United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013 No. 133

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of my lifetime of public service has been to work on bipartisanship. I have a long record of working with Republican Governors and Senators back home in Oregon. Here in Congress, every major initiative I've advanced has been working to engage bipartisan sponsors and finding ways that bring people together rather than divide them.

But here in Congress, under the Republican leadership, I must say, it has been difficult, if not impossible. For example, there's been a claim that Republicans want to repeal and replace ObamaCare. They've never indicated a hint of how they would replace the Affordable Care Act and protect its most important provisions. They cannot say how they would produce a health care plan that would eliminate the stark specter of medical bankruptcy, which, under the Affordable Care Act, Americans no longer have to fear. They have no plan to protect families from being denied health insurance because of preexisting conditions and eliminate the pernicious lifetime limits which penalize families in the most desperate and tragic of circumstances.

Now we're in the middle of their manufactured crisis of a government shutdown, and they risk a meltdown of the global economy by threatening America will not pay its bills on the national debt.

There are three simple steps my Republican friends could take to prove they're serious and not cynical:

First of all, Republicans campaigned the breadth of this country against the ACA, but they have included in their budget over a half trillion dollars in savings under the act and all of the revenues from the taxes. If they are serious and not cynical, they will remove that money from their budget and show what other services they would cut or taxes they would raise to make up for it.

If they are serious and not cynical, they would bring their own spending bills to the floor for their members' vote. Remember, we still have pending the Transportation-HUD spending bill. On July 30, they just stopped in the middle of deliberations because they figured out that the bill was so bad that their own members wouldn't even vote for it.

If they are serious and not cynical about their spending plan, they ought to allow their members to vote on their own spending bills, see if there's any more support today than there was 3 months ago. Then bring the Interior spending bill to the floor, which has been in committee limbo. The showstopper will be Labor, Health, and Human Services. If they're serious and not cynical, they will have recorded votes to show the American public what they really believe in.

Last night, I was stunned that the final stunt in their ''let's-make-a-deal, made-for-TV semireality show'' was to demand a conference committee be appointed. They want a conference committee on a bill that has already been law for 3 years that the American health care industry and local government have spent billions of dollars to be ready to implement, which goes into effect today.

If you're serious about working on a cooperative basis and negotiating differences and want to have a conference committee, why don't you appoint a conference committee on the budget? The Senate and the House have both approved budgets, and the Republicans have refused to appoint conferees so that people can work together to resolve these differences. That is a pending item right now. It's ready to go.

It's interesting. We had a jaw-dropping moment in the Budget Committee last week when my friend, Chairman PAUL RYAN, said the reason they would not appoint conferees is because there might be too many motions to instruct. My goodness, the House might express its will and not be tightly controlled?

We're in the midst of a manufactured government shutdown crisis with a looming disaster if they throw a tantrum that would prevent Americans from paying their bills. Republicans can prove that they are serious and not cynical by not using the health care reform savings to fund their budget, bringing their own spending bills to the

Printed on recycled paper.

floor and allowing them to be voted on, and then having a conference committee not on a law that is 3 years old, but on a pending item between the House and the Senate: the budget. Sooner or later, the system ought to be allowed to work.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown should not have happened. The Framers of our Constitution designed our system to have tension and differences between the two houses of Congress—that's a given. But after the House and Senate have exercised their best judgment, they are then supposed to sit down and negotiate out their differences. This is the way our bicameral system has worked for 225 years. It is the only way that it can work.

That hasn't happened this time. This time the House proposed a compromise nearly 2 weeks ago to keep the government open and to defund ObamaCare in order to address the epidemic of dropped health care policies, massive rate increases, and job cutbacks that we're now seeing as a result of its implementation. The Senate rejected that compromise by insisting on full funding with no reform. That is their prerogative. It represents the best judgment of that body.

At that point, the differences were supposed to have been negotiated. They weren't. The Senate's leaders refused even to discuss a compromise. So the House offered the second compromise of funding the entire government, including ObamaCare, but at least delaying its implementation for a year to address the rapidly growing complaints that we are all receiving. Instead of taking up the measure, the Senate instead chose to take the weekend off, come in at the leisurely hour of 2:00 in the afternoon on the day of the fiscal deadline, and then summarily reject the House offer, again refusing even to discuss a compromise.

With the clock running out, the House offered a third compromise: fund the entire government, fund ObamaCare, including the malfunctioning exchanges, but at least delay the mandate for individuals to obtain coverage for a year while these problems are addressed and rescind the illegal action of the President that shields Members of Congress from the costs of this law. It's a simple principle: equality under law.

Since the President has already exempted Big Business from the mandate to provide health care for employees, then those employees should also be relieved from the mandate to purchase it. And if Members of Congress can't afford the new costs of ObamaCare, how do we expect the average American to do so? Once again, the Senate summarily rejected the third compromise by the House and once again refused even to discuss our differences. The clock ran out, and the government is now in a partial shutdown.

Ironically, House Republicans have been accused of a ''my way or the highway'' approach, yet the record is quite the opposite. House Republicans compromised and compromised and compromised, only to be met by absolute intransigence at the door of the Senate.

The House has now asked for a formal conference committee. This is the mechanism that has evolved over centuries to resolve even the most intractable differences between the two Houses. Yet once again, Senate leaders summarily rejected the offer even before it was formally made.

The only explanation for this conduct is that Senate leaders believe that a government shutdown inures to their political benefit because they can blame Republicans. If Mr. REID and his followers didn't want a shutdown, they would have been feverishly working through this weekend to avoid one as the House was doing. The fact is they didn't, and that speaks volumes.

Our system of governance was not designed to operate in this manner. It cannot operate in this manner. The essence of a bicameral legislature is for each House to act according to its best judgment, isolate the differences, and then work them out. This is the critical link in our deliberative process, and it is not happening. It's not because of any failure of design, but rather because of designing men.

In his 1862 address to the Congress, Abraham Lincoln set the only course that is open to us. He said, ''We can succeed only by concert.'' It is not ''Can any of us imagine better?'' but ''Can we all do better?'' The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to this stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Senate to set aside its dogmas, rise with the occasion, and accept the invitation of the House to sit down in conference. Let us reason together, and then let us save our country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, last night, just after midnight, you allowed the government to shut down.

Enough with the gimmicks. I'm not up here to play the blame game, to blame Republicans, to blame the President, to blame the Senate, to blame Democrats. That isn't what the American people want to hear. They want us to do our work. They want us to come together.

Mr. Speaker, we need leadership at this juncture. You're the Speaker of the House, and this is a House that has both Democrats in it and Republicans. We need your leadership at this moment to open the government and serve the American people. That's what they want to see.

Mr. Speaker, you must be willing to work with Democrats in this body. We are ready and waiting to work with you. My office is open. I'm a doctor, and I'm happy to work with you on the Affordable Care Act and make this about taking care of patients, make this about the American people. We stand ready to do the country's work, but we need your leadership and your willingness to work with Democrats.

The Senate has passed a bill that will keep the government open. Bring it to the floor. If the Republicans don't like it, they'll vote against it. But bring it to the floor and give us a chance to vote up or down. That's how government should work. Give us a chance, as a full body, to vote up or down. We're here to work with you, Mr. Speaker, but bring that clean bill to the floor. Don't attach gimmicks to it.

Keeping government open isn't about attaching a gimmick like access to birth control pills. That isn't what this is about. Stop attaching gimmicks. We are ready to work with you to strengthen and fix the Affordable Care Act and make it about the American patient, but this is about keeping government open. Do your job, Mr. Speaker. We need your leadership.

We've got to stop playing the blame game. This is surreal right now. This is not an episode of ''The West Wing.'' This is real life. In fact, I'm going to read a letter from two constituents of mine, Matthew and Michelle. This is the real world.

> Representative BERA, I realize you're not the cause of the looming shutdown, but I'm begging you to do everything you can in your power to keep the shutdown from happening. My wedding is literally going to be ruined if the shutdown happens as we are to marry in Glacier National Park on October 13 . . . It is messing up so many people's lives . . . because some elected people in Washington can't compromise.

□ 1015

Here's what Matthew wrote:

> The constant bickering and self-interest rather than the interests of the general public seem to be a common focus for many in Congress. Start working together and getting things done.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time for bickering. We need to step up and do our job for all the Matthews and Michelles in America. They're watching, and they're the ones who are suffering. We need to put their interests ahead of political parties, ahead of individual interests.

We got elected to do a job and put the people's interests first. ''We, the people.'' This is the United States of America. We have to start working together in a united way. Mr. Speaker, let's do our work. We stand ready to work and reopen the government. Bring the bill to the floor.

AMERICA'S DEBT TAX

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, today President Obama and Senate Leader REID got what they wanted—the Federal Government is shut down.

House Republicans made four attempts to avoid a shutdown; all were denied a straight up-and-down vote in the United States Senate. And now they won't even agree to a conference committee to work out the differences between the two bodies, per the Constitution.

Given this ''my way or the highway'' mentality, I want to briefly talk to the American people about what to expect in a bigger fiscal crisis, our impending default on the Federal Government's legal obligations by exceeding our debt limit. Without agreement between the President and Congress in a few weeks, America will default on its obligations for the first time in its history. And I fear that our President and congressional Democrats will play politics with our debt ceiling like they did with going with a government shutdown.

And here are the words of a key player in this debate on increasing our debt ceiling. This was a speech in Congress on March 16, 2006:

> The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Over the past 5 years, our Federal debt has increased by $3.5 trillion to $8.6 trillion. That is 'trillion' with a 'T.' That is money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, borrowed from China and Japan, borrowed from the American taxpayers. And over the next 5 years, between now and 2011, the President's budget will increase the debt by another $3.5 trillion.
>
> And the cost of our debt is one of the fastest growing expenses in the Federal budget. This rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy, robbing our cities and States of critical investments in infrastructure.
>
> Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities. Instead, interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans—a debt tax that Washington doesn't want to talk about. If Washington was serious about honest tax relief in this country, we would see an effort to reduce our national debt by returning to responsible fiscal policies.
>
> Our debt also matters internationally. Now, there is nothing wrong with borrowing from foreign countries. But we must remember that the more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours.

And finally:

> Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that 'the buck stops here.' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America deserves better.
>
> I, therefore, intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Those words were the words of Senator Barack Obama. Senator Obama is now our President. Unfortunately, President Obama has forgotten his words as a Senator.

In his first 4 years in office, he added more to our national debt than all the Presidents combined in the history of America. And now, instead of working with Congress to fix this debt crisis and the drivers of this debt—the entitlement programs, our President is demanding a naked increase in our debt ceiling.

Mr. President, the government did not have to shut down today. Mr. President, America does not need to go into default. Work with us, please.

CELEBRATING THE OPENING OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, well, today is a historic day in our country. Despite a Republican-led government shutdown that was completely unnecessary, we are celebrating the opening of the Affordable Care Act or, as I affectionately call it, ObamaCare.

You know, after almost 100 years of fighting to expand universal access to health insurance coverage in the United States of America, in 2010, Congress finally passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court upheld ObamaCare as the law of the land. And starting today, Americans will be able to learn about the health plan choices and the financial assistance that is going to be available to them. An army of in-person assisters have been trained and stand ready to help Americans understand their options and enroll in coverage that best meets their needs.

Americans can go to healthcare.gov, or in Illinois, where I'm from, getcoveredillinois.gov is up and running.

Now I have heard from colleagues on the other side, all these scare things about how terrible ObamaCare is going to be for the country and for individuals. Let me read to you some constituent letters that I have received.

This is from Gayle Weiss. She says:

> I was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis in 1997 and have consistently been denied affordable insurance since that time.
>
> I am so excited that our President has taken steps to help all Americans with access to health care. It's so fitting that tomorrow is my 59th birthday, and what a fantastic birthday gift. Finally, I won't have to worry about losing everything I've worked so hard for if, God forbid, I suffer a catastrophic health issue. No one should have to risk their future for something they have no control over, like illness.

I heard from David Zoltan. He is 34 years old. This is what he writes:

> One week before Lehman Brothers went under, I was laid off from my job at the time and spent the next 2 years without health insurance. As a diabetic, the scariest thing in the world is to go without health insurance. Insulin averages around $100 to $120 per bottle, and I need approximately three bottles each of two kinds of insulin every month to live. I had to rely on my doctors to help me apply for any charity care program we could find or beg for the very medicines I needed to survive on a daily basis. Even so, I had to visit the hospital emergency room several times just to get insulin when my doctors couldn't get me free medication.
>
> ObamaCare gave me the preexisting condition plan pools as a lifeline until better solutions were available.
>
> ObamaCare has done so much for me, and I'm proud today to see the beginning of the largest expansion of health care in my lifetime. There will be problems to fix, but we are America. We will fix these problems. We will give the precious necessity of health security to our citizens. We will prevail.

And then I also heard from Eva Strobeck. She said:

> I used to get insurance from my husband, who retires in January. I am one of those people for whom it is impossible to get insurance independently. I have three illnesses. ObamaCare makes it possible to get insurance at an affordable rate, which I cannot do without. My psychological medications alone cost about $5,000 per month. I can't survive without ObamaCare. It must be funded by Congress.

So I want to say that this effort to defund something that will bring life-saving health care to millions of Americans, about 30 million Americans who either have to go bankrupt, who have to pay exorbitant prices, or simply have to do without health insurance, who would be against that? Are there going to be glitches in the program? Of course there are.

Medicare part D had news article after news article talking about the problems of this health benefit for the elderly. Let's get on with it and provide health care for all Americans starting today.

THE UNSUSTAINABLE PATH OF OUR BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning. Many in the Nation have questions about how we arrived at this point. It's not that complex. Different people across the country elect people to represent their viewpoints. Even across my own State, the viewpoints vary widely. I probably represent five or six different demographics, different economic engines, different needs. We are sent here to make decisions, to make hard decisions.

One of the toughest things that the Nation faces right now is that we are on an unsustainable path in our United States budget. Those are not my words. They are the words of a specialist, the economist that we hired to tell us such things just last week, notating that what we're doing is not sustainable.

The one side, I recognized their viewpoints, that they should provide more for more people. Other viewpoints are

that we should live within our means as a Nation, that we cannot continue to borrow from the future to pay for the present.

And so we arrived at this budget negotiation, this way to fund the government, the continuing resolution. What should happen is that we pass 12 different appropriation bills funding the government, one unit at a time, with great insight coming from both points of view, both parties, both sides of the aisle.

About three or four or five of those have been passed out of committee. Some have been sent to the Senate. Those have not been processed, but the House hasn't finished its work. So we were forced into a circumstance caused by both houses, both parties that said, we'll fund the government with a continuing resolution. That is, we will resolve to continue how we spent before. Those are sometimes inadequate, inaccurate reflections of current spending problems, current spending needs. But that's where we were.

Now on the one side, the President said, We want you to just give us the money to spend. Our side said, We will do that, but we want things in return. If we're spending more than the Nation can bring in, if we're spending more than the government has, then we would like to check that spending. We would give attention to the Affordable Care Act, to ObamaCare, that we would choose that in order to relieve the pressure.

The bill is unpaid for. We are printing the money to make government work now. About $1 trillion a year is being printed.

□ 1030

We call it quantitative easing because printing sounds so crass to the American public. So we're quantitative easing $1 trillion a year; and yet we're bringing on another program which is unaffordable and which we do not have the trillion or $2 trillion to spend.

So our side said, initially, we will give you the funding for the government, but on our side, we would like to defund the entire program. That position simply was never responded to by the Senate.

In good faith, we said, okay, we understand your unspoken communication, so we notched down a bit. We will still continue the government funding at the price that you, the President, are asking for. And this time, we'll simply delay the program for 1 year. It's not working. It has problems in many different States. We still aren't certain where the funding comes from.

And, again, the President and the Senate remained silent, not even bothering to show up for work for a couple of days before they sent our first opinion back, simply rejected. The second was sent back.

Last night we were faced with another quandary. We said, we'll notch down one more time. We said, we'll fund the government at the level you're requesting, but we should, on our side, suggest that we would delay the individual mandate.

The President has given many individual exemptions. He's given waivers to companies, to unions. He said to all employers, we're going to delay your input for a year.

Last night the Senate rejected that. That's the reason we're here today.

I call on the Speaker, the President, and Mr. REID, to gather publicly in front of TV cameras and work the differences out.

THIS IS A SAD DAY FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for the American people and for American democracy.

For weeks, I've told my constituents that I know things look bad, but the Republicans won't shut down the government. There's too many adults on that side of the room to let this happen.

And now, after watching what happened yesterday, I can barely explain this to myself. The best I can say is I feel like I'm serving in the Nation's largest kindergarten, only we're in charge of the Federal checkbook and the nuclear arsenal.

The fact that so many Republicans are holding their breath because they don't like the Affordable Care Act—Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. The President signed the bill into law. The Supreme Court has upheld the law.

And yet this body keeps voting to try and repeal the Affordable Care Act, not just once or twice, getting the message, but 46 times. And it's still operational today.

What happened last night, in the final half hour before closing down our government?

The Republicans came up with a last-ditch effort: let's go to conference committee.

I serve on the Budget Committee. We have been asking, for 6 months, to have the Republicans appoint conferees so we could have a budget in this country. The only obstacle between this country having a budget and not is the fact that the Speaker would refuse to appoint conferees to a budget.

Last night, with 15 minutes to spare, the best idea the Republicans have, after 46 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, is to have us go to a conference committee.

What are the results of what happened?

Well, one, government is shut down. Thank you, Republican Party.

Two, the Affordable Care Act is implementing today and is the law of the land.

And, three, I'm guessing the Tea Party had a pretty good fundraising week or two.

But here's what happens to the people in my district. People who are trying to get small business loans from the Small Business Administration are going to be halted; $1 billion a month that happens is halted right now, so we can't grow the economy.

People trying to get housing loans for rural families and low- and middle-income families are going to be put on hold.

The Women, Infant and Children program for low-income, pregnant women will be put on hold, after this Congress has already tried to cut $39 billion from food stamps.

We're going to block the Centers for Disease Control from tracking influenza, something that could potentially have devastating impact across the country.

And more than 800,000 Federal employees are going to be furloughed because some Republicans couldn't get their way on the 46th try.

I served in the Wisconsin legislature for 14 years before coming here, and we had our differences, but we always moved on. We did our jobs.

Now it's time for Congress to do our job. It doesn't matter what party you belong to. America deserves better.

The adults in the Republican Party need to take the keys back from the Tea Party before they have to call a tow truck to take the country out of the ditch. It's time for the country to act, and we need the Republicans to get behind something that gets a budget done.

DISASTER RELIEF FOR COLORADO

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, this House worked to find a solution to the impasse over the continuing resolution, sending over various options to the Senate to try to jump-start negotiations to work through an agreement to find a solution to keep our government funded.

In the early hours of this morning, we finally said to the leader of the U.S. Senate, HARRY REID, let's find a way to meet face-to-face, through a conference committee, to negotiate a solution and avoid a government shutdown. We've passed, three times now, measures to keep the government funded and a way to find solutions to this critical issue.

But there are many people in Colorado who are struggling now because of the shutdown and who are worried about what happens to their situation, particularly those who may have been impacted by the flood. And that is why we must find a way to get government funded to find a solution to get government going back on track, while preventing policies that we know are bad for the economy.

So let's work together and find solutions but also, at the same time, ensuring certainty to people who are suffering from Colorado's greatest natural disaster.

That's why I bring to your attention a statement that the Vice President made on September 23 in Greeley, Colorado, after touring the damage and devastation that those floods caused.

I stood 2 feet away from the Vice President of the United States as he addressed the people of Colorado and said this:

None of the Federal assistance that we're providing, none if it is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown.

So while people may try to use this as a scare tactic, try to politicize a disaster, the Vice President himself stood before the people of Colorado and said there will be no impact on flood recovery.

And yet we have seen in the newspaper people are trying to scare people to try to take away any kind of certainty that exists, but you can't take those words back.

That's why I also sent a letter this morning to the White House reminding the White House, Mr. Speaker, of the promise that the Vice President made to the people of Colorado. And we, as elected officials in Congress, in the Senate, the Governor of Colorado, we have a responsibility to make sure that the Vice President and the President keep their word, they're true to the people of Colorado; that we make sure that, indeed, this statement:

None of the Federal assistance that we're providing, none of it is going to be impacted, even if there is a government shutdown.

So while we work to resolve this issue before the government right now, while we work to make sure that policies are put in place to return to normal operations, we cannot let this be politicized. We cannot let the people of Colorado be forgotten, and we must hold the Vice President and the President accountable and true to their word.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letter that I sent to the White House this morning, and also the statement, in full, of the Vice President's comments.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, Colorado is recovering from some of the most devastating floods in state history. Catastrophic water levels caused over $1 billion in damage to infrastructure and property throughout my district and other areas in the state. More than 20,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, eight individuals lost their lives, and overflowing rivers left a path of devastation. I am grateful for the recovery efforts led by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Guard, and others involved in this process. Federal assistance is critical in this time of need and I have fought to ensure that funds are available for disaster relief. On September 30th, my legislation that would raise the cap on disaster-related transportation funds successfully passed the House.

Unfortunately, Congress has not yet come to an agreement to fund the federal government and the nation is now facing the effects of a government shutdown. While I am working diligently with my colleagues to resolve this funding gap, it is vitally important that the people of Colorado do not suffer as a result of gridlock in Washington. To this end, I was pleased to hear Vice President Biden pledge to the people of Colorado that ''none of the federal assistance that we're providing—none of it—is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown.'' This commitment from the White House is reassuring for my constituents and others in the state worried about the impact a shutdown might have on disaster funds. I appreciate your support in this recovery and look forward to working on behalf of the thousands affected by these recent events.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

CORY GARDNER,
Member of Congress.

VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN IN COLORADO—9/23/13

Now a lot of you will hear probably on the national news about the potential for a government shutdown. And it's probably going to scare the living devil out of you. Well the truth of the matter is there is reason to be scared but not in terms of disaster relief. None of the federal assistance that we're providing, none of it is going to be impacted even if there is a government shutdown. I don't want folks that are here in shelters watching on TV seeing the dysfunction of Congress thinking that all, all the relief efforts that they are now benefiting from or (inaudible) are likely to continue to benefit from are going to shut down. They will not shutdown even if the Congress doesn't fund the federal government in a continuing resolution.

THIS IS NOT POLITICAL?

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. The gentleman who just preceded doesn't want this to be political. It's totally political.

The Republicans spent billions on the last election. They lost badly in the Presidential. They didn't take over the Senate. They even got 1.4 million fewer votes for the House but, because of gerrymandering, they're still in charge.

So now they're attempting to usurp the constitutional order in the United States of America. They're saying that one-half of one branch of the government of the United States, that is, the Republican majority in the House, should dictate policy to the rest of the country. They should be the rulers. They can change laws. They can ignore the Senate, ignore the President.

They are making unequivocal demands. They've taken the country, the government hostage. This is disruptive. It's expensive. It's inconvenient for a lot of Americans who need to access these agencies.

I was just meeting with the chief of the Forest Service. It's going to delay their capability of planning salvage and restoration activities on the hundreds of thousands, millions, of acres across the West that burned. They're going to have to stop all that. And then winter sets in, and then you're going to have big problems that you can't undo.

But they don't care about any of that because this is totally political.

Now, we're in the shutdown phase now, but their objective is to drag this out and hitch all of their demands—and if you've seen the list of demands, it's every bill that the Republicans have passed since they took over in 2011 that has not seen action in the Senate or been rejected by the Senate—would be appended to the debt limit of the United States.

Now, shutting down the government, pretty radical. But we are really dealing here with, for short, ''Cruzites,'' I guess I would call them. They're sort of anarchist radical Libertarians who don't believe in government.

They don't believe in evolution. They believe in devolution; devolve all the duties to the States, dissolve the Union, essentially, go to some loose federalism, and we'll reach some ideal point somehow.

It's crazy stuff. But they're in charge. It's not even a majority of their caucus. It's a minority of their caucus who are dictating to the majority, because, with 211 fully-red Republican districts, this is all about politics.

Those people know that if they act reasonably here that they will get an ultra right-wing nut case Tea Party primary challenge, funded by the likes of the Koch brothers and others, very, very generously funded.

So they've even managed not only to take the government hostage, but to intimidate their own truly conservative members, those who aren't ''Cruzite'' anarchist radical Libertarians.

Now, default is unbelievably irresponsible. Even a tiny threat of default, as they did a couple of years ago, downgraded our credit and drove up interest rates just a little bit. But we were much better off then.

Today, if they do this, interest rates for everything in America will go up dramatically. That means tens of billions of dollars more per year just to retire the Federal debt. They supposedly care about the debt. Well, they're going to raise the debt immediately by adding interest costs.

It means home mortgages bump again, stalls out the housing recovery. Cars go up again for loans.

But, you know, they don't really care because they don't borrow money for things. Most of these people are rich, so they don't care. So what if it impacts hundreds of millions of Americans in their daily lives with their credit cards, with their car purchases, with their attempts to get at housing?

They don't care. No, let's not make it political, guys. No, this isn't political.

Come on. You want to be responsible?

What's it about?

If it's about the problems with ObamaCare, there are a lot of us over here who would like to fix it. You came in with repeal and replace, repeal and

replace, 42 times repealing. Where's the replace?

What are you going to do about people who have preexisting conditions?

What are you going to do about kids between 18 and 26 who are on their parents' policies?

What are you going to do about childhood disabilities who can get insurance now?

What are you going to do about the 50 million uninsured people in this country?

Where's the replace?

Repeal, repeal, repeal. And now you're going to append a whole other list of demands onto this. Not political. Of course not. Not political at all.

You lost the Presidential election. You lost the Senate elections. You lost the popular vote for the House; but because of your gerrymandering, you're still in charge.

You do not represent a majority opinion in the United States of America on these issues. Don't do irrevocable harm to our government, our country, our future to get your political demands met unilaterally.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you to all my colleagues who've been trying to work hard to do what we came here to do, which is to govern. It's a disappointment to me that we're in a situation like this where government will begin to shut down.

□ 1045

That's not good for America, that's not good for our districts, and that's not good for the hardworking taxpayers of this country.

