means, but here is an interesting comparison: Under President Obama—he has been in office for about 5 years now—our national debt has gone up $6.1 trillion. The debt accrued by all 43 previous Presidents was $10.6 trillion.

Our national debt is $16.7 trillion, and President Obama has asked to raise that credit limit another $1 trillion. Here is the catch: If he had a plan to actually deal with how we are going to pay down this $16.7 trillion, then maybe there would be a discussion. What he wants is what he called a clean debt ceiling, which is a blank check. President Obama wants a blank check to continue to borrow more and more money—not so we, the present generation, can live up to our responsibilities and make sure we are fiscally

responsible but, rather, to foist that debt off onto the next generation and beyond with absolutely no plan in place to repay it.

We have heard discussions about grand bargains. We were with the President this morning. He was kind enough to invite Republicans in the Senate over to the White House. He sort of chuckled about the grand bargain that he and Speaker BOEHNER and others have been pursuing over the last few years. He likened it to a unicorn. In other words, he likened it to a mythical creature no one has actually ever seen. That is what the grand bargain is, at least under this administration.

We reminded the President this morning that none of us wanted a government shutdown. This is not what we actually want, and we are all eager to end it. We also told the President that now is the time—and divided government is perhaps the best time—to end our fiscal crisis and to be responsible for the $16.7 trillion and come up with a payment plan.

If you went to the credit card company and said: I want to raise my credit card limit another $10,000, they would say what is your plan to actually pay down the debt you already accumulated? If you come back to us with a plan, then maybe we can talk about raising the limit on your credit card.

As I said, for the 220 years between the start of George Washington's Presidency and the end of George W. Bush's Presidency, the Federal Government accumulated $10.1 trillion in debt. During the Obama Presidency alone, it has been $6.1 trillion. If the President gets his way tomorrow in the vote, we are going to have to get a blank check to raise it another $1 trillion-plus. It won't be $6.1 trillion; it will be $7.1 or $7.2 trillion with no plan to pay down the debt and deal with the impact of this growing indebtedness on our economy and on our next generation.

It is important to remember what the President has said about the debt. In 2008, when he was a Member of the Senate, he said adding $4 trillion to the national debt was, in his words, ''irresponsible'' and ''unpatriotic.'' That was President Obama back in 2008, and here he is again asking for a higher debt limit with no plan to repay the $16.7 trillion or any portion of it.

President Obama is also the same person who said in 2009: ''I refuse to leave our children with a debt they cannot repay.'' He is the same person who said in 2010 that America's massive debt ''keeps [him] awake at night.'' I can't imagine he is getting much sleep these days if that is true.

This is the same person who in 2011 echoed the comments of the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ADM Mike Mullen when he was asked what his biggest concern was as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Admiral Mullen said the greatest long-term threat to America's national security is America's debt. President Obama said he agreed with that.

Finally, President Obama is the same person who in 2012 said he was running for reelection ''to pay down the debt in a way that's balanced and responsible.''

The most amazing thing I thought about the meeting we had with the President this morning is that he was actually taking credit for a reduction in the deficit. Of course, the deficit is different from the debt. The deficit is how we measure the amount of money coming into the Treasury and how much goes out in a given year. We are now spending roughly 16 cents on the dollar of borrowed money; in other words, more money than what is coming in.

The President was actually taking credit for the annual deficit's decrease. The deficit can be zero this year, and we would still have $16.7 trillion in debt. Those are related but different issues because the debt accumulates over many years when you spend more money than you have actually coming in.

In fact, if we look back, the two reasons the deficit has gone down this year is because, No. 1, one of the largest tax increases in American history that the President demanded in January of this last year—that was the fiscal cliff negotiation—and, secondly, it was the Budget Control Act and the sequester, which has actually capped discretionary spending for the last 2 years. That is what has caused a reduction in the deficit, not anything else.

So now the President said it is no big deal, this debt—$16.7 trillion is no big deal. And $17 plus trillion is no big deal, either, to hear the President say it today.

Now the President has changed his tune. Earlier he told ''ABC News'': We don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it is going to be in a sustainable place.

Well, besides being completely irresponsible and not making decisions today but, rather, kicking the can down the road to the next generation and beyond, this high debt is having a present-day impact on slow economic growth. All we have to do is read the Congressional Budget Office reports, which say when the Federal Government borrows this much money from foreign governments such as China and elsewhere, that is money—the Federal Government is actually competing in the marketplace against the private sector for credit and it actually drives down private sector investment. With the debt this high, people know something is going to happen. Either the Federal Government is going to have to cut spending to deal with this debt or the President is going to want to raise taxes again, and that is exactly what he has requested year after year.

Speaking of the next 10 years, the President's latest budget proposal, which he unveiled in April, would increase our debt by $7.4 trillion as well as raise taxes by another $1.1 trillion, even though the President has raised taxes by $1.7 trillion already.

There is a reason why our economy is growing so slowly, why the private sector is sitting on the sidelines rather than investing and creating new jobs. There is a reason why the percentage of people active in the workforce is at a 30-year low. That is called the labor participation rate. All we have to do is Google the Bureau of Labor Statistics and it will tell us what the labor participation rate is. It is at a 30-year low.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. So not only is the unemployment rate unacceptably high, those are people still looking for work. We know more and more people are simply giving up because they have quit looking, and they are reflected in that smaller percentage of people actually in the workforce.

As we all know, the President has had multiple opportunities to make that grand bargain for long-term debt reduction. He has endorsed a grand bargain but walked away from his own bipartisan fiscal commission, the so-called Simpson-Bowles Commission, in December of 2010. He might have also endorsed a grand bargain put forward by the Bipartisan Policy Center's Domenici-Rivlin Commission, but he walked away from that one too.

President Reagan negotiated with Tip O'Neill. President Bush 41 negotiated with George Mitchell. President Clinton negotiated with Newt Gingrich. President Bush 43 negotiated with Ted Kennedy. That is what Presidential leadership requires, and which is so obviously missing in this context.

I hope the President will follow up on this meeting we had this morning and begin the kind of negotiations that would provide a payment plan to pay off the debt America already owes—by the way, it is not just America, it is every man, woman, and child in this country—before he comes back here and asks us to raise the credit card limit by another $1 trillion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the Senate floor to talk about how the government shutdown is affecting North Dakota ranchers and farmers, particularly my ranchers who were hit by last weekend's storm and lost a vast number of cattle, jeopardizing their livelihood for years to come, and aren't getting the help they need from the USDA and the Farm Service Agency.

Today I wish to talk about another devastating consequence of this shutdown, and that is the consequence of this shutdown on Indian Country in my State, and undoubtedly Indian Country all across this Nation.

In North Dakota we have five Indian reservations which are home to many Native-American families. These are communities where economic development and many times employment

have been trying to get a foothold, trying to catch up, and where many of my State's most vulnerable individuals live. We have heard a lot and much has been made about the United States living up to its obligations, its contract obligations, its obligations to the entities that hold our debt, but we haven't talked about the United States living up to its treaty obligations to Indian tribes in this country. This shutdown poses a serious—and I am not exaggerating—a serious threat to the basic services the Federal Government provides to Native-American families as part of its trust, its contract, its obligation to Native Americans and Native-American nations.

I recently had a discussion with tribal chairs all across North Dakota. I was hearing more and more of the kind of horror stories we hear when all of a sudden weather is coming and food assistance is needed and fuel assistance is needed. I wish to share with this body today the stories I heard, because they are telling stories about how foolish and how dangerous this government shutdown is to many very vulnerable families, particularly vulnerable Native-American families.

By way of introduction, most of the five tribes in North Dakota are direct service tribes, which means BIA itself performs critical functions to help Native-American families. So BIA is the place where people go to get assistance. With the shutdown, there are few or no BIA employees in each reservation to carry out this very important work. That means BIA's general assistance programs are no longer able to serve, for example, the 600 families on the Turtle Mountain Reservation who would otherwise receive an average of $97 per person to meet essential needs of food, shelter, and utilities. The food banks and the food pantries are overrun. It is not an exaggeration to say this shutdown has caused people in the Turtle Mountain Reservation to go hungry.

At the Spirit Lake Nation, something we have heard a lot about in the last year is that social services are stretched to the max, where we have problems in even a fully funded government; but today the vast majority of BIA child social service agencies have stopped, leaving children stuck in limbo in the court system, waiting for someone to find them a safe and decent home. Some examples: A woman wishing to report a sexual abuse of her son has been attempting to contact Child Protective Services for over a week now. When she went to the office, the doors were shut and the 24-hour on-call person didn't answer the phone.

At the same time, BIA law enforcement is limited—and there is a lot of acreage out there that they have to cover—to one officer per shift. They are patrolling 252,000 acres with one officer.

At the Sisseton-Wahpeton Reservation, almost 50 percent of the tribe's ongoing budget consists of Federal funds. The tribe is preparing to furlough more than 200 employees. Right now, the tribe is able to pay them out of carryover funds, but unless the government reopens soon, it won't be able to afford to pay these employees and they will be furloughed.

In a couple examples of great tragedy, the Sisseton-Wahpeton community recently lost a 3-month-old baby and, because of the shutdown, the mother has been turned away for burial assistance for her child.

Gerald Thompson, an elder at Sisseton-Wahpeton and a Vietnam vet—and I know on the floor with me is our Senator from South Dakota and he can attest to the great number of Native Americans who serve in our military, at a much higher rate than almost any other group. Gerald is a proud Vietnam vet. He receives a small Federal stipend which is not even enough to cover the basic essentials. His stipend is no longer available because of the shutdown. His wife is suffering from diabetes and stage 3 kidney disease. He worries about not being able to afford the gas to drive her to Fargo once a week, and he wonders how he is going to buy propane for heat for his family and his home.

At Indian Health Service facilities, health care workers such as those at Standing Rock recognize people still need medical attention, so they are still coming to work with no promise of a paycheck and probably, some people would argue here, doing so illegally.

The Mandan Hidatsa and Arikara Nation, which is at the epicenter of oil and gas development in the Bakken oil shale in North Dakota, will see that development slowed. There is always competition for rigs in North Dakota. Where are those going to move? Everybody is waiting for the rig to show up and begin to drill their wells. The tribes have had a tremendous opportunity not only to develop the resource that will help them economically, but to develop this resource which is moving us in the right direction for energy independence. But because of the shutdown, MHA Nation is losing a substantial amount of Federal oil and gas revenue. Right now, the tribes aren't able to get energy development agreements. They can't get drilling permits approved or have environmental impact assessments completed because BLM and EPA are shut down and not available. Those rigs will move someplace else. The tribe has hundreds of drilling permits awaiting approval and this is only going to delay them further.

The situation is also dire in urban Indian communities. U-Tech, United Tribes Technical College, is one of several tribal colleges that serves over 600 students trying to better themselves and another 300 children who attend their K-through-8 elementary school on the college campus. But because of the shutdown, they are reducing those education services to both the college students and to children.

The list goes on and on and on. It will only get worse. If we continue to not address this problem, we are turning our back on these very real needs. But I think also, importantly, we are turning our back on an obligation this country undertook when it signed treaties with the tribal people of my State.

All across North Dakota, families, workers, children, people who are disabled, are losing access to services and assistance and are losing their paycheck. Why? Why is this happening? Because Congress, arguably the greatest democratic body ever envisioned, is bickering and plagued with inaction. House Republicans continue to bring up individual bills that only address the issues of the day and programs that have only been written about in headlines. Whenever there is a headline, we can fund that because we want to say we are responding to those needs. Well, I think I need a headline for our Native-American families who are in dire straits, and for the Bureau of Indian Education as well as BIA. So I ask: What about Native-American families who are unable to get critical social services to afford food or housing because BIA is closed during the shutdown? Where is the bill for them? Also, equally important, where is the public safety for them? Where is the public safety for those tribal members?

What about the ranchers who lost a huge percentage of their herd not only in my State in the southwest corner, but also all across West River and South Dakota, who can't get assistance from the Department of Agriculture? Where is the bill for them?

What about our young farmers who are trying to build the farms of tomorrow and feed our country, who aren't able to receive their income checks because the Farm Service Agency is shut down? They can't even get their money. Where is the bill for them?

What about North Dakotans trying to start a small business or get a home mortgage and aren't able to access those Federal programs? Where is the bill for them?

It is time we stop this. It is time we respond to the very real hurt in America.

We hear a lot about who is winning and who is losing politically. That is a sad day when that is the deliberation we have, because it is the American people whom we are here to serve. It is the American people to whom we have an obligation. We need to end this impasse and to open the government.

My people in Indian Country in North Dakota need and want and believe they have earned that respect and a commitment to their treaty rights.

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from South Dakota.

LIVESTOCK DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, a week ago today western South Dakota was preparing for a coming storm, but

no one had any idea it would be one of the worst and most devastating snowstorms in that area's history.

I grew up in western South Dakota. I was born and raised there. We saw a lot of nasty blizzards over the years—storms that swept through the middle of our State and all across our State, with the destructive impact that can have, the way it would close down roads, the difficulty it would create for people and, obviously, the loss of livestock that comes with that. We have seen over the years blizzards that have taken their toll on one of our State's most important industries.

But the storm damage I saw yesterday when I toured western South Dakota was epic, looking at the mountains of branches that were piled high waiting for disposal, or the gut-wrenching scenes of fence lines, draws, and pastures that were scattered with dead livestock.

This snowstorm started out as heavy rain—and I know the distinguished Presiding Officer had much of this in her State of North Dakota as well—but that soaked the livestock. Then it turned into a raging blizzard, with heavy snow and sustaining winds of 60 to 70 miles an hour. These winds drove livestock for miles—some more than 12 miles from their pastures. The fortunate ones lasted through the storm, miles from their origination, but still alive.

As I speak, South Dakota ranchers are still assessing their losses, trying to determine ownership of those that survived but are miles away from home, and hauling away or burying the tens of thousands of dead livestock. To add even more challenges to an already devastating situation, this area is now experiencing heavy rains. Flash-flood warnings have been issued this morning for areas of the Black Hills, with an additional 2 or more inches of rain in the forecast.

This storm-damaged area of 17 counties in western South Dakota contains more than 6,000 ranches and more than a million cattle and sheep. For most of these ranchers, their livestock is their sole source of livelihood. These ranchers have a 365-day-a-year obligation to care for their livestock, which they have done for generation after generation.

Madam President, I want to show you the impact of this storm and what it did to some of these livestock. As shown in this picture, this is an area we saw from a helicopter yesterday—a low-lying area where there was some water. As you can see, there are upwards of 40, 50 head of livestock that are lying there dead in that area.

We saw numerous examples like that yesterday.

This is another photo we took yesterday of trucks, rendering trucks that were coming to pick up some of the dead livestock. As you can see, not only are the trucks filled, but there are livestock along this road. We saw that situation, that image, over and over yesterday, as well, along highways in western South Dakota.

The point I am simply making is, this was an incredibly powerful impact—this storm—that created an enormous amount of damage to the No. 1 industry in western South Dakota. The people who work the land, the people who raise these animals, they are independent, they are hard working. These ranchers are the best friends and neighbors anybody could have, all willing to lend a helping hand. They are first to provide assistance and the last to seek it.

The best thing we can do right now, the most effective assistance we can offer them right now is found in the livestock disaster section of the farm bill, which has passed here in the Senate, is now passed in the House of Representatives, and is awaiting action by a conference committee.

The Livestock Indemnity Program, known as LIP, was something Senator BAUCUS and I authored as part of the 2008 farm bill. It provides much-needed financial assistance to these livestock producers. But in order to get this assistance to them, a new farm bill has to be passed.

This program, the Livestock Indemnity Program, or the LIP program, in the farm bill is fully paid for with cuts in other farm programs, and it has eliminated the need for ad hoc disaster assistance that was the standard emergency assistance in past years.

I remember past years, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, something like this would happen, and we would have to come to Congress for ad hoc disaster assistance, emergency assistance. The whole point of getting a disaster title in the farm bill was to eliminate the need for that ad hoc disaster assistance on an annual basis sometimes.

So this title was put in the farm bill back in 2008. It created a permanent program, paid for. As I said, the one in the farm bill that is being considered now is offset by cuts in other areas of the farm bill.

What we are waiting for is for the conferees to get together in a conference to work out the differences between the two bills and to report them back to the House and to the Senate, where they can be voted on, hopefully, passed and put on the President's desk. That is what it is going to take to get assistance back to these livestock producers, because the existing disaster title, as I said—the Livestock Indemnity Program in the disaster title of the farm bill—expired. It expired at the end of 2011.

When we passed a bill in the Senate in 2012, it reauthorized it, and in the farm bill that passed this year it has been reauthorized. But until we get the farm bill passed, that authority that can help producers in circumstances like this no longer exists. That is why we have to get conferees together in a conference committee and, ultimately, a bill on the President's desk that can be signed into law that would allow the Department of Agriculture to issue the regulations that are necessary to put this program back into effect.

I have been encouraged by reports I have heard that they are going to soon name conferees to move a farm bill forward in the House. I wrote a letter earlier this week to Speaker BOEHNER asking him to name conferees so the conference committee could begin its work and make this assistance available to livestock producers.

I have also sent a letter to Secretary Vilsack asking him to determine that the Farm Service Agency personnel in the impacted counties are essential so they can open these offices and begin the process of preparing damage assessment reports that are going to be needed for Federal disaster declarations. The distinguished Presiding Officer mentioned in her remarks the impact this is having in western South Dakota. In western North Dakota, the Farm Service Agency personnel are not working, and in this circumstance they are the ones to whom the producers would go and the States and affected parties would look to to do the damage assessments.

So I am hoping Secretary Vilsack, who has that authority, particularly in this sort of a situation where you have an emergency, will declare these people as essential and get them back on the job so they can begin those damage assessments and prepare the way for, hopefully, when a farm bill passes and the disaster title is authorized again.

So those are a couple of things that have to happen, in my view, fairly quickly. And I will be the first to say that I have had concerns about the farm bill as it worked its way through the process here. There were some things in the commodity title that I thought could have been done differently—perhaps a better policy approach and, arguably, something that is more compliant with our World Trade Organization obligations and less market distorting. There were a number of things in the commodity title, there were some things in other titles of the bill that we had some concerns with, but there were a number of things in the farm bill that we worked very hard to have included, and the disaster title was one of those.

I am hoping as this farm bill works its way through the process, and hopefully as conferees get named by the House of Representatives, they can begin their work, work out some of those differences, and I will continue to be a strong proponent of the livestock disaster assistance that was created in the 2008 farm bill and was included in both versions of the 2013 farm bill—both the one that passed the House and the one that passed the Senate.

I appreciate the work Chairman STABENOW has done, and our ranking member Senator COCHRAN. I thank them for their tireless efforts to try and get a new farm bill enacted as soon as possible.

This past week's snowstorm is only one example of the urgency behind that to get it done so the programs can once again support our farmers and ranchers and the millions of others whose jobs rely on agriculture. Again, in my State of South Dakota, it is our No. 1 industry. It always has been and it probably always will be. We have so many farm and ranch families who look to their leadership here in Washington, DC, to provide some certainty with regard to the rules they are going to play by. When we do extensions such as the one we are in the middle of right now—we did a 1-year extension last year of the old farm bill—but we do not make the reforms, some of the changes that are necessary to update farm policy, then we do not give producers the certainty they need as they make their planning decisions for the future. So getting a 5-year, a multiyear reauthorization in place is important, and it is timely.

My hope would be that in the very near future the conferees can sit down, they can work out the differences between the two bills—reconcile those differences—and get this thing moving again. I say that not only because it is critically important to these livestock producers in western South Dakota but because it is critically important to all producers across South Dakota.

The farmers in the eastern part of my State, the people in the entire farm belt and the regions of this county who depend upon agriculture for their existence need to know what the policies are going to be, what the results are going to be, so they can plan and plan effectively, and so we have the mechanisms in place, so when something like this happens—like happened in western South Dakota this past week—there is a mechanism in place, there is a way in which we can respond and provide support for the hard-working farmers and ranchers and the millions of people whose jobs rely on agriculture.

Looking at those images yesterday was very gripping, in many ways very disturbing. As you fly over these areas and you see these massive losses of livestock, you realize what that means for the people who are out there every single day, who for generations have made their living on the land by raising these cattle, and it has contributed in such an enormous and significant way to the economy not only of western South Dakota but of this entire economy—people who literally every single day are out there feeding not only America but feeding the world. Agriculture has a tremendous impact domestically, obviously, but it has a profound impact around the world, and it is something that from an economic standpoint creates thousands and thousands and millions of jobs here in this country.

I hope we can get the farm bill done. I hope the conferees will get named soon by the House, and that we will be on our way toward passage of a farm bill and, hopefully, the certainty that producers across this country need and the ability to respond to this type of emergency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, we are now in the 11th day of this unnecessary government shutdown. Just as my colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, pointed out, there are some impacts in South Dakota as a result of this shutdown. We are seeing those very real consequences in New Hampshire as well, and I am sure the Presiding Officer is seeing those in North Dakota.

It has become clear to me by talking to people in New Hampshire that the longer the shutdown goes, the worse the impact on families, on small businesses, on people who need the services from this government.

But as difficult as the shutdown is, there is actually another crisis that looms on the horizon that would have even more disastrous consequences for our economy, and that is the possibility of a first-ever default on this country's debt.

For the first time ever, if we default, the country would not pay the bills it has incurred—the bills it has incurred because of decisions made by this Congress or previous Congresses.

As economists across the ideological spectrum have warned, the consequences of a default would be severe. We could see businesses stop hiring. That would have an impact, as we are already seeing as a result of this shutdown, on the economic recovery we are experiencing. Retirement accounts and families' nest eggs would lose much of their value in a very short time. Interest rates would rise, which would mean higher costs for consumers, for small businesses, and for the Federal Government, as we need to borrow. And consumer confidence, which is so important for small businesses and for the economy, would drop sharply.

Some people have suggested that these are scare tactics. But these consequences are very real, and we know that because we have been here before. In 2011, which was the last time we came close to defaulting on our debt, the mere prospect of that default was enough to have significant impact on our economy.

In late July and early August of 2011, the period that led up to the debt deal in 2011, the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped 2,000 points. As a result American families saw their household wealth plummet by $2.4 trillion. We saw a sharp drop in consumer confidence, and by the way the current circumstances that we are in have seen a similar drop in consumer confidence over the concerns about the shutdown and the default.

In the last few weeks we have seen the biggest drop in consumer confidence since Lehman Brothers collapsed in 2008. Then in 2011 our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in America's history. The crisis in 2011 resulted in $1.3 billion in additional borrowing costs for the Federal Government, thereby increasing the Nation's debt.

So for all of those people who said we are not going to raise the debt ceiling, we are not going to pay the bills this country has incurred because we are worried about the debt and deficits we face, the fact is that action alone increased our debt by $1.3 billion.

There is no question that we need to get this country's debt and deficits under control. I think all of us who are here believe that. But the best way to do that is to reach a comprehensive long-term bipartisan agreement that looks at all areas of spending, that looks at the domestic side of the budget, at the defense side of the budget, at mandatory programs and at revenue.

Despite the partisanship that we have seen too much of here, I still think that kind of an agreement is possible and that is critical. Senator THUNE talked about certainty for farmers who are not sure what is going to happen with the farm bill. But that kind of uncertainty is going across the economy for businesses, from whatever sector they are in, because people do not know what we are going to do here in Washington about dealing with this country's long-term budget.

As some of my colleagues have noted, the response to the financial crisis and the great recession led to a higher deficit. There is no question the country was in trouble. One of the ways we helped to address that was to increase spending on vital safety net programs, while revenues declined—to try to stimulate the economy, to put people back to work.

Those policies as well as the fiscal policies that were enacted over the past decade, including two wars, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, all of those things made the country's debt and deficits increase. Actually in the last few years we have seen significant progress to reduce spending and to narrow our deficit.

We put in place discretionary spending caps that have reduced spending by the Federal Government, and we let the tax cuts for wealthiest Americans expire which raised additional revenue. All told, we put in place approximately $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. This has not been easy. There has been a lot that has been affected that I would not have chosen, but the fact is we are on a more sustainable budget path.

One of the best ways we can improve our budget outlook is by growing the economy, by focusing on jobs that boost revenue and decrease the need for social programs. While we certainly have more work to do on that front, consistent job growth has helped increase revenue and reduce our deficit.

Since this President took office, we have seen this country's deficit fall by over 50 percent. That represents a remarkable improvement, and all that is coming with the financial crisis and the recession that began in 2008. So

just think about that. We have reduced this country's deficit by over 50 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that our deficit will drop to 2.1 percent of GDP by 2023 from its current level of 4.2 percent. We have made great progress, and we are on a path to make even better progress. The budget that the Senate passed is a very good place to look at how we achieved additional savings and how we continue to grow our economy.

That budget would give us an additional $1.8 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years. It would also make very important investments in our economy, in families in this country, in infrastructure, in business, in education. That is a conversation we need to have. I think we should go to a conference committee on the budget. It has been unfortunate that we have not been able to get agreement in this body to do that because we have a small group of people who keep preventing that.

But that is not really what I wanted to talk about this afternoon. What we need to do is, we need to get this government back up and running. We need to agree that we should pay the bills this country has incurred and not default. We are continuing to see, as I said when I started, the very real impact of this government shutdown on families and small businesses across New Hampshire and the country.