But I got to see politics at its worst over the last few days. We put forth a solution to stop a government shutdown. We asked for some simple corrections, simple changes to a law that many in this country—an overwhelming majority—say is going to be a train wreck. Even Democrats in the Senate say this law, as it is implemented, is going to be a train wreck.

Why did we do it now? Because today is the day that the ObamaCare exchanges open. Our opportunity to fix the problems that even many on the other side of the aisle see may have ended today. That's why we sent a bill that said defund ObamaCare, like many Americans want, but avoid a government shutdown.

The Senate said: We're not going to talk. We don't want to listen. So we said: Let's just delay it for a year, just like the President has delayed it for Big Business and many of his political allies. The Senate again said: No, we don't want to hear from you. We don't want to talk. And we said: Let's just delay the individual mandate, because the President and his political allies don't have to follow the law that was passed long before I got here. Again, the Senate said no.

And what pains me the most as a brand-new Member of Congress is when we asked the Senate last night to keep the government open but get rid of their own special congressional perk—an exemption in their own health care plan—they again said no.

That no was a thumb right at the American people. That no cut right through the fabric of our communities in this country when the Senate said they deserve a special perk more than anyone else in America. That's shameful.

That's why we're here today. We've put forth the plans to keep government running. And I believe we are going to continue to do that on our side of the aisle. It's time for the American people to demand governing, not just out of our side of the aisle, but out of both sides of the aisle. We need to demand leadership out of this administration. We need to demand leadership from the Democrat-controlled Senate.

What this has become is politics. It's become a blame game. Who's going to be blamed for this government shutdown? I guarantee both sides are going to be polling on this issue to determine who's going to get an advantage.

Politics should not determine policy in this institution. Politics should not come before governing in this institution. And I think the American people should demand action from everyone, and they should demand it now.

A WONDERFUL DAY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my father used to get up in the morning and say:

> Today is the day which the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

It's a verse from the Book of Psalms.

This is a day I think we can be positive about. All we're hearing is negative stuff and bad stuff, but let's talk about the good things.

Today is the first day in our country that you have the ability to apply for health insurance. No matter what your status is, you can go down to the exchange and ask for a quote and buy an insurance policy, no matter what your condition is. No matter your employer, no matter what illnesses you have in your family, no matter what, you can have insurance. That brings the United States up to the level of every other country in the industrialized world. For the first time, we have joined the countries that take care of the health security of their people. But it's very clear it's going to be uneven across this country.

I come from the West Coast. We call it the ''Left Coast.'' Washington, Oregon, and California are up and running. They have been planning for 3 months how they're going to get out and get everybody enrolled. The State of Washington's goal is something like 70 percent in the first 6 months for those people who don't have insurance. We're serious about making this thing work. The Governor of Kentucky has just said almost the same thing.

There are spots across this country where you are going to see this law take effect, and people, for the first time in their life, can relax and know that they won't be bankrupted by an illness or injury or be able to say: I'm sorry, we can't do for you whatever is necessary for you or some member of your family.

This is a great day.

In other States, people are going to stand around watching what is going on on the West Coast and say: Why can't we have what they have in California? Why can't we have what they have in Washington? And the answer is: Look to your political leadership. Look to your Members of Congress who said: No, we don't want to put a plan in. We don't want a plan. They'll say: Yes, we want to repeal and replace, but they never once put a ''replace'' on the table.

I sit on the Ways and Means Committee, where Medicare and the Affordable Care Act came from. The Republicans have been in control ever since it passed in 2009. They have never put a plan on the table to repeal and replace.

They do not care about people who do not have health insurance. It is very clear. The Governors across this country who refuse to take the Congress's generous offer of full funding for Medicaid are simply saying: We don't care about the poor people in our State. We are not going to provide health care for them. Even if the Federal Government will pay the whole thing, they say: No, they can't have it.

The people of those States are going to have to look, Mr. Speaker, at their leadership and say: What are you doing? Do you not understand what it is to be a human being in this society without health insurance and wait and wait and wait until whatever it is that's bothering you is so bad that you have to go to the emergency room?

The reason some people have good health care in this country is because they have health insurance and they can have preventive care. They can have mammograms, colonoscopies, blood pleasure checks, sugar checks, and all kinds of things that people who do not have health insurance don't have access to because they can't afford it.

Beginning today, anybody in this country can have their blood pressure checked and their blood sugar checked to see if they have high blood pressure or diabetes. They will be able to begin the process of having much better health care and not have to worry about what happens to their family.

I talked to Bill Frist, who was the Republican leader of the Senate, for

about an hour the other day on the phone. He said: Jim, what those guys ought to do is simply amend the bill that's there and make it work. There hasn't been a single amendment brought in the House to make it work better.

This is a wonderful day for everybody.

HARD CHOICES TO MAKE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we're here during—I would not call it historic, because historical things simply happen every once in a while—a shutdown of our Federal Government. It's come because our colleagues on the other side of the building have simply taken an attitude of ''it's my way or the highway.'' That's a wonderful way to look at life. It rarely works in the life you and I live in and that most of our colleagues and our constituents live in back home.

If you look at the Constitution by which we govern this country, it was a series of compromises—big States, little States, unicameral, bicameral. Across the board, there were compromises within that document that have allowed us to try to prolong and preserve this wonderful experiment that we call the American Dream and self-governance. This ''my way or the highway'' attitude that the leadership of the Senate has taken is calling that into question.

The statements made over the last several days by the folks who support the leader in the Senate must make them feel really good. But to those of us on the receiving end of those comments, it is insulting to be treated this way. It is insulting to have every opportunity we've put over there to try to reach a compromise on this issue to have it simply dismissed out of hand, not taken up on its merits but simply looked at and said: Never mind. It's the lower body over there. We'll treat these folks like children. Their ideas are unworthy of consideration and unworthy of debate. Let's just put them on the table with all the other hundreds of bills that this House has passed over the last 2 years and 8 months to try to move this country into a better position to move it along.

JFK said, ''Let us never negotiate out of fear.'' We agree with that. But he also said, ''Let us not fear to negotiate.''

Why is HARRY REID fearing the negotiations? We've got our conferees ready to go. They've been named this morning—all good men and women. And the simple question is: Mr. REID, where are your conferees? Why are you afraid of getting into a room with House Republicans and House Democrats—if they'll ever appoint their conferees—and work this issue out? Why are you fearing that option? You're fearing it because you know that the American people are behind House Republicans in this effort to rein this in.

The core of this issue is the Affordable Care Act. It is without question that this country is on an unsustainable fiscal track. We cannot afford the promises we've already made to each other over the next 75 years. Our grandchildren are at risk for not being able to self-govern because of the spending plans that we've got in place right now. The Affordable Care Act adds a new, third entitlement to this mix. It also is unsustainable. So why would we want to continue this process in the face of the threats that we already have with respect to the spending plans that are now in place for Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid? They will bankrupt this country soon.

We've got hard choices to make with health care. There is infinite demand for health care, unquestionably, and there are finite resources. That requires a reconciliation.

At the core of the Affordable Care Act is: Who does that reconciliation? Should it be government? Should it be 15 bureaucrats in a room, nobody knows who they are, that are deciding what that care should look like? Or, should it be patients and caregivers making some of the most difficult decisions we will ever make in life to decide on health care issues? My money is on the folks in the fight. My money is on the families and the caregivers. They can make far better decisions in this difficult reconciliation process than anything that could be done here in Washington, D.C.

At its core, that's the fight—who makes your health care decisions at the end of the day, and how can this country afford the promises we've already made, which this President has said over and over he will not negotiate with respect to Medicare and Social Security. Where are his plans? Where are HARRY REID's plans for those two entitlements? And now they've taken that same mantra with respect the Affordable Care Act. They're refusing to negotiate anything about that.

It's unseemly. It's un-American. And, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, my constituents are demanding that we fix this and that we stop this shutdown that's unnecessary, but they also demand that the Senate come to the table with their conferees and let's begin the process of working that out. It is unseemly, as I said, for the Senate to continue to dismiss out of hand every attempt.

Quite frankly, those of us on the House Republican side are getting criticized for having to look like we're negotiating with ourselves, finding time and time again we're trying to find some middle ground that the Senate could, in fact, come to work with us; and this ''my way or the highway'' attitude the leadership has taken is beneath the dignity of this body.

□ 1100

LET THE MAJORITY VOTE

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, this dog does not hunt. The cow has left the barn. This is absurd.

I rise today to urge Congress to put aside partisan politics. We are playing a dangerous game that the majority of Americans agree is time to end.

While certainly Congress needs to fix the Affordable Care Act—of course. I've signed on to several of these bills; we want to make this work. But what is true is that this is behind us. We can neither go back nor start again. We need to fix what we have.

Instead of finding commonsense solutions, all we are doing is letting people go home and not respond to those needs. In Florida alone, 90,000 folks are going to be sent home.

Not passing the legislation closes critical parks that are essential to tourism and hurts agencies that are essential to driving trade and commerce. This is ridiculous, and it is beneath the dignity of this body.

We've heard a lot of things from the other side here. I understand messaging so that we can make the argument, but what needs to be done is we need to sit. I sat with my colleagues on the other side just yesterday. You can see the angst in their eyes. But unfortunately, they have been taken hostage by extremist elements in their party.

The time has come to put these guys aside and come to a deal. We can fix a lot of these problems. We've cut government spending. We can do more of it. We can make government more efficient. We can fix the sequester and give agencies more flexibility.

We agree with all of that on this side. We just need our colleagues to step up and push aside these extremist elements, this ''Taliban'' that is in America's core for some reason. It's time to act. It's time to fix this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please step forward. There are many of us that want to find a solution. We need to let the majority work its will. That is what the Founders intended for the House of Representatives. It is the voice of the country. It is the popular voice. Please let the majority vote.

LET'S NEGOTIATE, MR. REID

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to ask the Senate to work with the House because of this shutdown.

You know, four times now we have met here in the House to send a plan over to HARRY REID to ask him to consider to negotiate, to find some solution to avoid the shutdown. But indeed, he made a decision that we would not have an honest, open debate; we would

not negotiate. Instead, one person in the Senate decides the fate of our government, of the American people, and it all comes down to HARRY REID.

When we look at this, we were here until 1:30 this morning passing the fourth proposal—and I agree with some of my colleagues, they're saying you're negotiating against yourself. But we wanted to go that extra mile to make sure that we put forth that final proposal that says: Can we not find some common ground?

Now Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have made comparisons to the Taliban. You know, I don't find that there are any American citizens that deserve that kind of rhetoric and name-calling. It's time that we have an honest and open debate about the merits of this offer, the merits of this debate.

I come from North Carolina. And in North Carolina, we are one of two States that are the worst off of the side effects of ObamaCare. I just got off of a phone call from a government worker who I thought was going to give me a hard time because of the shutdown, and yet she and her husband said that they serve our Federal Government loyally right now. He has served in the military. And he says: You know what, we're standing with you, Mr. MEADOWS, because you're standing with the people.

I think that what we must do is never forget who we've been elected to represent and support. Because you know what, it's not about here in Washington, D.C. It is not about the people that write down the news headlines. It's about the people that we represent back home. And it's time that we start negotiating.

I find it unconscionable that we would send four different proposals to the Senate, and three of them they didn't even vote on. Why is that? Because they want to provide political cover. This quit being about the people and it started to be about politics. Why? Because HARRY thinks that he will have an advantage by shutting down the government, that they will blame those in the House. Well, I want to ask you, Mr. REID, how can you blame someone who has sent you four different proposals, and the best that you can do is just say no response?

I think it is high time that we get together and we work together for the common good. You know, there is not a better example of that than when we passed a Pay the Military Act just the other day in the event of a shutdown to make sure that our military men and women who serve this country faithfully and loyally are paid. And what did we find? Well, that wasn't politically expedient to ignore over in the Senate, so they passed that and it is now law.

It is time that we put the American people in the same focus. It's time that we come together and understand that there are hurting families back home—people that are losing their jobs, people that are having to be forced to part-time, people that truly are starting to see their insurance go away. They can't keep their doctors anymore. It's high time that we start to address that. People expect a difference, and I'm committed to represent those people of western North Carolina.

I think the other part of it is key, and I'll close with this, Mr. Speaker: I'm willing to work around the clock so that we can find the best way to make sure that we put people back to work here in the government because they are families, too. I've got friends that I've met here that I can see, and I can honestly say that it is hurting me that HARRY REID is not thinking about them.

This is not about politics, it's about people. And it's about time that we come together and start to negotiate. I challenge the leader of the Senate to quit giving the cover votes. Because when we put forth something that says that Congress should not get a better deal than the American people, he should have taken it up.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, quite a day—first day of the government shutdown.

Americans come to Washington to see the Lincoln Memorial, visit the Smithsonian, go to the National Zoo. They go to New York to see the Statue of Liberty—''give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning for freedom.'' Go to national parks—the treasures of our country—closed. Services tapered down. No new patients at the National Institutes of Health. This should not be in America. Government shutdowns are wrong, and they're bad for our country.

Now, let's think a little bit about how we got here. We got here because the job of the Congress, according to the Constitution, is to come up with a budget and appropriate monies. The Republicans have had a budget, and the Democrats in the House have asked month after month after month after month to have a conference committee appointed so that we could work with the Senate and come up with a budget. And the Republicans—even though we had bills, letters, requests—no conference, no, no, no, no, no.

Now, beyond the last minute, beyond midnight last night, when all of their failed attempts to get the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—and that's what it is, it's an affordable care act and a patient protection act—abolished; passed 3 years ago; 43rd attempt. Reality: it's not going to happen. It's the law of the land. And one day it will be seen, like Social Security and Medicare, as one of the three greatest laws ever passed by this Congress.

But they've tried everything they can to stop it: defund it, put it off a year, come up with different prevarications. At the last minute after midnight they say: We want a conference committee. They can get a conference committee if they come with a clean continuing resolution.

And what's in their continuing resolution? A budget of $986 billion. The Ryan figures were less. That's what they wanted. It's not what the Democrats wanted. The Democrats want a higher budget. This cuts 17 percent from Health and Human Services, programs the government offers to people in need, the safety net, people who more than ever need SNAP payments, need Meals on Wheels, need assistance. We accepted their lower figure for a continuing resolution. Even then it wasn't enough. They put it in all these proposals and abolished the health care bill.

You know, when the Republicans came to power about 3½ years ago, one of the things they told the American people: We're going to be different. We're not going to have bills that combine different subjects. You know all you people don't like that, these bills with different subjects that come back from the Senate or pass the House with amendments. We're not going to do that. Then they come with bills that are the budget, a continuing resolution, along with abolishing ObamaCare. That's against what they said they would do.

They said they were concerned about the debt, and they have offsets—no bill could pass without an offset; nothing could contribute to the deficit. Yet they brought a bill, a continuing resolution, but abolishing the medical device tax, costing the government $30 billion. No offset.

In the history on ObamaCare, they have been cited by PolitiFact twice for having the governmental ''Lie of the Year.'' One is they said there were death panels, panels that simply said that end-of-life discussions could be covered by government payments, a proposal that Republicans put forward—I believe with Senator GRASSLEY and a gentleman from Louisiana.

They also said it was a government takeover of health care. It's not a government takeover; it's insurance. It's the plan Mitt Romney put into effect, Bob Dole championed, Richard Nixon championed. It's a Republican plan. Most Democrats would have preferred a single payer, certainly a public option. They're not satisfied with that.

Now they're talking about a special deal that Congress people get. Shame on them. I, for one, don't take Federal insurance. I have a different program. But for the people in Congress and their staffers, because of an amendment Senator GRASSLEY put in the bill, they go into the exchanges and they leave their Federal health care plan they've been in. It was subsidized, like employers subsidize health care. Now it is no longer. It's unfortunate.

My time has run out. The government has run out.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, here we are, the government has shut down. It's amazing some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have political amnesia, sort of revisionist history. Let's just look at some of the facts.

The other side of the aisle, the Democrats, took over in 2008. We haven't had a Federal budget since 2008. The only way we got a budget this year from the United States Senate was a provision that the Republicans passed: ''No budget, no pay.'' We had to force them by passing a law and embarrassing them to pass a budget.

How did we get in this situation? And this is a very critical financial situation for the United States of America, for all Americans. The shutdown is very unfortunate, but sometimes you have to take dramatic steps to move forward. We got in this situation because the other side—controlling the House, the Senate, and the White House in 2008—went on a spending binge unprecedented in the history of mankind in any government.

The first year they spent more than $1.5 trillion more than we took in. From 2008 to current, we went from a $9 trillion deficit to $17 trillion; nearly doubled it in 5 years—every year spending out of control.

□ 1115

We put the brakes on a bit. This is about funding the government for this next year that starts today.

In 2 weeks, we will reach the maximum limit of the indebtedness of the United States. We can't let the United States become a Greece or a deadbeat nation. But stop and think, they are going to ask for another trillion—$900 billion in debt and deficit limits for the United States.

At some point, you have to say enough is enough. Now, I Googled last night to see my comments on the shutdown. I put in ''Mica shutdown.'' Sometimes we forget what has happened.

In August of 2011, I chaired the Transportation Committee and came to the floor. The other side had controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, and they could not pass an FAA bill. They did 20 extensions costing millions and millions of dollars leaving the FAA,—an important agency—in turmoil.

Finally, I said: Enough is enough. I sent over an extension to Mr. REID—it was a clean extension—except it cut out his $3,720 per airline ticket subsidy. I am not kidding. In Nevada, one of his airports was getting $3,720.

So rather than take that, we had a partial shutdown of the FAA. Recall that. Just Google it and you will see. I was called the ''Shutdown King.'' For 2 weeks they pilloried me. They called me an ''extortionist.'' They said I was a ''one-man Tea Party terrorist.'' They accused me of holding a gun to the Senate's head.

We did pass an FAA bill. We got an important part of our government working again.

I don't like to take those tough measures. We have tried to be reasonable. None of us on our side of the aisle voted for ObamaCare. The other side voted for it, and they told us that we could read the bill afterwards, and we would find out what is in it. We found out what is in it. We tried and we voted more than 40 times to repeal it. We tried in a reasonable fashion. We sent over three times proposals to do some of the things that even the President has done, and that is delaying mandates. He carved out exceptions for everybody, except for individuals.

So here we are. They don't want to compromise. They didn't show up for work on Sunday at all. They came in yesterday. How would you like to show up for work at 2 when things are going to heck in a handbasket and then reject a proposal?

We can't revise history. We have got to work together; we have got to get this done. We have offered a conference to sit down, and we can get the job done. Sometimes it is tough.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I take no pleasure in coming down to the House floor to talk about the government shutting down today.

I represent the metro Atlanta suburbs, Mr. Speaker; and we got a lot of CDC employees in my district. I know everybody has got important Federal functions going on in their district; but I will tell you what the CDC does is honest to goodness life and death business—serious, serious business. I want to see the CDC open, I want to see the CDC funded, I want to see the CDC making America proud, as it has year after year.

We have to look at how we got here today, Mr. Speaker. I have been in Congress 2½ years and the sad fact is in those 2½ years there has only been one time that I felt like the White House gave two hoots what my constituents cared about, just one time. That was in the debt ceiling debate in August of 2011. One time. It was a crisis circumstance, a crisis like a government shutdown—the only time the President came to knock on the door to say how do you think we ought to handle it, how do your 700,000 constituents believe we ought to handle it, how can we come together and make something happen? And we did. We came together, and we made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I remember coming to this Chamber as a young man. I sat over there, I sat right over there in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. I looked over there on the House floor and there was absolutely no one here. I don't mean not many people here, I mean absolutely no one here. I happened to have the misfortune of being here coming to see the Congress on a day when the Congress was not in session. There wasn't a thing going on.

Mr. Speaker, where we are now in 2013, where the President's new position is, I will never negotiate, period, never, ever; where the Senate's new position is we do not need to have conversations with the House, we have the President of the United States on our team and so we never need to negotiate, ever—Mr. Speaker, if that is what we are going to have here in America, not only should I take my Constitution and toss it out the door, we should just go ahead and turn the lights off altogether. We shouldn't have to have a young man sitting in the balcony wondering why the place is closed down. We should just go ahead and confess that the reason the House no longer meets is because the President no longer cares what the people's House has to say.

Mr. Speaker, I hear it over and over again: it's the law of the land; we should follow it. Now, I happened to hear it in the context of the President's health care bill. I don't hear it in the context of immigration law, for example, where the President just decides what it is that he wants to do, and he just goes out and implements it on his own. I don't hear it in the context of Federal drug law where the President decides, do you know what, these laws aren't as important as those laws so I'm just not going to enforce those anymore. And I don't hear it in the context of the President's health care bill, Mr. Speaker, for the literally thousands of exemptions he has already given to the law because he knows parts of it are unworkable.

Now, we have to confess, Mr. Speaker: America moves in fits and starts. The pendulum swings back and forth. I have to give the President credit for bringing the discussion of health care in this country to a new place. He absolutely did. He brought attention to folks who are uninsured who can't find insurance. Not only did he bring attention to it, Mr. Speaker, really we have created a majority of America that believes we ought to do something and solve that problem.

But instead of solving that problem, the President re-regulated America's entire health care industry. There is not a man or woman in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman representing Americans in the U.S. House of Representatives who doesn't have someone in their district who has lost their health insurance because of the President's health care bill.

If you like your health insurance, you can keep it, was the promise. Do you remember the promise, Mr. Speaker? If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. That promise hasn't just been broken, that promise has been virtually erased from America's

memory because tens of thousands of Americans are losing their health insurance. There is a headline in the paper every day, Mr. Speaker.

All we are asking is for the Senate to sit down with us and let's try to solve real problems that real American families are really having today. For all the knowledge that my colleagues have of these citizens in their districts losing their health insurance, they've proffered nothing, nothing.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, right now before it gets any worse to do better. We should seize that opportunity. We should come together as our constituents expect us to. We have offered that hand to the Senate, Mr. Speaker. I hope they will take it.

UNINTERRUPTED PAY FOR THE MILITARY

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reassure our Nation's military members—both Active Duty and Reserve in Active Duty status and their families—your pay and benefits will continue uninterrupted during this partial government shutdown.

Anticipating your needs, yesterday House Republicans introduced—and Members of both parties and both Chambers agreed—to pass this bill to ensure you will not face any economic hardship during this time of uncertainty in Washington. The President has signed this bill into law.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA trauma counseling services and hotlines will remain open for business. Also, all VA medical facilities and clinics, including vet centers, will remain fully open and operational.

Additionally, yesterday, I introduced a separate bill that expands on our commitment to our military and national defense. My bill would provide uninterrupted pay and benefits to Guard and Reserve members, Department of Defense civilians, and designated defense contractors.

My bill would also provide the President with the ability to carry out other vital national security priorities, which could include funding for military operations or other national security priorities such as intelligence and homeland security.

Our greatest duty as a Nation is to our men and women in uniform. We are grateful for your sacrifice, and we will do all we can to ensure you are treated with the respect you have earned and that you deserve.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a government shutdown—no matter the duration—is a failure on a part of this institution to fulfill its most basic function.

The House has voted to fully fund the government and prevent this shutdown. The Senate dragged its feet and refused to pass anything for days.

We have also used every opportunity to protect Americans from the health care law's most harmful provisions. The Senate leader has been unwilling to allow an up-or-down vote on even the most reasonable change.

The law's medical device tax that is costing jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is supported by both Senators CASEY and TOOMEY and previously passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 79–20. This was part of the House bill. It was rejected by Senator REID.

Each and every day I hear from my constituents about how the health care law is either harming their economic situation or impeding access to quality and affordable care.

There is an appropriate way to conduct budget negotiations and that is through a normal procedure of appointing a conference committee to work out the difference. The House did that last night. We appointed our conferees. The Senate rejected even that measure earlier today.

The American people deserve better. It is time for the Senate leaders to lead.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I just met some of my constituents who had been to a wedding and decided to drive to their Capital, the Capital of the United States of America. It was good to see them, good to welcome them, good to see their smiling faces and their faith in this Nation.

I think it is important to lay out the real facts, for some of us who had the honor of serving in this House and have seen the previous shutdown for the debate over the last 72 hours might give the impression that in actuality there has been no attempt at compromise by the Democrats or by the President of the United States.

Let me disabuse you of those horrible myths. First of all, there are many Democrats who voted for an ugly term by the name of ''sequester,'' which means that it was a ''compromise'' to Republicans to not shut down the government 2 years ago, to take an ugly number that has hurt families across America, that has closed Head Start seats, that has underfunded major infrastructure projects when cities and counties across America in States have been crying out and begging for the fixing of the national highway system long overdue, airports long overdue. But we accepted this ugly word called ''sequester'' because the original team of Members again could not find a compromise—Republicans and Democrats—because, again, Republicans were listening to the far right voices and did not want the government to operate, simply did not want a Federal Government.

□ 1130

So the American people should know that, right now, we are operating under sequester—our staffs are furloughed; we are operating with shortened staffs when lines of cases are in our offices; our staffs are being penalized, and their jobs are to serve the American people, to answer those phones—the desperate calls from around the world of constituents who are stranded, of families who need help for their soldier sons and daughters or husbands and wives, or of seniors who need to be helped or to be straightened out in the confusion of the Medicare and Social Security system sometimes.

That is the work that we do. We make the government work. But yet, right now, we are operating under furloughs. The government, itself, is operating under furloughs, and that's an ugly term for some people. ''Well, let the government fall.'' I don't view it as a government; I view it as people.

So, last night, it looked as if there were no compromise, but you have to understand that the last ditch effort of the Republican Conference was a save face, knowing full well that they had every opportunity to stop the shutting down of the government by supporting something called a ''CR.'' There are all of these acronyms. So, for our constituents who ask, ''What is that? What the heck is it?'' it simply means we would keep the doors open until November 15, and reasonable men and women—reasonable minds, constituents—could have input, and discussions could be entered into about what are the pros and cons of running this government, about what is the value of the government, about how do we meet the Founding Fathers' values and the Constitution that said, We formed this Union to make it more perfect so that all men—and women, I might add—would have the right for the great values of this Nation. But each time over the weekend, there was one obstacle after another. One Republican Member put up a silly amendment about denying women preventative health care when dealing with their gynecological health needs.

I think it is important to be able to know the truth. They say that the truth will set you free, and the truth is that we now have a sense of rebels who really don't have a cause, because the cause should be the American people.

I note that, in my own community, a base of services of the National Guard was shut down immediately at midnight last evening, or early this morning. These are the consequences—veteran service centers, Mr. Speaker, senior citizens not getting Medicare processed.

So you have an opening, my friends, and the opening and the solution are to have a CR until November 15. Then we can address the needs of the American people. We are looking for solutions and are prepared to work for the American people right now. Mr. Speaker, put it on the floor of the House, and let us vote.

SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, we are at a shutdown, which is to say that we are in a challenging time.

My prayer, I think, is joined by so many other Republican colleagues for families that have been affected. It is something that we very much wanted to avoid in any way possible. That's why the multitude of different options were offered here by this House to the Senate, but they were ultimately rejected.

I think that the bigger question, though, in any challenging time is: What does it mean, and where do we go from here? In that light, I'd just like to offer a little bit of context as to what all of this means and what's going on.

Quite simply, I'd say that there is real value—real wisdom—in different perspectives. I don't think it's lost on any of us as Republicans in the House that two beats one in the world of politics. You have here a President who has said, I'll negotiate with Syrians, and I'll negotiate with Putin. You have HARRY REID, who has been anything but wanting to work with the Republicans in the House—he has been awfully dismissive—when what Republicans have been trying to say is, Wait a minute. Let's pause for just a second. There is a different perspective that we are hearing from folks back home on the implications in the implementation of so-called ''ObamaCare'' in going forward.

The first is an issue that, frankly, has been lost in this whole debate, which is the constitutional issue on, ultimately, the balance of power and the separation of power. Our Founding Fathers were very deliberate in setting up a system wherein the Congress was to create laws; the judiciary was to interpret them with a thumbs up or thumbs down on constitutionality; and the executive branch was to administer. But what you have in this particular instance is a breach of that separation of power, because you have a President that is sort of unilaterally picking and choosing that which is to be implemented.

Can you imagine if Bill Clinton or George Bush were to selectively decide the way in which the Tax Code might be implemented? We're just going to enforce it on poor folks but not on rich folks. To a great degree, that's what is happening here, and it is a constitutional issue that sets precedent in going forward, in essence, on the very separation of powers as deliberated and laid out in the Constitution;

Secondly, I think it is a big issue and worthy of debate because, in this instance, you have 1,200 bigger businesses that were granted waivers before, ultimately, it was absolved for all large corporations while individuals were still stuck dealing with the law. You had an exemption for Members of Congress but no exemption for individuals across this country. That idea of selectively implementing, I think, is very, very dangerous ground because, ultimately, I would say a good part of the glue that has held our Republic together for over 200 years has been this notion of fairness, or equity. People believe that you may not like some of the laws, but, ultimately, they were administered fairly, evenly. That is not what is taking place at the onset of the Affordable Care Act, and I think you are playing with real dynamite when you begin to selectively implement a law.

Thirdly, as has been noted by a number of speakers earlier, I would say there are real cost considerations. We are at something of a tipping point as a civilization as to what our Nation can afford, and we are looking at an awfully big, new bill that will come with this particular bill.

Fourthly, I would say we are looking at some real unintended consequences that, I think, are worthy of the pause, simply the delay, that if you're going to have the selective implementation of a bill, it warrants the delay of that bill because, in this case, you have entities as disparate as the University of Virginia, where I went to graduate school, or UPS, saying, We are no longer going to offer health care to spouses and dependents. You have unintended consequences in terms of businesses cutting employment at 50, or you look at the number of hours that one works, saying, Okay, we're going to tap you below 30 hours.

There are very serious, unintended consequences that, again, I think, warrant the House's position of simply saying, Should we pause for a year since the President, himself, has decided to give pause to any number of parts to this bill?

One last thought on context, and that is that the media would have you believe that this is a fight of epic proportions, of epic consequences, of epic nature. In fact, if you look at what has happened with shutdowns in the past—and this is in no way to minimize their effect or the significance of where we are—there have actually been 17 shutdowns here over, basically, the last 35 years. I was here for the last one back in the mid-1990s. If you look at those 17, 12 occurred while Tip O'Neill was sitting in your Speaker's chair, Mr. Speaker. In many cases, it was a Democratic President with a Democratic Senate, with a Democratic House, wherein they disagreed on whether or not we should produce a nuclear carrier or how we were going to fund abortion or how we were going to fund some other portion of government.

So I think that what we have here is a simple disagreement that has ground to a halt right now, but there is a larger context that, I think, is very, very important that the Republicans are trying to advance, which is: how we move forward in a way that doesn't hurt the American public.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the request for conference by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) ''Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.''.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

This is a painful day for many across our land, and the sense of disappointment deepens. May those who possess power here in the Capitol 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.

You know, Lord, what our needs are. Inspire the Members of this House to better serve not only their constituents, but the entire Nation, which looks with wavering hope to them for heroic leadership that benefits all.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

FAIRNESS FOR ALL

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the issue of fairness for all under ObamaCare.

Democrats, working with the President, sought and obtained a special exemption for Members of Congress and their staffs from ObamaCare's onerous costs and mandates. This is outrageous and insulting to the American people.

Last night, the House passed legislation to ensure that Members of Congress, their staffs, and other well-connected political insiders don't get any special carve-outs from ObamaCare. It's a fundamental issue of fairness. But the Senate, last night, voted to exempt themselves, their staffs, and other political cronies in the White House from living under the mandates imposed on the rest of the country.

Time and time again, this President has given special breaks to unions, campaign donors, and Washington insiders. These are breaks he is not giving to the American people. This is one of the fundamental problems of ObamaCare. It creates another way for the government to pick winners and losers.

INVESTING IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Robert S. Pierson is a Canadian freighter full of wheat, trying to reach a Buffalo business. It's been stuck in the Buffalo River for 5 days because of a broken lift bridge, causing economic damage throughout the Great Lakes and its economy.

For years, House Republicans have chosen policies of austerity, sequester, and now, shutdown. They have refused to invest in America, and, as the Pierson shows, this is catching up to us.

In a recent interview, World Fuel Services Chairman Paul Stebbins decried our lack of investment in infrastructure, education, and research, saying:

> Europe has 10 years of disaster ahead of them. China's a mess, financially. The U.S. could be blowing the doors off it, but the worst enemy is us. This is self-imposed. So shame on us.

Indeed, shame on us. Shutting down the government and playing games with our credit is exactly the wrong thing to do. Now is the time for bold investment in rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure, not brinkmanship.

LET'S FIND A SOLUTION

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I have to say, I'm disappointed in the actions of the United States Senate this morning by rejecting the bill passed by the House last night.

The bill we passed in the House last night would have funded the government through December 15 and would have provided fairness to the American people under ObamaCare. No exemptions, no exceptions. Let's treat everyone the same.

And last night, they not only rejected that, but they also rejected our call to sit down and resolve our differences under the Constitution, which makes it clear that if the two Houses disagree, that we should sit down and discuss and try to resolve those matters. My goodness, they won't even sit down and have a discussion about this.

Our country has big problems. Today, our government has big problems. The only way these problems are going to be resolved is if we sit down amicably and keep the American people in mind and come to an agreement.

HEALTH CARE NOW AVAILABLE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Good news, Mr. Speaker; today is October 1, and health care in America is now available for all Americans. Last night between 1 and 2:30 in the morning, after leaving this floor with a degree of disappointment, we went to the Web site. We took a picture. We saw how extensive and detailed the Web site was for Americans to enroll for preventative care, to be able to ensure that seniors don't have to pay high costs for prescription drugs, to make sure that young people, strong young people who believe that the world is theirs can be on this Web site. It was exciting, because as we logged on, it said, We are loaded. There are so many people trying to get on to be able to access America's health care.

And you know what, we have the ability to debate the health care issue while Americans are continuing to access it. And we can pass a clean continuing resolution. That's a good plan.

We understand there's disagreement. I respect my good friends. But America is excited today. Not only is it my brother Michael's birthday, but it is also the day for good health care in America. Enroll. The marketplace is open. That's what America is all about.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I'm calling for the government to reopen. I'm calling for leadership on both sides to resolve these issues. The FBI is being impacted. The CIA is being impacted. The National Counterterrorism Center, which is looking at leads that are coming in to keep this Nation safe, is being impacted. The NIH and cancer research and Alzheimer's research is being impacted. People and families are being impacted.

This is bad for America. It's bad for America. Enough is enough. It's time to be leaders. It's time to govern. Open up the government.

SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to resolve this fight and stop this government shutdown. Today, Federal workers across the country, including at Dover Air Force Base in my home State of Delaware, are being sent home without pay. America is better than this. Many of us on both sides of the aisle are willing to work together to find consensus and to focus on solutions. That's the responsible way to govern.

And I'm convinced that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want this government shutdown either. It's only a small minority of those in the Tea Party who have forced this on the American people. But the

other side has been hijacked by these extremists, and they're holding our government hostage.

It's time to put the people above politics. It's time for the responsible voices here in Congress to prevail. It's time for us to do what's right for the American people, and end this government shutdown.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS UNACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of leadership from the President and Senate Democrats, our government is experiencing a shutdown. American families are faced with smaller paychecks, and the most vulnerable are being denied access to necessary government services.

The American people should look at the actions of officials, not words. The President never planned negotiations, and Senate Democrats left town during the crucial weekend of votes. Meanwhile, House Republicans have passed four different bills to keep the government functioning.

Our country deserves better than this kind of behavior from some elected officials. It is revealing that Washington Democrats have refused to sit down at the table, engage in dialogue, and negotiate a solution.

It is my hope that the Senate changes course and begins negotiating with a bipartisan group in the House who wants to put the well-being of American families over party politics.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Happy sixth birthday, Emily Ruth Wilson of Naples, Italy.

SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last night, this United States Congress put more than 800,000 patriotic Americans out of work indefinitely. That means 800,000 families may not pay their mortgage, their car loan, or their college tuition.

To those Tea Party colleagues who rejoice in a government shutdown, I once again quote our mutual friend, Dr. Seuss. Please listen carefully:

> Oh, the places you'll go! There is fun to be done! There are points to be scored. There are games to be won. And the magical things you can do with that ball will make you the winning-est winner of all.
>
> Fame! You'll be as famous as famous can be, with the whole wide world watching you win on TV.
>
> Except when they don't, because sometimes they won't. I'm afraid that sometimes, you'll play lonely games too. Games you can't win 'cause you'll play against you.

NO OBAMACARE SPECIAL EXEMPTIONS

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

Mr. COTTON. Regrettably, the government has shut down because of the stubborn party line votes of the Senate Democrats.

The House Republicans have acted reasonably and responsibly to act on two simple principles: the government should be funded, and the American people should get relief from ObamaCare. We have repeatedly made reasonable and responsible compromises. We couldn't repeal ObamaCare, so we offered to defund it. We offered to delay it for merely 1 year when the President has delayed so many parts of it himself, yet the Senate rejected every one of those compromises.

And now we have simply said, if ObamaCare is such an amazing success story, then the Members of Congress and Senators and their staffers should live under the laws they imposed on the American people. Yet that is not enough for the Senate Democrats. They would rather keep their special exemption from ObamaCare than keep the government open.

So when I'm asked, When will the government reopen? The answer is very simple: when the United States Senate puts the national interests ahead of their personal financial interests.

□ 1215

TODAY IS A SAD AND SHAMEFUL DAY FOR OUR NATION

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad and shameful day for our Nation. For the first time in 17 years, our government has been forced into a shutdown.

This morning, many of our veterans, seniors, and over 800,000 hardworking government workers, including as many as 170,000 from California, woke up to a new day of great uncertainty.

I'm saddened and terribly disappointed that the Republicans have chosen this irresponsible path. We get it: you hate the Affordable Care Act. But we should not shut down the people's government to sabotage a law that provides millions of Americans with affordable health care for the first time.

It's also a good day because I'm already hearing reports from people back in California that our State's health care exchange is off to a great start. And as a mother, I'm happy and relieved that my own 32-year-old, uninsured son finally has access to the health care he needs.

Keeping the government running is our most basic responsibility as lawmakers. Let's end this embarrassment today and get back to the business of the American people, and vote on a clean bill that will fund the government and end this shutdown.

END THE SHUTDOWN AND PROVIDE FAIRNESS TO ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama will negotiate with the Russians, talk to the Iranians; but he won't come to Capitol Hill and work with the duly elected representatives of the American people.

HARRY REID refuses to work with House Republicans to end the government shutdown and level the playing field for Americans.

The House has made numerous attempts to delay ObamaCare for the American people, just like the President has for businesses.

We also want fairness for all and have voted to strip out Federal contributions for Members, staff, the President's Cabinet, and political appointees. Unfortunately, the Senate doesn't care about providing fairness for hardworking American families.

It's time for the Senate and the President to engage in the process and fight for commonsense solutions for the American people. The government shutdown will only be temporary, but ObamaCare is going to have long-term consequences that will hurt our economy.

I urge the Senate and the President to come to the table, work with the House Republicans, end the shutdown, and provide fairness for all Americans.

TODAY IS A DISGRACE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today's the first day of the Republican shutdown of our government. It's a disgrace. And why?

Because of this obsession with repealing, weakening or defunding ObamaCare, a bill that was passed by both Chambers after full debate, signed by the President, affirmed by the Supreme Court, was a central issue in the last Presidential campaign.

But this obsession with denying millions of Americans access to quality, affordable health care has caused our friends on the other side of the aisle to shut down the government unless they get their way on this policy issue.

That's not how our democracy works. Our friends have allowed the Tea Party coalition within their caucus to hijack our government and shut it down, causing harm to veterans and seniors and Federal employees, and stopping the basic functions of government.

It's time to end this practice. It's time to put the American people first.

You got exactly what you wanted. One of the key spokesmen of the Tea Party, one of our colleagues said, and I quote:

> We're very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

The American people deserve better.

FAIRNESS

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about fairness. Last night, I sent a letter to our Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives asking that my salary be withheld during this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are no better than anyone else in the State of Missouri or the United States. Families in my district and across the country are facing furloughs because President Obama and the Senate Democrats refuse to work and cooperate with House Republicans to stop the negative impact ObamaCare will have on our economy and our health care system.

Senate leaders and President Obama must be willing to work with conservatives here in the House. While our government is shut down, I'm refusing my congressional salary because Members of Congress should not be treated any differently than any other American; and I urge every colleague and every Senator to do the same.

IMPACTS OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Many years ago, during the last shutdown, my husband was a Federal employee, and we were impacted.

My husband used to leave the house every morning around 5:15, walk to the bus stop, like so many Federal employees, catch a bus at 5:30. And my son would have Cub Scouts maybe at 7, or some event that night, so he'd try to be home by quarter of 7.

And then one day, the government shut down. And I can't forget the sense of betrayal there. For all the hard work, for doing the people's work, this is what happened.

And now this is happening again today to so many. This is just wrong on every level.

The reason we have shut down the government is because they don't like the law. They don't like ObamaCare. They don't want all the people who have no insurance to get insurance today. They don't want people who have preexisting conditions now to be able to get health insurance.

Send us a clean bill. If you really want to work this out, send us a bill, take out the ObamaCare, take out the part about birth control, take out all of your special stories there. Give us a clean bill, and we could pass it today.

But, instead, they want to hold the American government hostage.

THIS IS ABOUT MORE THAN OBAMACARE

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, the government is shut down today because Democrats like HARRY REID and the President refuse to negotiate. We, in the House, have sent not one, not two, not three, but four different spending proposals to the Senate. All were rejected without debate, and the Senate has refused to appoint conferees to even talk to us about it.

This is now about more than ObamaCare. This is now a fundamental debate about how we work in a divided Congress. Republicans must work with Democrats. The House must work with the Senate, and the Congress must work with the President.

During a Conference Call With Your Congressman last night that I hosted in the middle of all of this, Gloria Wilson from Corpus Christi said:

> You make us feel like we have a voice.

Well, I am the voice of my constituents, and that's what we're doing here in the House. Compromise and coming together and doing what's right for the country is what the Founding Fathers intended when they set up two Houses of Congress and three branches of government.

We, in the House, are ready, willing, and able to negotiate with the President and the Senate. What we're not willing to do is give up our constitutional responsibility as guardians of America's purse and voices of our constituents.

LET US REJOICE AND BE GLAD

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in Psalm 118:24 it says:

> This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

This is a day of rejoicing. The Republican wrecking ball that was supposed to take out ObamaCare has failed. It was a failed idea. It was a bad idea. And ObamaCare is going into effect today.

So rejoice. Everyone in this country now has a chance to have health insurance coverage. We've been waiting for 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed it. And finally, it's here.

Newt Gingrich said, If we allow Mrs. Clinton's health care plan to pass, the Democrats will be in for the next 60 years, like they were after we passed the Social Security Act of 1935.

Well, folks, that day is here. It's a glorious day. Rejoice. You can get your health insurance.

THE PLOT CONTINUES

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, almost before we finished our vote on the floor of the House calling for a conference committee to address concerns and try to face each other eye-to-eye, House-Senate, to come up with a solution, the phone lines were ringing and a robocall was sent out: while you were sleeping, your Member shut down the government.

This morning, I went to check and see how much further this plan had gone on, that purely said what was done for the last 2 weeks was political, to shut down the government, designed by the Senate Democrat leadership and the President of our United States.

I went to E-Verify. This is a computer program. E-Verify is unavailable due to the Federal Government shutdown. It's a computer.

The Panda Cam at the zoo was shut down. That's a camera. It's not a Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, we offered fairness for the people of the United States, an option to make sure that we lived under the same plan that they do. The Senate rejected it.

We offered a compromise to go, simply, to a conference committee and discuss a plan of a way forward. It was rejected.

The plot continues. Political, not policy, not for the good of this country.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IS WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MCDERMOTT. It is a happy day for the American people because today people can begin enrolling in the Affordable Care Act.

Imagine if you were there when Social Security became the law of the land. Imagine if you were there when Medicare did—and two of our colleagues were, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DINGELL.

But you are here when the third pillar of economic and health security for the American people is being put into place. It's historic: health care for all Americans, as a right, not just a privilege for the few. We'll talk more about it in the course of the day.

But I come to the floor to really address the issue of the government shutdown, an attempt to hold back the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act. It didn't happen.

But what is happening is that our colleagues on the Republican side have

refused to accept their own suggestion. So I come, once again, to the floor to propose to the Speaker and our Republican colleagues an explicit offer to help get the votes for their number, 986. I think it's a number that's too low, but I do think with the 6 weeks that are built into it for us to come to the table to discuss a budget that reduces the deficit, that creates jobs, that puts people to work, that we can make progress.

Once again, an explicit offer to help you, Mr. Speaker, get those votes, because this shutdown, while it might be a joy to all of you who are opposed to government, is a luxury our country cannot afford.

Senator REID, leader of the Senate, has three times, at least three times, accepted your offer of 986. Once again, he will send it back to us so that we can take ''yes'' for an answer to a number that the Republicans have put forth, which the Democrats don't like because we already agreed with the Republicans on a number, a compromise number, 1,058, but are willing, in the interest of the American people, to accept that number as the basis for discussion and go to conference, really go to conference.

Well, I won't even go into my view of what happened last night. I will say, and remind, that 5 years and a couple of weeks ago, we had terrible news brought to us that said that our financial institutions were in meltdown.

House Democrats rallied to support President Bush to stop that meltdown from happening, even when Republicans rejected the proposal of their own President.

Bipartisan cooperation is what the American people expect; and when it is a question of a meltdown of a financial institution, the shutdown of our government, we have no choice but to cooperate with each other.

So in that spirit, I offer a hand of friendship to the Speaker, to our Republican colleagues, accepting their number as the basis for us to go forward to truly go to the table, as was suggested 6 months ago and many, many times in the time since then.

So I hope that, again, in the interest of the American people, the Republicans will take ''yes'' for an answer to their own proposal, and let us sit down and get to work for the American people.

Shutting down government should not be an option that is taken lightly by any of us here. Let's get it open. Let's get to work.

□ 1230

FAIRNESS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, the House continues to send the Senate options to end the current government shutdown, but they refuse to appoint conferees. Every American family has to live within its means and overcome differences. Congress must do the same. I implore the Senate to take the very basic step of agreeing to a conference with the House to resolve our differences.

House Republicans remain committed to ending this government shutdown. It is unfair for the administration to grant a delay for big businesses, but not to individuals. It is unfair for the administration and Congress to exempt themselves from ObamaCare and to grant hundreds of other special waivers, but not allow a delay of the individual mandate for every ordinary American.

We must all live under the laws that we enact and provide fairness for the American people.

TAKE THE RESPONSIBLE COURSE

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, last night, as we were preparing to vote at an ungodly hour, I was receiving messages from friends from home who were concerned about the irresponsible nature of the leadership in this House in taking actions that would lead to the shutdown of our government.

One of the messages that was particularly important to me was from a dear friend who was waiting for midnight so that she could sign up for health care for her child. My friend Ellie's husband died at a very young age, unexpectedly, and left her alone with a young child. Her child has developmental issues and challenges, but he's done very, very well with a great deal of help, and he's gone off to college. She couldn't be more proud of him.

But the truth of the matter is she can't afford health insurance for her family. It's over a thousand dollars a month. She wrote to me:

> I cannot wait until I can sign my family up for health care.

That's what today is about. We need to get the country back to work, open the government, and take the responsible course.

TIME FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that only the American people can drag HARRY REID to the negotiating table. Back home, Hoosiers already know that Washington is fiscally broke; but today, after the Senate pushed this country into a shutdown, they also know that Congress is broken.

The House has sent HARRY REID and Senate Democrats four separate proposals to keep the government open, yet Senate Democrats have rejected each one of them without offering a single counterproposal. It's clear that President Obama and HARRY REID would rather shut the government down than even discuss the real-world consequences of ObamaCare.

The American people don't want the government to shut down and they don't want Washington to saddle them with ObamaCare's tax hikes, job losses, and higher premiums. My colleagues in the House have listened and acted. It's time for the Senate to respond.

I'm hopeful that the American people will continue to make their voices heard in Washington. It's time for Senate Democrats to end their politically motivated obstructionism. It's time for Senator REID and President Obama to come to the table and talk.

HARDER YET MAY BE THE FIGHT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of talk about fairness. Let me tell you what's not fair.

It's not fair for a working mother with one child who works full-time at $7.25 an hour and makes $15,080 a year. That working mother works full-time and lives below the poverty line. The poverty line is $15,180 a year. It is not fair for that working mother not to be able to afford health care for herself and for her child. This is the fairness that we are addressing.

This fight is all about working-class people, not about those who make millions and billions. One person in this country made $3 billion. That's $400 a second. It's not about this person who, by the way, paid 15 percent taxes. It's not about 1 percent raking in all of the wealth. It's about working-class people who can't get health care.

We cannot allow health care to become wealth care in the richest country in the world. One out of every 60 persons in this country is a millionaire. One out of every 11 households is worth more than a million dollars.

This is about working-class people. Harder yet may be the fight.

NO SPECIAL DEALS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my constituents' frustration with Washington, D.C. After a long career in the private sector, I share their frustration. I have negotiated many contracts where I used to work. To negotiate a contract, you need two parties to come to the table.

Last night, the House sent a reasonable compromise to the Senate that

subjects the rulers in Washington, D.C., to the effects of the health care law like the rest of the American people, and provides the American people with the same deal that President Obama gave big businesses and his friends. Members of Congress should not get a special deal when the American people do not.

Senator REID's refusal to talk, negotiate, compromise, and work with the House resulted in the shutdown of the Federal Government. The refusal to negotiate in order to protect congressional perks is indefensible.

The American people expect and deserve better. The Senate must now come to the table.

CHECKING THE FACTS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you how indefensible it is. The provision that said that Congresspeople and their staffs were kept out of the Federal insurance plans and put into the exchanges was drafted by CHARLES GRASSLEY, a Republican from Ohio, who said, on September 26, that he never intended that to take away the employer subsidies that congressional staffers have gotten for years and years and years, like every other employee in America. The Republican who drafted this himself said: That's not correct. It's not right.

The Republicans have lied about health care, saying ObamaCare was the government takeover of health care. PolitiFact said it was the biggest lie of the year. They said there were death panels—biggest lie of the year. This will give them a triumvirate, the three biggest lies of the year. They're lying about their own employees, their own health plan.

The fact is they were the only people in the country to be put out of the plan they were in and had their subsidies taken away. It's cruel and wrong. They deserve health care, too.

DEPENDENT ON THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say ''therefore, the working class,'' but their actions speak more loudly than their words.

The working man just got a $100 a month pay cut with the expiration of the payroll tax cut. The President's war on coal will deny our cheapest fuel and will increase American families' monthly utility bills by another $50 a month. The administration's energy policy is designed to drive up costs at the pump—over $1 a gallon in the last 4 years—costing the average working family $150 per month. And now comes ObamaCare.

Forbes Magazine estimates that medical insurance will average 90 percent more for men and 60 percent more for women, costing families hundreds of additional dollars per month. Sooner or later, these $100s per month add up.

The administration has a plan: break the middle class with taxes and higher costs so we'll all be dependent on the government. But hey, at least then we'll get subsidized government health insurance.

IT'S A SAD DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House has wanted the government to shut down, as it has today. Indeed, Speaker BOEHNER himself predicted no government shutdown several months ago and was holding by that—until he became hijacked by a certain element of his party.

In May of 2007, President George Bush was President, the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate, and 140 Democrats in the House of Representatives voted to defund the Iraq war. In September of the same year, Congress voted to increase the debt limit.

Now imagine if NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats had threatened to breach the debt limit unless the Republicans agreed to defund the Iraq war. At that time, approval of the Iraq war was polled at 33 percent in favor and 64 percent against.

So today is a sad day, in view of the fact that our government has shut down. It's a sad day for workers across this country—especially government workers. Those on the extreme right are happy about it. We read their quotes every day in the press. MICHELE BACHMANN said:

> We're very excited. It's exactly what we want. We got it.

Another Member on the majority side from Texas said:

> Let's roll. Let's go for it.