I talked earlier on the floor about some of the small businesses that have been affected in New Hampshire. But today I want to talk about some of the Federal employees who are affected. I heard from an employee at the Federal Correctional Institution in Berlin, NH. This is a medium-security prison. It is new. It has not even been completely staffed, and it does not have all of the inmates there yet. This is from one of the employees who is currently working there—without pay as she points out.

She told me that her husband had already seen his hours cut at his job. Now she says:

> I sit in fear that I will not receive a pay check at all. I will not be able to pay my mortgage payment, my student loan payments, our vehicle payments, or any other debts. I also assume that my daughter's daycare is not going to accept an IOU. I also will not have the money to buy pellets for my stove or fuel for my furnace for the upcoming winter.

She is worried about the long-term mental and physical well-being of those who are working without paychecks at the prison because many of her colleagues are living paycheck to paycheck.

We have talked a lot about the courage and dedication that many of our Capitol Police officers showed on October 3 during the shooting incident here. It was extraordinary to see people put their lives on the line without getting paid. The same is true of people who are working at our Federal prisons. They are putting their lives on the line every day they go into work in a dangerous environment.

I heard from another furloughed employee of the prison. She said:

> I am a single parent with two sons . . . My sons depend on me and only me. I have to pay for my sons' lunch and extracurricular activities, which keep him out of trouble and gives him something to do. I also have medication that my son and I need on a monthly basis which we cannot go without . . . The oil here in Berlin, NH, is absolutely high.

Berlin is in the north country of New Hampshire so it gets cold there in the winter. She concluded:

> What are we going to say to the bill collectors? Can anyone answer that?

What kind of answers can we give to these people who are putting their lives on the line every day working for the government to protect all of us? Yet we are not giving them the paycheck that they earned.

I also heard from a furloughed employee with the Department of Agriculture in New Hampshire who is on furlough. She said:

> It is an understatement to say I am a bit anxious and scared. I live from paycheck to paycheck.

She told me she is worried about going into debt as a result of this shutdown. She said, ''I love my job at USDA and feel I make a difference every day to make this a better world.'' She urged me to work with my colleagues here to get her back to work.

Those are just a few examples of the stories that we are hearing every day from people in New Hampshire who are affected by this shutdown. The consequences are very real and they get worse with every day that it goes on.

As bad as that is, the consequences of a default of this country refusing to pay its debt are even worse. While Social Security and Medicare have not been affected by the shutdown, that would change if we default. A default could delay or disrupt Social Security checks that are due to go out at the beginning of November. Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits, and military salaries, all of those could be affected by a default. According to the Treasury, delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57.5 million Americans from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner and interfere with payments to 3.4 million veterans.

This could put the most vulnerable in jeopardy and prevent them from receiving the benefits they have earned. That is why the majority in both parties, in both Chambers in Congress, recognizes that defaulting on this country's obligations is not an option.

My former colleague and fellow Senator Judd Gregg, who is a Republican—and while we do not agree on everything, this is one issue we certainly agree on. In an op-ed published by The Hill newspaper he said that brinkmanship on default is:

> The political equivalent of playing Russian roulette with all of the chambers of the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy . . . A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the federal government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

In other words, as Senator Gregg said it so well: It is short-sighted and irresponsible. There is no doubt we need to keep working on a long-term budget for this country. But we have to do it in a way that is responsible. That is why I certainly hope that the Senate will be able to agree on the legislation that is currently before this body. I hope the House will come to the table. I hope we can all agree that allowing this country to default on our debt, to not pay our bills, would have disastrous consequences.

We are not going to be that irresponsible. We still have some time to get this done. Not long. So far the financial markets and the American people have been more than patient. Everybody is frustrated. Everybody understands that it is time for us to act and to act now.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, as we know, this is the 11th day of a completely manufactured crisis, a self-inflicted wound that came about because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obsessed with repealing a law that is called the Affordable Care Act—a law that passed almost 4 years ago, and the benefits have taken root. I will go over those benefits for all Americans and a group of Americans who have had a very hard time getting insurance. We are only now being able to see them enroll for health insurance, and for some of them, this is the first time.

Because our colleagues are so obsessed with repealing this law, which passed almost 4 years ago and was upheld by the Supreme Court as being totally constitutional and about which there was a Presidential election and a Senate election in which the people who wanted to keep this law and make it better won, of course—the Republicans can't accept it. As a result, they have shut down the government.

We wouldn't know it if we listened to the speeches now because they have somewhat changed. Now they are saying they want cuts in Medicare and Social Security. That is what they want.

But when we go back 11 days, before the government shutdown, Speaker BOEHNER was crystal clear. He said: The American people don't want a government shutdown, but they don't want ObamaCare either.

The government shut down. They didn't listen to us. We explained to them that if the government shuts down, that won't stop the Affordable Care Act because those funds come from a different part of the government; they don't come from the appropriated moneys. At least 85 percent of the Affordable Care Act comes from another part of the government. We begged them and told them: If you shut down the government, health care is going to go forward anyway. Why on Earth would you shut down the government? They didn't listen. Now people in the country are saying: What are you guys doing?

I am prayerfully hopeful they will turn around and let us reopen this government—the government of the greatest country on Earth—and that they will also allow us to pay our bills and stop the possibility of default. If default happens, it will be first time in our history.

Yes, we are in the middle of a crisis, but it is manufactured and it is made up. If you think about deficits, look at what has happened since President Obama took office. Deficits have been cut in half. It can't be about deficits. The Affordable Care Act is not going to be stopped. What is this all about? A temper tantrum? A childish way to handle a situation about which they are not happy?

So Republicans who are listening to me know, I have served five Presidents since I came to Washington, first as a House Member and then as a Senator representing the largest State in the Union, the most fantastic State in the Union—but that is only my personal view—California. There have been five Presidents—three Republicans and two Democrats. Obviously, I didn't agree with these Presidents all the time. Sometimes I really disagreed with them, such as over the Iraq war and tax breaks for billionaires. Both of those added mightily to the deficit. I opposed those, but I accepted the fact that all I could do was work to change things in a democratic way, try to pass legislation on those issues to bring the troops home and to make sure everyone pays their fair share. I didn't win those issues.

We all know that, yes, there are many times one votes against the debt ceiling as a show of displeasure, but we have never brought down the full faith and credit of the United States. The last time the Republicans tried this a couple of years ago, the Dow Jones average plunged and it cost us $19 billion. You would think they would have learned a lesson from that, but they didn't. You would think they would have learned a lesson from the Newt Gingrich shutdown that made their poll numbers plunge then.

We need to behave like grownups. I am prayerful and hopeful that we can see the talks that are starting in the Senate continue across party lines to resolve this.

Let's be clear. It is easy to solve this problem. This is the great news: It is easy to solve the problem. Allow our bill that passed here about 12 days ago to be voted on in the House—it will allow this government to reopen—and do not attach any riders to it, such as cutting Medicare, Social Security, or whatever your pet idea is. Then let's sit down and negotiate through the Appropriations Committee chairman, BARBARA MIKULSKI, and through the Budget Committee chairman, PATTY MURRAY. Then they can sit down with their counterparts and resolve our differences on spending, the deficit, and deficit reduction. It is very easy.

What Senator REID is saying is absolutely the right thing to say. Pay our bills, and don't allow us to default. Pay our bills, open the government, and then we can talk about anything and everything that has to do with the budget.

Last week when we were in the middle of this, I went home to see how the Affordable Care Act was working in California. We are a State that has fully embraced the Affordable Care Act. We are 38 million strong, and we have millions of uninsured—millions of uninsured. I am getting daily reports from constituents. They are talking about the Affordable Care Act and what it means to them. These are constituents such as Janice Brown, a semiretired travel agent from Prather, CA. She called the help line and downloaded an application to buy a plan for $1,500 a month for herself and her husband. She said to the Associated Press that was $1,000 less than her current private plan. She said:

> I'm thrilled. The coverage is better. It's fantastic.

Why do my friends want to shut down the government and stop Janice Brown, a semiretired travel agent from my State, from getting affordable health care? Why? Does it make them feel better to do that? I would hope not.

Dr. Travis Sanchez runs a chiropractic clinic in Salinas. It is one of the small businesses buying coverage under Covered California. Under the Affordable Care Act, Sanchez plans to offer his full-time employees the health care coverage which they currently lack. Do you know what he says? The Affordable Care Act is going to be life-changing for many of the people whom I see as a clinician every day.

Then Covered California told us about Paul Torrigino of Sacramento. He enrolled in a bronze plan. In California, you can get a gold plan, a silver plan and a bronze plan and the higher the plan—the gold plan—the less of a copay. The bronze plan is less costly. So he said he enrolled in a bronze plan that was extremely affordable. He said:

> Oh my gosh, the insurance has been going up for the last few years like crazy. All our money was going to pay for medical insurance.

Now he has this very affordable plan.

Leslie Foster, a 28-year-old freelance filmmaker in Hollywood, told the Wall Street Journal he found a plan that will cost him $62 a month. Because Leslie earns $20,000 a year, Federal assistance will pick up three-quarters of the cost of his premium. Leslie says he hasn't had comprehensive health insurance since 2006.

Why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to stop Leslie from getting comprehensive affordable health insurance? Because they didn't like the results of the election? Because they were mad the Supreme Court said the bill was constitutional?

I am at a loss to understand it.

Then I have San Franciscan Paul Cello. He told KQED that he selected a plan that would save him more than $300 a month. He said:

> It's like a whole 'nother world. The coverage is better . . . a lower premium, no preexisting condition exclusions, I get mental health coverage, so there's way more coverage than I had and I'm going to be saving.

These are real people with a heart and a pulse and a life and hopes and dreams and they are finally getting health insurance. Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are stamping their feet and having a tantrum because they don't like it. I don't know why they don't like it. They ought to come to meet these people.

I have Rachel Mansfield of La Quinta. Nothing could dissuade her. She sent in an application for Covered California on Tuesday. She has been waiting for the exchange to start so she and her husband could get health insurance. She got it. Her new premium will be around $400 for both of them, with higher quality coverage than she currently has.

Melissa Harris, a communications student at Fresno State, stopped at a Covered California tent on campus Tuesday. She is paying $600 a month—with help from family members—for insurance through her former employer. She has diabetes, hypertension and other medical issues and lives on disability payments. Under the Affordable Care Act, which prevents insurance companies from denying coverage for pre-existing conditions, Harris said she can afford health insurance on her own. ''It's a godsend for me—a blessing,'' Harris, 33, said.

At the Fresno County Department of Social Services, people were signing up for Medicaid. ''I came in for food stamps,'' Kevin Burke, 51, told the Fresno Bee. An assembly worker, Burke said he has been out of work for two years. He had Medi-Cal previously, but was disenrolled when his daughter turned 18, he said. Under the Affordable Care Act, Americans under 133% of the federal poverty level are now eligible for Medicaid, regardless of how older their children are, or if they have children at all.

At Vista Health Center, Rufina Arango, who is diabetic, filled out an

application for coverage through a significant expansion of Medi-Cal, the state's Medicaid program. Rufina and her family lost their health insurance several years ago, when her husband was laid off after 22 years working for a wood products manufacturer in Windsor. ''It's great, because it is going to help many of us. If not for Obamacare, many of us would not qualify for health insurance,'' Rufina told the Press Democrat.

I have to point out an op-ed piece that appeared in the Washington Post this week about the experience of one of my constituents with the Affordable Care Act. This constituent of mine and her son were also on the Lawrence O'Donnell show last night. Anyone who watched that show—anyone with heart and a soul—would understand how amazing it is for her that the Affordable Care Act passed. Let me tell you the story.

Janine Reid is a writer from the San Francisco Bay area. This is the title of her opinion piece that ran in the Washington Post. ''ObamaCare saved my family from financial ruin.'' Let me repeat the title. ''ObamaCare saved my family from financial ruin.''

She relates her experience with her loving son, Mason. He had brain cancer and he had to undergo major surgeries and multiple surgeries. He would have hit his lifetime limit and the family would have been driven into, in her words, the ''financial abyss'' without the Affordable Care Act. Do you know what she says? She writes that the family thanks ''God and whoever else would listen for our good fortune to have coverage.'' She ends her piece with this line: If I could get those who are trying to repeal this law:

> . . . on a conference call, I would explain this to them. I would tell them that while they were busy trying to derail the Affordable Care Act over the past two years, Mason has again learned to walk, talk, eat and shoot a three-point basket.''

Why would anyone—anyone in the Senate, in the House, in the country—want to hurt a family like that? I am just saying, I don't get it. Because a law is a law is a law. We don't decide that one day we are going to undermine a law. You don't do that. You live by the law. If you want to change it, of course, you have a chance. They tried 43 times to repeal it. It didn't get repealed. They shut down the government over it and it didn't get repealed and it will not get repealed. My constituents are not going back. No one is going to take away their benefits.

Most Americans may not even realize the benefits they are already getting under the Affordable Care Act. Wherever they live, whether in the State of the Presiding Officer or my State, 3 million young adults are now covered through their parents' plan. Three million young adults are now insured through their parents' plan, and 71 million Americans are getting preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Let me say it again. Millions of Americans are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Seventy-one million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Three million young adults are now insured through their parents' plans.

Why do my colleagues want to take that away from Americans? Why do my colleagues want to shut down the government? Because they don't like it. What is it they don't like about this; that some young person doesn't have to fret or his parents don't have to be worried sick that their kid doesn't have health insurance. Now 17 million kids with preexisting conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, can no longer be denied coverage. Why do my friends want to take that away from the families in the United States of America? Why? Why did they shut down the government to take that away? What are they thinking?

Insurers can no longer cancel your health insurance because you get sick. The Chair knows as do I that you could be going along 100 miles an hour and all of a sudden get an illness and be shocked and all of a sudden imagine getting a note from your insurer saying: Sorry you just got sick, Senator BOXER, but we are canceling your health insurance. That happened every day of the week, but it can't happen anymore. Why do my Republican friends want to cancel out that benefit? No lifetime limits on coverage.

I just told the story about the woman who lives in the San Francisco Bay area whose son was born with a brain tumor and who needed constant operations. They hit up against the lifetime limit. But when ObamaCare went into effect, otherwise known as the Affordable Care Act, guess what, no more lifetime limits and the child was saved and the family was saved from financial ruin.

These are just some of the benefits that are going into effect and now are in effect.

Then the Republicans said: Oh, the Affordable Care Act is going to make everything cost so much. No, health care costs are growing at the slowest rate in over 50 years, and insurance companies have to justify premium hikes, so we are getting back checks if they overcharge us. Listen, 8.5 million Americans have received rebate checks from their insurance companies because of the Affordable Care Act. Do my friends want to get that money back, take it away from the people? They shut down the government. They must think that is a very bad idea.

I can't answer the question as to why they want to take away these benefits, but I can guess at their motivation. They are throwing a temper tantrum. They don't like the way the election turned out. They don't like what the Supreme Court did. A law is a law.

I don't get it. Speaker BOEHNER said he is shutting down the government, punishing people, because of ObamaCare. We told him you can't stop it. He tried and failed 43 times to repeal it. He stamped his foot and he shut down the government. Now that we have proven to him he can't stop the Affordable Care Act, now that he sees how many people are benefiting from it, he should open the government. Eleven days the greatest country in the world has been shut down.

I have to tell you, in my great State—and we could all talk about our States, I know the Chair did this—we have a magnificent national park called Yosemite. Honest to God, the first time I stepped on that valley floor I thought I was in Heaven. I had never seen anything like it. There are 3,500 Park Service employees who have been furloughed, with 600 of them at Yosemite.

Here is the thing people don't seem to understand. It is not only the pain of the people who have saved to get to a place such as Yosemite and saved for their families and are looking forward to this opportunity, it is also the small businesses that surround the park.

Douglas Shaw, co-owner of Yosemite Bug Rustic Mountain Resort, may have to lay off 30 percent of his staff. He said:

> We're a good example of a business that could die if this continues. This is all we've got, and I'm scared, honestly. I don't think a lot of people realize how important this issue is for a great many people whose livelihoods are at stake.

Derek Arakelian and his wife Marielle Debree were laid off from their jobs at Yosemite. They held a yard sale to raise money. They held a yard sale to raise money. They said:

> We've got a new little boy and a lot of expenses. We need to make money to pay our bills.

Why are they shutting down the government? The Affordable Care Act is moving forward. A law is a law is a law is a law. We all have our issues. Serving here for a long time, as I said, I have opposed wars, opposed tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, I have opposed rollbacks in environmental regulations that I thought were critical, and I saw us turn away from sensible ways to protect our people. I wasn't happy. I have a right not to be happy, and they have a right not to be happy. But I don't have a right to decide which laws I am going to say should be enforced. I have an obligation, if I don't like the law, to work my heart out in the next election and change things. That is what you do in a democracy. You don't pick and choose.

Then they have their little bills coming over here. I call it governing by press release. Something gets hot, they hear a story I am going to tell, and they say: Oh, well, we will open that little segment.

We don't run a country that way. We don't run a country by press release. We don't run a country in order to get political cover. We have an obligation to keep the doors open, to make sure things work better, to negotiate over

budgets. You don't negotiate by taking hostages. This time the hostages are the American people—people such as Doug Shaw, co-owner of Yosemite Mountain Resort, and people who are laid off—firefighters at the Forest Service. They are working without pay. Lovely. We are getting our pay. One of these firefighters says:

Most people here live paycheck to paycheck.

It is a disgrace. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention will stop its seasonal flu tracking program, and furloughed 9,000 employees. My understanding is they have brought back some of their employees, but they are not getting paid, and they are standing sentry.

David Johnson of San Francisco is the CEO of GigaGen, which does immune system research to help organ transplant succeed. The NIH awarded him a small business grant of over $1 million. He has already hired staff, but he can't get the funds until this shutdown ends. How many of us have read about people who get into trouble because their body rejects the organ? Here is a guy getting $1 million from the NIH, and he can't get the funds. It is shocking.

Why do they shut down the government? They don't like the health care bill that is helping so many people. Now they don't even talk about it. Now they talk about cutting Social Security and Medicare. That is their new dream. That is what they want now. I don't know how that makes us a better country. They can explain it for themselves. Open the government, pay our bills, stop the default, and then we can negotiate. The President has been clear. There is nothing he won't talk about.

Speaking as the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee and as a member of the commerce committee, 93 percent of the EPA have been furloughed. The Environmental Protection Agency has the support of about 75 percent of the American people, if not more. They are under attack constantly. That is one reason we never saw a mini-bill to restore the Environmental Protection Agency. They don't care over there. But what do these employees do? They guard our landmark environmental laws. They ensure our drinking water is safe, our rivers are safe to swim in, and our air is safe to breathe. They make sure that Superfund sites are cleaned up. Five hundred Superfund sites, and they have stopped the cleanup. And look at what a Superfund site is: It is a toxic brew of toxins that can hurt you, such as arsenic, benzine—you name it, the worst things. My Republican friends shut down the government because they want to stop the Affordable Care Act. They are also now stopping cleanup of Superfund sites in their own communities where they are a threat to children, to pregnant women, and to our families and our seniors. How does that make us a better country when we have no inspectors on the ground, not one in California, to make sure the air is safe and the water is safe?

Then, if we care about farming—and I know most of us do—EPA is responsible for the inventory of pesticides imported from abroad. This means that millions of dollars of imported agricultural chemicals have been stuck at U.S. ports because EPA personnel are not on hand to approve them for entry. This could be devastating for our agricultural economy, and it could further raise food prices for consumers.

Somebody explain to me how a government shutdown helps the farmers who are waiting for these pesticides to be cleared by the EPA. Somebody explain to me how a government shutdown helps when we have many road projects that are just getting ready to go forward, but we don't have any of the agencies ready to complete the studies to make sure they are safe enough to go forward. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs at stake, and most of them, when it comes to the highway bill, are in the private sector.

We just learned yesterday that 92 percent of the workers at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have been furloughed. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission fulfills a critical mission. The NRC was created ''to ensure the safe use of radioactive materials.'' Anyone who has been alive the last year or so knows about Fukushima and what happened to the people there and understands when you are dealing with radioactive materials you are dealing with danger. The NRC had to furlough 92 percent of the workers because the Republicans don't like the Affordable Care Act, and they shut down the government.

Open it up. Enough is enough. Give the people back the government they asked for in this last election.

I understand. I didn't like it many times in my life, but I dealt with it. Grow up. Curling up in a corner and having a temper tantrum with a blanket and your teddy bear is not the right way to deal with it. Open the government, sit down with us, and tell us what you want to fix.

We have already agreed to a low number in the continuing resolution, a number we don't like at all and think is too low. We think it is a hardship. We agreed to the lower number because we wanted to have a chance to negotiate. Senator MIKULSKI is ready. Senator MURRAY is ready. We tried 21 times to get to conference with them and negotiate a budget, and 21 times they objected. And then they have—I have to use the word now—the chutzpah to say we won't negotiate when we tried 21 times to go to conference. There are no inspectors on the job to make sure the air is clean, to make sure the water is safe, and to make sure the nuclear powerplants are safe.

The Republicans talk about the parks, and I appreciate it. But they fail to mention that the Army Corps manages 12 million acres of public lands and waters nationwide, and the recreation areas host 370 million visits annually. These recreation areas support local businesses like resorts, marinas outfitters, grocery stores, gas stations, and hotels which provide goods and services to visitors as well as boost our Nation's economy. Because of this Republican shutdown the Corps closed Lake Mendocino located north of San Francisco. Lake Mendocino hosts half a million visitors annually, and in 2010 visitors spent $12.7 million at businesses within 30 miles of Lake Mendocino, supporting 106 jobs and $2.8 million in labor income.

So we get a little mini-bill over there, open the parks. No, open the government. Open all our recreation areas. Don't do this government by piecemeal, government by press release, government by your favorite agency. It is ridiculous. No party, Republican or Democratic, has the right to say to a community: You will thrive, but you will die. No party has the right.

I have a community near Los Angeles called University Park. The L.A. Times did a big story. The children there are suffering illness and everyone believes it is from an oil and gas site nearby. It is an environmental issue. The kids are suffering, and we don't know what is wrong with them. We called the EPA. They said: Senator we will be right on it. The government shut down. We don't have any inspectors in California.

Those kids are sick. So we get a small bill. Let's help the kids with cancer. Of course we want to. What about these kids? We don't know what they have. No party, Republican or Democratic, should say this child lives, and we are not sure about this child.

That is not America. This is one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. It is not for the Republicans to decide what they want to fund. It is for all of us to decide. Open the government. You shut it down because of the Affordable Care Act; I appreciate it. Fight that. We were with the President for a couple of hours yesterday. Republican Senators were with him today. He said he would look at everything. But don't keep this government closed and don't bring us to the first default we have ever had.

The National Transportation Safety Board furloughed 380 of its 400 employees. In my State we had an investigation going on into the Asiana Airlines Flight 214 crash. This crucial hearing was to include the testimony of foreign officials from Asia. Its postponement and the ongoing shutdown will delay the entire investigation. We need to know what went wrong, but this shutdown has shut down that investigation. Two weeks ago there was a small plane crash at the Santa Monica Airport that killed four people, and the NTSB is unable to investigate the crash. They had to take their materials, stick them in a file, and hopefully, some day they will come back to it.

Open this government. Don't say this community will thrive and that one will die, this family will get help and this one won't, this Federal worker will get paid, but we are not sure about that Federal worker, while they take their checks. This is stunning.

It is no wonder the American people are expressing their views, and I hope they will continue to put pressure on those who have this government shut down. There is no winner in a shutdown. It is devastating. And my friends keep saying they don't want it.

So open the government. It is easy. We did it here. It is waiting over there for JOHN BOEHNER to call it up. Don't add your pet peeves to it. I have a lot of pet peeves I would like to add to it, too. This shutdown is devastating for our workers, our businesses, our contractors, for our economy.

Speaker BOEHNER, put that bill on the floor. Let's open this government. Let's not default for the first time.

I was here in the House when Ronald Reagan was the President. Here is what he said about default:

> The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

We named an airport after him, a building after him. Let's pass this debt ceiling in his honor. He warned us. What has gone wrong with the party of Ronald Reagan? Where have they gone? What are they thinking—shut down the government? The last time they did, it cost a fortune. The last time they played with the debt, it cost a fortune. We hear about people dumping American bonds. Is that what they want?

Open up the government. Let the people have their government. It is a self-inflicted mess.

It is as though you wake up in the morning, it is a pretty nice day, you feel pretty good and, all of a sudden, you decide you are going to hit yourself with a brick. Oh my God.

These little mini bills—how ridiculous.

That reminds me, one of my friends gave me this analogy, which I think is right on, which is you see a woman drowning and you grab her and you take her halfway to the shore and you leave her and she drowns anyway. That is what these mini ''press release'' bills are. You find someone bleeding to death but you only sew them up halfway. It is a self-inflicted mess. That is the bad news.

The good news is, because it is self-inflicted, it is easy to get out of it. All you have to do there is take up the Senate bill and pass it. The Presiding Officer knows, she served there proudly. It has the Republican budget numbers in it, which we think are way too low, but we agreed to them as a compromise because we did not want to see the government shut down.

Take up the bill and pass it. Then we can talk about all these issues. Don't allow the greatest Nation in the world to default.

> Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

I used to work on Wall Street—a very long time ago. We saw what happened when the markets thought we were not going to get together and resolve this default situation. The markets started to go down, 300 points, 200 points, and then at the mere hope that we could fix this problem, the markets shot up. The markets are watching. They know what is happening here. We are going to have a vote to lift the debt ceiling, to make sure we do not default on bills that were already incurred.

Let me be clear on that. We are talking about paying the bills we already incurred. You have to do that when you are a homeowner. You pay your mortgage. You pay your bills.

Then they started to say, what is a default? That was unbelievable. I looked it up in Black's Law Dictionary. If you don't pay your bills, that is a default. Don't tell me you pay the interest on the debt but you cannot pay the other bills—no, no, that is not the Black's Law Dictionary definition. Pay your bills. Don't make this Nation a deadbeat. If you want to treat your family that way, that is your choice, but this is the USA family. We do not default and we do not threaten default. Ronald Reagan warned us:

> Open up the Government, pay your bills.

It is basic stuff. It is not complicated. Majority Leader REID has been clear. He is a guy who can compromise, negotiate, talk—he has been around a long time. But he just said it: Open the government, pay our bills, and we will negotiate.

We are going to hear a lot of words, but I want people to understand why the government is shut down. The government is shut down because the House, Republican House under the leadership of JOHN BOEHNER or ERIC CANTOR or PAUL RYAN—we are never sure. Every day it is someone new but it is supposed to be JOHN BOEHNER—fine. I like him. That doesn't change where we are. They refuse to take up the bill that opens up the government—let's be clear—just until November. And it takes the numbers the Republicans like and we do not like and we say OK, we will give you that, let's keep the government open. We did it over here. I thank my Republican friends who voted to allow us to vote on that bill. That was a hard vote for them and I am very appreciative of that.

All BOEHNER has to do is take up that bill and pass it. That is all. Then we are out of the shutdown mess and that self-inflicted wound is gone. We can negotiate over the budget as we should. Then all they have to do is join us and make sure we do not default for the first time in history and make this country a deadbeat nation. How horrible. How embarrassing.

I will close with this. This self-inflicted wound mattered so much that President Obama had to cancel a trip to the Asian countries. That trip was important for our economy and for jobs and to get foreign investment. They did not care. We did our best, we sent the best face we could, Senator Kerry, Secretary of State. He did his best, but I know that was not a good thing to do because it gave China the upper hand. China made some cracks about the dysfunction here in the West. We are dysfunctional here, self-inflicted dysfunction, self-inflicted crisis.

This is not Hurricane Sandy. This is not the horrible blizzard that happened in South Dakota. I want to send my best to our colleagues there who are suffering because of what happened from that blizzard. Someday we will talk a little bit about climate change—maybe we can move forward—and the extreme weather that is happening. But I am not going to talk about that now. I have enough problems.

What we need to do today is the right thing for the country: Open up the government that belongs to the American people. It is easy. That is our job. Make sure we do not default. Then we sit down as friends, as colleagues across the aisle, and we negotiate all the important issues that Republicans care about and Democrats care about. I look forward to those negotiations.

I hope as they are going on around now in little back rooms around us that we are finding a way out of this mess. But we cannot forget what brought us here and the reason I wanted to be here today is to make it known in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the harm that has been done. There is a reason why there has not been a shutdown since I think it was 1996. There is a reason—because the people who lived through it recognized it was devastating. I guess the memory faded. People say: Oh, there have been 19 shutdowns. Yes, but there has not been one in all those years, since 1996. It is a lot of years. The reason is, it was devastating.

I want to put in the RECORD, first of all, how the Affordable Care Act is benefiting the people of this country already. Yes, it has had its major problems on getting on its webpage and the rest. We had that the first day in California, but we had millions of visits to the site, millions. We didn't expect it. It is going to be smoothed out. Yes, there will be ways to fix it. But I wanted to put in the RECORD the individual stories of my people and how they will benefit and how, it seems to me, so counterintuitive to stop a bill that was passed almost 4 years ago, upheld by the Supreme Court, and now finally is going into place. It is wrong to shut down the government because of such a law that is bringing peace of mind to so many—tens of thousands already in California signed up. I had to make that point.

I also want to reiterate what Ronald Reagan said, President Reagan, about playing with the full faith and credit of the United States. I want the American people to think about why we are in this place and how they can stop this from ever happening again, because I think it is a disgrace and it is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I have enjoyed—well, not really, but I listened to my colleagues from the left talk about just reopening the government. I think to myself as she used the analogy of saving someone's life, dragging them halfway to the shore and stopping—I think to myself, think about the veterans. The House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I think about all those veterans who served our Nation, put their lives on the line. The House of Representatives sent over a bill to fund the very crucial needs of our veterans. Yet the Senate has failed to take it up. I think about the national parks and all the opportunities we have to see our parks reopen, see our veterans from World War II not denied. But, no, the Senate refuses to take it up.

I think of NIH and the critical funding that is necessary to continue the research. Yet our friends on the left refuse to take up this critical piece of legislation.

I enjoy being lectured to. I call it ''the Democrat lecture series,'' but at the end of the day we ought to have action and not simply words. I understand it is important for us to figure out who to blame.

In politics, the lowest common denominator is always fear. Our friends on the left do a very good job of assigning blame to someone, someplace, somehow, all the time, but what we need is leadership, not more information about polls but leadership. We need people committed to a cause. In a town that seems to be the epicenter of activity for the economy, we have two-thirds of this legislative process, the White House and the Senate, being run by our Democratic friends. Yet they want to blame the Republicans for the shutdown.

I call this, no question, undeniably the Democratic shutdown. I hope we find ourselves in a position to tell our veterans we were not kidding when we made the promise. Promises made should be promises kept. There ought to be no question of our commitment. We have seen that commitment demonstrated by our friends in the House, Republicans and Democrats, working together to pass legislation to take care of our veterans. We need more of that. That is leadership, working together, finding common ground to take care of those who have made America possible. But not today, not in this Senate, not when those bills sit idle. But the men and women who served our country cannot sit idle. They go without their benefits. I wonder why. I wonder why we are not seeing the sense of urgency to take care of those areas where there is full agreement. Why are we not taking advantage of the opportunities presented to us on a consistent basis by our friends in the House of Representatives? I do not understand that. I simply do not understand that.

I will say I do find it very difficult to find common ground in the Senate at times. It is going to be very difficult for Republicans and Democrats to find something we have in common. I believe we strive to work in a bipartisan fashion on a consistent basis, and I will tell you that on the most important issues it is very difficult. But I have been encouraged in my research in the last few days of looking for common ground—I have been encouraged that I have found some friends on the left who actually seem to agree with my position on some of the most important issues facing the Nation today. I will even quote some of my friends to the left as I think through the debt ceiling debate.

As a matter of fact, the first quote I will start with from my friends on the left:

> The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure.

I concur with my friend on the left. Another quote:

> Interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans. A debt tax Washington did not want to talk about.

I concur and agree with my friend to the left. Another quote:

> Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here.

I agree with my friend on the left. My colleague on the left is now the President of the United States. These are quotes from Senator Barack Obama.

Our President of the United States and our Vice President, combined, voted approximately I think it was 10 or 11 times not to raise the debt ceiling of our country. They called it a failure of leadership. I think it is interesting. As a small business owner for the last 15 years I have had the opportunity to borrow what I considered at the time real money. Now that I am in Washington, I have to redefine the definition of real money. But at the time I was trying to get my business started. I went to a bank to borrow some money. The banker had some very interesting questions for me. He wanted to know how I was going to pay it back. He wanted to know what assets I was willing to put up in order to receive the resources I needed to fund my business.

I see the debt ceiling debate as a debate over how we explain to our investors, the American taxpayers, that we are handling responsibly the underlying causes for the need to increase our debt. I cannot tell our investors that we are handling our debt—our spending responsibly. I cannot tell our investors that we have a plan to balance our budgets. I cannot tell our investors, the taxpayers of America, that we are even thinking about controlling our spending. No. As a matter of fact, over the last 5 years we have spent nearly $5 trillion more than we brought in. And our friends on the left want to have a serious conversation about the spending of this country.

I cannot tell our investors, the American taxpayers, what I want to tell them, but I can tell them that we do not deserve an increase in the debt ceiling unless we produce a plan. I can tell our investors here at home that we do not deserve an increase without balancing our budgets. I can tell them, the taxpayers of America, that until we are willing to cut our spending at the same rate that we increase our credit card limit, we don't deserve their confidence in raising the debt ceiling.

Some would ask: Senator SCOTT, where, pray tell, would you find the revenue when our friends in the House of Representatives say that there is just no more money for us to cut? We can't find any place to cut anything in this $4 trillion spending plan. Really? Well, there are many options on how to cut spending here in America.

Senator TOM COBURN regularly shares reports on government waste. Last year he showed how the Market Access Program provided $20 million to the Cotton Council International. They used that money to create reality TV shows in India intended to promote the use of cotton. India, for the record, is an exporter of cotton and produces twice the amount the U.S. does.

The OMB released a report that improper payments for Medicare amounted to $47.9 billion in 2010, or 9 percent of Medicare's budget. The Chamber of Commerce looked at the Davis-Bacon requirements and found that it inflates the costs of Federal construction projects by as much as 15 percent and costs the taxpayers over $1 billion annually.

There are over 1,500 programs in the U.S. Government that are in duplication and costing the taxpayers more than $400 billion.

I would like to be able to share with the investors of America, the taxpayers, that we have a plan. I would love to share with the taxpayers of America that one day we will balance our budget. I would love to tell the taxpayers of America, our investors, that they can have confidence in our ability to lead us in such a way that future debt increases will be less likely to happen. I have not seen such a plan. I have not heard conversations about controlling our debt, only conversations about increasing the limit to create more debt.

I am concerned that as we wrestle with the problems of today we have no focus on tomorrow. I hope that this body will work diligently not only to have a conversation about the debt limit of America but to have a conversation about how we take care of the underlying problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from California.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD BANK REFORM EFFORTS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the World Bank-IMF Annual Meetings are this week, and President Kim is expected to propose and seek approval for significant changes to the Bank's strategy, organization, and budget. After years of promised but undelivered change, serious and lasting reform at the World Bank is long overdue.

An October 9th Washington Post article, entitled ''Wider Impact Eludes World Bank,'' describes the limited impact of billions of dollars spent by the Bank on some 700 projects in 100 countries since the global financial crisis because of delays, poor oversight, cost overruns, and projects that did not deliver promised economic benefits.

This track record raises serious questions about the World Bank's relevance as developing countries struggle with growing demands for energy, water, food, education, health care, and jobs.

There are many capable, dedicated people at the World Bank who chose to work there because of their belief in its development mission. But for too long the Bank has been an insular, inflexible, arrogant, and risk-adverse institution, more responsive to government elites than the needs of the poor.

Beyond that, an October 7th New York Times article entitled ''World Bank, Rooted in Bureaucracy, Proposes a Sweeping Reorganization,'' describes a recent survey of the Bank's 10,000 employees. The survey revealed a ''culture of fear'' and a ''terrible environment for collaboration.''

I have voiced concerns about this culture myself. Fiefdoms are jealously guarded by Bank managers. Staff has been retaliated against, ostracized, and had their careers destroyed because they had the audacity to complain about incompetence, corruption, waste, or instances of sexual harassment and abuse.

For literally decades, I have heard promises of reform from one president of the Bank after another, yet the Bank's bureaucracy has defended the status quo. The Bank has become expert at appearing open to reform while fiercely resisting change.

So it is refreshing to hear a World Bank president openly acknowledge that the Bank has drifted away from its core mission of fighting poverty, and that its bureaucracy has become ''concretized.'' President Kim has denounced the culture of fear that leads to risk avoidance, and he has shown a willingness to challenge the conventional wisdom.

He has said that the employees of the World Bank's multiple components must work together if they are to have any hope of meeting the goals of eliminating extreme poverty by 2030 and increasing the incomes of the poorest 40 percent. He has also said that the World Bank must become more efficient and responsive to balance the increasing influence of countries like China. And to get there, he is proposing the first major strategic realignment in 17 years.

How does President Kim propose to change the Bank?

He has already shaken up senior management and brought in new people from outside. And he is proposing changes to the way the World Bank is organized and does its work. He wants to take down the bureaucratic silos that are inefficient, promote rivalries, and keep people from working together.

President Kim wants the technical staff to have greater influence within the Bank and he wants them to share their knowledge with countries. He thinks the Bank should be a better partner, helping governments make sound education, health, and job training investments for their people.

President Kim recognizes that the Bank requires increased resources to achieve its goals but that the Bank's long-term financial health is ultimately dependent on its ability to become more self-reliant. He wants to leverage private sector funding, increase revenue, and seek new financial tools to support country development.

He proposes to cut the World Bank's operating costs by $400 million over 3 years. He estimates that for every $100 million reduced in the Bank's operating budget an additional $1 billion would be available for new loans.

I am encouraged by President Kim's energy, focus, and willingness to address long-standing entrenched problems at the World Bank. He and the Bank's many employees should know that those of us in Congress who are responsible for appropriating the funds for the U.S. share of payments to the World Bank will be strongly supporting his efforts, and basing future appropriations on the results.

NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this month, our Nation commemorates the 10th anniversary of National Cyber Security Awareness Month—a time to raise awareness about the need to ensure a safe and secure environment for all Americans in cyber space.

All of us have a stake in improving the Nation's cyber security. That is why I join with stakeholders in the government, academia and the private sector in calling attention to the need to address new cyber threats.

In today's digital age, we face new challenges in securing our computer networks from cyber threats and cyber crime. Even as the Internet and other rapidly advancing technologies spur economic growth and expand opportunity, there is growing uncertainty and unease about how Americans' sensitive personal information is collected, shared and stored. National Cyber security Awareness Month provides an important reminder about the need to update our Federal laws to keep pace with this new reality.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I continue to work to update our outdated Federal privacy laws. Earlier this year, I reintroduced bipartisan legislation to update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, ECPA. The bill requires that the government obtain a search warrant—based upon probable cause—before gaining access to the content of our email and other electronic communications, when those communications are stored with a service provider. This common sense legislation, which I have cosponsored with Republican Senator MIKE LEE, enjoys broad support from a diverse coalition of organizations including the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Tax Reform, the Center for Democracy and Technology, and the Heritage Foundation.

I remain disappointed that a Republican Senator has objected to the unanimous consent request to pass this bipartisan bill, which overwhelmingly passed the Judiciary Committee in April. These privacy reforms are too important to delay. I hope that the Senate will consider and pass my bipartisan privacy bill without further delay.

I will also continue to work to better protect Americans from the growing threats of data breaches and cyber crime. For several years, I have sought to enact comprehensive data privacy legislation that would establish a single nationwide standard for data breach notification and also clarify and strengthen the criminal penalties for violations of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. These critical privacy proposals will help make all of us safer and more secure in cyber space and I will continue to push for enactment of these privacy reforms.

I commend the many citizens from Vermont and across the country who are holding events to recognize National Cyber Security Awareness Month. I look forward to working with these stakeholders and with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to help ensure that our right to privacy is protected in cyber space.

GILLESPIE RESPONSE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the majority leader quoted from a speech delivered on September 30 by Ed Gillespie, the former chairman of the Republican National Committee and the current chairman of the Republican State Leadership Committee.

The majority leader used this quotation to attack Congressional Republicans and defend the hardline strategy embraced by Democrats. Unfortunately, he took Mr. Gillespie's words out of context and failed to mention some of the other remarks Mr. Gillespie made in that very same speech.

Not surprisingly, Mr. Gillespie has responded with a letter. He ends his letter by saying: ''Republican governors and legislators work across the aisle daily to solve the most critical issues in their states. It's an example of executive and legislative leadership you and President Obama would do well to emulate.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Gillespie's entire letter, along with his entire speech to the 2013 Republican State Leadership Committee Annual Meeting.

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

RSLC CHAIRMAN ED GILLESPIE LETTER TO SENATOR HARRY REID

WASHINGTON, D.C. (October 9, 2013).—Today the Republican State Leadership Committee released the following letter from Chairman Ed Gillespie:

DEAR SENATOR REID, Yesterday on the Senate Floor you cited remarks by me at the Republican State Leadership Committee National Meeting to bolster your own flawed policies. I'm sending you a copy of the remarks as they were released so you can see that they explicitly criticize your position and support Republicans in Congress.

Specifically, at the beginning of my remarks you'll see that I said: ''It's hard to see how President Obama could oppose a legislative extension of the individual mandate when he's issued an extension for big businesses by executive fiat, and it's hard to see how Harry Reid could oppose funding the rest of the government just to protect a carve-out for himself and his colleagues.''

You neglected to mention this in your floor statement yesterday.

Nor did you quote the full context of my RSLC remarks, which were: ''On top of that, Republicans in the House majority and Senate minority, are nearly always in the position of talking about what they're against—what they want to block or repeal or defund.

''And we join them in staunch opposition to the President's harmful policies—but our party might be better off if we spent more time speaking in positive terms about WHY we're against those policies and, more importantly, why we're FOR the policies we're for—as our state Republican leaders do so consistently.''

To be clear, I agree with House Speaker John Boehner when he said, ''The way to resolve this is to sit down and have a conversation to resolve our differences.''

Republican governors and legislators work across the aisle daily to solve the most critical issues in their states. It's an example of executive and legislative leadership you and President Obama would do well to emulate.

Sincerely,

ED GILLESPIE,
Chairman,
Republican State Leadership Committee.

CHAIRMAN ED GILLESPIE REMARKS AT 2013 RSLC ANNUAL RETREAT, AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

As we're meeting here today, things are pretty messy in Washington, D.C.

And Americans are growing increasingly frustrated with President Obama and Congress. The approval ratings for everyone in Washington are dropping, but sadly Republicans in Congress are the ones in the basement, with approval ratings below President Obama and Democrats in Congress.

I'm hopeful today's decision by the House leadership to pass a Continuing Resolution which funds the government while delaying the individual mandate in Obamacare for a year, and eliminating its subsidies for Members of Congress and staff will change that.

It's hard to see how President Obama could oppose a legislative extension of the individual mandate when he's issued an extension for big businesses by executive fiat, and it's hard to see how Harry Reid could oppose funding the rest of the government just to protect a carve-out for himself and his colleagues.

So while there has been some very positive developments in this debate, I also think our Republican friends at the Federal level could benefit from sounding more like state leaders like those here today—lieutenant governors, attorneys general, house speakers and senate leaders—who talk all the time about improving the quality of life for the people you serve, in tangible terms.

When it comes to improving schools, growing jobs, creating opportunities, making communities safer, helping families in need, providing affordable housing for the working poor, fixing roads, and effectively responding to natural disasters—Republicans at the state level practice what they preach.

And the majority of Americans—53 percent to be exact—who live in states with a Republican governor and Republican majorities in their state legislatures, like what they hear and, more importantly, what they see.

Our caucuses continue to grow, expand and set records because of the positive leadership people like the elected officials we're honored to have with us here today are providing back home.

Now, I worked on Capitol Hill for more than a decade, and I've served in the White House as Counselor to the President. I was there for the confrontations between Speaker Gingrich and President Clinton, and President Bush and Speaker Pelosi. So I understand the dynamics when one party has control of congress and the other the presidency, from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—and the advantage of the ''bully pulpit'' over often competing voices.

On top of that, Republicans in the House majority and Senate minority, are nearly always in the position of talking about what they're against—what they want to block or repeal or defund.

And we join them in staunch opposition to the President's harmful policies—but our party might be better off if we spent more time speaking in positive terms about WHY we're against those policies and, more importantly, why we're FOR the policies we're for—as our state Republican leaders do so consistently.

I mean . . . when it comes to health care, Republican policies would protect people with pre-existing conditions, hold down premiums which are skyrocketing today, let people truly keep the health insurance they have if they like it, and allow workers to earn wages for 40 hours per week instead of 29.

Republican energy policies mean lower gas prices at the pump, lower home heating bills in winter, high-paying American jobs and less reliance on foreign sources of oil.

Republican economic policies mean more working families enjoying a better quality of life, and more people knowing the difference between holding a job as opposed to building a career.

We want American companies to expand jobs here rather than invest profits abroad by eliminating loopholes and tax breaks to bring the tax on business down from the highest in the world, so 401(k)s and pensions get bigger for those wanting to retire and young people graduating from high school and college are able to start a life on their own instead of living with their parents.

A friend once told me, ''The American dream is not just owning your own home, it's getting your children out of it.''

Those are some of the positive impacts of Republican policies in people's lives, and voters of every kind would welcome hearing about them—and they could lead more minorities, women and young people to think about voting Republican.

Unfortunately, all they too often hear from us is, ''Repeal Obamacare. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline. Pass tax reform.''

Repeal. Approve. Pass.

Short-hand process arguments that resonate strongly with people who already agree with us, but not really music to independent ears. We need to break out of a speech pattern that dwells on process, and discipline ourselves to talk about the benefits of Republican policies.

Democrats talk more than we do about lifting people out of poverty, expanding the middle class, and addressing income inequality.

And yet it's our policies that actually do those things and their policies that make them worse.

Most Americans realize that the constant stream of taxes, mandates, regulations and programs coming from the Obama Administration are not making our lives better, and certainly not helping our economy.

And I think deep down, many worry that these policies are not only killing U.S. jobs, but—worse—they run the risk of destroying the American work ethic.

They're worried about themselves and their families, and are pessimistic about our country's future.

Now, I sometimes find myself feeling angry and frustrated that more of my fellow Americans aren't more angry and frustrated. But while expressing anger and frustration gives voice to our core voters, it doesn't do much for all those worried and pessimistic voters.

They want hope and optimism.

They want to know how Republican policies will make things better, and it's our job in the states to explain that in relatable terms and demonstrate it with tangible solutions based on our conservative principles of freedom, liberty and equal opportunity.

Republicans understand that prosperity results from an economy based on creating wealth, not just redistributing it; and that if you truly care about helping the least among us and lifting millions of people out of poverty and expanding the middle class, history proves you should favor a system of democratic capitalism over a government managed economy.

We need to start measuring compassion not by how many of our fellow Americans are living off government programs, on food stamps, or in public housing but by how . . . many have become able to provide for themselves and their families through good jobs, like we're seeing more and more in Republican-led states.

It is no coincidence that the boom in natural gas occurring across our country is taking place in the one sector of the energy industry regulated by the states rather than the Federal government—and no coincidence that so much of that is taking place in states with Republican governors and legislatures who know how to protect our environment and property rights while also unleashing a transformative source of abundant domestic energy.

Republican policies promote equal opportunity. We know that eliminating discrimination is a moral imperative, but it does not alone guarantee the equal opportunity we all believe in.

So Republican attorneys general not only enforce anti-discrimination laws, Republican state legislators fight to improve our schools, empower parents and give children in poor neighborhoods a quality education that enables them to get into college or qualify for a good paying job.

The quality of a child's school should not be decided by the zip code in which she lives, and state legislators like the ones in this room are the ones who consistently stand up for those children against entrenched education establishments.

Another issue that's being resolved in the states is a very sensitive one, and it's being worked out in a more respectful way than it would be at the Federal level. I'm talking, of course, of same sex marriage.

As with, I'm sure, many of you, I have friends and family who are gay. And according to the tenets of my Faith, I accept them for who they are and love them. But the tenets of my Faith also hold that marriage is between one man and one woman. Indeed, in the Catholic Church, marriage is one of seven holy sacraments.

You see, for me, this is not a matter of opinion, or even really a choice. But I understand that what is a sacred rite to tens of millions of Americans is also in our civil law the means by which couples garner survivorship benefits, hospital visitation rights, insurance coverage and other benefits. So while I don't support same sex marriage, I do not begrudge its advocates their position on the issue.

And, I don't believe that everyone who supports same sex marriage is anti-Catholic, or a religious bigot. But in the same vein, it would be nice if so many of them would stop accusing everyone who doesn't share their views of being anti-gay or homophobic. Freedom of Religion is still in the very first Amendment to the Constitution.

We may not all agree on whether we should redefine what constitutes marriage, but hopefully we can agree not to redefine what constitutes tolerance.

So on the state level, and in particular in states with Republican leadership, we're seeing the benefits of respectful dialogue, problem solving policies and fiscal responsibility. Republicans are balancing budgets, reducing tax burdens, improving schools and making families safer and better off.

I know you're all familiar with our Future Majority Project at the RSLC, where we are recruiting hundreds of candidates for state legislatures who more fully reflect the growing diversity of our nation. So in addition to a positive message, we'll have fresh-faced messengers as well.

The RSLC's sole purpose is to help elect Republicans. Doing that means getting a majority of votes in thousands of different districts, and dozens of states.

We understand that Republican legislators here in Hawaii will not pass legislation identical to those in Texas or Ohio or North Carolina; and that attorneys general in North Dakota, Georgia, or Idaho won't have the same list of priorities.

But their shared beliefs, principles and values take each of their states in a much better direction than their Democratic opponents would.

Republicans don't seek to win elections to gain power, but to translate our principles into policies that make our country stronger and make lives better for our fellow citizens. And that means winning majorities in legislative chambers, electing governors and other statewide officeholders, and—ultimately—winning a majority of the Electoral College again.

If Republicans can have unified state government where a majority of Americans live, we can win back the White House. But to do so, we'll have to learn valuable lessons at the national level, and those lessons are being taught at the state level.

The United States of America is a great nation, but we can see how President Obama's policies are making us weaker—here at home and in the world. The Republican Party is a great Party. But we have not won the national popular vote in five of the last six presidential elections.

For our country to be stronger, our party must be stronger.

And that begins with all of us.

RECOGNIZING NIH RESEARCH

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, today I wish to honor Dr. Tara Palmore and Dr. Julie Segre, 2013 Federal Employees of the Year, for their ground-breaking research to stop the spread of deadly hospital-acquired infections. Each year approximately 100,000 patients die from hospital-acquired infections. These deadly infections affect patients who are in the course of receiving healthcare treatment for other conditions; therefore, the patients often already have compromised immune systems. These two doctors created a revolutionary model to identify and halt the spread of infection for the rest of the health care industry to follow.

Over the course of a 12-month period in 2011 and 2012, a rare and deadly ''superbug'' was spreading from patient to patient at one of the Nation's premier research hospitals, the National Institutes of Health's Clinical Center. This two-woman team—Dr. Tara Palmore, a deputy hospital epidemiologist, and Dr. Julie Segre, a senior investigator—partnered with a talented team of doctors to accomplish an extraordinary achievement. For the first time ever, they were able to sequence the bacteria's DNA to decipher how the pathogen spread from patient to patient. This allowed doctors to detect the origins of the infections, trace the transmission, and implement measures to put an end to the outbreak.

Tragically, 18 seriously ill patients acquired the bacteria and seven ultimately died from the infection, but this use of genomics could profoundly change the way hospital-acquired infections are identified and halted, leading to quicker response times and saving tens of thousands of lives. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the NIH said,

> ''It is a groundbreaking advance in one hospital that will now have an impact across the world and will become the standard. It is a fantastic example of taking a challenging medical problem and applying technologies in a new way to come up with a remarkable result. We now have a new weapon in the battle to stop the spread of drug-resistant organisms.''

Dr. John Gallin, the Director of the NIH's Clinical Center, said the breakthrough by the NIH team is ''a magnificent demonstration of how a hospital can contain these infections when they occur.''

There are a limited number of antibiotics available to fight these types of highly resistant bacteria, so this new discovery provides a new approach for hospital infection control that will benefit numerous patients in the future. I congratulate Drs. Palmore and Segre for their hard work and critical contributions to the health care community and to all of their colleagues for the great work at the National Institutes of Health.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ORTHEIA BARNES

• Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, on November 3, the many friends and admirers of Ortheia Barnes will gather in Detroit to pay tribute to her remarkable life and career. ''Careers'' would actually be more appropriate in Ortheia's case, because this extraordinary lifelong Detroiter has excelled in multiple fields.

Some Detroiters know Ortheia as an entertainer. They have heard her voice accompanying Motown legends and recording stars such as Aretha Franklin, heard her powerful renditions of gospel songs or watched her sing during the annual Thanksgiving parade downtown or they have seen her in stage productions or local television programs.

Other Detroiters know Ortheia from her civic involvement. She is active in a host of charitable endeavors, from the American Cancer Society to Focus: HOPE, to programs that help people recover from addiction.

Some may know Ortheia from her political activism. She has long been active in Michigan elections, from city council to Senate, and she is an energetic advocate for the idea that every American, regardless of race or creed or color, is welcome and needs to be active in the political process.

If you do not know Ortheia as an entertainer or supporter of worthy causes, you know her for her faith. She has ministered around the world, not only sharing her faith but doing the good works that are so fundamental to it.

I am fortunate to know Ortheia for all the gifts she has given our community and in one more way: My wife Barbara and I have known her as a longtime family friend. Her family and ours have been linked through three generations, beginning with Barbara's and Ortheia's mothers. Ortheia herself briefly babysat our kids while she was in high school. We know how proud Ortheia's warm and wise mom Belle was of her daughter back then and of her growing pride as the multigifted adult Ortheia emerged.

When Detroit gathers on November 3 to celebrate Ortheia's birthday, the dress will be sharp, the music will be proud, and the stories will be many. Whether we know Ortheia from the

pulpit or the stage, from campaign strategy sessions or gatherings of family and friends, Detroiters admire her spirit, her energy, her dedication and her talent, and we thank her for all she has done and all she will do for our community and its people.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11 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. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mrs. McCarthy of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), the Minority Leader appoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Award Board: Mr. Mitchell Draizin of New York, New York.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolutions were read the first time:

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1094. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–113).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. Res. 268. A resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and Reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

(This section will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 268—CONDEMNING THE SEPTEMBER 2013 TERRORIST ATTACK AT THE WESTGATE MALL IN NAIROBI, KENYA, AND REAFFIRMING UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF KENYA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 268

Whereas, on September 21, 2013, armed terrorists attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, killing more than 60 people and injuring at least 175 from at least 12 different countries during a four-day siege;

Whereas the attack was the most deadly terrorist incident in Kenya since the 1998 al Qaeda bombing of the United States Embassy in Nairobi;

Whereas al Shabaab, a Somali Islamist extremist group with ties to al Qaeda, has claimed responsibility for the attack, declaring that it was in retaliation for the Government of Kenya's participation in the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM);

Whereas al Shabaab was designated a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the United States Government in 2008 and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist entity in 2012;

Whereas the investigation to identify those responsible for the attack and efforts to bring them to justice are ongoing;

Whereas Kenya is an important ally and regional security partner, playing a vital role in breaking al Shabaab's recent stranglehold on Somalia through its participation in AMISOM;

Whereas the Republic of Kenya and the United States have a strong and enduring partnership based on a shared commitment to promoting peace and prosperity in East Africa and around the world; and

Whereas Kenya is a culturally rich and ethnically diverse country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the heinous atrocities and terrorist attack that occurred at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, from September 21 through 24, 2013;

(2) offers its condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed in the attack and expresses its hope for the recovery of the wounded, including United States citizens;

(3) recognizes the many heroic and selfless act by Kenyan citizens, first responders, and the Kenya Red Cross to rescue those caught in the Westgate Mall during the attack;

(4) reaffirms United States support for the efforts of the Government and people of Kenya to combat terrorism, counter extremism, promote tolerance, and bring the perpetrators of the Westgate Mall attack to justice;

(5) commends the Government of Kenya's continued participation in the African Union Mission in Somalia; and

(6) recognizes Kenya as an important regional ally and partner of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 11, 2013, at 1 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Impacts of the Government Shutdown on Our Economic Security.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES. 79

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I understand that H.J. Res. 79 has been received from the House and it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Saturday, October 12, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the time until 12 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, at noon tomorrow there will be a cloture

vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, the debt limit legislation.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SESSIONS and BLUNT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

THE DEBT INCREASE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, the Republican Senators met with President Obama earlier today and discussed many of the financial issues facing America and the difficulties we are having in achieving an agreement that puts us on a sound financial path. There surely are actions we can take together to improve our situation. I believe there was some progress made, and there are some avenues for progress that could be opened in the hours to come. I hope we can do that.

But now it is well to recognize that our Medicare and Medicaid programs are surging in costs, and—as the President rightly noted to us at our meeting earlier today and has done so for a number of years—that government health care costs are the biggest drivers of our debt. In other words, it is increasing at a faster rate than other programs, and we project it will continue to increase at those rates.

I think that is true. It is true. We have a huge challenge there. But importantly to this whole discussion, I recall during a formal address to a joint session of Congress in September 2009, the President promoted his Affordable Care Act and stated that he would help fix this problem of growing costs of health care and then flatly and unequivocally promised, ''I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits either now or any time in the future, period.'' That is astoundingly inaccurate, and we have to know this. We are voting and wrestling on what to do about our health care bill and other spending programs. But one thing that has been overlooked is this promise that the health care bill—the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare—is not paid for as it was promised, and it is astoundingly over budget.

Let me talk for a few minutes about this issue and its importance. As we work together to try to reach a compromise, we have to understand that fact. As we work to deal with some of our long-term financial challenges, we need to focus on that matter.

Indeed, it appears, according to the Government Accountability Office, that over the long-term accounting period used to evaluate the unfunded liabilities of the United States, that the Affordable Care Act will add $6.2 trillion to the unfunded liabilities of America. That does not count the interest on that over this long period of time which may well double that figure. It puts it almost equal to the liability of Social Security—and maybe even more. So this is a big deal.

I want to share with my colleagues some thoughts as good faith negotiations are going on by Members. Republicans and Democrats are talking, the White House staff people are talking, and House Members and the Speaker are talking. There are some principles they need to be aware of as we go forward. I have a budget warning, and will make this point: Trust fund improvements—Social Security and Medicare primarily—are produced by savings or increased revenues in these programs. A number of ideas have been floated that could do that, and they need to be done. But those savings through revenue or new cutting of expenses cannot be used to justify or pay for breaking Budget Control Act caps, and that is very important.

It is essential in these hours of financial debate that all Members of Congress and the American people understand that the savings gained from much-needed reforms of our financially unsound Social Security and Medicare trust funds can only be used to strengthen those funds and not be used simultaneously to support spending for a new program, such as the Affordable Care Act. We can't use the money twice.

Our vital Social Security and Medicare programs are not solvent at this time. We know they are going into deficit right now. Our revenues will increase for those programs or costs to those programs will be brought down—as many ideas are being floated, and indeed, a number of them are in the President's budget and have some merit—and the resulting funds can only be spent once. The Budget Control Act restricts discretionary spending. It says: We are not going to increase spending over a certain rate. We are going to reduce the rate of increase in government spending.

The Budget Control Act is in the law. It was negotiated by the President, Senator REID—the majority leader here—the Speaker, and Senator MCCONNELL, and they agreed on certain limits on spending over the next 10 years. At that time we were projected to increase spending over 10 years by $10 trillion. If it was flat spending, we would spend $37 trillion; under projected growth it would go to $47 trillion.

Under the Budget Control Act we said: OK, we are going to cut spending. It really wasn't a cut in spending. But we would reduce the growth of spending from $10 trillion to $8 trillion, and that is why we are hearing so much today.

In the 2 years-plus since that agreement, Congress—except for a few budget gimmicks that my staff members bring up—has largely stuck to those limits. The President and the Democratic Senate have openly and directly opposed those limits. The President—6 months after signing the Budget Control Act—submitted a budget to this Senate that would increase spending $1 trillion over the limits agreed to in the Budget Control Act. Can you imagine that? There was a bipartisan meeting. As we worked on the debt ceiling to raise the debt ceiling $2 trillion, we agreed that over 10 years we would cut spending by $2.1 trillion.

Six months later, the President submits a budget to the Senate and to the House that calls for spending $1 trillion over that amount. So I think that was a breach—a serious act of the President to move away from the promises he had made and the act he signed into law.

To be more specific about it, one of the proposals in the President's budget that received a lot of discussion is an alteration of the way we calculate the inflation index for Social Security. It has been referred to as chained CPI. It is projected to save a certain amount of money—maybe $128 billion or maybe more. Let's just say it is going to save $100 billion—chained CPI—and it would, in fact, increase the revenue into Social Security, and it would reduce the amount of money that is paid out of Social Security. It would save, let's say, $100 billion. So this would strengthen Social Security, there is no doubt about that. It would strengthen Social Security because the Social Security liabilities are going down and the revenue is going up.

What I wish to say to our colleagues as they wrestle with how to bring our numbers into better balance is that those savings cannot benefit Social Security and simultaneously justify increased Treasury spending over the Budget Control Act levels.

We can't use the money twice. This is so basic. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars.

CBO, our Congressional Budget Office, has analyzed this kind of maneuver, and they have clearly affirmed that even though the budget score over 10 years, using the unified budget accounting methods, would suggest otherwise, we cannot spend the money in both places.

So if we know how to ask a question of CBO, over the 10-year budget window, it can give the appearance that we have this money because it creates more money coming into the government that we can spend over here. But the money is dedicated to Social Security. It is Social Security money. It can't be spent twice. If it is going to strengthen Social Security, it can't be spent over here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer most graciously.

CBO has flatly called this in a letter, at my request, double-counting. Can

my colleagues imagine the Congressional Budget Office saying that the U.S. Congress is double-counting? Actually, in that case, in dealing with the Affordable Care Act, $500 billion of money extracted out of Medicare was being used to claim it would pay for the Affordable Care Act when it was Medicare's money.

So I am talking at this point and just sharing an example from Social Security and the chained CPI, but the principles are the same because both are trust funds. So it is double-counting.

In fact, any Social Security or Medicare trust fund savings so produced are legally assets of the trust fund, and debt instruments of the U.S. Treasury are issued and interest paid from the U.S. Treasury to Social Security and to the Medicare trust funds on the monies that are borrowed in that way. If the savings, as is likely, do not result in a trust fund surplus, then there is really no surplus that they can borrow. It simply tends to show more income to the U.S. Treasury—falsely showing that because, again, the money is committed off-budget to Social Security.

The critical fact is that all of those moneys are already obligated to Social Security and Medicare and will be needed by those programs, and more money, actually, is going to be needed by those programs to meet the future obligations of those trust funds, which are insolvent. They don't have enough money coming in to pay the obligations they will be required to pay in the years to come.

So the scope of this abuse of our accounting system is truly enormous and threatens our Nation's very financial future. For example, it has allowed the President to falsely assert that the Affordable Care Act would not add one dime to the debt when, absent double-counting, the act would increase our debt by over $500 billion over the next 10 years—$500 billion. It is going to adversely impact the financial condition of America.

The same accounting manipulations enabled many supporters of the Gang of 8 immigration bill to assert that their legislation was paid for. They were going to spend all of this money and they were going to make us safe from illegal immigration and it was all paid for—every dime of it—and wouldn't add to the debt. Do my colleagues know how they did that? Well, they were going to give Social Security cards to millions—11 million or however many would come forward—and they would pay Social Security, and they would have more Social Security money coming into the U.S. Treasury, and therefore that would pay for the extra border patrol and other expenses they said they have to spend money on.

But I ask my colleagues to think about it. The money paid by the people who have been given legal status, the Social Security they have paid for is their money. It is their money. They are going to draw out every penny of it when they get older. We can't say it is available to pay another expense today. If we do, it is not going to be there, to pay for their Social Security when they retire. How simple is this? This was the message here on the floor. They steadfastly insisted that the bill was paid for, double-counting Social Security money.

So we have to get straight about this, I have to say. Legislation must be adopted to stop this double-counting. It is open to abuse and manipulation and has been done, really, by both parties in the past but not as much as we have seen lately. It is enabling the Nation's dangerous financial trajectory.

Finally, as we work to end the Nation's financial impasse, another warning is needed. All should understand that consent to passage of a continuing resolution or debt ceiling bill cannot be achieved until we have sufficient time to have a complete CBO score of it so we know what kind of maneuvers are being used in the bill. So I am going to object. We are not going to wake up one day and say we have to run to the floor and pass a bill with 30 minutes' notice or 3 hours' notice. That would be a mistake.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

SETTING PRIORITIES

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, first of all, I wish to follow up on a comment my friend from Alabama just made on Social Security and Medicare. I think it is very important that we listen carefully to what he had to say, that if we do things that are so-called reforms—and I think there are many places where we could reform those programs—we should use those savings to save those programs. We shouldn't say we are going to have reforms in Medicare, more likely, perhaps, right away, then Social Security, and then not use those reforms to extend the life of these important programs.

These are programs, we have told Americans—in the case of Social Security since the mid-1930s, and in the case of Medicare since the mid 1960s—that people would be able to rely on. We see that those programs can be extended and adjusted and reformed, but I think our leader on our side of the budget effort who spends so much time trying to make the case for the right kind of budget decisions is clearly pointing out that if we make savings in these programs and then use that money to fund other discretionary spending, is that the fair thing to do with Social Security or Medicare? I don't think so, and I think the Senator from Alabama has raised a very good point.

As we try to figure out how to move forward this year, we need to be sure that savings are real savings, that they are not double-counted, that we are not saving money in one program that clearly should go toward the priority of that program rather than the other priorities we haven't yet set.

This brings me to the topic of setting priorities. We had the opportunity to go to the White House—the Democrats yesterday, Republicans today—to talk to the President about how we move forward with the budget year, the spending year that has already started. When we were there, the President made it clear once again that we shouldn't negotiate, but on more than one occasion in the morning when we were there, the President said we shouldn't be allowed to negotiate for things we couldn't get or didn't get in the regular process.

My view of that is there is no regular process. As the President said that, I thought, this is like pouring gas on a fire of frustration for Members of the Senate and particularly in the House who are frustrated that there is no process. There is no place earlier than a crisis to say: Let's debate these issues, let's debate these priorities.

How many of the 12 spending bills for the year that began 11 days ago have we had on the floor of the Senate? One. One of the bills that should have been done starting in about last March and April and that should have been completed over the summer. That money would have been spent beginning October 1. Not one of the 12 was on the floor, and, frankly, it was a bill the majority leader had every reason to believe wouldn't pass if it was brought to the floor. Let's assume it would have passed. It still would have just been one of the 12 bills we need to run the government.

So when the President or anybody else says we shouldn't use these crisis moments to try to get our priorities discussed, they are the only moments we have. They are the only time we have.

I don't like government by crisis. I think it is very unfortunate for this Presidency that if we really look at how the government has worked in the last 5 years, it is from one crisis to another. If I could do anything to help President Obama pull away from this crisis management, I would be inclined to want to try to do that, particularly if pulling away from crisis management meant we were going to come back and have a fair debate between a divided Congress that leads to some way forward that can actually accomplish something.

The idea that we won't negotiate at this moment—or the President, feeling that somehow he won't be held hostage to the debt limit—I am certainly going to vote tomorrow not to even move forward with this discussion for a $1 trillion debt ceiling increase with no discussion of what we are going to do to change our behavior.

President Obama, to his credit, entered into a negotiation just 2 years ago, in August of 2011, and in return for $2.5 trillion worth of spending cuts over a decade, he got $2.1 trillion in additional debt ceiling. Now, the President

agreed to that in August of 2011 and then in October of 2013 says nobody should ever negotiate on the debt ceiling.

Fifty-three times since 1978 we have had a change in the debt ceiling, and since 1978 more than half of those debt limits included legislation dealing with either spending or other matters.

The President says: I will not put this on future Presidents, to be the President who goes forward with increasing the debt ceiling under some—with a negotiation.

Well, every President since 1978 has had the same situation the President had in August of 2011, the same situation the Presiding Officer and I would have if we were going to get our line of credit extended and we had exceeded our line of credit. Whoever is going to extend that line of credit is going to say: What are you going to do to change the behavior that allowed you to blow through your last line of credit?

The President and others will say: This is about America paying its bills. This is about wanting the current Congress to pay the bills it has incurred.

Well, most of the bills that have been incurred weren't incurred by this Congress; they were incurred by past legislation. Sixty-two percent of the spending is now in last year—it will probably be higher in the year we are in at this moment—62 percent of the spending was mandatory spending. It was spending put in place by Congresses beginning in the 1930s, through the health care bill. That is mostly mandatory spending. The current Congress didn't get to vote on the health care bill, but more importantly, most of the current Congress wasn't alive when the Social Security Act passed. Many of the Members of the Congress and even some of the Members of the Senate were not alive when Medicare passed.

This is the time for this Congress to look at those pieces of legislation and say: What do we need to do to adjust them to the future needs of the country? What do we need to do to adjust them to the current and future demographic realities of society? People live longer. People need these services longer. What do we do to make this work in a way that these programs can last?

These are not programs put in place by this Congress. These are not bills incurred by this Congress. These are bills, in fact, for which this Congress and this President can decide we are going to look for these programs and be sure they last and look at these programs and be sure they can be paid for.

That is exactly the kind of discussion we should be having when we ask the American people, through their Congress, to extend the line of credit.

The idea that we will not negotiate on the debt ceiling or we will not negotiate on how to spend the money—if we do not negotiate on how to spend the money by bringing the appropriations bills to the floor, how are we supposed to negotiate and set priorities and let democracy work? I do not like democracy by crisis. Whatever we do in the next few weeks or months that it takes to finish out the year we have already started, what we should all do is commit ourselves for the year that begins next October 1 to be prepared for that like the Congresses until just 6 or 7 years ago generally were prepared at or near that date.

When there was a government shutdown in 1995, six of the appropriations bills had been passed, signed into law, and all those parts of the government were working after a debate that provided funding.

So I would just say, as I conclude, we need to move away from management by crisis, but we also need to understand that if we do not do the work the regular way, there is no other place to take a stand, there is no other place to have this debate. As to the President's sense that you could get this at some other point, there is no other point if the Congress and the President are not doing their job.

I will just say, we should do our job, we should do it in a way people can see. We should do it in the small bites that the budget process is set up to allow us to look at and debate. We have not done that over the last 12 months. We have started this year in about the worst possible way. Hopefully, we will get through this and then resolve to do the work the right way for what begins 1 year from now. But at this moment, the President thinking we can just go ahead and move forward without negotiating is a wrong decision on the President's part.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, October 12, 2013, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 170th Anniversary of B'nai B'rith International. I am proud to acknowledge the accomplishments of the oldest existing Jewish service agency and celebrate their achievements.

On October 13, 1843, twelve German Jewish immigrants convened to address the challenges of their growing community. Immediately, they established a financial support system for families of the deceased, open a Jewish public library, and assisted flood victims in Baltimore. They also began to speak out against anti-Semitism. These early priorities of advocacy, education, and community support can still be seen in B'nai B'rith's work around the world today.

B'nai B'rith is one of Israel's strongest advocates in the United States and Europe. Working with policymakers in the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations, B'nai B'rith has championed Israel's right to defend itself, advanced the rights of Jewish refugees in the Middle East, and ensured that life insurance companies cannot refuse coverage due to travelling to Israel.

B'nai B'rith has also sustained the health and well-being of the aged through advocating for senior services, tirelessly working for affordable access to medical care, and providing housing for seniors. In partnership with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, B'nai B'rith is the largest Jewish sponsor of subsidized housing in the United States. Residents are accepted regardless of religion, race, or handicap.

Following the Jewish tradition that every life is sacred, B'nai B'rith assists victims of natural disasters around the world. From the Great Chicago Fire of 1871 to the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, B'nai B'rith is on the front lines helping those who need it most.

This esteemed organization is a beacon to all who strive for a safer, healthier, more tolerant world. I welcome the opportunity to stand with B'nai B'rith International on the 170th anniversary of its establishment.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF GEORGE BAKER

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief George Baker upon his retirement from the Mashpee Fire Department.

Chief Baker has spent the past thirty years serving the town of Mashpee through his invaluable service to the Mashpee Fire Department, filling the role of Fire Chief for the past two decades. His many friends and colleagues describe him as a man truly dedicated to his service, always putting his fellow firemen and the Mashpee community first. Even on his last day at the Department, Chief Baker chose to wear a blue firefighter's uniform instead of his usual white chief's uniform to remember his earlier years of service, and he spent the day responding to emergency calls throughout the community. His dedication to helping others sets an example for us all to follow, and I know I speak for many when I say that his accomplishments have been invaluable to the town of Mashpee.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Chief George Baker upon his retirement from the Mashpee Fire Department. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Chief Baker for his many years of service.

TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES VETERANS INITIATIVE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the United States Veterans Initiative upon its 20th anniversary.

U.S. Vets is the nation's largest nonprofit provider of comprehensive services such as housing, counseling, and career development to homeless and at-risk veterans. Since its founding, U.S. Vets has established 11 facilities across the nation dedicated to providing vital services to over 20,000 veterans and their families.

In 1992, the West Los Angeles Veteran Affairs Medical Center discovered that 25% of its veterans were being discharged into homelessness. As a result, "The Genesis Committee" was formed under the guidance of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Harry Pregerson, a Marine veteran of World War II, to address the dire need for veteran housing. "The Genesis Committee" later became the first U.S. Vets Board of Directors.

U.S. Vets opened its inaugural site, the Westside Residence Hall in Inglewood, California, in 1993 with five veterans. Since then, U.S. Vets has risen to national prominence with locations in Houston, Texas; Las Vegas, Nevada; Phoenix, Arizona; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Washington, D.C. In 2000, U.S. Vets opened the largest transitional housing facility for homeless veterans in the nation, Villages at Cabrillo, a 26-acre project in Long Beach, California that houses over 550 veterans.

To address the continually evolving needs of veterans, U.S. Vets has expanded their efforts into specialized programming to provide services to veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, female veterans, and the chronically mentally ill.

The time, energy and care the United States Veterans Initiative has given to our veterans in need is truly extraordinary, and the nation as a whole has greatly benefitted from their dedicated efforts. At this time, I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the United States Veterans Initiative upon its 20th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Northwest Florida State College located in Niceville, Florida. Throughout the past 50 years, its faculty and students have exhibited an assiduous dedication to excellence that has led to the college's growth from its beginnings as a junior college with a makeshift campus to now a state college with seven campuses and centers and six bachelor's degree programs. I am proud to congratulate them on this great achievement.

Access to education is one of the most vital components for a successful society, and in the spring of 1963, the Florida Legislature, recognizing the opportunity to better serve the educational needs of the citizens in Northwest Florida, authorized the establishment of a junior college to be located in Okaloosa County. Originally named the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College, its doors opened for the first time to 767 students in a temporary location in the City of Valparaiso, Florida on August 24, 1964. In honor of the heroism of the Doolittle Raiders, the students chose "Raiders" as their college's official mascot.