It's a sad day.

STAND UP FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. DOGGETT. They come every 17 years. They make a strange and unpleasant noise, and then they shut down.

Like those periodic cicadas that trouble different parts of the country, an irresponsible segment of the Republican House caucus has reverted to the old GOP shenanigans of a government shutdown that they've left in some burrow for the last 17 years. That Republican ''Shutdown Caucus'' has taken over the leadership of the Republican Party. They've hijacked it.

But we cannot permit them to hijack America. This is more than a backyard nuisance. It is an attempt to interfere with the lawful rights of millions of Americans to gain access to the health insurance that they have been denied in the past.

We must stand for their right to protect their family and secure their future. We must reject those who appear every 17 years to shut down our government. And we must stand up for America.

SAD DAY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown was totally brought about by the Republican leadership. If you listened to our Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, when she spoke earlier, she made it quite clear that there wasn't any real disagreement with regard to the budget or the continuing resolution to keep the government going.

The fact of the matter is that last night, the Republican leadership could have simply passed the clean Senate bill to keep the government running, at least for a short period of time, if further negotiations were necessary. But that's not what they wanted to do. They wanted to shut it down in the name of repealing or defunding the Affordable Care Act.

We've already been through that. We had an election. The Affordable Care Act was passed 3 years ago. Those 30 or 40 million Americans who have no health insurance can actually sign up today. We should not be going through that exercise again for the 41st or 42nd or 43rd time.

Do not believe the Republican leadership. They wanted to shut this place down. They have shut it down. And I don't see any effort to try to reopen it. It's a sad day for the American people.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1643

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules

on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 70

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 National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum 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) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

(1) ''Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Operation of the National Park System''.

(2) ''United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—Holocaust Memorial Museum''.

(3) ''Smithsonian Institution''.

(4) ''National Gallery of Art''.

(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 ''Open Our National Parks and Museums Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

□ 1645

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 70 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of this important legislation to fund the operation of the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art.

The effects of the government shutdown, which began at midnight last night, are already being felt across the country and in our Nation's Capital. As of this morning, all 401 National Park Service units in the United States, 19 Smithsonian museums and galleries, including the National Zoo, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art, were closed to the public. This legislation, if adopted, would reopen these national treasures to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the American people woke up this morning to the headlines that read: ''The Capital of the Free World: Closed Until Further Notice.'' It's no surprise that the government shutdown has had an impact on real people and on the economy. On our National Mall, tourists yesterday raced from one museum to another, trying to see as many sights as they could with the government shutdown looming.

It is estimated that the local economy could lose up to $200 million a day with the National Zoo, the Smithsonian museums, the Holocaust Museum, the National Gallery of Art, and other popular attractions closed to the public. This doesn't even begin to measure the national and international impact of these closures.

In the case of the National Park Service, 21,379 employees across the country were furloughed today. This has an impact on real people. Families who long ago made plans to visit Yosemite or Yellowstone or the Statue of Liberty found these sites and others shuttered today. This has an impact on real people. I heard on the news about a group of World War II veterans who arrived at the World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C., today and found that the site had been barricaded. That didn't stop them from entering the memorial built to honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense bill, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I trust everyone in this body can imagine how much affection and respect I have for the national parks, that which I share with my very good friend from Idaho. We love the National Park System. I love the Smithsonian. When we have that family night, there is nothing more wonderful than taking our children to the Museums of American History and Natural History. I am so proud of what the Smithsonian offers the American people. The Holocaust Museum as well. You can't describe what happens to you emotionally when you walk through the Holocaust Museum.

But notwithstanding how immensely valuable these institutions are to this country and how proud this Congress is of those institutions, I have to rise to oppose this legislation because it is not the way to do business. By that I mean, the idea of shutting down the whole government, and then when we get an adverse reaction from our constituents, we pick and choose and we open up a few.

What happens tomorrow when the Social Security Administration comes to us and says, What about the 16,000 employees we just furloughed? These other folks got an exemption. How about us? It's going to happen every day with every agency until the Republican majority in the House realizes

that every Federal agency is there for a purpose, and it's a purpose that serves the needs of the American people.

But here we are. It hasn't even been 24 hours, and the House majority is feeling the heat from the government shutdown. We on this side warned the majority that you were playing with fire to shut down our government, but it is the American people who are going to get burned. Now, apparently, the heat has spread to the people responsible.

Instead of reopening the entire Federal Government, which is exactly what we should be doing, the majority rushes to the floor a bill, under expedited procedures and with no opportunity for amendment, to reopen just four entities: the National Park System, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum, and the National Gallery of Art. Of course, the National Gallery of Art should be open because it just so goes without having been said that, I think, we all share experiences of walking through the National Gallery. I mean, you can't find, really, anything comparable throughout the world except, perhaps, in the Louvre and in very few museums—but, my gosh, are we proud of it. Of course, the Smithsonian should be open. Of course, the Holocaust Museum should be open. Of course, our national parks should be open to serve the American people.

Now, if we open these, at least our Federal employees will have a place to visit while the rest of the Federal Government is shut down, but it is so unfair to the rest of the government to pick and choose a very few agencies, which has no real impact on the budget, which is the issue here we are supposed to be dealing with. It's a marginal amount of money.

This is an act of desperation. It's evidence, really, of how politically bankrupt this position of shutting down the government has become—degenerating down to picking winners and losers among Federal workers, just so as to dissipate the political heat, it will allow workers at the Smithsonian, at the Holocaust Museum, at the National Gallery of Art, and only those employees directly involved in the operation of our National Park System, to return to work. Even in the case of the national parks, thousands of National Park Service employees who are involved in historic preservation and in national recreation programs and in construction remain furloughed.

What about the 10,200 furloughed employees in the Bureau of Land Management? I don't have many of them. I have one, but I don't have anywhere near as much of a presence of the Bureau of Land Management as my good friend from Idaho has.

Can you justify the 7,750 furloughed employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service? This is hunting season, but you've got to close down these fish and wildlife refuges.

There are 16,000 furloughed employees at the Social Security Administration who want to be serving the elderly and disabled.

How about the medical researchers at the National Institutes of Health? When NIH comes to us and tells us what they're doing in terms of cancer research, in terms of the research on Alzheimer's and the like, what do we tell them? Are you going to tell them, ''We'll expedite under special procedures, and we'll pick you up? we'll take care of you next?'' Is that any way to run this government?

How about the Centers for Disease Control and the immunization program workers? Shouldn't they be valued as much as the park rangers and museum workers, who, obviously, have earned their value as well?

This bill is a bandaid on a shutdown that is disrupting the work of all Federal workers and the American people who rely upon the Federal Government to do its job. But for them to do their jobs, we have to do our job, and these exemptions aren't doing our job—picking and choosing what Federal activities we are going to allow to operate and which ones are going to remain shut down. It's going to prove itself to be a politically bankrupt as well as a morally bankrupt position. It is not fair to send 800,000 people home not knowing whether they're going to be able to pay their mortgages, take care of their children—sitting at home when they want to be serving the American people.

It is time to stop the games. The Republican leadership needs to let its hostages go and get on with the real business of governing. Let us vote on a clean CR and reopen the government. If we could vote on a clean CR—and if a majority were all we needed, which is what the Founding Fathers anticipated—that democracy would rule—it would pass in the Senate and it would pass in the House, and we would be done with this Kabuki exercise. This stuff is beneath us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond. The gentleman from Virginia is correct in that this is no way to run the government.

I would remind the gentleman from Virginia that we did pass resolution after resolution, and we sent them to the Senate to keep the government operating. Unfortunately, they were rejected by the body on the other side. Now, I suspect that you might have a different take on why that was done. So, finally, we said let's go to conference to try to work out our differences. No, they wouldn't even do that. They rejected that.

So is it fair to punish those people who have planned for months, sometimes years, to bring their families to Washington, D.C.? They've saved. They've put aside money so that they could come out here to show the American people our National Capital or to go to the Yellowstone National Park or Yosemite. Is it fair to punish them? This opens them and keeps them open for those people so that they can enjoy those natural things that you and I both love. There is absolutely no reason to punish them.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman from Virginia has his own time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, the honorable chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which will reopen the doors of our national parks and memorials, the Smithsonian museums and facilities, and the Holocaust Museum.

I couldn't believe my ears when the gentleman who just spoke said that he opposed the opening of these icons for Americans to visit.

I can't believe that you would oppose that.

The Capital City draws hundreds of thousands of visitors from across the country—from all over the world, in fact—every year. To turn these visitors away from the highlights of this country is unbefitting of the Capital City. All over the country, our national parks preserve our rich national heritage and serve as a reminder to all of us of our history and the vast beauty that makes this Nation great.

This legislation is essentially a portion of the clean continuing resolution I introduced several weeks ago. This is a piece of it. With that in mind, I certainly endorse this path forward. To keep these programs, parks, memorials, and facilities operational, this bill provides funding at the current annual rate of approximately $3.2 billion. This is $2.4 billion for the national parks, $775 million for the Smithsonian museums and $48 million for the Holocaust Museum.

While this bill helps to provide stability in this segment of the Federal Government, our jobs are far from done. We can't just fund the government in bits and pieces forever. Enacting full-year appropriations that reflect current needs should be at the top of our priority list. This bill keeps us on that path toward achieving that goal, but it's not the end of the line.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we have offered now three or four opportunities for the U.S. Senate to avoid shutdown. They've rejected all of them out of hand—dead on arrival, they said—measures that would keep the government operating, keep employees at work and keep all of our national activities going on. Now they say, We are not going to talk with you, not even a discussion. We have appointed conferees to confer with the Senate. The Senate refuses to appoint negotiators, conferees, to discuss with the House side, bipartisanly and bicamerally, ways out of this rut that we are

in. They simply refuse to talk, much less act.

It reminds me a little bit of when Abraham Lincoln was practicing law back in Illinois. A young man accused of killing his parents came before the court, and his plea for mercy was that he was an orphan.

I would hope the U.S. Senate would act. It's up to them. The bill that we passed last night—the amendment—would authorize the appointment of conferees, which the House did, and the Senate has simply refused to even talk. I thought that's what Congress was all about—negotiating, working across the aisle, working with each other, working with the other body to find some common path that we could all agree upon and then send the bill to the President for his signature. You can't operate if one side refuses to talk, so I urge the Senate to act.

I support this bill, and I urge everyone to support it.

□ 1700

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I say to my very good friend from Kentucky that that's a wonderful analogy, because this bill is an orphan that you're separating from the parent bill, where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, thirty-seven of 40 National Park Service workers at the Missions National Historical Park in San Antonio have been sent home because of this shutdown nonsense. I'd like to have them back at work, but what about the 90 percent of the Small Business Administration field employees across town who've also been sent home?

Suzanna Cabellero, president of Texas CDC, called this morning, just one of the agents processing small business loans, to tell me that this Small Business Administration shutdown is jeopardizing four of her small businesses that could create 214 Texas jobs. In two cases, the delay may cost a small business person to lose a purchase contract and earnest money. This latest Republican shutdown nonsense discriminates against small businesses; and to some of those small businesses, that discrimination may be fatal.

What if a worker is killed this afternoon in a construction accident? Who from the largely shuttered doors of Occupational Health and Safety will be there to assure that another worker doesn't experience the same fate.

Of course, the shutdown caucus is happy, gleeful, delighted that they've been able to shut down 94 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency. Their only trouble is that they didn't get the other 6 percent, because they don't really believe in protecting, with effective safeguards, the quality of the air we breathe and the water that we drink.

Instead of shutting down this whole government, this resolution says let's just have a little dismemberment. Through all of this reckless Republican maneuvering, it's not only the United States that cannot pay its bills, but it's so many of our families who are out there wondering how they're going to make the next truck payment or the next rent or mortgage payment.

Shut down the Republican shutdown caucus before it strangles America the way it has strangled the House Republican Party.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation to fund our national parks. Nobody here wanted our government to shut down, but one of the consequences is that millions of Americans have been literally barricaded from entering our parks, memorials, and monuments. While it's understandable that some services would be limited in some parks, it's unfortunate that this administration has taken the unnecessary steps of closing off additional monuments in public places.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me the Obama administration is choosing to make this shutdown as painful as possible by unnecessarily preventing public access to open-air spaces and monuments. These are spaces that are normally open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year long. These are places without doors or without gates. Yet the Obama administration is going out of their way to erect barricades and have people manning them in order to keep people out of these monuments. Mr. Speaker, that's flat-out wrong, and it is terribly wasteful.

Just today, World War II veterans, who bravely fought to defend and protect our country, encountered armed National Park Police and metal barricades when they tried to visit their memorial, the World War II memorial. Yet these veterans were undeterred. The shortsighted decisions by the Interior Department officials couldn't stop them from completing a visit to their memorial. I congratulate them for going in, as a matter of fact.

This targeted bill before us today would allow our national parks and landmarks to reopen to the public, welcoming back tourists and families to these public lands that are critically important to so many local economies.

Mr. Speaker, the House has acted multiple times, as has been said, to fund the government, but now it is time for the Senate to act. I support this legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the very distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations Committee, as well as the chair of our Steering and Policy Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this irresponsible and purely political proposal by the House majority.

The Government of the United States is shut down. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are furloughed. Our country is bleeding from 1,000 self-inflicted cuts, and this majority is trying to play political games rather than work to resolve the crisis.

Because the majority has decided to shut the government down, all three of the priorities that we are voting on today—the Veterans Affairs Department, the National Park Service, the D.C. government—are in immediate need of funding, but so are countless other priorities that are not part of these proposals.

Right now, nearly 9 million mothers and children are losing out on infant formula and nutrition support; food banks are being forced to curtail their activity. Food safety efforts at the Food and Drug Administration are being compromised. Families cannot get home loans. Small businesses cannot get SBA loans. Seventy-three percent of the National Institutes of Health have been furloughed, and biomedical research that saves lives is on hold. The Centers for Disease Control has been forced to halt its tracking of influenza cases right at the start of the flu season. Scientific research at NASA and the National Science Foundation is stalled. Federal economic reports used by businesses and investors are not being released. Environment reviews are not happening. Tax returns are not being processed.

The government is shut down, and families all across America are being affected in countless different ways.

On my way over here, I took the subway that takes us from our offices to the Capitol. The driver of that subway said to me: Do you see what they're doing, Ms. DELAURO? He said: I believe in opening up the park service and the D.C. government and the Veterans Affairs, but who cares about me? I don't know if I'm going to get paid. Do you know what kind of stress that has put me and my family under? All I could do was reach out my hand to him and tell him the Republican majority just doesn't care.

It's time to get real. Reopen the entire government. Stop this irresponsible charade. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who represents one of the most beautiful places in America, Yosemite National Park.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the little towns around Yosemite National Park depend on tourism for their economies. They're still reeling from the Yosemite Rim fire that brought

tourism to a near standstill last month.

This morning, the National Park Service ordered all visitors out of the park due to the government shutdown, causing lodges and concessionaires to lay off employees and close. A local merchant tried to deliver $10,000 worth of perishable seafood to the park and was turned away. Unlike government employees, these folks don't get their backpay when the impasse is over.

The one-two punch of the Rim fire and now the closure of Yosemite National Park make this one of the most economically depressed summer seasons on record. While the Senate obviously prefers a government shutdown to negotiating with the House over ObamaCare, I hope they will at least take pity on the gateway communities of our national parks that depend on tourism for their livelihoods and expeditiously pass this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. LEVIN from Michigan, the very distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it's deeply disturbing that someone comes here and talks about a park. That's important, but a park?

How about the children? How about the kids who need daycare? There are several billion spent on childcare and daycare in this country, and you're shutting it down.

What about health research? You talk about parks. What about health research that involves the needs of people in your districts where there's a park?

You're trying to evade reality. The reality is that you have to let all the hostages go, every single one of them. This Republican shutdown is a disgrace.

Here's what you need to do: face up to it, bring up the Senate bill, and let the majority work its will. The only reason you don't do it is because part of your caucus is being held hostage. Bring it up. Most of us Democrats will vote for it, and more and more Republicans will vote for it, and we will end this shutdown.

No more talk about parks. Let's get over this shutdown.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Montana (Mr. DAINES), that has Glacier National Park in it.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support for the legislation that will reopen our national parks in this country, and I speak as a fifth-generation Montanan. I speak also as a voice of the people from the State of Montana who know that our national parks not only represent an important part of our economy, but also an important part of our national heritage.

We're seeing firsthand, as we are listening to phone calls coming in from constituents across my State, the undue hardships that the communities surrounding Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks are facing due to Washington, D.C.'s failures.

As a fifth-generation Montanan, I've got great memories of visiting Montana's national parks. In Yellowstone Park, fishing, spending time listening to the elk bugle in September, seeing Old Faithful. In Glacier National Park, there is nothing like going over Going-to-the-Sun highway, watching mountain goats there on Logan Pass.

But communities like Glacier, Whitefish, Columbia Falls, Kalispell, around Yellowstone Park, West Yellowstone, Gardiner, Cooke City, Silver Gate, Livingston, they're being directly affected by these parks being shut down. They depend on these parks for tourism, for economic growth, for jobs.

I'm grateful I raised these concerns this morning to the leadership of the House, and here we are this afternoon responding to these problems and solving them. A little less talk, a lot more action is what is needed. I'm glad we're going to be moving forward here to open up the national parks.

I urge Congress to come together and provide the funding needed to keep our national park gates open.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1715

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman yielding.

Wow, the Republicans just figured out that their irresponsible activities of shutting down the government for political purposes have led to some unpopular things, like closing the national parks. They saw it on television. So, okay. They're going to try to put a bandaid on the national parks.

What about other natural resource agencies? I'm pleased that you're going to do something for the parks. But what about Fish and Wildlife? What about all of our national wildlife preserves? What about the U.S. Forest Service campgrounds, BLM campgrounds?

Today I just met with the chief of the Forest Service. He is suspending all activity for emergency recovery and repairs and anything for restoration on the Rim fire in California and on other fires throughout the West. And he has suspended all activities on any possible potential salvage. This impact is even bigger.

Then what about someone who has just turned 66 and wants to go down and get their Social Security benefits? Well, they can sign up, but they can't get it because they can't process it. What about somebody who is due for treatment at the National Institutes of Health? They're dying of cancer. Well, sorry. They're not taking any more patients.

So you want to put a bandaid on a few things that are getting on television, a few things that sound good. But you don't want to back off your unbelievably irresponsible, politically motivated shenanigans here about a full closing down of the government of the United States, which is having a real impact to accomplish ends you couldn't accomplish in the last election.

We don't have a system where one-half of one branch of the government gets to dictate to the Senate and the President of the United States and the courts. And that is what you are trying to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this stunt about helping a few people who are embarrassing the Republicans because of some TV coverage is the wrong thing, I'm telling you.

What about the folks in my district? In the Star Tribune ''Hundreds turned away from Social Security office.'' Hundreds turned away—what about them?

Look, we could reopen the government right now if we put this Senate CR on and pass it and then argue about all that stuff you want to talk about. Open up the government, every bit of it.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say we could reopen the government, yes, if we put the Senate CR on the floor. We could also open it if the Senate would bring up the House CR and pass it. So there are different ways to address this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. It is with great pleasure that I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. I also thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his leadership and supporting the natural resources of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate did pass the House CR on more than one occasion and sent it back here. Accept what they had on it; they had accepted your number—take ''yes'' for an answer—a number that even the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, our distinguished chairman has said does not adequately support government in its purposes of helping the American people.

But nonetheless, in the spirit of going to a conference, they accepted your number, as do I. I said over and over again to the Speaker and on the floor of the House more than once, including this morning, that we make an explicit proposal to you that we accept your CR number and look forward to

going to conference on that number. So it has been accepted.

You haven't taken ''yes'' for an answer, because why? Because you wanted to undo the Affordable Care Act. And that was the part of your proposal that was unacceptable. And this is exactly what we're doing right now.

This isn't about the parks. They are using the parks as a pawn. This is about defunding the Affordable Care Act on a day when millions of people are logging in to find out how they can enroll. It's really a remarkably historic day, where people can receive the promise of our Founders—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A healthier life, the liberty to pursue their happiness, and following their passion, whether it's to be in Congress or to be a photographer, an artist, to start their own business, to be self-employed, to change jobs. The entrepreneurial spirit will be unleashed on our country. It's a great day.

So here we are, back on the floor of the House, trying to come in the back window to, once again, go down a path to defund the Affordable Care Act. It's not going to happen.

While we can all sing the praises of our leadership, our chairman, and our ranking member on their support of parks while cutting them off from other services of the Interior Department, that's curious. But it's not about the parks. It's about the Affordable Care Act.

I urge our colleagues to see this for what it is. It's pathetic. It's not responsible. It's beneath the dignity. I keep saying that, but we keep getting further beneath the dignity of what our responsibilities are in this House.

Let us reject this because, you know, they took hostages by shutting down the government. And now they are releasing one hostage at a time. Now it's the parks. Later it's veterans. Our veterans fought for our country, for our children, for our families, for our society. We've already passed an appropriations bill that covers our veterans in that respect. But our veterans need more than what is in the veterans bill. They depend on other services of the United States Government. So if we're honoring our veterans, let us do so in a way that honors what they fought for and honors what they need beyond veterans benefits.

And then they talk about the District of Columbia. I know why you probably don't want to take a vote on the District of Columbia, because I don't know how many people over there will vote to support the District of Columbia. Certainly, certainly it should be treated like any other entity. We would all be in an uproar if our States were treated the way this Congress treats the District of Columbia. But they'll use them as a pawn, too.

This is all subterfuge. This is a waste of time. It's not going anyplace, thank heavens. But what it is is not about what they're talking about—parks, veterans, or the District of Columbia. It's about the Affordable Care Act. One at a time, we'll do our cherry-picking so at the end of the day, we can isolate the Affordable Care Act. We're not going to let that happen. And let's just deal with our colleagues with some level of integrity as to what this is about.

That's why as tempting, as alluring as their camaraderie of opening up government may be, they're throwing us crumbs while they take the pie someplace else. So I urge a ''no'' vote on all three of these suspensions.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the gentlelady, my friend from California, that there is a process. And it's called, when the House and the Senate disagree on something, they ask for a conference. And they go to conference and they try to work that out.

But my good friends on the other side of the rotunda chose to say, No, we don't even want to talk about it. We don't care what you want. We don't want to talk about it. And so they were unwilling to go to conference to discuss it.

The other thing I would notice—I don't know that it is beneath the dignity of this House to make sure that when the World War II veterans—who are scheduled to come here tomorrow to fly the colors and celebrate at the World War II Memorial but are presently barricaded out—to make sure that that memorial is open so that they can enjoy it. I don't know that that is beneath the dignity of this House. That is all this bill is trying to do.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the World War II veterans who today sent a clear message that they would not be locked out of their own memorial. This morning, because of the Senate Democrats' unwillingness to negotiate on a deal to fund the government, the National Park Service was ordered to close many of our Nation's monuments, including the National World War II Memorial. These memorials are not regularly closed for any purpose and remain open 24 hours a day. The government went out of their way to ensure Americans could not access their own memorial.

Not to be deterred, a group of veterans on an Honor Flight from Mississippi showed the resolve that made them America's Greatest Generation, moving barricades aside so they could appreciate the memorial that commemorates their generation's heroism and sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, Americans—especially America's heroes—should not be punished because Senate Democrats refused to come to the table and do their job, negotiating a solution to fund the government. The bill before us would reopen America's national monuments and parks so that we, as Americans, can continue to honor our heroes in the manner they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the World War II veterans who made headlines today and the dozen more Honor Flights that will visit the National World War II Memorial this week by passing the bill before us and ensuring that the memorial will be open to welcome our Nation's heroes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today 30 child cancer patients were turned away from NIH's clinical center because three-quarters of the staff was furloughed.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone here would like to be sure that those World War II veterans can see that memorial. And the way to do that is to put the Senate bill on the floor and pass it right now, which is what would happen. Before the clock strikes midnight, the government shutdown would be over.

Now if the majority persists with this charade, here's what will happen: I'm skeptical that this bill will pass. But if it does, it will go to the Senate, and they start all over again on their mystical magical Senate procedures. Maybe it goes somewhere and maybe it doesn't. Maybe someone filibusters it maybe they don't. If you are serious about opening up the monuments, opening up the NIH, opening up NASA, all the things that you say you want to do, put the Senate bill on the floor, and let the majority work its will. We all know: that bill will pass.

And to the American people, we say about the pain of this government shutdown: this too shall pass.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are 17 hours into the Republican shutdown of the Nation's government, and the Republican majority has come up with yet another bit of meaningless political theater. This is show business wrapped in spin. And don't take my word for it. Let me read to my colleagues part of a memo that was sent out by the Republican leadership earlier today.

And I quote:

> Today the House will begin a strategy of passing limited and targeted funding bills with the goals of being on the offensive and taking away Democratic talking points.

Did you catch that, Mr. Speaker? The Republican goal is not to end the government shutdown. Their goal isn't to come to the table for serious negotiations on the budget. Their goal is to write another press release.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I love national parks. I support them fully, and I want full funding for these parks above the

awful sequester levels. But what about the cancer drug trials at NIH? What about the low-income mother who has been cut off from WIC?

Mr. Speaker, when my kids were little, we used to give them trail mix as a snack. There was granola and raisins and nuts and all kinds of healthy things. But my kids always wanted to pick out the M&Ms. That is what this Republican majority has been reduced to, trying to pick out the M&Ms from the trail mix. Eventually, my kids grew up. I hope the Republican majority will do the same.

We can do this the right way. We can pass a clean CR that has already passed the Senate. It is time for them to put on their grownup pants and do their job.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of visitors every year to the Bureau of Land Management. And yet the entire BLM is closed down because of the shutdown.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, so less than 12 hours from where we were last night—maybe a little longer than that—you've discovered that shutting down the government is not as funny as you thought it was when you came from the meeting in the basement. Everybody laughing and talking about how giddy you were about it.

Let me tell you that since all of this has been about trying to kill the health care bill, I simply wanted to put on the record that this morning, in the first 2 hours of the exchange opening in the State of New York, 2 million people logged onto the Web site. I don't have the figures for the rest of the day, but we are off to a smashing start. So I think you guys are going to have some explaining to do.