Just a few years and an Act of Congress later, the permanent home for the college in Niceville was established. In 2004, the college name was officially changed to Okaloosa-Walton College in reflection of the new accreditation to award bachelor's degrees, and in 2008, it was changed to Northwest Florida State College, upon the creation of the Florida College System.

While its name and structure has evolved throughout its 50-year history, students have never stopped pouring through its doors. Students of all ages made the college their alma-mater, whether high school students taking dual enrollment courses or adults simply interested in expanding their knowledge in a variety of areas. Fifty years; seven locations; numerous state, regional, and national athletic titles; and more than 350,000 students later, Northwest Florida State College is recognized for its cultural enrichment and stellar educational opportunities provided to the Northwest Florida community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Northwest Florida State College. My wife Vicki and I join the citizens of Northwest Florida in congratulating the faculty, students, and alumni of the

college on its golden anniversary. We wish them many more years of continued success.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.J. Res. 91.

This past Sunday four of our brave soldiers were killed in Afghanistan by a roadside bomb. Those four included an Army nurse from Joint Base Lewis-McChord, an Army criminal investigator from the 5th Military Police Battalion in Vicenza, Italy, and two Army Rangers from Company B, 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, at Fort Benning, Georgia, which borders my Congressional District, and which I feel a deep commitment to.

And earlier this week I was shocked and angered to learn that the Secretary of Defense and the President were withholding the Death Gratuity for the families of these fallen heroes.

For those of you who do not know what that is, the Death Gratuity is a benefit payable to a designated beneficiary, in a lump sum of $100,000, for a death on active duty or inactive duty training, and Burial Benefits which provide up to $10,500 to survivors to cover expenses related to the burial of the service member.

In order to prevent these kinds of delays in benefits, on September 29th, with my full support, the House passed H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act. On September 30th the bill was passed by the Senate and signed into law by President Obama.

Among other things, that bill was to ensure that during the shut down there would be funds available to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components, who are performing active service.

The Congressional intent of the legislation was clear: to give the Department of Defense the authority to pay these very types benefits to the men and women of this great Nation who have sacrificed to preserve our freedoms. It is a shame that the President and Secretary of Defense are playing politics and not honoring the Congressional intent of the bill already signed into law.

What is even more shameful is that as the Commander in Chief, President Obama is not honoring that role. As the head of our Nation's military, I find it incomprehensible that he has not ordered these benefits to be paid out no matter what. Congress has already approved these funds, but the buck stops with the President, literally. How can the leader of our military turn his back on those he swore to lead?

It is for that reason I speak in support of H.J. Res. 91. This bill will ensure death gratuities and related survivor benefits will be paid out to those families who have given the ultimate sacrifice for our nation.

I hope both sides of the aisle show the president today that he cannot play politics at the expense of our fallen service men and women, and their families, and give these brave soldiers the respect they deserve.

BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that Republican-Majority has brought a bill (H.J. Res 79) to the floor that would provide funds solely for specific offices within the Department of Homeland Security. DHS deemed 86 percent of its employees essential during this forced Republican government shutdown; however, this bill only provides funds for: Immigration and Customs Enforcement, National Protection and Programs Directorate's office of Biometric Identity Management, Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection, and Citizenship and Immigration Services.

The bill does not provide critical funding for many of the other offices within the DHS that play a vital role in protecting our country. As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, I advocate for funding of the offices and programs that protect our nation from cyber attacks and monitor our critical infrastructure.

The consequences of accepting this piecemeal bill are very severe, a very risky impediment to the daily duties and services that DHS provides for our country's protection. Providing funds for the DHS, as a whole, is vital to our homeland security. Republicans continue to use this piecemeal approach; showing a reckless disdain for the Federal government and her dedicated employees, which fails to grasp the bigger picture, and have failed to bring an end to this government shutdown. We must, and cannot accept these extortion tactics.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and vote for a clean CR, and to raise the debt limit now.

HONORING THE FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY FOR OVER 40 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE IN OFFERING VALUABLE HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Florida Atlantic University (FAU) for their excellence in offering valuable educational opportunities to the residents of South Florida for more than 40 years.

FAU first began operating in my district in 1971 with the opening of the Commercial Boulevard campus in Fort Lauderdale. This campus saw high enrollment and immediate success, and in 1987—just eleven years later—FAU began construction of the Reubin O'D. Askew Tower in downtown Fort Lauderdale. In 1989, the Florida Legislature designated FAU as the lead state university serving Broward County. Shortly thereafter, another large campus was established in Davie. The latest addition to these FAU campuses is a state-of-the-art, 12-story Higher Education Complex, also located in downtown Fort Lauderdale.

Throughout its history in Broward County, FAU has worked in close cooperation with Broward College, establishing a system of seamless transition from lower-division to upper-division work that can be called a model for the Nation. Thousands of place-bound students who otherwise would have been unable to obtain a university education have earned degrees on FAU's Broward campuses, and have gone on to pursue successful careers in fields that include architecture, public administration, business, communication, engineering, computer science, criminology and criminal justice, social work, urban and regional planning, education, nursing, the arts and sciences, and many more.

FAU boasts the most diverse student body in all of Florida's public universities. With nearly half of the population representing minority groups or foreign nations, their 30,000 member student body was recently ranked the 27th most diverse university in America by the U.S. News & World Report. Students from Broward make up almost 40 percent of this body, maintaining the county's historic status as the home of the greatest number of FAU students and alumni.

Furthermore, it is focused on preserving and protecting the future of South Florida and helping cities all over the world face the challenges of the 21st century. On the Davie campus, FAU researchers are engaged in a critically important initiative to understand and mitigate the major human-caused stressors that have created grave damage to the Everglades. In the Atlantic Ocean, off the coast of Broward County, FAU engineers affiliated with the Southeast National Marine Renewable Energy Center are working to establish the world's first offshore turbine test site, with the goal of advancing the effort to generate energy from ocean currents.

In Dania Beach, residents are being served by a new nano-filtration facility that has vastly improved the quality of the water they receive in their homes. Designed with input from FAU engineering faculty members and students, this is the first water treatment plant in the world to receive Gold Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification from the U.S. Green Building Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Florida Atlantic University for the tremendous work that the institution has done in South Florida for over 40 years. I want to express my sincerest gratitude for their leadership in both providing opportunities for higher education and addressing many environmental issues in the community. I wish the University all my best and many more years of continued success.

COMMENDING NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY FOR ITS SECOND ANNUAL HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION PUBLIC SURVEY

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, with jobs and the economic recovery continuing to be a top concern of many of my constituents, I rise

today to call attention to the results of a new public opinion survey about higher education and workforce development recently released by Northeastern University.

There's a great deal of public concern about whether colleges and universities are preparing students for employment—as well as how best to prepare them. To ensure hard data is part of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, Northeastern University has released a new, timely national public opinion poll about the future of higher education.

Last year, Northeastern released a poll focused on innovation in higher education, including public attitudes about the online revolution that is currently underway. This year, Northeastern has taken it one step further by not only asking the public for its views, but also asking hiring decision makers at a cross-section of employers nationwide what they expect from our higher education system.

The results, which challenge the conventional wisdom, provide an important window into how well our colleges and universities are doing in preparing graduates to be competitive in the 21st century global workforce. In particular, the poll finds that—nearly two-thirds of Americans (65 percent) and almost three-quarters of hiring decision makers (73 percent) believe that having employees who are well-rounded with a range of knowledge is more important than possessing industry-specific skills.

While almost two-thirds (62 percent) of those surveyed say that the higher education system is doing a ''fair'' or ''poor'' job of preparing recent college graduates for the workforce, Americans continue to believe higher education is critical to achieving career success. A large majority (70 percent) say that a person's level of education is the most important factor in a job candidate's success in the employment market. Nearly three in four Americans (74 percent) believe that a college degree is more important today than it was for their parents' generation, by far exceeding other factors such as current economic conditions, socioeconomic status, nationality, and race.

Mr. Speaker, Northeastern's poll results show that Americans also see a shared responsibility when it comes to preparing recent graduates for success. They believe the number one reason for employers struggling to find qualified job candidates is that companies do not invest enough in training new hires. However, hiring decision-makers say that colleges and universities are not in tune with industry needs and not preparing graduates accordingly. In fact, 55 percent of business leaders surveyed say their firms have trained recent college graduates on skills they should have learned at an academic institution.

Consistent with the findings of last year's Northeastern survey, Americans strongly support experiential learning in which a student's classroom education is integrated with professional work experience. Nearly nine in 10 Americans (89 percent) believe that students with work experience related to their field of study are more successful employees—and nearly three in four hiring decision-makers (74 percent) agree. Among those that gained work experience during college, a large majority (82 percent) says it was valuable for their personal and professional development.

Mr. Speaker, other important findings from Northeastern's survey include:

A strong majority of hiring decision-makers (87 percent) believe teaching students about entrepreneurship, including how to start their own businesses, is important to prepare students for the workforce;

A majority of Americans (64 percent) believe the federal government should grant visas to international students who graduate college in the U.S. so they can remain in the country and work, while only 41 percent of hiring decision-makers agree; and

Although only a small percentage of Americans surveyed have studied or worked abroad in college, the majority of them (66 percent) believe that global experience was valuable for their personal and professional development. While most Americans (58 percent) believe that students with global experience are generally more successful employees, only 39 percent of hiring decision-makers agree.

These important results were released on September 17, 2013 at The National Press Club here in Washington, DC, where Northeastern hosted its second annual summit on issues facing higher education. The summit, entitled Innovation Imperative: Enhancing Higher Education Outcomes, featured a high-profile panel of experts and a keynote address by Northeastern President Joseph Aoun. Moderated by Catherine Rampell of The New York Times, the panel included Mitchell E. Daniels, president of Purdue University; James Kvaal, deputy director of the White House Domestic Policy Council; Jeff Wilcox, corporate vice president for engineering at Lockheed Martin Corporation; and Deborah L. Wince-Smith, president and CEO of the Council on Competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Northeastern University, under the strong leadership of President Aoun, for undertaking this important work. As discussions get underway in the House about renewing the Higher Education Act, it's important that we focus on approaches that generate value and produce excellent outcomes for students. As policymakers, understanding what the American people, education consumers, and employers want and need from our higher education institutions is vital. Northeastern's work in this area is a great contribution to the public dialogue. I urge all of my colleagues to take the time to review Northeastern's important effort.

HONORING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL CHILD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the second International Day of the Girl Child, which takes place on October 11. This day was designated by the United Nations General Assembly to promote girls' rights and shine light upon the discrimination and inequalities that girls suffer to this day.

In December 2011, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to declare October 11 as the International Day of the Girl Child to ''recognize girls' rights and the unique challenges girls face around the world.''

The theme this year is ''Innovating for Girls' Education'' because education is the key to ensuring women's social and economic empowerment in this world. It leads to lower poverty, lower mortality rates, democratization, and fewer child marriages.

This is not just a far-away problem. American youth can take action now working to ensure that women's rights and girls' rights are a priority in our foreign policy and by advocating for educational opportunities for girls at home and around the world. Annie Gersh from Marlborough High School in Los Angeles is doing that now. She is on my Youth Advisory Board and was a teen advisor for Girl Up, a project of the UN Foundation. I am proud that Annie is a constituent, and I hope that she and other young people like her will continue their fight for girls' rights in America and around the globe.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF GLENN OLSON

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Fire Chief Glenn Olson upon the occasion of his retirement from the Eastham Fire Department.

Chief Olson has given over 3 decades of invaluable service to his community. I know I speak for many when I say that his outstanding achievements are evident in his distinguished career as a Firefighter and Paramedic in both the Hyannis and Eastham Fire Departments. The Eastham department recognized his skill and value when they appointed him to Shift Lieutenant in 1987. Chief Olson continued to honorably protect the people of both Hyannis and Eastham for 13 years until he was chosen as Fire Chief of the Eastham Department. On November 1st of this year, Chief Olson will retire having spent thirteen years as Fire Chief.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Fire Chief Glenn Olson upon his retirement from Eastham Fire Department after thirty-three years and eleven months of invaluable service. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating him on this important occasion and in thanking him for all that he has done for his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOU CIAMPI, SR. FOR BEING THE 2013 ITALIAN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LUZERNE COUNTY'S ''PERSON OF THE YEAR''

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lou Ciampi, Sr., who was selected ''Person of the Year'' by the Italian American Association of Luzerne County. Lou started his printing career over fifty years ago as a teenage apprentice in Pagnotti Coal's in-house print shop. After serving in the military and working in several shops in both Luzerne and Lackawanna counties, Lou joined the PA Hutchinson company in Scranton as a folder operator in the late 1960s. He quickly rose

from bindery foreman to plant superintendent and was soon on the road as a salesman. His experience as a salesman fueled his entrepreneurial spirit, so he opened Lou's Bike Shop in the mid-seventies.

In January 1980, Lou and his partner Ted Heoffner founded Independent Graphics, Inc. At first, Lou did everything for Independent Graphics—he printed flyers, forms, stationery, and policies for Mr. Heoffner's American Independent Insurance Company. In 1984, Lou purchased the company from Mr. Heoffner.

Lou quickly made an impact on the Wilkes-Barre community by founding the Craftsman's Club. The club included printing owners and laborers, and provided a place where vendors could share cutting edge ideas to improve the industry. Business blossomed and the company moved to a new facility in Port Blanchard, PA. By the turn of the millennium, Independent Graphics, Inc. offered everything from black ink on post cards to full color digital printing and wide format.

In 2002, Independent Graphics was named the Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce's small business of the year. When the New York Yankees moved their Triple A franchise to Scranton, Independent Graphics became their ''play ball'' printer, producing program books on third shift for the next day's game. Independent Graphics also sponsors the Scranton Chamber of Commerce's Momentum Magazine. ''Our Impression Will Sharpen Your Image'' is the company's motto, and Lou's company has improved the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre community's image for three decades. The company Lou built from the ground up now employs 27 people full time, working round the clock providing imaging services. In May 2013, Lou was inducted into the Junior Achievement Business Hall of Fame.

Over the last four decades, Lou has generously supported many local charities. He has donated services to numerous local little leagues, youth football teams, high school teams, cheerleading squads, and many others. In the 1970s, Lou was the president of the West Pittston Rams and the general manager of Greater Pittston Legion baseball. The American Heart Association and Garden Village Youth racing have also benefited from his generosity.

Lou is a graduate of West Pittston High School. He and his wife Marianne have been married for 51 years. They have four children: Louis, Jr., Michelle Reilly, Joseph and Jimmy. They are also blessed with six grandchildren. I convey my congratulations to Lou for being honored by his community.

RESOLUTION TO COMMEMORATE INTERNATIONAL PLASMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker:

Whereas October 13–20, 2013 marks International Plasma Awareness Week with observances throughout the United States and Europe designed to raise global awareness of the need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize the value that plasma donors contribute in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of rare diseases and plasma protein therapies;

Whereas, plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biological products for which no substitutes or alternative treatments exist save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world;

Whereas, plasma protein therapies are used to treat bleeding disorders, primary immune deficiency diseases, alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency and certain rare, neurological disorders;

Whereas, these therapies are also used in emergency and surgical medicine to save and improve lives;

Whereas, plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life, markedly improved patient outcomes, and extended life expectancy for individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions;

Whereas healthy committed donors provide plasma essential to manufacture these lifesaving therapies;

Whereas, there are over 400 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 113th Congress that October 13–20, 2013 is recognized as ''International Plasma Awareness Week'' in the United States of America.

INAUGURATION OF CHRIS EISGRUBER AS PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the wise remarks of Dr. Hunter Rawlings, President of the Association of American Universities, delivered at the ceremony installing Dr. Christopher Eisgruber as President of Princeton University, September 22, 2013.

REMARKS OF DR. HUNTER RAWLINGS, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, FOR THE INAUGURATION OF CHRIS EISGRUBER AS PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2013.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be here for Chris's inauguration.

As a graduate alumnus, and longtime colleague of Bob Goheen, Bill Bowen, Harold Shapiro and Shirley Tilghman, and now Chris, I feel closely connected to this university, which has a unique place in higher education globally.

Let me begin my brief remarks with my favorite Princetonian, James Madison. When Madison finished his degree here in 1771, like many humanities majors today he did not know what to do with himself, so he asked President Witherspoon if he could spend an additional year studying Hebrew and theology with the president. Witherspoon said yes (Chris, I hope you will be open to such invitations from Princeton seniors), and Madison devoted a postgraduate year to pursuing more of the ''useless knowledge'' he had acquired previously. When that year was over, still at a loss for something to pursue, Madison committed what Americans today consider the ultimate sin: he went home to live with his parents. And he stayed there for four years, jobless and clueless about his future.

Today, the young Madison would be counted a failure, and his education would be condemned as worthless by many Governors and other public leaders. His post-graduation salary of zero would in turn count against Princeton's ledger when it comes to rating universities by the now-fashionable measure of the average salaries of their alumni shortly after graduation.

The current rage for reductionist metrics depends in turn upon a purely instrumentalist view of the purpose of higher education. Society wants universities to be instruments of its short-term will, and to abandon or at least to curtail their traditional role of giving students a broad and deep education that will last a lifetime.

This preoccupation with utilitarianism is a product of our success: America's research universities are so strong now, and so dominant globally, that governments, corporations and families are demanding many quick fixes from them: fast and cheap degrees and certificates, patents and jobs and economic development, mass education through online lectures, mass entertainment through intercollegiate sporting events, not to mention the current Beltway preoccupation, a fix for cyber security, and, that perennial Congressional fantasy, a biomedical cure for death.

To accede wholeheartedly to all these demands is to convert our universities fully into that most American of objects, a commodity. Many states are already proceeding in this direction by tying funding for their public universities to the average salaries of alumni 18 months after graduation, and our President has recently made such metrics a feature of his new plan for evaluating universities.

Accountability rules the day, but as Stanley Fish reminds us (the New York Times last month), metrics measure only what can be quantitatively valued and push everything else aside as irrelevant. ''Everything else'' comprises intellectual stimulation, moral and ethical insight, critical acumen, deep thinking about complex problems, sharpened intuition, immersion in human cultures, the urge to challenge received opinion, and similar intangible, ineffable, uncountable qualities. In other words, the qualities you need to be an educated person and an informed citizen capable and desirous of contributing to a democracy, the qualities you gain and hone at a great university.

I want to add one more item to the list of qualities engendered by great universities pursuing their fundamental mission: pleasure. We are so busy being utilitarians today that we derogate pleasure as an end in itself. And yet intellectual and aesthetic pleasure is an essential goal of higher education, one we omit at great cost and peril. Let me give two examples of what I mean. In 1870 Henry Cabot Lodge took a course at Harvard from Henry Adams. Here is what Lodge has to say about the difference that course made in his life:

In all my four years, I never really studied anything, never had my mind roused to any exertion or to anything resembling active thought until in my senior year I stumbled into the course in medieval history given by Henry Adams, who had then just come to Harvard. . . . [Adams] had the power not only of exciting interest, but he awakened opposition to his own views, and this is one great secret of success in teaching . . . I worked hard in that course because it gave me pleasure. I took the highest marks, for which I cared, as I found, singularly little, because marks were not my object, and for

the first time I got a glimpse of what education might be and really learned something. . . . Yet it was not what I learned but the fact that I learned something, that I discovered that it was the keenest of pleasures to use one's mind, a new sensation, and one which made Mr. Adams's course in the history of the Middle Ages so memorable to me.

To teach students that it is a pleasure to use one's mind is our single most important task at universities, I think, and it seems inescapable that we cannot measure how well we perform it. Instead of talking metrics, let's listen to another source of wisdom on intellectual pleasure, namely, Lionel Trilling.

. . . if we abandon the idea of literature as an independent, contemplative experience, as a pleasure, . . . if we continue to make it conform to philosophies of immediate ends, . . . and do not keep clear its own particular nature, we shall be contributing to the loss of two things of the greatest social value. Of these one is the possibility which art offers of an experience that is justified in itself, of nearly unconditioned living. Upon such experience, or even the close approach to it, we have learned to turn hostile faces: that is one of the strategic errors of our culture, for in the long run the possibility of such experience is a social necessity. The second thing we shall lose is the awareness—it is ultimately practical—which comes only from the single-minded contemplation of works that arise from the artist's own contemplation of events and objects; this is an awareness of the qualities of things. In the realm of art we call these qualities style, in the realm of morals we call them character, in the realm of politics we have no name for them but they are finally important. To these qualities, especially in times of crisis, society seems to be stolidly indifferent; actually they are, after survival, the great social concern.

We are in the age of big data, accountability, and hurry-up offenses. But long-term quality, not instant quantification, should be our concern in universities: helping our students gain ''an awareness of the qualities of things'' for a lifetime of personal pleasure and democratic contributions.

Intellectual contemplation and pleasure are, to put it mildly, not much in vogue these days, but they are clearly what Princeton gave to James Madison almost 250 years ago. Knowing Chris Eisgruber and his passion for intellectual engagement as the true measure of higher education, I have no doubt that Princeton will remain faithful to this central principle. And I wish him and all of you a lot of pleasure in its pursuit!

GREATER CARLISLE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which celebrated its 100th anniversary on October 10, 2013.

Founded in 1751, the borough of Carlisle is a historic community in south-central Pennsylvania. The Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1913 and serves to encourage economic growth and stability throughout the area. The Chamber takes on many roles vital to the prosperity of the borough including helping start and grow local businesses, planning and hosting networking and professional development events, and assisting tourists in exploring the town. They continue to be an important asset to this growing community.

Mr. Speaker, for 100 years the Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce has been a catalyst for economic growth in Carlisle, PA. Therefore, I commend all those who have served to improve their community as part of this important organization.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF REVEREND LAWRENCE E. AKER III

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Reverend Lawrence E. Aker III. During his years of service, Rev. Aker has ministered to thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In honor of his tenth anniversary as pastor of Cornerstone Baptist Church, Rev. Aker was honored at a celebratory banquet on April 27, 2013 at Steiner Studios in Brooklyn, New York.

In 1917, Cornerstone Baptist Church was founded in Brooklyn, NY by a small group of forward minded individuals. Today, it is a thriving church of over 1,500 members with active boards, clubs, Sunday school programs, and choirs. In the last decade, Cornerstone Baptist Church has continued to thrive under the outstanding leadership of Rev. Aker. In order to meet the needs of his ever-growing parishioners, an additional Sunday service was added. By embracing technology, Rev. Aker has made his church more accessible to all who are called to worship. During his tenure, the church underwent extensive renovation to the exterior of the edifice. This beautification of the church was greatly celebrated by the community, lifting not just the congregation but all those in its vicinity. As a visionary, Rev. Aker plans to continue the church's enhancement through the renovation of the church's gym and community center.

His strong commitment to nurturing the next generation led to the creation of ''Friday Nite Fire,'' a weekly bible study for youth and young adults. He also created the Women of the World (WOW) ministry, which offers spiritual guidance to women. Rev. Aker's reach extends outside the parish: I experienced this first hand as a member of the Assembly when we worked together to organize a community career fair at Cornerstone Baptist Church.

This past winter, I was privileged to accept the Martin Luther King, Jr. Award with the Reverend, given to us from the State of Israel and presented by Ambassador Ido Aharoni, Consul General of Israel in New York, for ''spreading compassion and uniting communities of all backgrounds.'' As a life-long parishioner of Cornerstone, I could think of no higher honor than to be counted among his company.

Rev. Aker holds a Bachelor's degree in Communications from Howard University, a Master in Theology from Dallas Theological Seminary, a Master of Sacred Theology from Yale University, and is currently a Doctor of Philosophy candidate at Drew University.

Rev. Aker is an inspirational leader whose work would not have been possible without the love and support of his wife Cynthia Aker and their devoted children. We thank his family for sharing him with us all. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Rev. Aker on his 10th pastoral anniversary. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn, he is worthy of the highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLEN CHAPEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 80th anniversary of Allen Chapel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church of Asbury Park, New Jersey. Since its founding, Allen Chapel AME Church has provided outstanding spiritual guidance and outreach to the community.

Allen Chapel AME Church has grown structurally and in membership since its founding as a mission in 1933. First worshipping at a local Presbyterian Church temporarily, the founding committee acquired property and moved the mission to its permanent and current location in 1934. The congregation assisted in renovating and rebuilding the site to a house of worship, a study room, choir room, lecture room, kitchen and a large yard for outdoor events. Twenty-two years later, the church purchased another adjacent building to use as a parsonage. In 1960, design and construction began to replace the original church building with a new, modern church on the same site. Church leaders, congregants and friends volunteered to help with the demolition and rebuilding and the new church was completed in 1964. Less than 10 years later, the mortgage burning was celebrated.

Allen Chapel AME Church is dedicated to expanding its ministry, social action and community outreach. In 2012, it began a prayer line during the Lenten season that was eventually extended to a weekly occurrence. Allen Chapel AME Church also facilitated bringing Covenant House to Asbury Park, providing a haven to the homeless youth throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Allen Chapel AME Church on its 80th anniversary. Its dedicated service to its congregants and the greater Asbury Park community is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 532, I was unable to cast my vote due to conflict which did not allow me to return to the floor in time to make the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

HONORING THE ORGANIZERS OF THE LAC-MÉGANTIC BENEFIT CONCERT AND THE AREA FIRST RESPONDERS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of Farmington, Maine, who continue to aid and assist the residents of their "sister city," the town of Lac-Mégantic, a small town located near the Canadian border.

Early on the morning of July 6, 2013, a train derailment and horrendous explosion devastated the center of this scenic lake-side town of 6,000 residents. 40 buildings were destroyed, 47 people lost their lives, 2,000 residents were displaced and countless lives were forever changed. The heroism of the local fire department aided by fire crews from the Franklin County towns of Chesterville, Eustis, Farmington, New Vineyard, Phillips, Rangeley and Strong helped to avert an even greater tragedy.

In rural Maine, people know what it means to be a good neighbor, and I am heartened by the outpouring of support that has come from the local communities. Four days after the tragedy, local business leaders and municipalities joined together to launch the Lac-Mégantic Relief Fund, a fundraising campaign to assist the town to recover from this disaster. At last report, over $32,000 has been raised, and I know that this generosity will help the town through this difficult time.

On Saturday, October 12, 2013, a benefit concert will be held in the University of Maine at Farmington's South Dining Hall, and the community will host Lac-Mégantie's mayor, police chief and head of the Chamber of Commerce. I want to thank Farmington Selectman Ryan Morgan, the Wilton Selectmen, and Maine State Senator Tom Saviello for their hard work in organizing what will be a wonderful evening of entertainment, fellowship and solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring all of the first-responder heroes who responded to the Lac-Mégantic tragedy and those fellow Mainers who continue to support this community as it rebuilds and recovers.

IN THE BATTLE IN HONOR OF A REAL AMERICAN HERO SPC COREY GARMON BRONCO TROOP PLATOON THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one America's and one of Alabama's most heroic sons, and his family. SPC Corey Garmon of Boaz and The United States Army. On July 11, 2012 while out on patrol in Kandahar Corey was almost killed in an IED blast. Losing both his legs and sustaining numerous other life threatening injuries he has battled back. Just recently he celebrated his alive date, marking the one year anniversary of brush with death. His lovely wife Megan has been by his side from the beginning, giving him the love and support to help bring him through these darkest of all nights. They are about to have their first child. We are not sure if this is blast related or not, but one of Alabama's brightest sons is a Gator fan. We hope in the coming years once he gets back home we can make him see the light. I submit this poem penned by Albert Caswell in honor of his valor and courage and his family's.

IN THE BATTLE

(by Albert Carey Caswell)

In . . .
In The Battle!
All In The Fight!
There are but all of those who but bring their light!
Men of honor!
And Men of might!
Who so march off to war with hearts and souls of steel so very bright!
To leave behind all that they so love and adore!
As where they go,
Angels so fear to tread so for sure!
For no day is so promised all in war!
All in this darkest of dread all the more . . .
As all around them the red blood flows and pours!
Where it's, one for all . . . , and all for one!
A place to where fine hearts of Strength In Honor so run!
For these are America's greatest of all Daughters and Sons!
The Men and Women of Bronco Company,
who for all of us so do what must so be done!
For they so live by a code!
As they so lock and load!
A Code of Honor!
A Code of Faith!
While, all around them such darkness waves!
As they so bravely stare death right in the face!
As upon each new morn as they awake,
not knowing if this is to be their last and final day!
While, thousands of miles away . . .
their families now so cry and pray!
As they so ask our Lord,
to so let their loved ones live just one more day!
As somehow out into that darkness they make their ways!
To a way of honor!
To a way of faith!
To a way of courage,
that so makes the Angels pray!
As they do battle upon each new day!
As their families,
the tears in eyes they make!
And for all of those who upon battlefields of honor who've died!
It's for all of you and your families we now so cry
Because all in that Battle,
all of your promises you did so keep!
As you so pledged your fine lives away,
to all of your Brothers In Arms all in this bond which binds you so very deep!
For in The Battle,
there is something so magnificent of so to speak!
That Keeps Them Strong,
Them So Keeps!
That So Helps Them To So Fight On an On!
That which will not allow their most courageous hearts,
to so retreat!
All In This Battle,
This Battle Oh So Very Deep!
And one such Southern Son,
who to sweet home Alabama his fine heart so speaks!
Specialist Garmon,
whose heart so shines like the mid day sun!
This BO from BOAZ,
and he knows how to lock and load!
And so lives by such a code!
Who is but Army Strong!
Who all for his Country Tis of Thee,
his fine heart beats loud and long!
Who so came out of death to rebuild his life just like a song!
While, all in those moments between life and death . . .
As upon him he could so feel but that hand of death!
As it was in that moment Corey,
when to yourself you so made a pledge!
To win this new battle that which to you this war had left!
With your two strong legs now gone,
your most courageous heart would crest!
As somehow it so helped you to move on only with what you had so left!
As it was Life or it was Death,
as you got up and out of the bed to our hearts catch!
All at speed,
as this Bama would not so rest, would not so heed!
For you had mountains to so climb!
And people to so inspire all in your time!
And a great wife named Megan,
so divine!
And with the help of your fine wife,
as she so stood by her man, so by your side!
As together you've so passed one of the greatest tests of time!
In our times, and in our lives . . .
There are Battles that we must fight!
Will we so find the strength and the courage,
to somehow deep down inside all of our hearts to so nourish!
The strength to so find!
Or in a town called pity will we now so reside,
and feel so sorry for our selves and begin to cry?
Or will we like Corey,
get up and so begin our climb?
All with hearts of courage full,
to once again to do Battle one more time!
For moments,
are all that we all so have!
To change the world!
To so make the good from out of the bad!
To make a difference with it all!
To so teach us!
To so beseech us!
To against all odds in the end still so standing tall!
But your not perfect Corey,
because you're one of the biggest Florida Gator fans of all!
I wonder if that sticks in coach SABANNNNN'S crawl?
Why you won't roll with The Tide at all?
I'm sorry Lou,
but out to this hero The Gator calls!
And when you get back to Bama,
there's work to be done!
We've got to get you to roll with The Tide,
or as a War Eagle fly high my son!
Corey my son,
you are just a young man!
But already,
look at what all in your short life what you have done!
More than most anyone!
And up ahead,
there's so much more for you my son!
Better to live life like a hero,
all in your most heroic sun!
Than to die in the darkness of a life,
of which nothing you have done!
Because, we will all die some day . . .
but only heroes up in Heaven will so run!
For life is but a Battle,
that only with but hearts of courage full can so be won!
And Corey, you are one of America's and Alabama's . . .
Most Heroic of all Sons

In life and in War . . .
All In That Battle,
will we be the ones to so bravely march forth?
All in our most selfless quests, to ourselves to so ignore!
Is that not who Heaven is for?
Specialist Gorman,
you are a real American Hero so for sure!
For only The Few,
will In The Battle so march off to war to so answer that call!
And the last time I saw Specialist Gorman,
he was walking tall!

HONORING JOSEPH ACABA FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Joseph Acaba's inspiring career as an astronaut, hydrogeologist, serviceman, and an educator.

Mr. Acaba received his Bachelor's degree in Geology from the University of California, Santa Barbara and his Master's degree in Geology from the University of Arizona. Mr. Acaba was a Sergeant in the United States Marine Corps Reserves where he served for six years. He also worked as a hydrogeologist in Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Acaba spent two years in the United States Peace Corps and trained over 300 teachers in the Dominican Republic in modern teaching methodologies. He then served as Island Manager of the Caribbean Marine Research at Lee Stocking Island in The Exumas, Bahamas. Upon his return to the United States, Mr. Acaba moved to Florida where he became the Shoreline Revegetation Coordinator for Vero Beach. He also taught science and math at Melbourne High School and taught for four years at Dunnellon Middle School.

On May 6, 2004, Joseph Acaba became the first person of Puerto Rican heritage to be selected as an astronaut candidate by NASA. After completing training, Mr. Acaba was selected as an Educator Mission Specialist and assigned to the crew of space shuttle Discovery's mission which launched on March 15, 2009. Mr. Acaba, carried a Puerto Rican flag with him and requested that the crew be awakened on March 19 to the Puerto Rico folklore song ''Que Bonita Bandera.'' During his mission, Mr. Acaba performed a spacewalk that successfully unfurled the final ''wings'' of the solar array that will augment power to the International Space Station.

Mr. Acaba was also a crewmember aboard the Soyuz spacecraft which launched from Kazakhstan and docked with the International Space station in May of 2012. He and the crew spent 30 days at the International Space Station before returning to Earth on September 17, 2012.

Mr. Acaba has received numerous awards recognizing his accomplishments including the Ana G. Mendez University System Presidential Medal, an honorary Doctorate from the Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico, and recognition from the Senate of Puerto Rico.

I am happy to honor Joseph Acaba, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Hispanic community and his many achievements.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LEO LAMOS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Leo Lamos for his service to Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

Mr. Lamos is a tireless and devoted public servant who has continuously given back to his community. One of Central Florida's great music educators, Leo serves a crucial role in the south Orlando community as the Director of Bands at Cypress Creek High School. As a former student at Cypress Creek High School and later a student at the University of Central Florida, Leo has brought his talents and leadership to a community with which he is very familiar. Under his direction, Cypress Creek's band program has continued to uphold its tradition of excellence by bringing national attention to its burgeoning group of music students.

In order for public school bands to travel, perform and compete on a national level, involvement and sponsorship from the community is crucial. Encouraging partnerships and sponsorships from locally owned businesses, Mr. Lamos has been tireless in his efforts to create an unparalleled musical experience for his over 100 students. Mr. Lamos's efforts in mentoring and educating his students have produced promising young musicians that have gone on to study at the prestigious Manhattan School of Music and several other universities.

I am happy to honor Leo Lamos, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his dedication and service to the students of Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ELIAS ''RICO'' PICCARD

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Elias ''Rico'' Piccard for his service to our country and to my district.

Rico Piccard, born Elias Piccard, was born in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico in 1946. In 1966, he left the island and relocated to New York City. A year later was drafted by the U.S. Army to serve during the Vietnam War. After his honorable discharge, Piccard attended the Hostos Community College in the Bronx, NY, where he graduated with an Associates of Arts degree and completed his Bachelor's Degree in Liberal Arts. He later went on to attend Columbia University, where he completed a Master's Degree in Social Work.

Piccard's career is characterized by his selfless dedication to help others. During his career he worked as a Social Worker for Volunteers of America and spent ten years working at the Montifiore Hospital in New York City's Rikers Island assisting inmates with mental health issues.

In 1994, Piccard left his position at Montifiore Hospital and moved to Orlando, FL. In Orlando, he became a community leader and helped organize multiple rallies and marches in the Hispanic community. In 2000, he started a new tourist transportation company called Rico Transportation.

Piccard began writing a column called ''Rico Informa,'' Rico Informs, for Puerto Rico's El Nuevo Dia newspaper to describe issues affecting Puerto Ricans living in Central Florida. In 2009, Piccard helped create United Front 436, Frente Unido 436, a community organization formed by a group of neighbors concerned with the physical deterioration and lack of security in the east side of Orange County and Orlando.

I am happy to honor Elias ''Rico'' Piccard, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his tireless service to his community.

RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF PALMIRA UBINAS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Palmira Ubinas. Mrs. Ubinas has made invaluable contributions to the arts and Puerto Rican culture.

Mrs. Ubinas has mastered many art forms and uses them to represent her heritage and traditions as a Puerto Rican American. She currently serves as the President and Founder of the Hispanic Arts and Culture International Association (ALPEH), as well as the Co-Chair for the 500th Florida Discovery Council Round Table.

A native of Puerto Rico, Mrs. Ubinas received a Bachelor's Degree from the University of Puerto Rico in Psychology and Political Science. Later, she completed her post-graduate studies in Communications, Public Relations, and Hispanic Literature. Mrs. Ubinas has showcased the talents she obtained through her childhood in Puerto Rico and her university education in her various professional positions. As a journalist, event coordinator, editor, TV and radio host, Mrs. Ubinas has been able to represent her culture and heritage proudly. She has earned several awards and recognitions and served as the Educational Specialist and Commerce Development Officer for the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration.

I am happy to honor Palrnira Ubinas, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her continuous service to the arts and commitment to the Hispanic community.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARYTZA SANZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the accomplishments of one of Orlando's true leaders, Marytza Sanz.

As founding President and CEO of Latino Leadership, Inc., Marytza Sanz has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life of families in Central Florida. Through Latino Leadership, Mrs. Sanz has implemented social enrichment programs that incorporate leadership development and empowerment, education advancement, and economic community development. Her contribution to our community has helped pave the way for young Hispanics to succeed and become leaders in their own right. Mrs. Sanz truly understands the need to invest in future generations.

Mrs. Sanz lends her expertise to the University of Central Florida President's Minority Advisory Board, the Homeless Coalition Board of Directors, and Florida Devereux Board of Directors. Her work in voter engagement and health education has received national and statewide coverage from media outlets such as CNN, Univision, Telemundo, the St. Petersburg Times, NPR News and the San Juan Star. Mrs. Sanz can be heard on her radio program, Al Oido de la Comunidad.

Mrs. Sanz is a leader and staunch supporter of minority representation. Her work to ensure fairly drawn electoral districts in Orange County has been celebrated in the Hispanic community. Ms. Sanz's work against voter suppression has helped protect the integrity of the democratic process in Central Florida and empower our citizens and families.

Before founding Latino Leadership, Mrs. Sanz worked for the Census Bureau and

served as the Central Florida Hispanic Outreach Coordinator for the Gore/Lieberman campaign. More recently, Marytza Sanz was appointed by Governor Charlie Crist to serve on Florida's 2010 Statewide Complete Count Committee to ensure a comprehensive count of Florida's population during the 2010 Census.

I am happy to honor Marytza Sanz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her accomplishments and service to the Central Florida Hispanic Community.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARISSA SALA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Marissa Salas for her dedicated civic engagement. Marissa is a leader in Central Florida who believes in equality and advocating for the rights of the LGBT community. She currently serves as the GLBT Statewide Caucus Campaign Director and President of the Rainbow Democrats of Orange County, Florida.

Marissa graduated with her Bachelor's Degree in Social Science and her Master's Degree in Urban Planning from Florida State University. During her career, she has served as a GIS Test Manager and Analyst for Geonetics, Inc. in Boston, MA, and as a Senior Project Director for Lopez and Cheung, Inc. in Tampa, FL.

Marissa has participated in several campaigns including as the Campaign and Political Director for John Alvarez in the 2012 Florida House of Representatives race in Brevard County. She is also the principle and owner of her own consulting firm, Marissa Salas Consulting. Her public policy research has been published by the New York Times, and used as reference material by the UCLA School of Law. Marissa has also received many awards, including the 2007 Civic Award from the Municipal League of King County.

I am happy to honor Marissa Sala, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for being a champion of equality and an inspiration to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARIA ISABEL BARAJAS-MARTINEZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize an amazing young woman named Maria Isabel Barajas-Martinez.

Maria was an active leader in the immigration reform movement since she was in high school. She graduated from Lake Region High School with high honors in 2009, where she was also the president of the National Spanish Honor Society. She went on to pursue her education at Polk State College and aspired to become a pediatrician. While attending Polk State College, Maria joined the local chapter of Students Working for Equal Rights. In May 2010 she founded a youth organization dedicated to community service called the Young American Dreamers.

With the help of her organization, Maria focused on raising funds to provide scholarships for high school students seeking a higher education. Maria and the Young American Dreamers committed themselves to helping their community. The Young American Dreamers adopted Lake Blue Park where they planted flowers and trees during its construction and participated in the yearly Martin Luther King Jr. parade in Winter Haven.

Maria was also a volunteer at Angels Care and at the Lakeland Regional Medical Center. Every year, she organized her friends and family to participate in the National Kidney Foundation ''Kidney Walk'' around Lake Hollingsworth. She was a mentor and tutor at Snively Elementary School and an active member of her church, Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Mission, where she was a member of the Youth Choir and Youth Group.

Although she was a U.S. Citizen by birth, Maria sympathized with the struggles of undocumented immigrants and dedicated her life to improving the lives of others. Until her untimely death in June of 2012, this outstanding young woman helped countless others through community service and activism.

I am happy to honor Maria Isabel Barajas-Martinez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her selfless dedication to her community and her many accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARIA PADILLA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Maria Padilla, a champion of diversity within the Central Florida community Maria is a well-respected journalist and currently serves as the editor of Orlando's oldest Spanish-language weekly newspaper, La Prensa.

Maria graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in English from Rutgers University. She also has a certificate in Hispanic Marketing Communications from Florida State University and graduated from the Leadership Orlando class in Fall of 2013. Maria broke new ground as a senior reporter covering diversity in Central Florida for the Orlando Sentinel in 1997. She later launched and headed El Sentinel, a new Spanish-language weekly newspaper and website. Maria also created Viviendo, a bilingual quarterly magazine. Her blog, Orlando Latino, was nominated best Latino blog in Central Florida by LATISM (Latinos in Social Media).

Maria has received numerous awards and acknowledgements for her contributions as a successful journalist. She received the National Association of Hispanic Publications award for a Multiple Series Article, was recognized multiple times for her work with the Orlando Sentinel, and was a finalist in the Knight-Wallace journalism awards. Maria is also a founding member of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists and was elected twice to their national Board of Directors.

I am happy to honor Maria Padilla, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her contributions to journalism and dedication to informing the Hispanic community on issues impacting their daily lives.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LETICIA DIAZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great leader in the Central Florida community.

A native of New Jersey, Leticia Diaz is one of the founding faculty at Barry University's Andreas School of Law and currently serves as Dean there. Before joining the full-time faculty, Dean Diaz pursued a full-time law practice while teaching part-time at the school. She practiced in the areas of personal injury, toxic torts, and workplace chemical exposure.

Dean Diaz attended law school at Rutgers University where she received the Merck Patent Scholarship and was recognized for academic achievement by the Association of Latin American Law Students. Before entering law school, she received her Ph.D. in organic chemistry from Rutgers University. She also spent two years as a post-doctoral research chemist at Hoffman-LaRoche, where she primarily worked on the synthesis of anti-HIV compounds.

Dean Diaz teaches in the areas of torts, environmental law, toxic torts, and product liability. She is faculty advisor to the Hispanic Association of Law Students as well as the St. Thomas More Society. Her publications range from analysis of the FDA's role in consumer protection to environmental law and consumer health.

Dean Diaz invites leaders from around the country to the Central Florida area to discuss the important issues of the day. She also convenes meetings and events that bring together varying perspectives on issues that affect the Central Florida community. Central Florida is a better place for the leadership that Dean Diaz has provided.

I am happy to honor Leticia Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service and her work to educate, train, and inspire the leaders of tomorrow.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAM FALCONE, SR. FOR RECEIVING THE 2013 ''LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT'' AWARD FROM THE ITALIAN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LUZERNE COUNTY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sam Falcone, Sr., who received the 2013 Italian American Association of Luzerne County ''Lifetime Achievement'' Award. Sam has dedicated nearly 60 years to his family's local business, Falcone Beverage Co., which his father started along with Sam and his brothers, Raymond, Charles, Carmen, Leonard and Angelo.

Throughout his life Sam has been an outstanding American and active citizen in his community. He was one of the original founders of the Luzerne County Sports Hall of Fame and its first president. He has been involved with an array of charities including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, YMCA, the American Red Cross, and he served on the board of the American Lung Association. He worked with many professional organizations such as the Better Business Bureau, the Chambers of Commerce in Wilkes-Barre, Scranton and the Greater Pittston Area, and he served as the vice-president of the Malt Beverage Distributing Association. Sam also actively worked to preserve the resources within his community by taking part in the Susquehanna River Watch and the Rails-to-Trails Riverfront Revitalization Committee.

Sam has lived in the city of Pittston his whole life and has devoted himself to the welfare of his hometown. A practicing Catholic, Sam attends St. Joseph Marello Parish and is a Fourth Degree Member of the Knights of Columbus Council 372, Pittston. He also served on the Pittston Child Development Center's Advisory Council. Recently, Sam had the honor of being the Grand Marshal of the Pittston's annual Tomato Festival Parade. Today, I am proud to recognize Sam Falcone,

Sr.'s lifetime of achievement and service to his community.

RECOGNIZING PLEASANTON CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ABRAHAM SAENZ, JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pleasanton City Council Member Abraham Saenz, Jr. for his 30 years of service to the city of Pleasanton and to the state of Texas.

Councilman Saenz, a Pleasanton native, is a remarkable and highly respected member of the community who has dedicated his career to promoting the quality of life for all residents of Pleasanton. First elected in 1983, Mr. Saenz has served the community as a Member, and now Senior Member, of the Council of Pleasanton.

During his tenure Mr. Saenz has been instrumental in implementing many city projects. Some of the most important include: paving roads throughout his district and other areas of the city, preparing the city to have an ample water supply for the next 50 years, improving infrastructure in the areas of drainage and wastewater collection, facilitated the construction of a sports complex for youth, and the construction of a new City Hall, Police Headquarters, Public Works Facility, Library, and Civic Center. More recently Mr. Saenz represented Pleasanton in Economic Issues with Atascosa County and has been at the forefront of planning initiatives to accommodate the exponential growth of the city due to Eagle Shale Oil and Gas Play.

Not only has Mr. Saenz held an esteemed and honorable career in the Council, he has devoted his life to his family, community, and country. After attending Pleasanton High School, Mr. Saenz joined the United States Air Force in 1952. While in the Air Force, Mr. Saenz fought in the Korean War and was honorably discharged in 1956. Upon his return to Pleasanton Mr. Saenz began working as a barber, becoming the sole proprietor of the City Barber Shop in 1971. In 1961 he married Ermelinda Gomez Saenz with whom he now has 5 children, 6 grandchildren, and 4 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to have had this time to recognize Councilman Abraham Saenz Jr. on his career and community involvement. He has contributed his time, knowledge, and efforts to his community.

SERGEANT PATRICK C. HAWKINS

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins from Carlisle, Pennsylvania who was killed in action on October 6, 2013 in Afghanistan.

Sgt. Hawkins was on his fourth tour in Afghanistan and serving as a rifleman, gun team leader and Ranger team leader when he was killed by an Improvised Explosive Device in Kandahar Province. He was tending to another wounded Army Ranger when he died.

Sgt. Hawkins graduated from Carlisle High School in 2007 and went on to spend three years studying culinary arts part-time at Harrisburg Area Community College before enlisting in 2010. He is survived by his wife Brittanie, of Lansing, Kansas, and his parents, Roy and Sheila Hawkins, of Carlisle.

Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Hawkins was clearly following part of the Army Ranger creed which says "I will never leave a fallen comrade" when he gave his life for our country. Therefore, for his dedicated service and sacrifice to protect our great Nation, I commend Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins.

RECOGNIZING MS. KRISTIN BECK FOR HER COURAGE AND SERVICE TO THE NATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Kristin Beck, a decorated U.S. Navy SEAL who not only spent 20 years fighting for her country in uniform, but is now leading the charge for equal rights for transgender Americans. During the course of her distinguished military career, Kristin was known as Chris Beck, and served through 13 deployments in Bosnia, Iraq, and Afghanistan, including seven combat deployments, before retiring and coming out as the first openly transgender Navy SEAL. From fighting terrorists overseas to knocking down gender barriers at home, she is a true patriot and source of inspiration.

At the age of five, the young Chris Beck knew that he was different, being drawn to his sisters' feminine clothes and toys. The son of socially conservative, dogmatically religious farmers, however, he was sent to a Christian school operated by televangelist Jerry Falwell and pushed into traditional masculine roles, such as playing football and riding motorcycles. Fifteen years later, Chris found his calling with the SEALs, the Navy's elite special operations force. He proved himself to be a courageous and much respected hero, while developing the deep bonds of brotherhood with his fellow SEALs. In between missions, though, when Chris had a little time to himself, he could not help but dress in women's clothes. Over the next two decades, he went on to serve on a tour with the counter-terrorism unit known as SEAL Team Six, famous for its harrowing missions and rescues, and earned the Bronze Star with "V," the Purple Heart, and other numerous honors.

In 2011, Chris retired from the military and embraced his true feminine identity as Kristin Beck. She started undergoing hormone therapy and physically transforming herself into a woman. With this metamorphosis came the decision to officially come out to the world. It began with replacing her LinkedIn profile picture with one of her dressed as a woman, and changing her name from "Chris Beck" to "Kristin Beck." On February 9, 2013, Kristin officially came out to the military in a press release, in which she stated that she "respectfully remained silent regarding her gender identity" during the era of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and deeply desired to be "afforded the freedom to live in a manner consistent with her life-long gender awareness as a female."

With the pain of shrapnel, broken bones, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as reminders of a life of extraordinary military service, Kristin agreed to participate in a study of "resilience" by Dr. Anne Speckhard, a Washington-area psychologist and adjunct professor at Georgetown University Medical Center. An expert in the psychology of terrorism, Dr. Speckhard wanted to study how service members draw upon coping mechanisms to integrate the stresses and exhilarations of combat with their workday lives back home. What she found was the disjointed story of a woman coming into her own following a lifetime of military service and societal pressures. After more than 100 hours of interviews that often resembled psychotherapy, Kristin and Dr. Speckhard co-authored the book Warrior Princess: A U.S. Navy SEAL's Journey to Coming Out Transgender.