□ 1730

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, even after we exempt national parks, 81 percent of the entire Interior Department will be furloughed.

I yield the remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Two hours ago, one of my constituents showed up in person at my district office in Lakewood. She was frantic and in tears. She just received her furlough notice last night.

She's a Federal employee who has been furloughed 3 days since March. She's a single mom of a 25-year-old and a grandmother of a 2-year-old, both of whom live with her.

She works hard, goes to work every day, and can't understand why she has to pay the price for these political shenanigans. I can assure you she's not celebrating like I saw some of my friends on the Republican side last night.

We've got to defeat this piecemeal. We've got real people who are hurt by this shutdown, and we need to take care of it right now and get the CR on the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this legislation. In spite of the Democratic majority leader on the other side of the rotunda's shutdown plan, the fact is every Republican wants the government to stay open.

We've passed several bills over to the Senate and asked them to take them up that would have kept the government operating. And at last we said, okay, you won't go for our plans; let's go to conference and talk about it.

But, no, they wouldn't even do that, wouldn't even go to conference to talk with us about it. It was shut it down. That's exactly what they wanted. In fact, all the time leading up to this, the only people talking about shutting down the government were my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Republicans did not want to shut the government down, and so now what we're trying to do is to open up parts of the government and see if we can get some consent on that.

I would have thought my friend from Virginia who loves the national parks just like I do and loves the Smithsonian and knows the importance of it, particularly to this area, would have been persuaded by the $200 million in revenue that comes in because of the Mall and the tourists that come here. But, apparently, that's not good enough.

What you need to do is quit holding the national parks, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum and others hostage to your desire to shut down the government. That's what's going on here.

You think we're holding the Affordable Health Care Act hostage. You're holding our national parks hostage.

And remember, we've got millions of people that have sat down, made plans to visit their national parks. They may have been planning for 6 months. They may have been planning for several years to save the money to visit Washington, D.C., to visit our Nation's history, or to go to Yosemite or to Glacier National Park or the Grand Canyon. If you've never been there, you need to go to them; but all of a sudden now they can't go.

Do you find it strange that, as Mr. HASTINGS said during his debate, the World War II Memorial is open to the public. There are no doors. There are no gates. You can walk through that at any time, day or night. It is just on the Mall.

Yet when the government is shut down, the Obama administration decided to put a barricade around it. For the first time they put a barricade around it so that you couldn't even walk through it.

We've got World War II veterans planning to come here tomorrow now asking—average 85 years old—they're asking the airline if they can refund their ticket and get them at another time.

If they do it another year, a lot of those 85-year-old people won't be with us. They're coming here because they want to visit their memorial, the World War II Memorial.

But, no, the Obama administration has put barricades around it. Does that sound to you like maybe they're trying to make this as painful as they possibly could?

I think so. All we're trying to do is reopen the national parks, the Holocaust Museum, the Smithsonian and the National Gallery of Art because they're important to the people that want to come here.

Are the other institutions that were mentioned during this debate important?

You bet they are. We would like to open every single one of them; and we will keep trying, in spite of the opposition from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend.

As my friend understands, the reason why the World War II Memorial was closed down was for security reasons so that no one can damage it because there are no employees able to protect it.

But I really ask sincerely, because you know better than I, about the revenue, $1 billion that's raised from the Bureau of Land Management. You talked about the hundreds of millions that come in from national parks. BLM raises even more, and yet BLM is being completely furloughed. So we are losing revenue.

Wouldn't my good friend agree that this is not the way to run the government's business or to operate the Interior Department?

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, as I mentioned, this is not the way to run the government, absolutely not the way to run the government. Everyone on this side of the aisle agrees with that.

But the fact is we have a difference between the House and the Senate. And what do you do when you have a difference between the House and the Senate?

Should it have been done 2 months ago?

Sure. It wasn't. We are where we are today, and now we need to sit down and work out the differences between the House and the Senate, and I suspect we

have a difference of opinion of how we came to this point.

Mr. MORAN. I suspect we have an agreement that what we need to do is to pass a clean CR, and that fixes the whole problem so we don't have to do these little bills one after the other. That's what we need, a clean CR.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all my Members to support this to keep our national parks open so that the families and their children can enjoy these national parks, and we will work on the rest of the government, trying to make sure that we get it open and get around this Democratic shutdown of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 70.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MORAN. 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 motion will be postponed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. This joint resolution may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

SEC. 2. (a) The District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds--Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20–127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) are provided under the authority and conditions as provided under the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113–6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. 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. 5. 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. 6. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 7. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Provide Local Funding for the District of Columbia Act''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 71, District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor today a continuing resolution which is narrow in scope and allows the District of Columbia to spend their own funds.

As some of the Members may be aware, some may not be aware, due to the city's unique status as a Federal city, Congress must appropriate their locally raised funds before the city can spend them.

And despite the multiple attempts by the House of Representatives to fund the Federal Government, we're here in day one of a government shutdown. This continuing resolution provides that the District of Columbia, it gives them their funds through December 15, under the same terms and conditions that they have under the spending bill in 2013.

So passing this bill today will allow the Appropriations Committee time to negotiate a full year's funding bill with the Senate.

Now, the District of Columbia has passed their own fiscal year 2014 budget. The Mayor presented a budget to the city council. The city council debated that. The city council approved, and the city's independent chief financial officer certified the budget as balanced.

So, therefore, the District's locally raised funds should not be withheld from them during this current Federal shutdown. This disagreement that the Republicans and the Democrats are having over Federal spending shouldn't stop the District from using its own locally raised funds like any other city in America.

The District is currently using reserve balances to stay open. However, we can't expect the District of Columbia to deplete all of its cash reserves to make up for the Federal Government's inability to pass a Federal budget.

We've got school teachers out there, we've got policemen, we've got firemen, we've got garbage collectors, we've got librarians, we've got all these city employees, and they're paid with D.C. local funds, and they should expect to be paid for their services. The citizens of the District of Columbia, they shouldn't suffer because Congress and the administration can't agree on a budget.

So this continuing resolution fulfills our responsibility under the law to appropriate the District of Columbia their local funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise, reluctantly, to oppose this bill. While, of course, we support freeing up D.C. to spend its own local funds, a policy we've asked to be made permanent, this is a sham of a process and a fake bill designed by the Tea Party, for the Tea Party, and of the Tea Party.

It's not a sudden concern or awakening to realize that D.C., this morning, needed all this help. My God, to those of you who've been around for a while, you know that I've made an appropriations career out of telling people to treat the District of Columbia with respect.

And all of a sudden, as part of its continuing attack on ObamaCare, your party comes up now and comes with a piecemeal approach to a major issue.

Instead, it's part of a strategy to try to draw attention away from the legislative hostage-taking which is hurting people around the Nation.

Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not point out that this bill continues an unnecessary and harmful rider that prevents the District of Columbia from expending its own funds, its own funds, on abortion services. No other State in the Nation has such a restriction.

Although, I repeat, I support D.C. being able to spend its own money, I do

not know why this is the only portion of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee bill being considered to date.

I must tell you, and I don't know how my leadership will feel about this statement, but I've got to give you credit, because just when I thought you had run out of gimmicks to bring to the floor, this one takes the cake, a piecemeal approach of three bills that do not speak to any resolution of any issue.

Many agencies under our jurisdiction have suffered, or will suffer, devastating problems as a result of the Republican Federal Government shutdown; but you're doing nothing about those agencies in this bill.

The Republican shutdown has forced the Small Business Administration to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. This has forced the agency to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas; but you're not saying anything about that in this bill.

The Federal defenders currently have enough funding to continue operations for a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they will be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants; but you don't speak to that at all in this bill.

The CPSC has been cut from 540 employees—listen to this. The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been cut from 540 employees to 22, making it difficult for the agency to perform its duty of fully reviewing thousands of different kinds of products. This will clearly increase the risk to the public, but we don't speak to that.

□ 1745

The IRS, the agency that always takes the biggest hit during this period of time, has been forced to let go most of their workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, examining questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings. The IRS brings in the vast majority of our Nation's revenue. The Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

All of these agencies need and deserve a continuing resolution so they can perform the many functions of government that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses.

Let me try to save you some time. Some of you newer folks will get up and say: Oh, my God, you are attacking the District of Columbia. No one, except for Ms. NORTON, has a clearer record on supporting the District of Columbia. I have said often enough on this floor that having been born in an American territory called Puerto Rico, I take very seriously how I look at and the respect that I have for the District of Columbia. But this is a joke. This is simply another approach at trying to get around the real issue, which is we need to bring a clean CR to the floor, and we will continue to push for that.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill when it comes for a vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I'm just surprised to hear my friend say it's okay that the citizens of the District of Columbia suffer just because Congress can't figure out how to fund the government.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to keep the District of Columbia operating as usual while Congress works to sort out its fiscal differences. I have to admit I'm really surprised to hear my good friend from New York—and we are good friends—oppose this bill.

This bill provides for the District of Columbia to use its money to provide the services that we all enjoy in this Capital City. I can't believe the gentleman would oppose this bill. This is a clean funding mechanism, nearly identical to what was included in the initial clean continuing resolution I introduced on September 10.

This legislation gives the District access to local funding at the current annual rate of $6.8 billion until December 15 or until full-year appropriations have been signed into law. This funding is solely local and does not come out of the Federal coffers. These funds will support critical District programs that its people rely on—law enforcement, safety, schools, and other essential municipal activities. I can't believe that I'm hearing opposition to this from that side of the aisle—or any side of any aisle.

This legislation will help clean up one portion of the difficulties caused by a shutdown, and it makes one more critical next step toward reopening the entire Federal Government. Let me say again that on this side of the aisle we offered to the Senate three or four different propositions to keep the government operating. They turned them all down.

Finally, last night we said: Okay, if you won't agree to any of these provisions, let's at least form a conference committee between the House and Senate, as is the usual process, which is time honored. Let's just meet in the rotunda, House and Senate conferees, and work out the differences that we have. That's what we've done around here in the past. The Senate said: No, we don't even want to talk to you. And so here we are. When the Senate said we won't talk, the shutdown took place, triggered by the Senate's refusal to even talk to Members of the House.

We've got to keep our eyes on the prize—and that's providing each and every agency, program, and department with full-year, updated appropriations, and ending this shutdown as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the greatest State in the Union, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown. Of course we support funding for the District of Columbia, but the House has not had that opportunity because Republicans couldn't even put the financial services bill on the floor. Why is resuming services in D.C. now more important than extending funding for Head Start or childcare assistance across the country?

Funding one budget item at a time while hundreds of thousands of Americans are on furlough and losing pay is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to keep the government running or to grow our economy. The bill we are considering now is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so reckless throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown.

We could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill to keep the government running, which includes the funding levels that Republicans support and would be signed by the President.

The House majority apparently can't take the heat from the fire they lit, so now they have put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for the Republican shutdown. Ending the shutdown couldn't be more simple: stop playing games; pass the reasonable bill the Senate and the White House have already agreed to.

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

I just want to remind folks that we could have avoided this shutdown if the Senate had passed the first resolution we passed them. That would have avoided a shutdown. If they had passed the second continuing resolution, that would have avoided a shutdown. If they had passed the third continuing resolution we passed to them, that would have avoided the shutdown. If they would agree to sit down and talk, we might even find a way to end this shutdown.

But I just hope everybody remembers that for Republicans, the last thing we want to do is be shut down. We go it. We would like to sit down and talk. But the arrogance of the United States Senate says we can't even talk.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It's very interesting to hear my colleague, Mr. Speaker, speak about that. I wish we had recorded him—maybe we have—how many times Mrs. LOWEY got up during appropriations meetings and said, Let's go to conference. In fact, once, she said it in Spanish, just to please me. That's how serious it's been.

All of a sudden, the big cry on the Hill is, Let's go to conference. But let's not really go to conference. Let's just go to conference and do what we want to do and not what should be done.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Republican shutdown.

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 until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Tea Party government shutdown.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this reckless government shutdown.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, point of order. At what point does this become dilatory activity inconsistent with the decorum of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to entertain proper unanimous consent requests.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's ever dilatory for Members of Congress to speak.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this unnecessary government shutdown.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for a unanimous consent request

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this ridiculous Republican government shutdown.

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

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

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 that would end this Republican government shutdown.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR that would end this Republican government shutdown because Congress needs to do its job and put thousands of dedicated government workers back to work.

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

The Chair will recognize Members for proper unanimous consent requests, but not speeches.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res 59, the clean continuing resolution that would end this unconscionable government shutdown.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a person who we all know has been a champion on behalf of not only the District, but all areas of our country.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York.

This debate is already heartbreaking to me. Every time I hear the District of Columbia mentioned in the same breath with other appropriations on either my side of the aisle, you are casting this city precisely where it cannot be cast—as just another Federal appropriation.

This is a living, breathing city, and the notion of holding up our budget under any circumstances or not distinguishing between the District of Columbia appropriations—a local budget and not one of your 12 appropriations; a local budget—and the other budgets is breaking my heart. It puts me in an impossible position.

□ 1800

I have a greater number of Federal employees than any part of this region. And of course, because I must support this piecemeal approach, when it comes to this D.C. continuing resolution, I'm leaving them behind. Well, what am I to do? What would you do if your local budget were here? Would you mention it in the same breath as the HHS budget, or the Labor Department budget, or the VA budget?

I was here when there was a piecemeal approach, and it was painful. After the District was shut down for 1 week, I went to Speaker Newt Gingrich and I said, please don't do that again for the District. There were CRs and there were bills, but each and every time Newt kept the District open after that. So I'm asking, keep the District open. Don't dare compare us to your appropriations.

I understand the resentment on my side about what is being done here, but carry out your resentment without putting us in the position of a thing, nothing but another piece of federal appropriation that you have something to do with. It's $8 billion in local money, not one dime of Federal money. It shouldn't be here. If it's here, everybody in this Chamber ought to be doing everything that you can to get it out of here.

One hundred twenty Democrats signed my letter—and I thank each and every one of you—to the leadership to say: Free the District budget; don't close the city down. What the mayor is doing now is cobbling things together, a piecemeal approach of his own. With contingency funds, he's keeping the District of Columbia government running. But that's going to run out in a few days. When it does, my friends, guess what happens? We can't appropriate a dollar, even if he declares that D.C. employees are all essential, without running into the Antideficiency Act. So we face default on our contracts because apparently neither side can tell the difference between a city and an appropriation of a Federal Government. I ask you, please, do not leave us in that position.

This resolution only keeps us open until December 15. How pitiful. So we'll be back again begging and pleading? It's on the floor now only because I have begged and pleaded the majority—and yes, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee. Yes, that's what I've done, to say please bring it any way you can, bring it to the floor.

I lived through a shutdown of the District of Columbia once. What makes this most frustrating to me today is that we have worked hard, and now have bicameral, bipartisan support for shutdown-avoidance legislation for the District of Columbia. The President put it in his budget. The chairman of the full committee, Mr. ISSA, has a bill that would keep the District from shutting down and go even further. The Appropriations Committee deferred to the authorizers, but said it believed that shutdowns hurt the District of Columbia. And the Senate appropriation bill has shutdown-avoidance language in it for the District of Columbia.

No Member has come to the floor to justify closing down the District, and I do not believe there is a Republican or a Democrat that wants to shut down the District of Columbia.

So yes, when the time comes to vote, there are going to be three bills. I am asking you to distinguish between the other appropriations and ours so that you know the difference between a city with its own money and a Federal appropriation. Please vote to keep the District of Columbia running until December 15.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the distinguished chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, if I could yield my time to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, she would probably say these words better than I can. But ELEANOR, thank you; thank you for your impassioned speech.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is different. Every Member, who in just a few minutes will vote on this piece of legislation, has the right to vote because we are from States. And every State in the Union is continuing to collect revenue and spend it as we fiddle.

Here in the District of Columbia, it is different. The District of Columbia is the only place here in the United States in which full citizens—undeniably citizens of the United States, with every right and privilege, including voting in every Presidential election—find themselves shut down if we don't pass a budget, if we don't pass appropriations.

Now, I heard the gentleman from New York, regrettably, lump in this bill with his opinion as though all three were the same. First of all, this is not a Tea Party bill. This is a bill inspired by both the majority and minority, under Ms. NORTON's leadership, to come up with a solution similar to what we came up with 17 years ago for the District. This is also inspired by a similar bill that is sitting in the Senate that wants to accomplish the same thing.

This is not Tea Party. As a matter of fact, the easiest thing to do, if you want to be strident, would be in fact to shut down the District. But every one of us who knows that, back home, our States and our cities continue to operate with their own funds knows that we have an obligation to allow the District of Columbia to spend their own funds.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CRENSHAW, and the chairman of the full committee for bringing this quickly to the floor.

Some months ago, we passed H.R. 2793, which would address this on a permanent basis, finding a way for—anytime this happens—the District of Columbia to continue spending its own money, and to plan their budget around the possibility that they would be offering jobs to teachers and so on during a time different than our budget year. I hope to have that bill on the floor in the reasonably near future.

But today, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Chairman DARRELL ISSA, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and all of us on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have already voted for this and more. And the Senate has supported this and more.

So you're not looking at the same as the other bills. Not one penny of appropriated funds actually is being determined today. We're talking about the money from the parking meters. We're talking about the money from property taxes. We're talking about the work that Mayor Gray and the city council do every day like the mayors of our city.

I talked to the mayor today, and he said: I don't know what you're going to do, but please do something. Mayor Gray deserves to have his funds overseen—because it's a Federal city? Yes. But kidnapped? No.

This is a narrow bill; it is not what I want to achieve for the District of Columbia. But it is in fact what gets us from now to December.

So I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle—and I will work my side of the aisle, and ELEANOR, I know you're not leaving the floor on this one—we have to pass this overwhelmingly because we're talking about the same right to spend their own money as every city in America has, every country in America, and every State in America. And as Americans, we can do no less for the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, the politricks have to stop. The politricks have to stop.

Today, I looked at one of my leading New York papers and this is the headline. This is what they are thinking of this House. The politricks have to stop. The divide and conquer mentality has to stop.

Why is it politricks? Look at what's really taking place here today and has been taking place over the last few days. We should be just, as other Congresses have done, passing a clean CR bill so that we can continue the government moving. But what do we do? We bring up issues that have nothing to do with the continuing resolution.

The first trick: repeal the Affordable Care Act. The second trick: delay the Affordable Care Act. The trick after that: delay the individual mandate. Then next you hear something: end the medical device tax. Then the next thing is: go to conference—something that Democrats have been asking for on budgetary issues since April. And now this piecemeal approach.

It's politricks, folks. It's divide and conquer. It's trying to take key issues from key individuals and make them decide whether you want to go this way or that way. It's making individuals try to decide in the Federal Government who is more important than the others.

You've got individuals working in the same divisions; some won't get paid, others will get paid. It's a divide and conquer mentality that could destroy the Nation. This Nation is supposed to be one together. United we stand. Don't divide this country. Don't pick winners and losers. Send all of Americans back to work.

Eight hundred thousand did not work today. Don't just pick a few and say you should go back to work. All of them should go back to work. They are all American citizens.

Let all of Americans free. Don't hold them in bondage, don't keep them back. Free them all. Don't go piece by piece. They all want the same thing. Their bills have to be paid.

I have to tell some of mine on my staff, for example: If you happen to get sick, you can't get paid. That's not what this country is supposed to be about.

The world is looking at us. We travel the world trying to show examples of democracy every place else, yet we're undercutting the greatest democracy in the world today over the last couple of days. We've got procedures that were put in place by the Founding Fathers. We are undercutting how they said we should do it.

Let's not divide. Let's bring this Nation back together. Let's send all of our workers back to work. Let's have a clean CR bill, and let's vote on that.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SERRANO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Because of the demands of extremists in Congress, today, in communities across our country crucial services have halted. Hundreds of thousands of middle class employees have been told

to stay home without pay. All because Congress has failed to carry out the most basic of its constitutional duties—to keep this government funded.

The bills we will be considering tonight will not fix the government shutdown. I am the first to support our military men and women and our veterans. Ensuring our citizens have access to their national parks is a priority. And I am a cosigner of the letter for the gentlelady from the District of Columbia asking for the city to be able to continue to be open and do its work. However, this piecemeal approach will only prolong a shutdown.

We cannot keep government running piece by piece. All—not just some—of my constituents deserve service.

I urge the House leadership to end the shutdown today by passing the continuing resolution that was approved by the Senate, and then get together to conference on a long-term budget that reduces deficit reduction and creates jobs.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, just to inform the gentleman, I am the last speaker. We have no further speakers.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I know I've already spoken, but as I talked to my friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the delegate made an impassioned plea to me, and it needs to be said.

We need to pass this. We need to pass this to show that we can in fact—maybe not agree on everything, maybe not agree on appropriations, but we need to pass this because the District deserves not to be held hostage in our fight. I will whip every Republican to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

I can't say that I'm going to intervene in everything that we do, but this one is important. I would ask all of us to really search our soul and say: Is the District of Columbia and their own funds the place we should be having an argument, or can we at least admit that if we get above the fray here today—the Senate has already gotten above it.

□ 1815

A similar bill has already been hotlined. This is not where the House and the Senate disagree and, as a result, it should not be where we fail to come together.

I ask all my friends to join with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and me and pass this bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is not an easy time. You would hate to think that 23 years of agreeing with Ms. NORTON on the issue of the D.C. budget and how we should treat D.C. goes up in smoke in one afternoon. We have never disagreed, and I know that starting in about 30 seconds or 1 minute or 2 minutes, we won't disagree again.

But we also cannot be ignorant of the fact that this is a sham, that this is part of a trick. It is a good trick; it is one that sells. In fact, the results may show that it is one that sells, but it is still a trick. It is a trick still to get at ObamaCare on the day that it starts to take place all over this country. It is still a trick to keep the government closed. It is a trick to say that we will single out certain people, certain monuments, certain areas, certain needs, but not others.

It is easy for me personally to say ''yes'' to this bill on the District of Columbia. But I also know that in another territory or in another place without congressional representation, they had to close down this morning the WIC offices because there are no people to be able to run that office. In other parts that do have representation, they had to close down areas of services where people need those services.

We know what the game is. I know it is not easy for some of us to get up and oppose certain things, but we have to. We have to because if we continue to allow the House to be run by a Member of the other body, we will never get anywhere. It is funny how much time we spend among ourselves knocking the other body, and yet we have a situation now where a Member of the other body is telling everybody over here what to do on one side. That's the problem we have.

As painful as this is for me and as difficult as it will be to stay out of the way of Ms. NORTON for the next day or two, I still think that the proper vote here is a ''no'' vote because we need a clean CR and we need a full approach, not a piecemeal approach.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a bill that talks about the most unique city in our country, the District of Columbia. It is a Federal city. It is unlike any other city in the USA. Because of that uniqueness, we have to appropriate the local funds that are going to be used.

The gentlewoman from the District has made an impassioned plea—a very clear and reasoned plea—as to why we need to pass this legislation. There are school teachers, there are police officers, there are folks that are picking up the garbage, there are people that work in the libraries, and they are working and they need to be paid for their services.

We shouldn't penalize the people of the District of Columbia because we can't come to some conclusion on our spending bills. We don't have to be here, Mr. Speaker. We have had ample opportunity.

As you know, this House has sent continuing resolutions to the Senate not once, not twice, but three times. Each time the answer was ''no.'' Now we simply ask for a conversation, for a reasoned discussion, about how we can end this shutdown. Once again, the answer is ''no.''

It is disappointing, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am sure we are all a little bit angry, but we're here. The least we can do is pass this resolution. It fulfills our responsibility under the law. It appropriates to the District of Columbia the funds that they have raised locally. It is the right thing to do, and I urge the adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the House Republicans' piecemeal Continuing Resolution to fund the District of Columbia Government during the shutdown they inflicted yesterday on our Nation.

This body would do the District of Columbia a great service by allowing its esteemed and very knowledgeable Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON a vote in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia had an estimated population of 632,323 in 2012. The state of Wyoming with 2 Senators and a voting member of the House of Representatives had a population of 576,412 in 2012.

It is the 24th most populous place in the United States.

The Washington Metropolitan Area, of which the District is a part, has a population of 5.7 million, the seventh-largest metropolitan area in the country.

Perhaps this is the day that members of the majority decided they wanted to do a little something for people they could see every day of the legislative work week. But our job is to look out for the interest of everyone in the Nation—those we can see as well as the hundreds of millions who we cannot see.

Urban areas around the Nation need exactly, or perhaps in some cases more than, the assistance we would be providing to the District of Columbia though this CR, but they will not be helped unless we pass the Senate's Clean CR.

The House should take up the clean Senate Continuing Resolution to fund the entire government.

If we only fund what the House majority wants then they will have no need to worry about funding the parts of the government that they do not like, which includes the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Labor, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Review Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, negotiation requires honest compromise and knowing what not to ask the other party to give up. The majority knows that the Affordable Care Act is non-negotiable for the President, the Senate, or the overwhelming majority of Americans who supported it in the past and who are supporting it today by joining the Healthcare Marketplace health plans.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the Federal Government are paid and that important things like our parks are open and our children are fed.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on reopening the government as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 71.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VETERANS BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

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 veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Amounts are provided for entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113–6), to continue activities at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 103(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 103, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 103(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 102. Amounts are provided for ''Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'' at a rate for operations of $2,455,490,000: *Provided,* That such amount shall be made available subject to the authority and conditions as provided under the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113–6) and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by such 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. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Joint Resolution 72, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Throughout human history, whenever there has been disagreement in ages, ages past, that has been settled with armed conflict. But in a civilized world, we settle those disputes in an amicable way under the law.

In this remarkable House Chamber, we are surrounded by images of great lawmakers from throughout human history. It is, I think, incumbent upon us as lawmakers, as civilized human beings, to use a little common courtesy and common sense to find areas of agreement and set those aside, get those behind us, and then move on to those areas where it is more difficult to find agreement.

In the House of Representatives, the constitutional conservative majority in the House has attempted to do so many times here over the last several weeks. When it comes to funding the government, the House of Representatives has sought to do so and, in fact, has done our job.