Kristin has embarked upon perhaps the greatest mission of her life: self-actualization. Since her return to civilian life, she has worked tirelessly to raise awareness of the issues affecting both the transgender community and veterans. Kristin works closely with Healing Grounds, the non-profit organization she founded to support returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. Healing Grounds lends therapeutic help to them by providing specialized training in landscaping and gardening to build a place of tranquility in their own backyards. In addition, she has two teenage boys from a previous marriage, and works as a Pentagon consultant.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Kristin Beck for her outstanding bravery and service to our nation. All her life, she has selflessly put duty and country ahead of her own needs. Kristin's story reminds us of the many daily struggles faced by transgender Americans and veterans alike, including the continued discrimination faced by transgender service members who must hide their identities in order to serve in the military. As she continues working to advance lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) equality and address the needs of veterans, I remain an ally in Congress and wish her the very best in her new life's mission.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF OSCAR JACKSON MOONEY, JR.

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor Oscar Mooney, Jr., a distinguished Alabama veteran, on his 90th birthday.

Mr. Mooney was born on December 2, 1923 at home in Weogufka, Alabama. In 1943, Mr. Mooney enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as a sergeant in the 16th Armored Division. The 16th Armored Division was instrumental in the liberation of Pilsen, Czechoslovakia. Mr. Mooney has received the WWII Victory Medal, the American Service Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Medal with one bronze star and the Good Conduct Service

Medal. This long list of accomplishments highlights the bravery with which Mr. Mooney has lived his life.

On July 21, 1950, Mr. Mooney married Jeannette Rodgers. Together they have two children, Roger Emory Mooney and Emma Elizabeth Mooney Fielding. They also have 4 grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

After 18 years of working full-time for the Kimberly Clark Corporation, Mr. Mooney retired to work full-time on their farm, the Mooney Home Place.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and Mr. Mooney's family in celebrating 90 years of Mr. Mooney's life, and please join me in thanking him for his outstanding service to our nation.

RECOGNIZING TULLYTOWN BOROUGH POLICE CHIEF PATRICK PRIORE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career of service to the community of Tullytown Borough by Police Chief Patrick Priore.

Chief Priore retired from the force at the end of August after serving more than 15 years as chief and nearly 24 years with the department overall.

The Chief's commitment to the people of Lower Bucks County was well known and widely respected. His dedication to protecting the people of his region continued even after he was seriously injured in the line of duty in May of 2009—an injury that forced him into an early retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Chief Priore for many years. A law enforcement professional of the highest integrity, Pat has been a good friend and confidant to me and an abiding influence on his officers and community. Most of all, he is a great father and husband. These traits are being passed through Pat's family and in to the community that has been privileged to have been blessed with his leadership, courage and faithful commitment to service.

While Chief Priore may no longer be the head of the Tullytown Borough Police Department, we still recognize and honor his service and sacrifice today and wish him the best during his retirement.

I thank you; the people of Tullytown thank you.

CONGRATULATING HONDA MANUFACTURING OF INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Honda Manufacturing of Indiana on celebrating their fifth anniversary of mass production. Honda's Indiana facility is located in Greensburg, in my congressional district.

On October 9, 2008, Honda opened their seventh North American auto assembly plant in my hometown of Greensburg, Indiana. The facility has grown to employ over 2,000 associates and has been a valued asset for the economy of Greensburg and Southeastern Indiana. Each vehicle produced at the Greensburg facility contains about 900 parts from hundreds of suppliers, many of them in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and Kentucky. In 2011 alone, Honda spent $16 billion with suppliers, supporting good jobs throughout the region. To-date more than 650,000 vehicles have rolled off the Greensburg facility production line. These include the Civic Sedan, Civic Natural Gas, and the Acura ILX.

I ask the entire Sixth Congressional District to join me in congratulating Honda Manufacturing of Indiana on this milestone. Their leadership and economic impact on our state has been invaluable. On a personal note, I am very appreciative of the impact Honda has had on my hometown of Greensburg and the Decatur County community at large. Honda Manufacturing of Indiana is a great community partner, and I look forward to celebrating many more milestones in the future.

IN HONOR OF MISSIONARY KATHERINE CASH GRIFFEY'S 80TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to an outstanding evangelist, life coach, minister, nurse, missionary and all-around phenomenal woman, Evangelist Katherine Cash Griffey, who will be celebrating her 80th birthday on Saturday, October 12, 2013, at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Perimeter at Ravinia in Atlanta, Georgia.

Missionary Katherine Cash Griffey was born on October 18, 1933, in Atlanta, Georgia to the late Mr. Robert Cash, Sr., and the late Mrs. Mary Jane Moss. The first of five children, she lived with her parents in the home of her grandparents, Rev. Lewis Woods and Missionary Irene Woods, who had founded Rome Church of God in Christ. Surrounded by religion, she was raised in the Christian Pentecostal Faith. Missionary Woods anointed her at birth, baptized her in the church at one year old and instilled in her a mindset of "Holiness is Right." Missionary Woods also showed by example that a pure, righteous, and true walk in life is the one taken on God's Path.

Mother Woods passed away when Evangelist Griffey was nine, but not before leaving her with these final words that she carries with her to this day, "You are to do great things for the Lord, and to be about His mission in your life." After Evangelist Griffey's grandmother passed, her mother suffered a nervous breakdown, her father joined the Army and the children were separated, each going to live with other family.

Evangelist Griffey went to live with her aunt, who had fifteen children, nine of whom lived in the home, so she never had her own bed in which to sleep. Her world torn apart, Evangelist Griffey became very ill and depressed, leading her to become inactive in the church.

Missionary Griffey attended Wesley Avenue Elementary School-Atlanta Public School System until her father took her and her brother to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where she attended and graduated from Westinghouse High School.

After graduation, Evangelist Griffey returned to Atlanta where she met her husband, Joseph Griffey. They began attending Antioch East Baptist Church, where she joined the Usher Board. The Rev. E.W. Lumpkin noticed her and called her in to tell her, "You have something to do. The Lord is trying to speak to you." This was a pivotal moment in Evangelist Griffey's life.

Encouraged by her pastor to accept a call to minister for God, Evangelist Griffey moved to Jacksonville, Florida, where she scrubbed floors while attending the Duval School of Nursing to earn her license as an LPN. She matriculated in the Zeta Van Gibson School of Theological Studies to better understand how she could fulfill the calling that God placed in her life. In 1967, she graduated with her License in Religious Bible Doctrine, Pages in Healing and Spiritual Advising and Teaching and simultaneously, the Spirit of God laid upon her heart the need to start The St. Katherine's Prayer Band at her home in Jacksonville, Florida. Then in 1969, while in constant prayer, Missionary Griffey made the decision to move back to Atlanta and continue her ministry with the Prayer Band.

In April 1982, Missionary Griffey purchased her current home and welcomed the Lord and the Prayer Band inside. The Prayer Band's services were held every second Sunday and every Thursday Night in the "Prayer Room" of the house. A debt-free Missionary Griffey was then led by God to mortgage her home and add the money to the funds that had already been raised to purchase a church building. Finally, on August 9, 1989, the church's first home at 1153 Ormewood Avenue was purchased with cash and officially named and registered as The St. Katherine's C.O.G.I.C., Inc. Through divine intervention and a developer as a benefactor, the church was able to relocate to a larger facility on Covington Highway, where it continues to flourish to this day.

Missionary Griffey has achieved much in her life, but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of her husband, Joseph, two sons, Joel and Jonathan, and her beautiful granddaughter, Brittani. Missionary Griffey has reared her family on the faith and belief that "Keeping God first will allow you to get far in life; Prayer without ceasing."

In her eighty years, Missionary Katherine Griffey has endured many tests and trials, but she has survived them all and has come out stronger for it. She has survived sickness, heartbreak, ridicule, and scorn. She has been shot and her office was fire bombed. She has overcome colorectal cancer, heart valve replacement surgery, and 10 hospitalizations since 2006. Although the load may seem heavy, she knows that the Lord would never give us more than we could bear. Through it all, her sturdy faith in the Lord was never shaken and her mission to win souls for Christ never ceased. She has come a long way from the malnourished child with severe asthma to a strong pillar firmly grounded in the Lord.

Always pressing towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, to better improve the craft of Christian ministry and discipleship, Missionary Griffey has helped to shape the lives of many, including Members of Congress, Governors, Mayors, state politicians, foreign leaders, ministers, and lawyers, among others, by means

of counseling, prayer, service, and support. She has had a tremendous impact in my own life and I am forever grateful for her counsel, guidance, and wisdom. She is truly a nurturer at heart and she loves everyone purely and genuinely with both her soul and with the love of Jesus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me, my wife Vivian, and well wishers all across the world in paying tribute to Missionary Katherine Cash Griffey. Ephesians 4:11–12 says, ''So Christ himself gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the pastors and teachers, to equip his people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up.'' Evangelist Griffey embodies every one of these roles and we are so blessed that she was put here on this Earth to do so much for so many for so long.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF REVEREND DR. CLARENCE NORMAN, SR.

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Reverend Dr. Clarence Norman, Sr. During his 60 years of service, Rev. Norman has ministered to tens of thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In honor of his six decades of service to our community, Rev. Norman was honored at a celebratory banquet on Saturday, April 6, 2013 at Russo's on the Bay in Howard Beach, New York.

In 1953, he helped found the First Baptist Church of Williamsburg located in Brooklyn, New York, which later relocated to the Crown Heights neighborhood. Shortly after the church's founding, he was ordained as pastor. Today, the First Baptist Church of Crown Heights has a congregation of over 2,000 people.

In addition to his ministry at the First Baptist Church of Crown Heights, Rev. Norman has been dedicated to improving housing and education in the community.

Rev. Norman's commitment to education is evidenced by his own academic achievements: he received a Bachelor of Arts from Bloomfield College, and a Master of Divinity and Doctorate in Religion from Howard University. The importance of education was imparted to the youth he mentored and taught. He served as the Director of the John Edward Bruce Day Care Center and Dean and Assistant Principal of the Whitelaw Reid Junior High School. Additionally, he taught social studies at the Nathaniel Macon Junior High School.

In 1987, Rev. Norman founded the Local Development Corporation of Crown Heights, which has developed over 800 housing units for senior citizens and low-income families.

He has received numerous honors and awards including the 1969–1970 Parish Ministry Fellowship by the Fund for Theological Education and the First Annual Ecumenical Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. In 2002, he was honored by Ebony Magazine as a ''great black father.'' Rev. Norman is an inspirational leader whose work would not have been possible without the love and support of his wife Ellen Norman and their devoted five children. We thank his family for sharing him with us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Reverend Norman on his 60th pastoral anniversary. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn and to his service of those less fortunate, he is worthy of the highest praise.

TEXAS' OLDEST ACTIVE LAWMAN—LOCAL LEGEND LIEUTENANT TOM MORGAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no one brings meaning to the phrase ''Don't mess with Texas'' more than our lawmen. Every once in awhile, when I have the chance to escape from the Devil City, I get together with what I call the ''Poe-leece''. The Poe-leece are a group of my friends in the Texas law enforcement community. I have been friends with most of them since my days on the bench. When we all get together we like to exchange ''war stories''. The most seasoned veteran of them all is a man named Tom Morgan.

Tom Morgan is the oldest active lawman in Texas. This year Tom turned 93 years young. I first met Tom 25 years ago at the North Harris County Criminal Justice Association breakfast meeting in Humble. This sprightly veteran still has the same passion for our country and our military that he did the day he enlisted. Tom served three tours of duty, but that is not the only remarkable part of his career.

Tom was born on September 20, 1920, in Bossier City, Louisiana, about twenty miles from the Texas border. He was a child of the Great Depression and grew up very poor. His town was very patriotic, especially since it was home to Barksdale Air Force Base.

When World War II began, Tom was just 21 years old. He answered his country's call of duty to serve and joined the U.S. Marines. During this time, the United States' first major offensive was launched against Japan in the Guadalcanal. Japan was trying to solidify its stronghold on the Island of Guadalcanal, because of its closeness to Australia. The Japanese had built an airfield and had about 8,500 men on the island. Tom's first tour was in Guadalcanal, in the Solomon Islands, in August 1942. Sergeant Tom Morgan and the Marine Corps—members of the Greatest Generation—secured the airfield and killed half the Japanese force. But the fierce fighting took three months. Conditions were harsh for our warriors—thick jungle, heavy rainfall, swamps, mud, mountainous terrain and a determined enemy. The Japanese sent in reinforcements during the ''Tokyo Express''; 4,000 of the enemy reached land. However, by February 1943, the U.S. marines took control of the island. Tom's unit played a pivotal part in the Battle of Guadalcanal. Over 1,500 American warriors were killed in action and 4,000 injured; thousands contracted malaria—including Sergeant Tom Morgan. Tom later recalled that malaria had put him near death.

He rested as much as he could and took the little yellow pill, Atabrine, which doctors prescribed. In the summer of 1944, Tom was sent to fight in the Battle of Saipan. Marines go where others fear to tread, and they fight for all American freedoms. They landed on the beaches of Saipan with a goal of gaining a crucial air base from which they could launch B–29 bombers. The Battle of Saipan was fierce and bloody; the enemy put up barbed wire along beaches and dug trenches to trap and ambush the marines.

Our boys laid claim to the beachheads inch by bloody inch. Nearly 30,000 Japanese soldiers died trying to defend the island and 3,426 Americans were killed with 13,000 wounded. On July 8, 1944, the United States flag was raised in victory over Saipan, and Tom survived his second major battle.

Less than a year later, Tom was sent to fight in the Battle of Okinawa, referred to as Operation Iceberg. This battle was the first time that U.S. troops fought on Japanese soil and it would be the bloodiest. Tom and the Marines were on board a transport ship Easter Sunday morning, 1945, eating breakfast in the mess hall when an enemy plane hit the ship. Water began filling up the mess hall and Tom thought he was going to meet his maker. However, the man above had different plans for Tom. The hatch flew open and he was able to escape. The marines went on to land in Okinawa. The battle lasted 82 days and was referred to as ''typhoon of steel''. American casualties were the highest experienced in any campaign against the Japanese. Battle casualties for the Japanese were 49,151, of which 12,520 were killed or missing and 36,631 wounded. Marine losses, including those of the Tactical Air Force, were 2,938 killed and missing and 13,708 wounded. On June 22, 1945, the United States flag was raised in victory over Okinawa and Tom survived his third battle.

Not many Americans fought in all three battles of Guadalcanal, Saipan and Okinawa. Tom remained in the Marines until 1946 and continued his service in the Reserves; he even served three months in the Korean War. After the war, Tom enrolled at the University of Louisiana to pursue his degree in mechanical engineering. During that same year, he decided to pay a visit to an old friend in Houston, Texas. It was there he met a Texas beauty; her friends called her Pat. Tom told me he fell in love with Pat at first sight. He immediately decided to move to Texas, transferred to the University of Houston, and married Pat the following year. He finished college, became a pipeline engineer and designer and began a family. He and his wife, Pat, raised three children in their home in Pasadena, Texas. He retired from Gulf Interstate Engineering in 1982, at the age of 62.

Now this is where I would normally say. ''And that's just the way it is.'' But, Tom's story is not over. Ten years after retirement, Tom decided to join the Harris County Sheriff's Office Reserve Command. At first, Pat was not too happy. He told Pat he was tired of following her around the grocery store and that he needed to be busy. So at the age of 72, he graduated from the Harris County Sheriff Office Academy and became the oldest rookie.

Today, Lieutenant Tom Morgan is assigned to the HCSO Marine Division where he patrols the waters of Lake Houston, San Jacinto River and the Ship Channel. Once a Marine, always a Marine. As a reserve deputy he works at least 500 hours a year. He conducts boat

safety inspections and boat stops to enforce all aspects of boating law.

For 21 years, he has put on the badge and a gun to protect and serve the people of Harris County that he loves. He patrols the Ship Channel, where he works closely with Homeland Security at the Port of Houston.

Retire? Not Tom. Again, let me remind you. Tom is 93 years old. Tom is the oldest lawman in Texas.

In 2008, Tom's Texas beauty, Pat, passed away. Tom and Pat were married for 61 years. It's been five years since her passing; Tom told me not a day goes by that he doesn't miss his Pat. He says it's good for him to stay busy: working, volunteering at his church, spending time with his three children who all live in the Houston area and enjoying his grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Ronald Reagan best summed it up when he said, ''Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference. The Marines don't have that problem.'' And Tom definitely does not have that problem.

Soon, Sheriff Adrian Garcia of Harris County, Texas, will recognize Lieutenant Tom Morgan with the Lifetime Achievement Award. A fitting honor for a remarkable man. Semper Fi! Oooh Rah! Marine and Texas Lawman—Tom Morgan.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING CC YIN OF SOLANO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to Senor Mr. CC Yin, who is being honored by the Asian American Bar Association of Solano County for his countless contributions to his community.

Mr. Yin's life exemplifies the ''American Dream'' that many immigrants have when they come to America. Mr. Yin arrived in America 48 years ago with no English language skills and very little money in his pocket. He worked his way through college to earn a degree in Engineering. After a successful career as a civil engineer, his entrepreneurial spirit drove him to seek an opportunity to own a McDonald's franchise. Along with his wife and two daughters, Mr. Yin owns one of the largest McDonald's franchises in the country, with 28 franchises in 11 cities. They have received national and international accolades for their successes.

CC Yin and his family have embraced the McDonald's motto of giving back and investing in the community. The Yin's are active in numerous civic organizations and give generously to many charitable causes throughout their community.

Above all, Mr. Yin has invested his personal energy and resources to build the non-profit organization, Asian Pacific Islander Public Affairs Association (APAPA). The goals of the organization are to promote the importance of political awareness and civic engagement for Asian Americans and new Asian immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, CC Yin has dedicated his life and resources to the betterment of all peoples in Solano County. It is therefore appropriate that we honor Mr. Yin today and wish him well in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE GROUNDBREAKING OF THE GATEHOUSE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce and celebrate the ceremonial groundbreaking for The Gatehouse, a truly transformative community for women in difficult situations, which will occur soon on October 16, 2013, in Grapevine, Texas.

The Gatehouse will be a unique community of transitional housing for women (and their children) coming out of abusive, impoverished, or other challenging situations. Gatehouse will be an entire suburban neighborhood complete with new houses of various sizes, a community center for counseling and events, a general store, a clothing boutique, and plenty of beautiful open green space. In addition to the physical amenities, Gatehouse is extraordinary because of its Independent Life Program—a two and one-half year program of practical and emotional assistance to ensure that women and families at Gatehouse are not just shuttled through life but make a positive long-term life transformation. The Independent Life Program at Gatehouse is also faith-based, though it does not affiliate with any particular church or take government funding, and is purely funded by generous private donors.

Gatehouse was founded by Lisa Rose and grew out of projectHandUp. In 2008, projectHandUp began as a group providing wisdom, hope, and practical resources to abused women at monthly ''First Friday'' meetings. Their first meeting drew 169, and they now are attended by 350 to 1,000 people. Financial assistance was also made available in some cases to those in need. Over a period from 2011 to 2012, a group of women from the project worked with the Grapevine City Council to develop the idea for Gatehouse, and approval was granted on August 21, 2012.

In June of this year, work began on the roads and infrastructure for The Gatehouse. The groundbreaking ceremony will occur on October 16. The community is expected to open in the Fall of 2014 with the first neighborhood, Phase I, providing 24 units. At Gatehouse, great importance will be placed on healthy and compassionate relationships within the community in order to foster a sense of dignity and lasting improvement in women's lives. I commend the good work done by those who are laboring to make The Gatehouse a reality and look forward to seeing the success of their mission to provide women with a ''hand up.''

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the groundbreaking of The Gatehouse in Grapevine, Texas.

BENITO A. TRANGUCH

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Benito A. Tranguch, an outstanding member of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

A lifelong resident of the area, Mr. Tranguch served as the president of the UNICO Hazleton Chapter from 2002–2005. UNICO is the largest Italian American organization in the United States. Members seek to improve their communities by providing assistance to area and national charities through fundraisers and donations. Additionally, they strive to honor and educate others about their Italian culture and ethnic heritage.

Mr. Tranguch's commitment to the community does not end with his service to UNICO. He is an active member of the Men of Malvern, the Hazleton Quarterback Club, Hazleton Community Concerts, Hazleton Gourmet, and the Queen of Heaven Church, where he serves on the Financial Committee and as an usher. He supports the Muscular Dystrophy Association (MDA), the Committee to Help Handicapped Infants and Parents Succeed (CHHIPS) and the United Rehabilitation Services (URS). Mr. Tranguch was also awarded V.I.P. of the year from the Helping Hands Society.

Mr. Speaker, for his dedicated service to both his Italian heritage and our community, I commend Benito A. Tranguch, an outstanding member of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

ENDING THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today is the 11th day of the government shutdown, with 800,000 government employees still out of work, including 1,400 of my constituents, due to this reckless, irresponsible and high-risk venture of House Republicans. $12.5 million is being lost every hour in work and services the government is unable to perform. Thousands of small businesses and startups—the backbone of America's economy—are without SBA's guaranteed loans and regulatory approval. And the latest estimate from the Treasury is that if Congress doesn't vote to raise the debt ceiling by October 17th there is a virtual guarantee that our economy and the global economy could implode.

Let's recall how we arrived here as we reach the end of the second week of this government shutdown. It all began when House Republicans insisted that the Affordable Care Act be repealed in order to win their votes to keep the government functioning.

This non-starter demand has now bled into the debt ceiling debate and mutated into a litany of others: offshore oil drilling permits; ending ''net neutrality'' policies; approving the Keystone XL pipeline; defunding the 2010 Wall Street reform law; and piecemeal funding of popular government programs. If I were to try to explain this to small children, I'd say it's as if Harry Potter overdosed on polyjuice potion.

What I can only expect next from House Republicans is something we'd find in a children's fantasy book, which is meaningless in the real world. It's meaningless for the millions of Americans the government shutdown affects, and the low-income mothers and their

infants without nutrition benefits. It's meaningless for pre-school children left without a Head Start program, and the hundreds of people infected with salmonella because the FDA couldn't do its job.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans need to drop the fantasies and bring a bill to the floor to reopen the government with no strings attached. Let's raise the debt ceiling like we've always done to pay America's bills. Let's end this manufactured crisis so we can negotiate a long-term, fiscally responsible path forward for our country. Let's do the job the American people sent us here to do.

RECOGNIZING MRS. CARMEN GARCIA BARRIOS

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the celebration of Mrs. Carmen Garcia Barrios de Garza's 100th birthday. With a century passing, Mrs. Garza has dedicated her life to her family, loved ones, and giving back to the community.

Mrs. Garza was born October 6, 1913. Throughout her lifetime Mrs. Garza and her family have lived in Jim Hogg County and Webb County, Laredo, Texas.

Since her marriage to Benito Garza Herrera, Mrs. Garza has been devoted and dedicated to her husband and her family. In the midst of World War II Mr. Garza bravely left to serve in the Philippines with the U.S. Army 5th Air Force. In her husband's absence, Mrs. Garza stayed in Texas caring for their children and keeping busy with her hobbies of sewing, cooking and gardening.

Upon his return from war, Benito Garza served as Deputy Sheriff of Jim Hogg County. It was here that Mr. and Mrs. Garza raised their 6 children—Oscar, Anita, Lidia, Hilda, Benito, and Ciria. Since then Mrs. Garza has been blessed with 19 grandchildren, 32 great-grandchildren, and 14 great-great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize and celebrate the tremendous life of Mrs. Carmen Garcia Barrios de Garza and her 100th birthday celebration.

PRESIDENTIAL INSTALLATION: THE IDEAL OF A LIBERAL ARTS UNIVERSITY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the eloquent remarks of Dr. Christopher Eisgruber at his installation as President of Princeton University, September 22, 2013.

Friends, colleagues, students, teachers, Princetonians:

I am honored to be standing here this afternoon and I am very touched, indeed a tad bit overwhelmed by the generosity of the remarks delivered by the speakers who have preceded at this podium. I am grateful for their gracious words. I am also honored by the presence here on stage of three great presidents of this University, Bill Bowen, Harold Shapiro and Shirley Tilghman.

In the past weeks, people have occasionally asked me whether I could have imagined, in the days when I was a student here, that I might someday be the university president. I reply very honestly that it never crossed my mind, not when I was a student and not, for that matter, when I returned to join the faculty in 2001. My dream job, both as student and a faculty member, was to be a Princeton professor teaching about the Constitution. And, when my dream came true, when I came back to Princeton as a member of the faculty, I reckoned that I had been very clever. I thought that by becoming a law professor at a university without a law school, I had reduced if not eliminated any chance that large administrative assignments might ever distract me from the teaching and research that I loved.

Of course, by returning to Princeton, I had also come home to a university that I loved more than any other, and where the responsibilities of administration would be more meaningful to me than anywhere else. Princeton's wonderful 19th president, Shirley Tilghman, realized that before I did, an she changed my life by offering me the opportunity to become her provost.