In the first week of June, the House of Representatives passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Defense. In the first week of June, the House of Representatives passed legislation to fully fund our Department of Veterans Affairs and Military Construction requirements of our men and women in uniform around the world.

We also made sure in the first month of the summer that the House of Representatives passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and sent that to the Senate as well. We have even passed an appropriations bill to fund the departments of the government that are responsible for the Department of Energy and the Department of Water. That legislation was also passed out of the House this summer and sent to the Senate.

It is common courtesy and just common sense that where you have a disagreement, you sit down and you work it out. If you've got serious disagreements, you, again, find those areas where both sides can agree there is common ground and put those behind us.

What better place to start, Mr. Speaker, than with the veterans who have served our Nation in defense of our freedom who make it possible for us to enjoy the prosperity, the liberty passed on to us by our ancestors. It is a real privilege for me to serve with my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and my colleagues on this subcommittee for appropriating funds for the operation of the Veterans Affairs and Military Construction to be sure that our veterans receive everything that they have earned for the sacrifices they have made on behalf of this Nation.

So we have brought the bill to the floor today as an obvious area of agreement in support of our veterans to ensure that not only are their health benefits taken care of, which under current law they are a year in advance, but we are here today to ensure, to absolutely guarantee, that there is no interruption to the veterans who are applying for disability compensation.

We have had a terrible backlog in disability claims that the committee has worked together arm in arm in a bipartisan way to ensure that it is fully funded. We included in our bill, which was sent to the Senate in the first week of June, language that would ensure that the Veterans Administration lives up to their own deadlines on handling those disability claims.

But the legislation before us today would also ensure that veterans receive on-time compensation for their pensions, for their post-9/11 education training, and employment assistance. Again, common courtesy and common sense compels us to do what is right by our veterans to find those areas of agreement.

We bring this bill to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that these veterans are fully protected, that they have a transition into civilian life that is as easy as humanly possible, and that they don't encounter any delays as they move into civilian life.

This bill, as the other does, provides funding through December 15 for VA disability claims, education, and employment benefits and provides $2.5 billion for claims processing to make sure that we are getting at the claims backlog.

I look forward to hearing from my colleague from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This, I believe, is really a fraud. This is just a part of the simple game that has been played to justify keeping this government shut. The proposed rate of $2.5 billion is the same amount provided in the House-passed MilCon-VA bill earlier this summer, which passed

421–4. It is the same funding request level by the administration.

This CR does not touch or do anything for the remaining VA discretionary accounts. In fact, the CR fails to include $155 million for the Veterans Benefits Management System. It fails to include $136 million for the Veterans Claims Intake Program. These two programs are vital to speeding up the claims process; yet they are not included.

The medical research account, not included; construction, major and minor, not included; Office of the Secretary, including the Board of Veterans Appeals, $438 million, not included; the VA Office of Inspector General, $116 million, not included; the VA IT, $13.68 billion, not included; grants to State veterans homes, to State cemeteries, the National Cemetery Administration, not included.

On June 4, we passed a full bill, a complete bill, a bipartisan bill 421–4. Mr. Speaker, if this measure goes on to become law, which I doubt that it will, a majority of the Federal Government will still be shut down.

For example, the Department of Defense will not have the materiel support needed to conduct training to ensure their readiness for the forces at home. Regular training exercises, including large-scale training rotations, depend on equipment that is in proper working order, facilities that have been properly maintained, and supplies needed to support the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in their training efforts.

Under this bill, pay would still be denied to more than 42,500 fellow law enforcement agencies and correctional workers at the Department of Justice, 4,000 weather forecasters and other National Weather Service employees. On extreme weather events, we won't have employees to protect us.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we don't have the luxury to pick and choose which parts of the Federal Government we want to fund. It is our responsibility under the Constitution to fund the entire Federal Government. Let me repeat: the entire Federal Government. So, instead of playing games, let the House of Representatives vote on a clean Senate CR and end this shutdown very quickly.

I am disappointed. I am downright disgusted. I truly resent the way that those on the other side of the aisle are trying to use veterans as pawns in this cynical game of government shutdown. All we have to do is pass a clean CR. This CR—this budget—should not be a Democrat CR, and it should not be a Republican CR. It should be an American CR for all of us. I urge that we defeat this cynical effort and that we adopt a full, clean CR.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and in support of continuing to provide our Nation's veterans with the important benefits they have earned for their service and their sacrifices. I am shocked to hear our friends on the other side of the aisle who are unwilling to help our veterans receive the benefits that they have earned in the defense of our Nation. For their unwavering commitment to this Nation, our veterans deserve to receive consistent, quality service and disability benefits. Any lapse in these services for our heroes is a failure on our part to do our jobs as Members of Congress.

I would like to remind the House that the language in this bill was essentially included in the clean continuing resolution I initially offered several weeks ago. For that reason, as well as my dedication to our veterans, I am happy to endorse this bill today.

The legislation before us continues funding to process and deliver disability claims and services at the Department of Veterans Affairs for those who have served in our Armed Forces, at the current annual rate of approximately $82 billion. The funding will last until December 15 or until we enact full-year appropriations.

In addition to providing for our former servicemen and -women, this bill will continue to move the ball down the field, closer to our ultimate goal of funding the entire government. Conversations must continue on how we as an entire Congress can come to an agreement that funds every agency and department, that ends this shutdown and reopens the government.

That's why I was so disappointed this morning when the U.S. Senate declared that they didn't want to meet with us to talk about how to end this shutdown. We offered to sit down and talk in a conference committee. The Senate at 9:30 brusquely says, No way. We don't want to talk to you. I thought that's what Congress was all about, was working out differences from this body across to the Senate, but, apparently, I am wrong.

I urge my colleagues to support our veterans and to take the next step toward ending this unnecessary government shutdown. Pass this bill today.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Of course we support the funding for our veterans. The proper way to do that, as our distinguished chairman knows, is to fulfill our constitutional responsibility—make the hard decisions and pass regular appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman knows, the House already passed in June a full-year funding bill for veterans by a vote of 421–4. As our distinguished chairman knows, that bill is $6.2 billion more than today's bill. So our veterans, as a result of this shutdown process, are going to have their funds cut by $6.2 billion. We need to pass a bill that helps them and that funds other critical initiatives. As our distinguished chairman knows, we could do this. We could pass these bills by regular order and prevent children from being part of clinical trials.

I just got an email from Francis Collins of the National Institutes of Health. Nearly three-quarters of the staff were furloughed. About 200 patients who otherwise would be admitted to the NIH clinical trials each week will be turned away. This includes about 30 children, most of them cancer patients. We know this is not the only place. It's Head Start, and it's funds for transportation. We've heard that. We can go on and on.

We could do this because there is a process in place. We don't need to shut down the government and invent new ways to pass these appropriations bills. Funding one budget item at a time while hundreds of thousands of Americans are on furlough and are losing pay is no way to fulfill our constitutional responsibility.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. The bill we are considering today is nothing more than a Republican ploy. It would not be necessary if Republicans had not been so reckless throughout the budgetary process, forcing us into a shutdown. We could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill to keep the government running, which includes the funding levels that the Republicans support and that would be signed by the President. The House majority, apparently, can't take the heat from the fire they lit, so now they've put forward this reckless political attempt to shift blame for their shutdown.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to point out that, as I said earlier, with any disagreement, you find those areas in which you are in agreement. You come to an agreement and make sure you get the most important things done first and set them aside. The House and the Senate have actually done that.

We note that our military has been paid. Legislation to fully pay for our military was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate, and it was passed out of this House. I would also reiterate that the House has done its job in

funding our veterans in passing this legislation in the first week of June and in funding our Department of Defense in the first week of June. We have done our part.

This shutdown that we face today is a deliberate result of the Senate's refusal to take action on the legislation that we sent them over 90 days ago, and that's why we are bringing this bill to the floor today, because this is one area in which we can all agree. Our veterans have earned our help, and they deserve our help. It is our duty to pass this bill as quickly as possible to ensure no interruption in the services that they have earned by their service to this Nation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time, but I also thank him for his leadership on behalf of veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the House and the Senate have already passed a measure that would pay for our troops in the middle of this government shutdown, and it's proper that we do this.

This morning, I had the privilege of meeting with 91 veterans from all over the State of Mississippi, who were in our Nation's Capital as part of an Honor Flight. When we arrived at the World War II Memorial, we found the entrance was blocked because of the government shutdown. Now, for these heroes of the Greatest Generation—those men who stormed the beaches of Normandy while facing German machine gun nests, those men who saw their friends die on Iwo Jima—even though these heroes may now be confined to wheelchairs, a few Park Service barricades were no obstacle.

It was my privilege to meet with them at the memorial that has been built in their honor. But the real way that our Nation pays tribute and thanks them for their service is for us to keep our commitment to them, our commitment in the form of VA benefits, of health care benefits, of disability benefits. Let us not fail those who have sacrificed so much for our Nation by failing to ensure that our veterans are provided the benefits and the services that they have earned. That's why I rise in support of this bill.

Our obligation to our troops does not end when a war is over, and we must ensure that our military men and women are provided with the care and the benefits they deserve both during and after their service. We have all agreed to unanimously fund this generation's military. Let us also agree to fund that of the previous generation's.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill we are about to vote on is as unnecessary as it is disingenuous. My congressional district is highly populated by veterans whose service and sacrifices are greatly appreciated. That is why I came to this floor on June 4 and enthusiastically joined with 420 other Members of this auspicious body to keep our obligations to them at higher levels than are included in this legislation.

Last night, the Tea Party Republicans shut down the government because they refuse to accept the verdict of the American people in last year's election. They shut down our government over the implementation of settled law—a position that polling shows that 72 percent of the American people oppose. Now they are using our patriotic heroes as pawns in their petty, partisan, political game.

Veterans should not have to choose between having their claims processed and their grandchildren educated. Their family members should be able to receive their medical treatments and enjoy our national treasures.

This piecemeal approach is the Tea Party's plan. They want to pick and choose winners and losers and only fund the priorities that they like. That's not how our government works.

As one of my favorite Republicans stated back in 1860, President Abraham Lincoln:

> Your purpose, plainly stated, is that you will destroy the government unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please on all points in dispute. You will rule or ruin in all events.

We should end this reckless stunt tonight. Let's reject this partisan gamesmanship and reopen our government like honorable men and women.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the only people who would be holding our veterans hostage would be those who would vote ''no'' against this legislation which we have brought to the floor today in an earnest, honest, commonsense, courteous way to ensure that our veterans are given everything they need for the service they have given this country.

It is my privilege at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), who is the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act. Let me explain why this bill is necessary.

Last weekend, the administration revised an initial shutdown contingency plan with the following statement relating specifically to the effect that a prolonged shutdown would have on the VA:

> VA has accepted VBA claims processors so that it can continue to process claims. Beneficiaries will continue to receive their payments. However, those benefits are provided through appropriated mandatory funding, and that funding will run out by the end of October. At that point, VA will be unable to make any payments.

□ 1845

What this means is that absent a deal on a CR—and we have anxiously awaited the Senate to do something over there, negotiate with the House—payments to veterans and their survivors that are due in November for a variety of benefits that have been earned by that veteran through honorable service may, in fact, be in jeopardy. That would mean a suspension of over a billion dollars per month in GI Bill tuition payments to nearly 1 million veterans or their dependents. It would end the subsistence allowance to over 66,000 disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation programs. It would cease payments to low-income wartime veterans with incomes that are just above the poverty level. It would end dependency and indemnity compensation to the surviving loved ones of servicemembers and veterans who died as a result of their service.

Mr. Speaker, this must never, ever be allowed to happen. Even more veterans and their loved ones should not even have to worry about something like this occurring. This bill would immediately remove any doubt from their minds that the dysfunction that's here in Washington would, in fact, jeopardize their earned benefits. These are America's heroes who have already gone above and beyond the call of duty. The last thing they deserve is for the country they courageously defended to abandon them in their time of need.

This bill will avoid all the calamitous events that I've mentioned, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of Homeland Security.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough of this cynical attempt to shift blame for the Tea Party shutdown.

Of course we want the American people to have access to our national parks, and I wish our Republican colleagues had thought a little bit more about that World War II Memorial before doing what they did last night.

Of course we want the D.C. government to continue to function. Why weren't Ms. NORTON's compelling arguments given more attention before what our Republican colleagues did last night?

Of course we want the Veterans Administrations to resume their operations for those who have worn this country's uniform, although we do not like seeing our veterans used to score political points.

What about the thousands of Department of Defense civilians who were told not to come into work today, including those in my district who serve Fort Bragg? What about those EPA scientists in the research triangle who spent today on a community service

project instead of conducting important research on air quality or the firefighters across the Nation who depend on FEMA grants to keep their communities safe? What about those Agriculture Department-funded researchers at NC State whose paychecks are running out? What about the NIH researchers at Duke and UNC whose grants are under threat, or those desperately ill people who will now be cut out of NIH clinical trials?

The American people deserve a government that works for everybody. The Senate has passed a responsible, bipartisan funding bill that would pass this House easily if the Republican leadership would simply allow it to receive a vote.

Let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to the basics: keeping the government open, paying the country's bills, and negotiating a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, that revives our economy and reduces our deficit. The first step is to pass a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, it's with great emotion that I rise today.

First of all, we're right in the midst of a government shutdown, and this is a terrible time. Second of all, this is my greatest hero's birthday; it was my father's birthday, October 1.

My dad passed away about 5 years ago. He was part of the Greatest Generation, as denoted by Tom Brokaw. He fought bravely in New Guinea during World War II, and he represented his country proudly.

My son-in-law is a captain in the Army. He's the father of my four grandchildren in Stuttgart, Germany. My nephew is an Army Ranger who has fought proudly in Afghanistan. It is for them that I rise today.

Make no mistake, the other side today says that they want to support these things, but they don't. Why? Because it's political posturing. They don't want to mitigate the pain because that might somehow hurt their ability to try to extract whatever they can politically.

Our constituents don't live in political rhetoric land. They live in the land where the rubber meets the road.

Let's be really clear: You have an opportunity on the other side of the aisle to fund the veteran programs, and you're going to be held accountable for that. If you vote ''no,'' that's where the rubber meets the road. You'll be responsible for denying them these benefits.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who does not respect and support the veterans of this country.

The gentleman who just spoke talked about preventing pain. What we want to do is prevent pain not only to veterans, but to children, to families, to teachers, to medical professionals, to farmers, to all those who every day rely on the Federal Government to be in operation—not piecemeal, not choosing between this and that, between the winners and the losers.

Why are we at this place? Why, as the gentlelady, the ranking member of this committee said, are we at a place where we're presenting a bill that cuts $6 billion from the bill you talked about, that I voted for and you voted for? I speak, of course, of the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because of the pain that has been visited not by the Senate. The Senate passed the only CR that didn't have a poison pill, the CR—we talk in this jargon—keeping government operating for the American people, the only body that's passed a bill that will do that that didn't include a poison pill that you knew the other side could not take and would not take and the President said he would not sign. You continue to not come to grips with the loss of the election.

You need a compromise. You would not go to conference. You talked about going to conference at 5 minutes of 12 a.m. last night. You've had 6 months to go to conference. For 6 months, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have had the opportunity of going to conference. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I'm sure, will talk about that.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. It's been 6 months and no action. That's why we have had this gridlock, because you have refused to go, as you talk about the regular order, to work out an agreement between the Senate and the House. So we find ourselves where we need more time.

We have tried to provide for 6 weeks, between now and November 15, to try to work together to get to compromise and pass appropriation bills—and not in piecemeal. I don't know that I've seen an appropriation bill on a suspension before.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong process, it's the wrong time, and we ought to pass a CR and keep government operating for the American people.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, there's only one question before the House tonight: Will we unify in support of our veterans and ensure their peace of mind for themselves, their families, and their survivors, that they don't miss a moment of the benefits that they've so rightly earned?

At this time, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, today veterans in northern Michigan and across the country woke up to the news that the United States Government had shut down. The government that they served, risked their lives for, could possibly further delay the disability claims process. This simply isn't fair.

As the House has offered four times, I might add, plans to keep the government open, the Senate continues to reject our offers and insists on shutting down the government. Last night they refused to even sit down and have a reasonable discussion with us.

As we work toward a solution, it is vital that those who have risked it all be able to continue to receive the services that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I've been a doctor for over 30 years. I've treated veterans at the VA hospital at Iron Mountain on a regular basis. I don't know how any Member in this body could think for even 1 minute that we should turn away our servicemembers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Honoring Our Promise to Veterans Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As the Speaker knows, a number of Members of Congress have asked unanimous consent to proceed to the Senate and pass the so-called ''clean CR.'' I want to understand the rule.

My understanding is that if the Democratic leader and the Republican leader both give their consent to that, then that bill would come before the body now; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request for consideration of certain measures must receive clearance from both sides.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So to further clarify, if both Democrats and Republicans were to agree to bring the Senate-passed CR before this House, it would come up for a vote now; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would entertain a request only if prior appropriate clearance had been given.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, when you say prior appropriate approval, do you mean approval from the Republican leader and the Democratic leader?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Leadership from both sides of the aisle must provide clearance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the current status of H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, if this body were to take it up and pass that bill, would that bill go back to the Senate or would that bill now go directly to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That measure is not currently pending, so the gentleman's inquiry is not appropriate at this time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, if the Democratic leader and the Republican leader were to give their consent, as you indicated, to bring that bill before this body and this body then adopted that bill, voted for it, would that bill then go to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request does not relate to the measure that is before the House at this time. The Chair will not give an advisory opinion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry with respect to the current bill before us, H.J. Res. 72.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill were to pass the House, would this bill go directly to the President, or would this bill go to the Senate, H.J. Res. 72?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All House-passed bills would be messaged to the Senate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So this bill that we're currently discussing would go to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If it passes the House, yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, is it the Chair's ruling that you cannot rule whether or not a resolution that's agreed to by the House and the Senate does not go to the President? Is that the Chair's parliamentary ruling, that you cannot give us an answer to that basic parliamentary question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will only respond to inquiries that relate directly to the current proceedings.

Mr. RANGEL. The current proceeding, if I am not correct, involves a concurrent resolution. The whole world knows what is before this House. Is the Chair saying, from a parliamentary point of view, that we can't deal with the issue of an agreement between the House and the Senate? Is that the ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending question relates to House Joint Resolution 72.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield back because I know my friend knows a better answer than that. We've been around a long time.

□ 1900

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is on the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House of Representatives as the daughter of a World War II veteran, a veteran who was disabled, a veteran who watched very carefully what his government, what this august body and the Senate and the President signed into law that would affect his benefits, our family's benefits.

And I rise today to oppose this new Republican scheme. Selecting random government agencies, programs, and museums to fund while the rest of the Federal Government languishes in a shutdown is simply irresponsible. The majority is making a desperate attempt to create distractions so that they're not held accountable for their actions. Congress needs to fund the entire Federal Government with a clean continuing resolution and end this reckless and unnecessary GOP—or, should I say, ''Grand Old Party''—shutdown.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the only question before the House tonight is whether we will unite and fund the veterans who have served this Nation. That is the only question before us.

And at this time, it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO), a veteran of Vietnam and Iraq.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Today I was reminded just how our Nation is made up of the people, not the government.

Just a few hours ago, dozens of World War II veterans, in an act of civil disobedience, defied the President's closure of the World War II Memorial on the Washington Mall and celebrated their historic defense against tyranny so many decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this shutdown could be a learning experience for both everyone in this Chamber and the people of the country. It allows us to determine what is essential and what isn't, what government should do and what it shouldn't.

When I first arrived here in Washington, I wrote an op-ed in my local newspaper, laying out some obvious budgetary reforms. One of them was to make every department justify its spending on the floor of the House. The Department of Veterans Affairs could easily do that. Currently, the VA is not shut down completely. But the time is soon coming where our former servicemembers will not be able to receive the benefits they earned fighting to defend our freedom.

Because of the Democratic Senate's inability to compromise, services to our veterans will be impacted if we don't do the right thing. In the military, we don't leave people behind on the battlefield. We shouldn't do that at home either. Surely my friends on the other side of the aisle do not believe that the Democratic Senate should hold our veterans hostage as we negotiate the CR. The people helped by the VA are American heroes. Let's not leave them behind.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia.

If you want to help our veterans tonight, we should take up the Senate-passed clean CR bill which keeps the government open for our veterans and funds programs that help their children and grandchildren, like education, like scientific research at the National Institutes of Health. And as we heard from the Speaker, if we take that bill up and pass it, it will be on the President's desk tonight, and he can sign it, whereas this bill just goes back to the Senate.

So why aren't we doing that? Well, it was reported in The Washington Post, since the Republicans want to shut down the government, now they're going for the Cruz idea for plan B. ''House GOP will go with Cruz's idea for plan B.'' That's Senator CRUZ. So again, Senator CRUZ is calling the shots here in the House of Representatives.

But here's what's particularly strange and cynical: our veterans are being used as props here. I don't think the American people understand that if we were to pass the CR tonight for veterans, it is actually a higher level of funding for the veterans by billions of dollars than what is in your bill before us today. So how can you say you want to help veterans by sending the Senate a bill with less money for veterans instead of sending immediately the President a bill with billions of dollars for veterans?

This cuts the amount that this House voted for for veterans in June. It cuts billions of dollars. Every Member of this House who voted in June on that Veterans appropriations bill who votes on this is voting for a cut from what this House provided for veterans earlier this year, and it represents a cut compared to the continuing resolution that we could send tonight to the President's desk and have him sign.

So, yes. If you really want to help veterans, Mr. Speaker, you should take up the Senate bill. Send it to the President. It will be done tonight at a level billions of dollars higher than this Republican bill.

Let's help our veterans, and let's help tonight.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Houston.

Mr. Speaker, last night we voted to go to conference with the other body. Our friends on the minority side opposed that. And the leadership in the other body refused to appoint conferees.

This afternoon we brought three bills to the floor on the suspension calendar to open our national parks, to give the District of Columbia the local funds that it rightly deserves, and to fund our veterans. These bills are under suspension, which means they need to come to the floor and get a two-thirds vote. We can't pass these bills if my friends on the minority side don't vote for them.

And I would point out, on the District of Columbia, the last time the voters of the District of Columbia voted for a Republican for President, his name was Abraham Lincoln in 1864. We need to pass these bills. We're just trying to help.

I would point out that being in the minority party does not mean you have to be automatically the opposition party. Let's do what makes sense, what's the right thing to do. Vote for the veterans bill, and vote for the other two bills on suspension. We cannot pass them if our friends on the minority side, some of them don't vote for these bills.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan told a story many years ago about a little boy who encountered a pile of manure and was very excited because he thought there might be a pony in there somewhere. And the truth is that a lot of people across the country are looking for a pony.

So many people understand across the board that this isn't really about veterans or parks or the Washington, D.C., budget. It's a fight over ObamaCare and whether ObamaCare gets funded or not, a subject that has had some 40-something votes in the U.S. House of Representatives.

And I will also tell you that today, I've spent my day talking to people on the phone. I spoke to a veteran employed with the Federal Government in San Antonio who is a single dad and is worried about how he will pay his bills. A retired sergeant in Fort Stockton with the same story. Two people who were very interesting, one who told me straight up that he was a Tea Party member in San Antonio, Texas. He said, If you have a fight about ObamaCare, that should be separate and apart from keeping the doors of government open. And a woman in Ozona, Texas, who told me the same thing.

But perhaps the best statement that I have had came from an airman who serves in the 23rd District who wrote me this:

> While I and many others appreciate the gratitude expressed in times like these, we have also become weary of the same. Whenever the actions of our national leaders have a negative impact on us, as government employees—which seems to have become the norm over the last years—we hear the same rhetoric. We don't want to hear how grateful and appreciative our leaders are. We want them to show their gratitude through deeds. Passing a fiscally sound budget.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a strong advocate for veterans.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of America, don't be fooled. Don't be fooled by what the Republicans are doing tonight.

Just 19 hours ago, they closed down this government. They closed down the government on the veterans. They closed down the government on D.C. They closed down the government on those who serve our parks. Many of them, when they left here 19 hours ago, were high-fiving and celebrating. We closed 'er down. We closed 'er down. And now they're here. They're here today with this hypocritical and deceitful act that now they want to do something for the veterans.

And to use these veterans—ladies and gentlemen, this is nothing but a fig leaf, a fig leaf to hide the shame of what this Republican Party did last night. And to use the veterans and to send—we are talking about just a period of just 10 or 12 weeks—to be able to send them $5.2 million and think you've done something? We have 21 veterans committing suicide every day. Where are you talking about that? Four in my district alone.

We need to treat our veterans with the respect that they deserve by making sure that we pass that full budget. Bring a clean CR. Lift up the American people, and treat them all with respect. Don't pick one or the other.

Let's vote down this fig leaf of shame that the Republican Party is presenting here today in this resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. At this time, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. NANCY PELOSI, the Democratic leader who is a strong advocate for veterans and a strong advocate for this government.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great service to our country and for his leadership on behalf of our veterans. They are precious to us. They make us the home of the brave and the land of the free. We couldn't be who we are, as a Nation, without the service and sacrifice of our veterans and their families.

Mr. Ranking Member, I thank you for your participation in our meetings that we have on a regular basis with the Veterans Service Organizations, where so many of them come and give us their priorities of how we can help them. Whether it was the veterans' budget, the forward funding, or a long list of concurrent receipts, there are so many issues that we talk about there. And now, of course, the backlog and the rest.

And in those meetings, almost every time we meet, either at the beginning or the end, we always practically in a prayerful way quote what we say about our soldiers. The military says, On the battlefield, we leave no soldier behind. And we say, And when they come home, we leave no veteran behind.

□ 1915

The gentleman has said that we have one purpose here today, and that is to unite and support our veterans.

Do we support our veterans when we leave their families behind?

Our veterans are willing to go to battle to fight for our country, for our values, for our families, for their well-being, for our freedoms. And those people are not just veterans. They're fathers, they're mothers, they're grandparents, they're aunts and uncles. They're members of families. They want the best for their children and their grandchildren.

It may surprise you: sadly, some of them receive food stamps. Some of them receive Meals on Wheels. All of them, again, want a better future for our country.

So we're not uniting to support our veterans when we do what we're doing here today, because they would want us to support what they were fighting to defend, the ability of our country to be great. And that greatness springs from the health and well-being of the American people, in addition to our military might.

That's how we would define our strength; and I think, from listening to them, they would too.

I listened with interest to how people identified with their families. Four of my brothers were in the Army. My uncle died at the Battle of the Bulge, and that has always been part of the great pride of our family, that great war of World War II, that my father's brother was killed there.

So this World War II Memorial means a lot to all of us. Even if we didn't know anyone, even if we didn't have someone in the family, it's really important to us. And so we have to think of the ramifications of our actions.

When we shut down government, we can't say, oh, we're not respecting our

veterans because they can't go to the World War II Memorial. That's what shutting down government is, shutting down much of what they fought for, shutting down the tributes that we pay to them.

So let's not leave our veterans behind by leaving their children, their grandchildren, their families and what they need.

Just to go into it, this bill is billions of dollars less than what over 420 Members of this House passed in June.

We're all there for our veterans. There is no question about that, as our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER, said. There is no question. Nobody questions the commitment that we all have, the gratitude that we have, the appreciation, the pedestal that we have our veterans on.

But we leave them behind when we leave behind all that they fought for, and we leave them behind when we put a bill on the floor that's billions of dollars less than we all came together to support just a few months ago.

Don't exploit them. Don't use them. We owe them too much.

On the battlefield, we leave no soldier behind; and when they come home, we leave no veteran behind, and all that they know and love.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we live in the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We enjoy freedoms that they enjoy no place else like in America, but freedom is not free. The freedoms we enjoy were bought with a price, and that was the price of the men and women who sacrificed.

I am very, very saddened tonight that our colleagues would use and would hide behind the garment of sacrifice of those veterans and put forth a CR that does not fund, as the Senate CR does, the discretionary budget fully, the mandatory budget fully. But theirs, this CR, will not.

I urge the defeat of it, and let's not allow them to hide behind the sacrifice of our veterans.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it's my privilege to yield our remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), a distinguished Army Ranger who served this Nation both in Iraq and Afghanistan, to close.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, no country that forgets its veterans can long endure, and that's why America has always celebrated and cherished our veterans' service.

George Washington, in his first days as President, demanded, in one of the most forceful requests he made to the Congress, that they honor our veterans.

Abraham Lincoln, who presided over our bloodiest war, dedicated two of his most beautiful speeches, the Gettysburg Address, and his second inaugural, in part or in full, to honoring our veterans.

This is something that has long united our parties on both sides of the aisle. The Democratic Party has many distinguished veterans, as does our party. That is why, today, we should continue this commitment.

We should ensure that the veterans who have been calling my office, who have been calling your offices, who've been calling all of our offices, don't have to face the kind of uncertainty and confusion that they do now because they aren't sure about what the Veterans Affairs Department can do for them.

We have our differences about ObamaCare, about funding levels, about many other matters. But let us, for our veterans, come together, as Abraham Lincoln said, and appeal to the better angels of our nature.

Uphold our veterans. Support and honor their service.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the drama that has played out on the floor of the House would make for a great movie. I must remind my colleagues that we aren't in Hollywood, and their dangerous and thoughtless actions aren't without consequences.

We are elected representatives of the United States of America. We are not actors. We are here to legislate. So I ask my Republican colleagues to stop pontificating to the cameras and get to the work of reopening the federal government.

The Democratic Leader came to the Floor yesterday and pleaded with the majority to bring the Senate's amended CR to the Floor for a vote. Last night as midnight drew closer, my colleague from New Jersey Mr. ANDREWS asked the Chairman of the Rules Committee to do what is right and fair and bring the Senate's amended CR to the Floor for a vote. The Rules' Committee Chairman refused to acknowledge Mr. ANDREWS' plea.

Shame on House Republicans for not giving members an opportunity to cast an up or down vote on the Senate's clean CR. Their refusal to move beyond Obamacare—a law that was upheld by the United States Supreme Court as Constitutional—and continue their insistence on dismantling the law—is absolutely astounding.

Because for every time we vote on a bill to delay, defund, or dismantle Obamacare knowing what the ultimate outcome will be, is time that we could spend working on behalf of the American people to advance important policies. Instead my Republican colleagues insist on holding the American people hostage.

This is a sad day for America. This is a sad day for America because of House Republicans' complete inability to lead. This dysfunction has been allowed to continue for too long.

I remind my colleagues that House Democrats are willing to accept a clean CR at the levels that Republicans demanded. It's not what we want, but we compromised in an effort to do the business of the American people.

Now we are asking you to compromise. Your refusal to do so has shut down the most powerful government in the world. And for what? Political theater.

Republicans are harming the American people and they deserve better.

Colleagues, vote no on these senseless resolutions and demand—demand a vote on the Senate's clean Continuing Resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolutions to reopen our National Parks. Today, 368 national park sites were closed and we now see that the majority has noticed.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is graced with 20 Federal Parks that include Big Bend National Park, Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument, Amistad National Recreation Area, Big Thicket National Preserve; Chamizal National Memorial; Fort Davis National Historic Site; Guadalupe Mountains National Park; Lake Meredith National Recreation Area; Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park; Padre Island National Seashore; Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site; Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River; and San Antonio Missions National Historical Park are all closed during the shutdown.

Texas also has national Forests and grasslands: Angelina National Forest; Davy Crockett National Forest; Sabine National Forest; Sam Houston National Forest; Caddo and Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) National Grasslands; Black Kettle and McClellan Creek Grasslands; Kiowa and Rita Blanca National Grasslands.

All of them are closed today because of the reckless behavior of the majority in the House of Representatives.

Perhaps this is the day that members of the majority of the House of Representatives received their first education directly from constituents about our nation's national parks and how much our parks are love and appreciated.

Federal parks also contribute to the local economies where they are found and create tens of thousands of tourist related jobs. Because they are closed today those jobs are at risk as well as the incomes of the Park Rangers who are stewards of our nation's most precious treasures.

The House should take up the clean Senate Continuing Resolution to fund the entire government.

If we only fund what the House majority wants then they will have no need to worry about funding the parts of the government that they do not like, which includes the Departments of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Labor, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Review Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are a part of life. We negotiate agreements everyday—with our spouses, children, and friends. We negotiate for commercial exchanges, and for most people they negotiate over matters related to work.

From what we have learned from the majority is if they get what they want then they will leave everyone else behind. They do not see the nation at large, but as a small place with small minded people.

They are wrong. The United States is a very large place with great minded people with big hearts, who do not believe in leaving others behind.

We have seen the majority's attacks against the poor in the form of legislation that would undermine programs to feed the poor—the most recent was a bill to cut $40 billion from the nation's food safety net programs under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs.

SNAP benefits the working poor which include those who earn 130% of the federal

poverty guideline, but the majority of households have income well below the maximum: 83% of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100% of the poverty guideline this translates into incomes of $19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91% of all benefits.

These are the people who we know the majority will leave behind if we allow a piece meal approach to managing the CR process.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the federal government are paid and that important things like our parks are open and our children are feed.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on reopening the government as soon as possible.

Texas will soon begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the $64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

$518 million in federal highway funds;

$411 million for interstate highway maintenance;

$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor;

$71 million, in Homeland Security grants;

$55 million in coordinated border infrastructtire and $97 million in federal doption assistance;

For these reasons, we cannot wait for the majority to discover all of the reasons why we have a federal government or the importance and purpose of each agency.

We have to pass a clean CR as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 72 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motions to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 71 and House Joint Resolution 70.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 164, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—264

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
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)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
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
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
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
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—164

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
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)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1944

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana and MAFFEI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 163, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—265

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
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 (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
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
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
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
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
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
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1954

Messrs. MEEKS and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OPERATIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, AND UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 176, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

YEAS—252

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
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)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
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)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
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
Tierney
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
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)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
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
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
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)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2001

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). 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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House 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.'', Senate insists upon its amendment and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE WILL CONTINUE AS BIPARTISAN LEADER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this is a first for me. This is a first for a lot of us.

Because of a partisan refusal even to talk with House Republicans about a plan to keep our government open and ensure fair treatment for all Americans under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is shut down.

Yes, the consequences of Presidential partisanship are real and are being felt throughout the country—in furloughed offices and in faulty health care exchanges.

Over the past 2 weeks, the House has offered four bipartisan proposals to fund government services fully and put ObamaCare uncertainty on hold.

Each effort was rebuffed. Each good-faith step we took to the middle was rejected—even the simplest request to sit down and work through our policy differences. Really.

Call us names, belittle our values, refuse to negotiate with us—fine. In this moment where leadership is required, be small.

But House Republicans still recognize that it is going to take bipartisanship to reopen government. We will continue to lead as the only body that has provided bipartisan solutions for the country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this government, the government of the greatest Nation on Earth, will reopen only when the public decides that one party is being uncompromising and unreasonable.

The continuing resolution that the Senate sent us sets the spending level, and it sets the level right there at the Republican Ryan budget level—$250 billion below the President's request, $72 billion below the Senate Democratic budget. When it comes to spending levels, we have compromised. It is manifestly unreasonable to shut down the government to achieve a legislative objective.

Today, we are told that they will keep the government open for 45 or 60 days if only we allow them to dismantle ObamaCare. In December, they will say we will keep the government open a little longer if only we will strip-mine Yellowstone.

What if Democrats took the same tactic? What if we said we are going to shut down government until we get immigration reform, campaign finance reform, or gun control? We are as dedicated to those issues as they are to their ceaseless quest to repeal ObamaCare. But we will not shut down the government, we will not destroy the economy, we will not take hostages, we will not hurt this country just to get our own way.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, my State of Wyoming is projected to have the highest average premiums under ObamaCare of any State in the Nation that is subject to the Federal exchange; by far, the highest rate of any State in the Nation.

Is it any wonder that because my State has the smallest population in the Nation that I would fight for not one-size-fits-all, top-down, Big Government solutions, but State-based solutions, health care that is negotiated between the patient and the doctor.

Yet ObamaCare has taken place today; it has taken effect. It is the law of the land, and I will abide by it; but Congress should not have an illegal subsidy under ObamaCare. House Republicans want to get rid of the illegal subsidy for Congress under ObamaCare. That is what we demand.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, GOP irresponsibility that led to the government shutdown is already having an impact across our country. I spent part of my day down at the World War II Memorial here in Washington. As the author of the bill that created the memorial—and we worked for 16 years from point of introduction to point of dedication in 2004—I witnessed an irony that Senators and Representatives who voted for the shutdown showed up today to remove the fence that was placed around the site because honor flights were coming in here.

Around our country, veterans are still coming with those who sponsor them. I thought how ironic to see this, that they would have the gall to show up at a site that they voted to shutter last night.

Knowing that honor flights are coming in from Ohio next week, I wondered where we would be. For the first time since the memorial was dedicated in 2004, do you know what, it was absent people, absent the American people. Last Sunday, we saw how crowded it was as the largest honor flight came in from the east coast.

I just say to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle: Did you really want to do this? Don't the American people deserve better than that, a vacant site, a fenced site?

It is time for our colleagues to wake up and not think about their party or themselves, but think about the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, one would think after all of the hours and hours of discussions that have taken place on this floor that perhaps enough has been said. That may be true, but so much of what was said seems not to be clarifying and providing a clear understanding of what has actually happened here.

We want to take a few minutes here, probably maybe as much as an hour, possibly less than that, and try to gain some clarity as to how we got to this point with a government shutdown, how we can get out of it, and what the impact is on Americans. There are good days and there are bad days and then there are really, really bad days.

About 12:30 last night, as we were finishing the votes here on the floor, it became very apparent that the government had, indeed, shut down and that there wasn't any hope of resurrecting it in the final hours of last night. So today, all across America, government offices are shut down. You just heard a description of the World War II Memorial. And that is but an example.

Now, how did we get here? How did this happen? We have been over the last 3 years now dealing with one manufactured crisis after another. They came to be known as ''cliffs'': ''fiscal cliff,'' ''debt limit cliff,'' on and on. Each time we would come up to some deadline, and it was made into a crisis. Our Republican friends were usually the—well, they were always the instigators of this, at least since the 2010 election.

What has happened is they have used these deadlines, which come and go every year, as an opportunity to leverage in one or another policy changes. That has been going on. I think one of the most noteworthy of these deadlines was the fiscal cliff that occurred in the summer of 2011 in which the United States came up against its debt limit and it was just a moment away from that default.

□ 2015

Fortunately, there were negotiations underway, and it did lead to a settlement. The settlement, of course, was the infamous sequester. It wasn't supposed to happen. Nobody liked it. It was in the bill. It did happen, and now we are living with it. As time went on, we have had even more of these moments of crisis, and yesterday was yet one more. It occurs on a regular basis. Every October 1, we start a new fiscal year, and that's an opportunity for us to look at all of the expenditures of the Federal Government and to make decisions about what should be or should not be funded and at what level it should be funded.

So we had a crisis last night, and the result is the Federal Government is largely unfunded, and monuments across the Nation—national parks, Veterans Administration offices, Social Security offices, and the rest—are in the process of being shut down, and some are shut down. This is not a good thing. It's a very bad thing. It is bad for this Nation. I was there in 1995 as Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior when the Department of the Interior was shut down—national parks, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey. Studies underway about the nature of everything from earthquakes to hurricanes and the like were just put aside for 26 days. We are back in that today. It could have been avoided—it should have been avoided—and had we followed through on the normal process of establishing a budget for the United States, it would have been, or most likely would have been, avoided.

Why didn't that happen?

The House of Representatives passed a budget in March. The Senate passed a budget at about the same time, and the Senate requested a conference committee. From April to this moment, no conference committee on the Budget has been established.

Now, the budget gives the framework in which the appropriations for all of the Federal offices—the Department of Defense, parks and so forth—are funded. It is within that framework of the budget. So, without a framework, we were literally wandering in the dark, and some very, very bad things happened. What happened was we came up against a deadline. The continuing resolution, which continues to fund the government—the first issue was for 2 months, until December 15, and then it eventually came down to November 15. That continuing resolution—sometimes called a ''CR''—actually provided less money than did the Senate's version of the budget. It was $986 billion, which is the sequestration amount that would continue forward.

While virtually every person in this entire House—435 of us—said sequestration was bad and that we will never vote for sequestration again, we were, in fact, presented with a sequestration appropriation, a continuing resolution, that would go for 2 months. The sequestration was, in fact, built into that. Now, the Democrats, in looking at this, said, We don't want a shutdown. We will compromise for 2 months and accept the lower funding level.

So, when people go back and forth here and say there was no effort to compromise, that's not true. The fact of the matter is the Democrats said, to avoid the shutdown of government, we will accept the sequestration level of government, which was, I think, over $50 billion less than what we would have liked to have spent to keep the programs going.

Along the way, our Republican colleagues decided that they would use this moment to terminate the Affordable Health Care Act. We are going to spend some time on that this evening. The termination of the Affordable Health Care Act would affect every American in many, many ways, and we will spend some time talking about all of those ways.

So, by combining the CR, which the Democrats accepted—and had it passed the House and the Senate, there would be no government shutdown—and by joining to that the desire, particularly of the Tea Party Republican caucus members, we wound up with a stalemate. We need to understand exactly what was in the CR and exactly what was the impact of the—what shall we say? There were three different versions of this. One version was to repeal, in other words, just wipe out the entire law—the Affordable Health Care Act, or ObamaCare. Another was to delay all of it. Then yet a third was to delay just a piece of it. So there have been different iterations, but each one would dramatically affect the people of America.

I would like to now turn to my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who will pick up with this issue.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would clarify that the gentleman was recognized for half the time remaining before 10 p.m., or approximately 54 minutes.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Talk fast, SHEILA.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his leadership.

If I might inquire of the Speaker again, you said the time was—how much time? I'm sorry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is 54 total minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Out of 60 minutes? Is that what you're saying?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rather than 60 minutes, it is 54 total minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you so very much. I wanted to make sure it wasn't 5 minutes.

Let me thank the gentleman again from California. I want to thank him overall for a litany of causes and legislative efforts that I've joined him on—Make It In America and a number of others. I am so glad that he has come to the floor today to be able to recount for the American people just what we have gone through.

I want to start where he started because I've heard a number of my colleagues who are here on the floor—Congressman HONDA, Congresswoman KAPTUR—speak eloquently about their work on the Appropriations Committee

and of the wall—the mountain—that they had to climb with a compromise that many Democrats voted for and that the President signed, which was the sequestration that was created to avoid a shutdown some years ago. The numbers were so odious that it was thought that we would bring the Republicans to the table in a consensus group. I'd hoped the American people would recognize that they would be surprised to find out that those odious numbers were not even enough, that it didn't bring them to the table. In fact, what it did is cause them to hunker down—to want more cuts, more damage to the American people—which is where we find ourselves today.

Without the shutdown that we are in now, that sequestration, itself, which is what Democrats were trying to work toward to avoid this deepening impact, was going to lose a million jobs, but we could not seemingly bridge that gap of understanding with House Republicans and, particularly, with the right-wing component. Over the weekend, by the way, one Minnesota Member of Congress and former Presidential candidate indicated that she was smiling. They got just what they wanted.

So, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am glad to be able to say these points just for a moment.

That was a moment of compromise—that was a moment of holding one's nose—because we were doing it for the good of the whole. It was for the greater good, for the good of the whole.

We come now to another moment of crisis. Someone asked me: What is the plan? The answer is right before us, and that is a clean CR. Let me explain.

It is not a clean CR to take us into 2014 and 2015. My friends, it is only until November 15 so we can have cooler heads, and we can reconcile with Senate Majority Leader REID—who was offered this compromise, this peace offering—and with the President and sit down even before Thanksgiving and get a budget for all of the running of the government and an appropriations process to allow that to happen.

Now let me quickly go to the three bills that we had and just say these things.

National parks. I want to say directly to the Bellaire teacher—and her name is Ann Linsley-Kennedy—that we are going to work as hard as we can to get those parks open, and I will tell you the answer. The answer is for the Republican House to vote on a clean CR, and you will be able to go to the park with the Bellaire students.

I am going to be calling you tonight, Ms. Linsley-Kennedy, to let you know how hard Democrats are working to encourage our Republicans to just vote on that clean CR, and your youngsters will be able to be headed to Yellowstone on October 4.

The other point is that I want to tell Patrick Smith, a disabled veteran who called my office: thank you for your service. The reason I voted down and joined my colleagues against this piecemeal veterans' bill, Patrick, is that the numbers were so insulting to your willingness to pay the ultimate on the battlefield. It was $6 billion less. It wasn't going to help reduce the claims or get your benefits. Those benefits are going to be running now for a couple of weeks, but I will tell you, Patrick, on the floor of the House: I promise you that we will not have this ridiculous treatment of our veterans, but we are going to do something that is meaningful, not what was done on the floor of the House today.

Finally, let me say to my colleague Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON—again, using the plight of the people of the District of Columbia—that you are deserving of the respect of using your own $8 billion, and the Republicans know full well that all they have to do is to vote for a clean CR to be able to ensure that this independent area—the Capital of the United States, whose Member does not have a vote—is able to do this.

Congressman, today is October 1. Again, I want to wish my brother, Michael Jackson, a birthday wish.

I hope you had a great day, but you had an historic day. October 1 is ''get covered.'' That means that, with all of the noise about ObamaCare—about the bill—it is the law.

I want to announce on the floor today that we are told that millions of people have gotten on this Web site—hear my words: HealthCare.gov—2 million or so in New York, California and all throughout the Nation. When I went to my office in the early morning hours of last evening or what was yesterday—at 1 or 2 in the morning—we turned on HealthCare.gov, and I want you to know that the system said it was overwhelmed, not because of inadequacy but because people were pressing to be able to have good health care. They needed it. These are people with issues and preexisting conditions—people who are suffering from sickle cell and people with diabetes and others. They were saying, thank God. There is one less spina bifida. One woman was 18 years old, and her family was told, You are off of the insurance. God knows she is going to be able to be covered.

So I want to thank you for doing that.

I am closing on a number of 3,000. These are 3,000 children in Houston who are on the waiting list for Head Start because of sequester and the government shutdown. I end on that note because we have talked about the disabled and disease, and we have talked about the District of Columbia and about going to a park, but who cares about the children—3,000? How many are across the Nation who can't get Head Start or who can't get food stamps because this body decided to vote $40 billion out?

I look forward to continuing this discussion, but more importantly, I want to thank you for recognizing that the way to the golden arch is through decency and compromise and sensible reconciliation. Vote on a clean CR, and we will get to the next step, which is to work to make sure this government stays open and that the American people are our first priority.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much.

There is no doubt that this House has the ability at any moment to vote on the continuing resolution that the Senate has sent back here. If that were to happen, the President would immediately have that law on his desk. He could sign it, and government would at that moment reopen. Keep in mind that that CR was not one that we thought was the best. It, actually, is significantly below the level of funding that the Democrats wanted, and it does continue, at least for another month and a half, the sequestration, which we do not like.

I would like now to turn to Ms. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, who spoke here on the floor a few moments ago.

Ms. KAPTUR, please share with us your thoughts on the current crisis in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman GARAMENDI for bringing us all together this evening, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, Congressman HONDA—those who are here and are serious about trying to rectify what happened last night with the GOP shutdown of our departments of the Federal Government. How very irresponsible, how reckless, how it puts our economy at risk to put politics ahead of the national interests, and so, so unnecessary.

□ 2030

I stand here this evening as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the committee and the Constitution that is responsible for operating and providing the funding for the Departments of our government: the Department of Transportation, the Department of Defense, the Department of Education. You can go across the Departments. As of the end of September, we're supposed to have the budgets passed for each of those Departments for fiscal year 2014. That officially began last night at midnight. At the moment, those 12 bills have not been passed. The Republicans are holding them hostage for their efforts to try to contort the legislative process to change the law, to change the Affordable Care Act because they don't like parts of it.

Actually, that is a tangential issue. It has nothing to do with whether or not the Department of Transportation will have the funding to sign contracts to get roads paved across this country, to repair bridges that are in disrepair across the Nation, or to make sure that we have air controllers across this Nation on a regular basis and not just on an emergency basis.

It has nothing to do with whether in Ohio, for example, at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the full complement of staff, both military and civilian, can

report for work at the 180th Fighter Wing F–16 unit in Lucas County, Ohio; whether the technicians who repair those planes, who were furloughed, over 200 of them, who are, in my view, essential—because you can't fly the plane if the thing doesn't work, right?—but they were let go for the moment and classified as not having to report for work.

This is such a mishmash across the government of the United States and so utterly irresponsible to try to hold every single Department hostage to the GOP's particular view of a bill that they don't like that has nothing to do with the operation of these other Departments.

I stand here tonight to say that they put at risk the entire economic recovery of the country, furloughing over 800,000 people across the Government of the United States, parks—some folks have talked about parks. It's way beyond parks. We talked about the World War II Memorial here and the first time I've ever seen it without anyone on site because it's all cordoned off. It was as though a neutron bomb had hit the site. There were no citizens that could access the site. The fountains were turned off, the Visitor Center, the facilities that are there for people to use were all shuttered. To what end?

The normal constitutional appropriations process works in a way that we pass our bills in the House and in the Senate; and then we meet, the House and the Senate, the Senators and the Representatives together, we work out our differences; we send the bills to the President by the end of September; and the government operates for another year.

The GOP in the House has been very unwilling to follow the rules, very irresponsible. They've now placed the whole country in jeopardy because they can't reach agreement with us. How sad for the Nation and how unnecessary; how reckless to do this to the economy. And we know that when contracts aren't let—and contractors are calling all of our offices wanting to know when those contracts will be signed. Whether it's for unmanned aerial vehicles that we have to develop in this country or whether it's fixing combines or overflows that are a serious challenge in the Midwest and other places, the government simply can't conduct its business. Generals and departmental administrators are spending more time thinking about who's going to be furloughed tomorrow than getting the job done. So it throws a wrench into the gears of a great society, of a great country, the oldest Republic on the face of the Earth.

I thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order this evening to say to the American people that we share their frustration. We are their representatives. We want the Government of the United States to work. To try to use the process that they've used to gerrymander in States like Ohio to suppress the will of the majority of the people by holding the Affordable Care Act out there and every Department hostage, they're contorting the government and its ability to operate in the same way that they contorted the gerrymandering of this country when, in fact, there were 1,500,000 more votes cast for Democratic Members who ran for Congress than Republican. In States like Ohio that vote 50/50, we only have four Democratic Representatives out of 16. There are 12 Republicans, 4 Democrats because of gerrymandering. The very same contortion that they did to the politics of the country in the drawing of those lines, they're now using that same weapon inside this House to try to contort the legislative process that has resulted in shutdown.

I thank Congressman GARAMENDI for bringing us together this evening, for trying to inject some reason, some responsibility and prudent behavior into the way that this government operates. We share your passion for that end.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. KAPTUR. We should have pointed out in the introduction that you are the ranking member of one of the Appropriation Committees—transportation, the energy programs, all of the research that goes on, and a lot of the projects of, I believe, NASA, also. I know you worked long and hard on that, and I sense a sadness, from your remarks, that all of the good things that are done by those Departments are simply in abeyance now; and given the level of funding that is in the CR with the sequestration, much will not be done.

Let me now turn to my colleague from California (Mr. HONDA), who has been serving for a while here representing the Silicon Valley and much of what we were just talking about, the research and the development of the economy. I know you've had a great deal to do with that over the years, really helping to create one of the engines of economic growth in the United States. Mr. HONDA.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, my friend. I want to add my thanks to you for convening this group and being joined by my good friends from Texas, the gentleman from San Antonio and the gentlelady from Houston.

The comments I want to make to the Speaker are two things. One, I want to share with the people of this country some information that maybe many people don't know about who you are, my friend. We have something in common. We spent 2 years in Peace Corps—you in Ethiopia and I in El Salvador. From those experiences, we understand the kinds of impact that we could have as individuals from this country. Through the program of Peace Corps that President Kennedy had put together, we've been able to accrue a lifelong journey and experience that allows us to reflect rather deeply and profoundly the impacts that government can have, both positive and negative.