I suppose that all of us, as we move through this complicated world, require some time to realize what matters most in our lives. The path to and through adulthood takes unexpected turns. Childhood heroes show hidden flaws; youthful causes lose their luster. If we are lucky, though, we find certain ideals from which we can draw enduring inspiration and to which we can commit our life's energies. In my life, there have been two: constitutional democracy, as manifested personally for me in the American constitutional tradition, and liberal arts education, as exemplified especially by the blend of research and teaching at this great University.

The iconic building behind me combines these traditions. Nassau Hall was once all of Princeton University, and this University's alumni still regard it as the symbolic heart of their alma mater—even if it has now become an administrative office building into which few students ever venture. Nassau Hall was also briefly, in 1783, the home of the Continental Congress, and so the seat of this nation's government. And Nassau Hall was, as Hunter Rawlings has so movingly described, the site where James Madison (undergraduate Class of 1771, graduate Class of 1772) acquired the learning that eventually made him the father of America's Constitution.

Constitutionalism and liberal arts education also have deeper connections, ones that depend not on the contingencies of history and geography but on their relationship to human nature. Both of them are long-term institutions that recognize simultaneously humanity's virtues and its imperfections, and that aim to cultivate our talents, orient us toward the common good, and make us the best that we can be.

In one of the most famous passages from his extraordinary arguments on behalf of constitutional ratification, Madison wrote, in Federalist 51, ''What is government . . . but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary.'' [Madison, Fed. 51; Rossiter ed. 322] Madison used gendered language, but I have no doubt that in this respect at least James Madison was a feminist: He meant his skepticism to apply equally to both sexes. If people were angels, they would cooperate, look out for one another, and generally do good deeds. They would need no laws, no courts and no constitutions. But people are not angels, so they need constitutions that create institutions, define processes and separate powers.

We might equally well add that if people were angels, they would have no need for teachers. Students would need no one to inspire their studies or correct their errors. If students were angels, they would need, at most, a few syllabi, a library, some laboratories, a computer and perhaps a few Massive Open Online Courses. They might then all be more or less self-taught, as were Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln, those almost superhuman, if not quite angelic, heroes of the American constitutional tradition.

But people are not angels, and very, very few students are like Franklin and Lincoln. The generations of students who have come to Nassau Hall, including the great James Madison, have wanted teachers to fire their imaginations, dispel their misconceptions, explode their prejudices, stir their spirits and guide their passions. And students have found mentors here, not just in professors and preceptors, but also in chaplains and coaches, counselors and graduate students, conductors and directors, deans and administrators.

I expect that all of you in the audience today can look back upon your lives and identify teachers whose support and guidance were valuable beyond measure and without whom you could not have achieved the successes that matter most to you. I am especially pleased that in attendance today are two teachers whose mentorship has guided me throughout my career: Mr. Pat Canan, who taught me physics at Corvallis High School; and Professor Jeffrey Tulis, who taught me about the Constitution and political theory when I was an undergraduate at this University.

I have kept in touch with both of these teachers for more than 30 years now. Thirty years is a long time. As I have already said, education, like constitutionalism, is a long-term enterprise. Great teachers, and great universities, make extraordinary investments in students and research in anticipation of future benefits that are usually unknowable and occasionally implausible. Perhaps the seeds you plant in the mind of 19-year-old students today will guide careers that blossom and mature many decades hence. Or, to take an example from our Department of Chemistry, perhaps your curiosity-driven research into the pigmentation of butterfly wings will, 50 years later, produce a drug that improves the lives of cancer patients.

If human beings were angels, we would cheerfully focus on long-term goods. We would invest enthusiastically in schools and colleges for our own children and for everybody else's children, so that they could become productive, engaged citizens in the future. We would happily support speculative research projects so that we could reap the benefits of discovery and innovation. We would gladly nurture humanistic inquiry because it provides an essential foundation for understanding what makes life meaningful and sustains the wellsprings of civil society.

Indeed, we need not be angels to do these things. We would do them if we were perfectly rational investors, because economists like Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz have shown convincingly that education and research are powerful drivers of economic prosperity.

But we are not perfectly rational any more than we are angels. We live embodied in the present, sensitive to short-term pleasures and pains. Notions of the common good and promises about future returns feel abstract and feeble by comparison to the intensity of immediate experience.

This bias seems especially fierce in America today. Our world features a non-stop news cycle, continuous political campaigns and an obsession with quarterly earnings statements. We demand that messaging be instant, and we talk in tweets.

This short-term perspective threatens America's colleges and universities. Already it has done significant harm. Our nation has reduced its support for public colleges and universities, and it has squeezed the funding needed for research, innovation and scholarship.

In so doing, we risk squandering a national treasure. America's colleges and universities are a beacon to the world. Parents around the globe dream of sending their children here, scholars dream of landing a place here, and nations dream of creating universities like America's. Yet, here at home, we see a parade of reporters, politicians and pundits asking whether a college education is worth it—even though the economic evidence for the value of a college education is utterly overwhelming.

People discount this evidence because they worry, quite understandably, about the cost of college. They say that higher education should be more efficient so that it can be cheaper in the short term and equally valuable in the long term.

Make no mistake about it: Those of us who lead universities must make our institutions as efficient as possible. We must also ensure, through financial aid and other programs, that our colleges are accessible and affordable to students from every sector of our society. But there is a difference between expense and inefficiency. Expensive investments can be both efficient and valuable if their returns are sufficiently high.

When professors provide individualized attention to students, their time is expensive and valuable. When scholars strive day and night to enhance our understanding of the world, their activity is expensive and valuable. Great colleges and universities are not cheap. They require big investments, and they are also among the very best investments that this nation, or any nation, can make. And, as I have said in the past, great universities are also places where the human spirit soars. They are special communities where students, teachers and researchers strive to transcend their limitations and, on occasion, to expand the boundaries of human achievement.

I am grateful to be joined on this stage by Princeton alumni, and by former Princeton faculty members and administrators, who now serve as presidents of an extraordinary range of colleges and universities from throughout the world. Their presence here today symbolizes our need to work together on behalf of higher education. It also reminds us of Princeton's obligation and opportunity to play a leadership role in public discussions about the value of research and collegiate education today. Those debates are urgently important to the nation, to the world, and to this University's mission, and Princeton University must be boldly active within them.

Long-term institutions, be they educational or political, can flourish only if they inspire energetic commitment in the short term. Madison knew this. Even ''the most rational government,'' he said, must have the ''prejudices of the community on its side.'' (Fed. 49, Rossiter 315).

In his famous debates with Stephen Douglas, Abraham Lincoln called attention to this country's annual celebrations on the Fourth of July. He insisted that the ''cannon which thunders [the] annual joyous return'' of our independence serves to remind us of the basic principles upon which this country is founded and which unite us as a people. [P. Angle, Created Equal: the Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858, at 130 (Ottawa); see also id., at 40 (Chicago)]. Civic pride, and the colorful and noisy celebrations that go with it, can reshape self-interest and motivate people to care about their collective future.

We, too, at Princeton have traditions of joyous return. We even have cannons—though our most famous one is buried deep in the ground behind Nassau Hall and none of them thunder anymore. But joyous return: We do that very well. ''Going back to Nassau Hall'' is woven into the music and the soul of this place. We go back to Nassau Hall for Reunions, for Commencement and Baccalaureate, for Alumni Day and the Service of Remembrance, and occasionally for special ceremonies like this one. In so doing, we renew the camaraderie that enlivens our commitment to this University, and we rededicate ourselves to the principles for which Princeton stands and upon which it depends.

I would not presume to enumerate all of those principles, but prominent among them are these basic convictions:

That liberal arts education is a vital foundation for both individual flourishing and the well-being of our society;

That residential and extracurricular experience both supplement and reinforce the lessons of the classroom, building character and skills that last a lifetime;

That rigorous research and scholarship are indispensable for understanding the human condition and improving the world;

That learning, discovery and understanding are valuable not only instrumentally but also for their own sake, as sources of the joy and fulfillment that make a human life worth living;

That scholarship and teaching are mutually reinforcing activities—that scholars learn from their students' questions, and that students learn best when they are exposed to, and can participate in, research that extends the frontiers of knowledge;

That we must cultivate new generations of talent enthusiastically and unselfishly;

That all social and economic groups should have access to the educational resources of this great University and to higher education more generally;

That we as a University, and we as alumni, must constantly rededicate ourselves to the nation's service and to the service of all nations; and last, but most certainly not least,

That a great university can and should be the heart of an alumni community that not only engages in a lifetime of learning, leadership and service, but that continues to do all it can to sustain, strengthen and nourish this University—ensuring that it can live up to these principles and achieve its highest aspirations through all the generations yet to come.

I am honored to accept the presidency of this, our beloved University, and I will work with you enthusiastically to sustain the excellence of what we are doing now, to realize more perfectly the ideals to which we are committed, and to demonstrate by argument and deed the extraordinary value of Princeton University, and of all the colleges and universities that help to bring out the best in the people of this country and this world.

Thank you for welcoming me so warmly this afternoon, thank you for coming back once more to Nassau Hall, and thank you, most of all, for your sincere commitment to this place and this community that matter so deeply to all of us. Thank you!

CHIEF PATRICK PRIORE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career of service to the community of Tullytown Borough by Police Chief Patrick Priore.

Chief Priore retired from the force at the end of August after serving more than 15 years as chief and nearly 24 years with the department overall.

The Chief's commitment to the people of Lower Bucks County was well known and widely respected. His dedication to protecting the people of his region continued even after he was seriously injured in the line of duty in May of 2009—an injury that forced him into an early retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Chief Priore for many years. A law enforcement professional of the highest integrity, Pat has been a good friend and confidant to me and an abiding influence on his officers and community. Most of all, he is a great father and husband. These traits are being passed through Pat's family and in to the community that has been privileged to have been blessed with his leadership, courage and faithful commitment to service.

While Chief Priore may no longer be the head of the Tullytown Borough Police Department, we still recognize and honor his service and sacrifice today and wish him the best during his retirement.

Chief: I salute you. I thank you. And the people of Tullytown thank you.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF FULL GOSPEL ASSEMBLY CHURCH

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 35th anniversary of the founding of Full Gospel Assembly Church in Brooklyn, NY. Pastor Michael Bacchus and members of the congregation commemorated this milestone at a banquet on October 4, 2013 at the Grand Prospect Hall in Brooklyn, NY.

Full Gospel Assembly was founded on October 1, 1978 by Pastor Michael Bacchus, Assistant Pastor Jesse Persuad and Brother Colin Wronge. The people of New York are grateful for the exemplary service and leadership of Pastor Bacchus, whose vision led the church from meeting in a classroom at Long Island University to building its own sanctuary on Sullivan Place in the Crown Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn. Under the direction of Pastor Bacchus, the Queens Campus of Full Gospel Assembly opened in 2011. The Full Gospel Christian Academy, which was founded in 1985, continues to offer pre-K and kindergarten classes.

The leaders and parishioners of Full Gospel Assembly have touched the lives of countless individuals through their compassionate service. In 1986, the church sponsored its first

missionary trip, where 45 parishioners traveled to Guyana to minister to the residents of Georgetown and Linden. The Berean Bible Study Center, which opened in 1989, has trained hundreds to be leaders in the church's ministries. To meet the needs of its diverse congregation, the church has a wide range of active ministries including those for children, youth, and families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Full Gospel Assembly on its 35th anniversary. The church leaders and parishioners have dedicated themselves to serving the people of New York, and for that they are worthy of the highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TUSKEGEE-MOREHOUSE FOOTBALL CLASSIC

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a classic gridiron rivalry, the 78th Annual Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic, which is known as the ''Matchless Classic of All Historically Black College Football Classics.'' This year, the Maroon Tigers of Morehouse College will meet face-to-face with the Golden Tigers of Tuskegee University at A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium in Columbus, Georgia on Saturday, October 12, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

The Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic, one of the longest running NCAA Division II classics in the nation, marks a rivalry that began in 1902 and has been played seventy-seven times in over a century. It first began as an entertainment event for the African-American civilian community and African-American U.S. Army soldiers in Columbus and Fort Benning, Georgia and Phenix City, Alabama. Today, it helps raise funds to provide young men and women with scholarships to help them attend college.

In 1955, the Classic Committee was formed by the late Mr. Gordon H. Kitchen, Mr. A.J. McClung, and Mr. Carl Haygood. The Committee continues to organize the Classic and has preserved the vision and mission of its legendary founders and past leadership. This year, the Committee will welcome Dr. John Silvanus Wilson, Jr., the Eleventh President of Morehouse College; Dr. Gilbert L. Rochon, the Sixth President of Tuskegee University; and Dr. Beverly Tatum, the Ninth President of Spelman College.

This is the ninth year the Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic will be played in the A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium, which was named for the late Honorable A.J. McClung, a 1933 graduate of Tuskegee University, Chairman Emeritus of the Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic and 29-year member of the Columbus Council who served as Mayor of Columbus in 1973.

The weeks leading up to this longstanding tradition are filled with excitement and anticipation. The Tuskegee-Morehouse Classic Parade is widely attended and filled with fanfare. The weeklong schedule of events also includes church services, recruitment activities, a media press conference, a golf tournament, Presidents/Queens Brunch, VIP Reception and high-spirited tailgating with thousands of fans from all over the United States and abroad.

Throughout the years, the high quality of play and competition between the two teams on the field has represented college football at its best. The players and coaches of both teams train and work tirelessly to ensure a memorable classic. Each Classic features a spectacular show put on by the marching bands, the Piperettes, Mahogany in Motion, cheerleaders, flag teams and other auxiliary units. It always generates enthusiastic responses from proud fans cheering loudly for their teams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting the Maroon Tigers of Morehouse College and the Golden Tigers of Tuskegee University as they compete in this classic gridiron rivalry. Naturally, I will be cheering for my beloved Alma Mater, Morehouse College. Despite the outcome, however, the 78th Annual Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic is sure to be a memorable affair overflowing with spirit, pride, and tradition on behalf of the students, alumni, administrations, families, and supporters.

RECOGNIZING DAVE EDWARDS' COMMITMENT TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Dave Edwards' retirement from public office following more than four decades of service. Mr. Edwards, formerly the Department of Public Works Superintendent of the Town of Caneadea, officially retired at the end of September.

Mr. Edwards' impact on my district is truly difficult to quantify as he has influenced countless aspects of the community. Dave Edwards has served on the Allegany County Fire Service Advisory Board for five years and is currently a member of the Allegany County Volunteer Fireman's Association where he is Chairman of the Memorial Committee. He has also played a pivotal role in the transformation of the Houghton Volunteer Ambulance Service, Inc. into the thriving corporation that it is today. This passion for service drives him to be a strong advocate for the maintenance and preservation of his community's fire fighting history.

Mr. Edwards' impact on the district has also been felt by the Caneadea Boosters Organization. He assisted with raising funds to repair the old steel-framed bridge within the town and has been a proud supporter of the Allegany County Republican Women's Club's 50/50 raffle for many years.

Perhaps most importantly, Dave Edwards is a devoted husband and father. He and his wife Linda have been married for thirty-four years and have one daughter, Stacey. It has been an honor and a privilege to work with Dave Edwards while serving the constituents of the Southern Tier and I wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 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 $16,747,421,858,503.24. We've added $6,120,544,809,590.16 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.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10th Taiwan celebrates the 102nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of China. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Taiwan on its impressive economic progress and strong record of democratic achievement.

On this important anniversary the U.S. Congress should commit itself to strengthening our relationship by singing a bilateral investment agreement (BIA).

Greater economic cooperation between Taiwan and the United States will benefit both our peoples, and support the economic integration and material well-being of the entire Pacific region.

Such an agreement would provide protection for investors of the two countries and expand market opportunities for investors all over the world.

I applaud the efforts of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington to maintain the strong ties that exist between the people of Taiwan and the US Congress.

I look forward to ever greater cooperation between our two nations.

REFORMS ADD INTEGRITY TO SNAP FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a good and generous people and don't begrudge helping needy families, and especially children, when times are tough. Sometimes our friends, neighbors, and their kids need a little help to get by after a layoff or personal hardship. But we do demand that our tax dollars be spent honestly and in direct support of those who need the aid. Today, that's not always the case.

The United States Department of Agriculture is spending tax dollars to advertise the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) on TV, radio, billboards, and through

agreements with foreign governments. Through loopholes and questionable recruitment activities, people whose incomes exceeds the SNAP threshold, illegal immigrants, and even the deceased are counted among those receiving taxpayer benefits. Able-bodied adults, too, are receiving food stamp assistance at record levels.

In a down economy, heightened demand makes sense, but with the President's 2009 waiver of work requirements for SNAP recipients, the percentage of able-bodied Americans receiving aid has increased 163%. By comparison, total participants in the SNAP program, including the able-bodied population, increased 70.3%.

This week in the House of Representatives, we voted to make America's food stamp program stronger and more accountable to the American people.

The Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program for families, and especially children, who rely on food stamps. Reforms in this legislation put stronger protections in place to ensure that SNAP money is reserved only for those who qualify for food stamps and isn't wasted on government public relations campaigns, medical marijuana purchases, or lottery winners. Questionable loopholes and recruitment activities which extend assistance to those who make too much money are also ended.

Further, consistent with the bipartisan belief that the solution to poverty is found through work, not just aid, the Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act reinstates Clinton-era SNAP work requirements. These rules stipulate that able-bodied adults, with no dependents, must be looking for work, developing job skills, volunteering for community service, or obtain employment to draw food stamp benefits. Not only will this provision ensure that the truly needy continue to receive aid, it will help beneficiaries compete and prepare for jobs.

An unchecked SNAP program that wastes its limited resources on publicity campaigns or subsidizing those who do not qualify is unable to provide the best service to the people it is designed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and as a safety net of last resort for the needy.

Nothing in this legislation adds to SNAP's eligibility requirements, so not one law-abiding beneficiary who today meets SNAP's income and asset tests, and who is willing to comply with applicable, bi-partisan work requirements, will lose their benefits.

Yet this legislation has its critics on the right and on the left.

Many on the left are crying foul because enforcing eligibility rules, requiring work or job search from the able-bodied and eliminating loopholes will lead to some current SNAP beneficiaries being dropped. Although that is true, it is because there are people today drawing benefits who should not be.

One of America's greatest strengths is that we are a nation of laws. Regardless of the example set by this White House, the government cannot operate outside of the law. We cannot pick and choose which to obey. If our laws set forth a standard for eligibility, recipients must meet the standard.

On the right, some are asking whether the savings and reforms in this legislation go far enough. I echo those concerns, and agree that even $40 billion in SNAP savings seems a small sum compared to Washington's vast mandatory overspending machine.

Do we need to find more savings? Absolutely. But the Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act improves the existing SNAP system and gives our country a unique chance to reform a mandatory spending program and rid it of inexcusable waste, fraud, and abuse.

The Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act is a step in the right direction toward ensuring the integrity of the SNAP program and that benefits are reserved for those who qualify and for those working to get back on their feet. Supporting this legislation is the responsible and conservative choice.

IN SUPPORT OF FISHING GUIDES IN THE EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the government shutdown, middle class and working poor Americans all across this country are suffering, including fishing guides whose livelihood depends on tourism in Florida's Everglades National Park.

On October 9, 2013, nine days into the government shutdown, more than 100 boats gathered outside the shuttered Everglades National Park to rally support for re-opening park waters. I wholeheartedly support the efforts of these hardworking fishing guides.

One guide stated that he has lost $10,000 in revenue since the waters were closed. There are around 350 such licensed guides in the area alone, not to mention the hundreds of employees who work in and around the park. It is time that Speaker BOEHNER and his Republican colleagues stop this charade, end the government shutdown, and let people get back to work.

This shutdown exemplifies government at its worst. American families should not fall victim to Washington's dysfunction. Wrong-headed cynical politics is interrupting the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of American workers who have done nothing wrong. Government is supposed to help its citizens, not make it harder for them to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that Congress must re-open the government. South Florida's fishing guides are ready to work. It is absolutely outrageous that politics is standing in their way.

RECOGNIZING MYKE REID

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Myke Reid for his distinguished service and commemorate his retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU). From the beginning of his postal career as a clerk in 1976, through serving as the Legislative Director of the APWO since 2004, Mr. Reid has tirelessly fought for and proudly represented our Nation's postal workers.

Since arriving in Washington, DC in 1984, Mr. Reid played a major role in shaping important legislation and worked tirelessly as a strong and effective advocate for postal workers across the country. As first the Assistant Legislative Director of the APWU, then the Legislative Director, he played a key role in the development and passage of many bills that made life better for people everywhere. His accomplishments can be seen in the bills he fought for, including the Family and Medical Leave Act, reform of the Hatch Act, and the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act. His career was dedicated to serving our nation's postal workers and strengthening our nation's postal system.

Mr. Reid's accomplishments and dedication to serving others extended far beyond the halls of Congress and the legislative arena. While working, he remained very involved and active in his community. His energy and enthusiasm also carried into his love of golf and photography. He also was a great fan of jazz music and the great New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Myke Reid on his retirement and commending him for his years of service to our nation's postal workers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for the following votes on October 8, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H.J. Res 84, rollcall vote 530; "nay" on rollcall vote 531, and "nay" on rollcall vote 532.

While I am a strong supporter of the Head Start program, I oppose the Republican piecemeal bills to fund the government. Vulnerable children and their families need and deserve critical government services that this legislation does not fund. I continue to stand ready to vote for a clean continuing resolution to end the Republican Shutdown and fund the entire Federal Government, including Head Start, the Community Services Block Grants, Child Care aid, and nutrition programs.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7389–S7417

Measures Introduced: Two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S.J. Res. 25, and S. Res. 268. **Page S7414**

Measures Reported:

S. 1094, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. **Page S7414**

Measures Considered:

Default Prevention Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014. **Pages S7389–S7411**

Messages from the House: **Page S7414**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S7414**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7414**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S7414**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7413–14**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7414**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:04 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Saturday, October 12, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S7414–15.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

IMPACTS OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security, after receiving testimony from Deborah A.P. Hersman, Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Marion C. Blakey, Aerospace Industries Association, Arlington, Virginia; Alan I. Leshner, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and Rachel Weintraub, Consumer Federation of America, both of Washington, D.C.; and Keith Colburn, F/V Wizard, Fall City, Washington.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3285–3290; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 60; and H. Res. 378–379, 381 were introduced. **Pages H6544–45**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6545–46**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 380, relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance (H. Rept. 113–244). **Page H6544**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Collins (GA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6495**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H6495**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:57 a.m. and reconvened at 10:25 a.m. **Page H6502**

National Nuclear Security Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 76, making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 176 noes, Roll No. 542.

Pages H6497–H6504

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Kelly (IL) 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 195 nays, Roll No. 541. **Pages H6502–03**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution, was agreed to on Friday, October 4th.

Recess: The House recessed at 11:07 a.m and reconvened at 1:59 p.m. **Page H6504**

Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013—Motion to go to Conference: The House agreed by voice vote to the Lucas motion to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate. **Pages H6504–14**

Debated the Peterson motion to instruct conferees. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H6514–20**

H. Res. 380, the rule relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and providing for consideration of the resolutions (H. Res. 378) and (H. Res. 379), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 544, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 543. **Pages H6505–14**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar: The House began consideration of H. Res. 378, to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar. Further proceedings were postponed.

Pages H6520–27

H. Res. 380, the rule relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and providing for consideration of the resolutions (H. Res. 378) and (H. Res. 379), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 544, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 543. **Pages H6505–14**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance: The House passed H. Res. 379, to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, by voice vote.

Pages H6527–32

H. Res. 380, the rule relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and providing for consideration of the resolutions (H. Res. 378) and (H. Res. 379), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 544, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 543. **Pages H6505–14**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H6504.

Senate Referral: S. 1276 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Page H6544

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6503, H6504, H6513 and H6514. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BIODEFENSE: RESOURCES AND PRIORITIES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled "Biodefense: Resources and Priorities within the Department of Defense". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT—CONFERENCE REQUEST—TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM AND CONTINUATION OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2018, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642 RELATING TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE'S ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642 RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642; H. Res. 378; and H. Res. 379. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a rule that makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion. Any debate on the motion is pursuant to clause 2 of rule XVII. The rule also grants a closed rule for H. Res. 378. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Pitts of Pennsylvania or his designee and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read. Lastly, the rule grants a closed rule for H. Res. 379. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lucas.

Joint Meetings

LONG-TERM FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the way forward from government shutdown and debt ceiling confrontation toward long-term fiscal sustainability and economic growth, after receiving testimony from Kevin A. Hassett, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; and Mark Zandi, Moody's Analytics, West Chester, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Saturday, October 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: At 12 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1569, Default Prevention Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Saturday, October 12

House Chamber

Program for Saturday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1492
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1491, E1495, E1498
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1496, E1501
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1489, E1494
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1488
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1501
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1495, E1499
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1498
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1496, E1500
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E1501
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1493
Gutiérrez, Luis V., E1502
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1488, E1495, E1502
Holt, Rush, N.J., E1490, E1499
Jeffries, Hakeem S., N.Y., E1491, E1497, E1500
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E1490
Keating, William R., Mass., E1487, E1489
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1488
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1498
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1496
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1492
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1487
Moran, James P., Va., E1501
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1491
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1497
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1501
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1502
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1495
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1487
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1498
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E1487, E1489
Westmoreland, Lynn A., Ga., E1488, E1491

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.