I do know, from my observation of your history in California, that being the first commissioner of insurance in the State of California was significant. That experience has to have some import and some insights into what's going on today in terms of the Affordable Care Act and President Obama's efforts in trying to make sure that this country allows each and every person coverage as individuals in this country and the benefit that it brings about.

The fact that you were the first commissioner of insurance also allowed you the interesting insight of the impact of the health insurance companies and how they manage to impact the cost of health care. I think being the commissioner of insurance in California also has to give you a sense of pride when October 1 is the day that we had kicked off the State exchange to cover California. That has to give you a sense of accomplishment, but also a sense of dismay that there are folks here who would use the political process to deny people the coverage that they need in order to have a good health program.

I just wanted to share those thoughts not only with you, but with the folks who are viewing us in this country so that they know that we're standing here not because we want to take up time and space, but we want to utilize the experience that we have accrued over time for the benefit of this country. That was the third mandate of Peace Corps, to come home and utilize all that we understand and invest it in this country. I just wanted to share that with you and with the rest of this country.

Now, all day the beltway discussion has been centered on who has the leverage and who is paying the political cost of a government shutdown. What about the human costs, and what about our workers and their families? What about our economy? They cannot afford this. Today there are over 800,000 people that should be working that aren't, and there are people all over this country that rely on the work that these people do.

As long as the majority wages this ideological war, the National Institutes of Health will not be able to accept new patients for lifesaving research. Our veterans will have to go without their disability and pension checks. American families will have their home loans stalled. Family businesses won't have access to the capital they need to grow, and pregnant women and young children will be prevented from receiving critical nutrition support.

I urge my Republican colleagues to think about the families in their districts that don't have a vote on this floor. They expect much more from us and deserve a better outcome. Let's remember that at this very moment, the common denominator is that there is enough agreement in this body on a funding level to end this shutdown right now. Let's do that. Let's bring up the Senate continuing resolution, a

clean one. Let's put people back to work and do what we were sent here to do: keep government working for the American people and fulfill our constitutional obligation.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HONDA, thank you so very much, and thank you for your lifetime of service, your early years in the Peace Corps in El Salvador, the work that you did there, and, as you said, bringing it home and continuing to serve right up through this day and beyond as you continue to represent the great Silicon Valley of California. So thank you very much for all that you have done over these many years.

You mentioned something that I'm going to turn to very quickly. I was the insurance commissioner, and one of the things that we wanted to do in California, but we couldn't get the legislature to pass, was the Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of this we tried to do with regulations, but the Patients' Bill of Rights is now the law of the land.

When our Republican colleagues came forward with a continuing resolution that was actually a sequestration and a low level of funding and added to it the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, I'm going: Wait a minute. You want to repeal the Patients' Bill of Rights?

I'm going to run through this very quickly.

Children with preexisting conditions, young children at birth or in the early years that have developed some serious medical condition before the Patients' Bill of Rights which now is in effect this day, children cannot be denied coverage, period. There are thousands upon thousands of children across this Nation that find themselves in this situation.

Young adults at the age of 18, prior to the Patients' Bill of Rights—and this has been in effect for more than a year now—at the age of 18, they were off of their parents' coverage and they were out there on their own, often unable, particularly if they were a woman, to be able to get insurance. But the Patients' Bill of Rights allows them to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26; and there are more than 6.6 million young Americans 18 to 26 that are now on their parents' health coverage as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Women have the right to health care coverage without discrimination for all kinds of things—breast cancer, pregnancy, and other kinds of illnesses that women might get. Prior to the Patients' Bills of Rights and the Affordable Care Act, there was heavy-duty discrimination against women. They couldn't get insurance. If they could, they would pay substantially more. We're talking that half of the population of America, at one time or another, women—actually, more than half—were facing this discrimination, but no longer with the Patients' Bill of Rights.

□ 2045

Seniors have a right to affordable medication and also to an annual wellness visit, which actually has dramatically reduced the ongoing inflation rate in Medicare, bending the curve.

And then finally, this one down here, every American has the right to health care coverage without a limitation on the annual amount that you could spend. A family with a cancer case would blow right through the limitation. They'd be on their own. And this is what led to the enormous number of personal bankruptcies, more than 50 percent of which were caused by health care problems.

So the Patients' Bill of Rights was, according to our Republican colleagues, to be repealed along with all of the Affordable Health Care Act. Needless to say, those of us on the Democratic side said, This is wrong. This is not good for America. It's not good for Americans, individuals, children, or adults. And we fought the fight.

We're not finished with this yet. Although as of today, it appears as though our Republican colleagues have dropped the issue of defunding, delaying, or repealing the Affordable Health Care Act as far as the continuing resolution is concerned.

I will come back. I will cover some of these things again. I would like now to turn to our new colleague from San Antonio, Texas, JOAQUIN CASTRO. Please join us. You have a great background in that city. And you come with an extraordinary reputation, well earned, as a scholar and as a great citizen of San Antonio.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. And thank you for all of your work and for pointing out the many benefits of the Affordable Care Act, which, as many Americans know, took effect today.

There were so many people that were anxious and excited about getting health care coverage, about comparing prices to see if they might get a lower price for insurance that the Web site actually had glitches, it had problems. But that is a good thing. And in Texas, we know that problem very well. We're the State that has the highest percentage of people that don't have health care coverage at all.

Would you believe that one out of four Texans—25 percent of kids and 25 percent of adults—have no health care coverage at all. Thirty percent of women don't have health care coverage. Thirty-eight percent of Hispanics in Texas don't have health care coverage. And so the fact that the Affordable Care Act and the exchanges kicked off today is a great day for Texas and a great day for Americans.

But as we think about what's going on today—and today has been a very sad day in our country not only because this is the first time in 17 years that our U.S. Government has shut down but because of the way it happened. And I think that, you know, when people woke up today and they turned on the news or the radio or picked up the newspaper and they saw a government shutdown, the people who usually live their lives, work hard every day, sometimes don't have a lot of time to pay attention to politics, saw those headlines and thought, What are these guys up in Washington doing? What are they up to? And that played into all of the stereotypes about how bad Congress is, about how bad politicians are.

But let's think about how this happened. During the summer, there's a junior Senator from Texas, from my home State that barnstormed the Nation and our State, insisting that we defund what was derisively called ObamaCare, that we get rid of all of the patient protections and all of the great things that you have just described. And he, in fact, said that he would do everything in his power, everything in his power to make sure that that law was defunded.

Now you and I both know that you pass laws, you do budgets, and you also raise the debt ceiling limit, but that those are different things, that you don't hold one hostage to the other. But he insisted and got many of the Tea Party members in the House of Representatives—in fact, he had conference calls with them, had personal meetings with them. His folks were calling out the Speaker of the House on Twitter and on Facebook, when the Speaker thought about being reasonable, passing a clean CR so that we could go about the Nation's business.

And it became clear that this was playing into a pattern that has developed with Republicans since 2010, since the increase in Tea Party Republican members. This is the pattern. Think about the sequester. That came about in 2011 through the Budget Control Act. It mostly came about because there was a lot of pressure by Tea Party Republicans to cut in every single corner of government. And so we got a bad law, the sequester, which I think most people acknowledge now is bad.

But if you will remember, Congressman, when that happened, these Republicans who for years, for years have been staking their careers on cutting government, all of a sudden magically were running away from the fact that they did it, were acting like, Wow, that was never our idea. It was the President who wanted sequester. It was the Democrats who insisted on sequester. When, in fact, for years and years and even more intensely since 2010, they have been demanding that we cut government no matter what. But when it happened, many of them wouldn't claim it. They say, That wasn't us.

Well, let's fast forward now 2 years. The same thing happens with a government shutdown. So the government shuts down as they wanted. And what happens the next morning? Folks come to the floor. They do interviews on television. They give quotes in the newspaper saying, It wasn't us. We've been

saying this the whole time, but it wasn't us. It was the Democrats that did it.

Look, if you're going to advocate for something, if you're going to push for something, then you need to own it, and you need to accept it.

Now I will say, if you look at a lot of the social media sites for Republicans, a lot of those Tea Party supporters are very honest about what they want. I had a chance to read through many of them yesterday. And they said, Shut it down. Shut the government down.

Now, look, there may be a small percentage of Americans who feel that way, who are so frustrated with government, who are so frustrated with American society that they do, in fact, want to shut America down. But the vast majority of both Republicans and Democrats know that that's a horrendous thing.

So what we have today are some errant comments by folks who slipped up politically and said, Yes, we're happy about shutting this thing down. But then you have another group of folks who, even though they voted in lockstep with Senator CRUZ and the Tea Party Republicans, now try to cast aspersions on the folks who tried to stop it, the Democrats. You can't have it both ways. If you advocated for it for years, if this was your strategy, then when it happens, you take responsibility for the results.

Now there's also been a little bit of debate about, well, how do you handle this situation? We know, as I said, that you don't hold the budget hostage to policy. In other words, you don't try to change policy through the budget. We understand that.

So just to crystallize that, I would ask my colleagues, if you think it's okay to not raise the debt ceiling limit or approve a budget because you disagree with public policy, a law that was passed 3 years ago, then I would ask you, should we not approve a budget, as Democrats? Or should we not raise the debt ceiling limit because we believe that there should be a comprehensive immigration reform plan with a path to citizenship?

Now bear in mind, these guys are saying that the Affordable Care Act is upside down in its numbers. In other words, there are probably about 53 percent of Americans saying, quite frankly, that they don't like it right now. More and more are liking it. But they're right on those numbers.

Well, 60 percent of Americans say they want comprehensive immigration reform. Ninety percent of Americans said they wanted background checks. Should we hold out and say, We're not going to raise the debt ceiling limit unless we get universal background checks or we get comprehensive immigration reform? Of course not. And Democrats have acted responsibly. There's a reason that we've not done that. Because we respect this democracy. We respect the Nation. And we're honest with the Nation.

So I hope that as cooler heads prevail that we'll be able to resolve this, that we'll be able to pass a clean CR, and that we will be able to do the people's business in a respectful and honest way.

Thank you, Congressman, very much for the time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CASTRO, thank you so very, very much. You spoke of your Senator, Senator CRUZ. I suspect in 5 years, you're going to replace him, and I would like that.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I'm happy to hear that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's time for us to go back to our East-West Show, which we have done here many, many nights. My colleague from the State of New York, PAUL TONKO, who has represented for 5 years now the area where the Industrial Revolution began, along the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers.

Right now we're in a fix here in Washington. The government is shut down. All of the things you've talked about over these many years, about building the American economy, manufacturing, the research that you were responsible for for the State of New York—and it's all shut down.

Mr. TONKO. Right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Share with us your thoughts if you would, please.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Well, the gentleman from Texas gave a great rundown of the dynamics that have brought us to this moment.

It's a sad day in this House with a government shutdown. The Republican shutdown of government is something that I think bears great consequences. And we've seen it and heard about it already. I wasn't here for the last such episode, which is about 17 years old in duration, but I do know that hearing from constituents already about concerns for vital services, about furloughing, about the impact on family budgets for our many, many Federal workers is real.

So we need to move forward, I think, in a way that allows us to address a clean CR. People say, Well, what is a clean CR? What is a CR? A continuing resolution allows for a short-term continuation of a Federal budget, absent a negotiated budget.

And I think that we find ourselves in this situation where we require a CR. Hopefully it will be a clean one. No bells and whistles, no attachments. And the desire to attach the Affordable Care Act and to call it on this floor in those discussions, in those debates ''a bill'' is disingenuous. It's an act. It is a law that was signed into place by the President and that was given constitutional approval when reviewed by the highest Court in the land, the Supreme Court. So let's call it what it is. It's a law.

This is unprecedented in trying to take a law and repeal it as part of a negotiating process to move a budget forward. A budget should be about the math of that budget, about upward/downward adjustments of programs and putting together a blueprint for whatever—a 3-month, 4-month scenario that will enable the government to be funded and continue to operate. And quickly coming upon the heels of that is a debt ceiling bill that needs, again, approval from Congress to have America pay her bills.

So these are basic fundamental processes that ought not be tainted by political whim and disagreement and discontent with an outcome that is 3 years old now and that found a great threshold date today, October 1, as many people are now allowed to enroll across the country for the purposes of health care coverage—affordable, accessible, quality health care for individuals and families. That was the thematic. That was the mission statement. That was the goal. So we need to go forward. We need to now get out of this shutdown and not enable it to continue for any longer in duration. And we need to make certain that we understand that the need for a CR, a continuing resolution, is because we don't have a budget.

Now when the United States Senate approved its version of a budget, when the House of Representatives—this body—approved its version of a budget, and when the President and his administration offered their fiscal blueprint for the fiscal year, we should have moved forward.

Many of us—yourself, myself—aggressively encouraged the leadership to name the panelists at the conference table. Name the ''conferees,'' as they're dubbed, to the process so that we can put together a budget—balanced, bold—that allows us to do the sort of creative qualities that would reduce the deficit, grow the economy, create a climate for growing jobs, and produce revenues where they're essential so that we cut where we can in order to invest where we must, especially in this innovation economy.

That should have been the order of business for the day. This whole debate, this whole shutdown, the Republican shutdown that happened to become reality this morning at midnight could have been avoided if we had gone forward, named the conferees, named the panelists to the conference table to negotiate out a settlement, recommend to the two houses, get the work done. This economy, this Nation requires that. The individuals, families members across this Nation deserve that sort of certainty, as does the small business community.

□ 2100

That's the business that should have been accomplished; but, instead, we find ourselves requiring a CR. And now, in this painful moment of allowing for the budget to be funded, or a CR to be done, we attach bells and whistles like the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Unnecessary, immoral, in a sense, to hold back a process like this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might just add to the exposition that you laid out: the

two budget proposals, the Senate and the House budget proposals both passed. The Senate appointed conferees. To this moment, the House has not appointed conferees to the budget conference committee.

Mr. TONKO. And the leader of the minority has named the conferees for the Democrats in the House. So you're right, just about everyone named those individuals that will be part of the team at the conference table, getting work done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So the Republican leadership refused to establish the conference committee by refusing to name the conferees.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And, again, every effort has been made to advance letters, to speak from the floor, to notice the leadership of our request, our urging, our challenge to name these people. That's the way the business gets done.

It was avoided, for whatever reason, perhaps not believing in your own budget that you put together as a House. Otherwise, why would you not bring it forward?

Why would you not vote on your own budget in a way that would have us at the conference table?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, there you have it. And we have a shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, let us split that time. Would you like to close, or would you like to continue on?

Mr. TONKO. I will just make mention of this, that I think the muddying up, if you will, of a CR, a continuing resolution, first, calling it a bill on the floor several times over is disingenuous. People place trust in us. You should honor that trust, and not, nomenclature-wise, change the outcome here.

We have an act of Congress that was signed into law. This is a law of the land, in this case, to provide for affordable, accessible, quality health care. If you didn't like that result, there were opportunities to change it.

Candidate Romney, Governor Romney, Representative RYAN, as the Vice President, they ran to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The people of this great Nation decided in that Presidential election for the re-election effort of President Obama, that they were going to stay with the President. So that statement was made.

The highest court in the land reviewed it for constitutionality. They approved that, gave it a thumbs-up.

Why are we still dwelling on this situation?

Why are we bogging down the process, where you either defund, deny, repeal, whatever the course may be. We have seen it over and over again, so that 45, 46, 47 votes in a row to repeal were all denied.

When you do the same thing over and over and over again, expecting different results, people have defined that as insanity.

So we have not provided the sort of integrity this process needs. We have not shown the respect to the individuals and families that are automatically showing today, with the very aggressive, very involved activism today to sign up with the Affordable Care Act. We are disregarding that. We're disrespecting that.

And I think the polling that was done, I saw a poll today that said 71 percent of the American public does not believe we should hold up and fold the government, shut down the government because of an effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. So the public is speaking. They're telling us, do it better.

And thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for the opportunity to join you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for joining me once again.

I'm going to wrap this up with a note of sadness. The American Government is shut down. It is shut down because of the conflict that has developed between the Democrats and the Republicans here in the House and on the Senate side.

It's a conflict that didn't have to happen. We could have worked this out in a conference committee, had Speaker BOEHNER chosen to appoint conferees. It didn't take place.

A continuing resolution—the Democrats compromised seriously and accepted a continuing resolution at the sequestration level, far less money than we think is necessary, but we wanted to keep the government running.

We refuse to abandon the Affordable Care Act and the millions upon millions of Americans that have benefited from that and are benefiting today as the exchanges are going into place.

California's had an enormous success, and it will work. And as it works, I think we'll find that those Americans, some 40 million that do not have health insurance, will, in the next months ahead, get their health insurance at an affordable cost. And this is already bending the cost curve for American health care. It's a good thing.

But it's also a very sad day. There is absolutely no reason that this government was shut down, except for the intransigence of our Republican colleagues demanding the repeal of things like the Patients' Bill of Rights, demanding that we go back on a promise that America has tried to have for some 60 years now, providing health insurance to all Americans. We're moving towards that with the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare.

It's a sad day, but it's also a hopeful day. It's a hopeful day because the exchanges are working. There will be computer glitches, and there will be some error in the mathematics; but across this Nation, the exchanges are working.

And the American public that is uninsured, not the insured, but the uninsured, they're going to the exchanges and they're saying, let me shop; let me shop in a rational market where I can compare prices and quality and providers. They're doing that in California, in New York, and in Texas, all across this Nation.

So it's hopeful. It's a hopeful moment, even though we have spent the last week battling out the fundamental question, Is America going to move forward and stay in business, or is the government going to shut down?

Republicans chose to shut down the government.

Are Americans going to get health care?

The Republicans said no, the Affordable Care Act must be repealed.

The Democrats said no way, no how.

It's in place, folks. The Affordable Care Act is in place, and the exchanges are working, and millions of Americans will find an opportunity to buy insurance in a competitive market, free market, not a government market, but a market structured by government so that the private sector can display its insurance policies, what their price is, what their quality is, which doctors they can go to.

It's a sad day, but it's also a hopeful day.

Mr. Speaker, with our 54 minutes, we thank you for the opportunity to explain this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 54 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, for allowing the House GOP Doctors Caucus to have the leadership hour tonight on this historic day, October 1, the ObamaCare exchange launch date. It's entirely fitting that the Speaker allowed our House GOP Doctors Caucus.

This group, Mr. Speaker, is made up of medical doctors, made up of registered nurses, dentists, hospital administrators, psychologists, optometrists, with over—now, get this, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues—with over 600 years of clinical experience.

Who knows better, in this Chamber of 435, than these 21 men and women who have spent almost their entire professional lives before being elected to the House of Representatives in the health care sector.

So here we are, October 1, ObamaCare exchange launch date, and hearing about malfunctions nationwide. We have received warning signs for months now that ObamaCare

wasn't ready, my colleagues, for prime time.

Now, with exchange malfunctions in more than 30 States on opening day, the best HHS can do is tweet, I'm sorry?

On top of that, after having years to prepare for this disastrous law, the President informed us that we could expect these glitches for months to come.

ObamaCare was a bad law when it was signed 3½ years ago; and now that we know what's in it, I firmly believe it's even worse law today.

Someone trying to receive coverage in the exchange right here in Washington, D.C., reported this today, Mr. Speaker: After waiting on hold for 3 hours and 43 minutes, I was finally able to speak to a representative, who told me she could not help me find a health insurance plan or provide any plan pricing information because, and this is a quote, ''the system is down and not currently working at this time.''

She recommended I call back in a few days. I guess $1.329 trillion in taxpayer funds no longer gets you a functional government takeover of health care.

Mr. Speaker, how can the administration expect people to believe that the exchanges are ready and that this bill is ready for prime time, with Americans facing this sort of experience today, October 1, the roll-out date?

Let me just take a moment and maybe play David Letterman. Top reasons why ObamaCare's exchanges aren't ready for prime time, colleagues:

Number one, your data isn't secure. Think about that. In the ObamaCare exchanges, Federal bureaucrats will have unprecedented access to your personal data. Thank the navigators that were hired. They will have not only access to your health care data, but also to your financial data.

And this raises a myriad of privacy questions, which are only further emboldened by the risk of human error. Recently, a Minnesota exchange employee accidentally leaked 2,400 Social Security numbers.

Number two, no eligibility verification to enroll. No eligibility verification to enroll. The Obama administration announced this summer that it will allow individuals to self-attest that he or she meets income requirements to get a tax credit, a subsidy.

Eligibility verification is not only required by the law, which the administration has chosen to ignore again; it ensures that aid reaches the most vulnerable Americans for whom it was intended.

I recently voted for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, to correct, Mr. Speaker, this reckless policy. That law, that bill that I voted for, it's not law yet because the majority leader in the Senate is putting it in File 13, where he puts every other bill that the Republican House passes.

I'm very pleased that the author of this bill, Representative DIANE BLACK from Tennessee, a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, is with us tonight; and I'll be yielding time to her momentarily.

Number three, Mr. Speaker, software glitches. Across the Nation, further implementation delays have been caused by several glitches in the health exchange software. One of these accounts even strikes at the heart of the law's coverage expansion, making it impossible to determine how much people need to pay for coverage.

Number four, system not prepared for small businesses. The Obama administration recently warned the small businesses, those companies that employ less than 50 people, sometimes maybe 10 or 15, that they won't yet be able to shop for health insurance for their employees through online exchanges, leaving them to rely on snail mail or faxes for at least another month.

Number five, plans advertised on the exchanges, Mr. Speaker are misleading. Early this month it was reported that many insurers, including Florida Blue and Aetna, were concerned that information offered on the exchange sites was misleading and, in some cases, not representative of plans that exist.

Well, I could go on, but at this point I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), my colleague and the author of that bill; and I know she wants to talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2115

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. I also thank you for having this tonight and giving us an opportunity to talk about the Patient Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, Americans didn't want a government shutdown and they don't want ObamaCare. Because of the Senate Democrats, today they're staring both in the face.

We in the House of Representatives offered the Senate Democrats three bipartisan continuing resolutions that would keep the government open and protect the American people from this onerous mandate and the President's disastrous health care law, only to see them quickly rejected along party lines with little opportunity for debate.

Now ObamaCare and the Senate Democrats' prized government shutdown are here. The reviews are in. They're not good.

Today, millions Americans experienced delays and technical glitches in trying to enroll in ObamaCare exchanges, leading the Associated Press to report that the program is ''not working as planned.''

Meanwhile, The Wall Street Journal tried unsuccessfully to apply online for ObamaCare in all 50 States. And on MSNBC, a reporter gave up trying to enroll in ObamaCare after 30 minutes, saying:

> If I were signing up for myself, this is where my patience would be exhausted.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. Under ObamaCare's Navigator program, thousands of unlicensed ''in-person assisters'' will be tasked with going across the country and propagandizing the President's health care law. They'll have as little as 20 hours of training and no background check, high school diploma, or prior experience required, despite having access to our very personal information, including our names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and tax returns.

But don't worry, says the Obama administration. They'll have a 207-page Navigator Standard Operating Procedures Manual. The size of a college textbook, this is the guide that navigators should be expected to learn in just 20 hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've been working my way through this manual, hoping that it would provide these navigators with some insight on our complex health care system. Instead, I'm finding that this manual is filled with lessons like in section 2–2-1, Smiling. Yes, it says, ''Smiles are contagious,'' the manual reads. ''Usually, when you smile at somebody, they will smile back at you.'' The manual goes on to instruct navigators to ''nod occasionally'' when interacting with consumers and to maintain an ''open and inviting'' posture.

Addressing security concerns, the manual reminds navigators not to leave Americans' ''tax return information on printers and fax machines.''

Mr. Speaker, the Navigator program is an open invitation for misuse of taxpayer information. The American people should not have their most sensitive personal information in the hands of people who have not been, at bare minimum, subjected to background checks.

My House Republican colleagues and I remain committed to fighting this law and protecting Americans from widespread fraud and abuse in the ObamaCare Navigator program. The Senate has an open invitation to join us. The question is: When will they?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Let me, colleagues, point out to you this poster that I have on the easel before us. This is the official United States Government Web site to get information about the rollout of the exchanges. And that's today, as we said at the outset of the hour, October 1.

The Web site, healthcare.gov, if you went to it today, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, here's the information you get:

> The system is down at the moment. We're working to resolve the issue as soon as possible. Please try again later.

Three-and-a-half years ago, March 23, 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—the official name of this law—was signed by the President. It did become the law of the land. I don't think that the name of the law is very appropriate. Patient Protection? I doubt it. Affordable Care Act?

Listen to this: In my home State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, the Aetna

Health Insurance Company has a number of policyholders. A recent letter was sent to those policyholders, Mr. Speaker. Let me read it, because I think this is so telling:

We're here to help you with your health insurance. We value our customers. We want to help you understand your health plan options for 2014.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this is a letter from Aetna Health Insurance to their policyholders.

The Affordable Care Act is changing health insurance. This includes adding new preventive care and essential health benefit requirements.

In other words, mandated. The government is going to tell people and health insurance companies what has to be in the policies.

They go on to say:

The Affordable Care Act also ends medical underwriting. Due to these and other changes, some people will pay more for their health coverage and others less.

In other words, standard rates, whether you have a preexisting condition. You could have heart disease, you could have high blood pressure, you could have diabetes type 2, or you could be a 28-year-old man or woman, healthy, strong, athletic, no bad habits, enjoy the Methuselah gene in your family. And so you're going to pay the same thing that someone does that's 58 years old and with three or four preexisting conditions. Well, that's exactly the case, and that's why Aetna goes on to say to their policyholders:

The Affordable Care Act will affect your health insurance plan. Your current policy will end December 31, 2013. You need to buy a new plan now so that you do not have a gap in coverage on January 1, 2014.

And then they go on to say this, Mr. Speaker:

Here are your buy-in options. Buy a 2013 Aetna plan effective in December. This plan is identical to your current coverage, and it would continue for the next 12 months. Then, you will need to buy a new Affordable Care Act plan in 2015. If you choose this option, please take action by November 25, 2013.

Now, here's your other option, as they point out. Option number two:

Buy a 2014 Aetna Affordable Care Act plan—

''Affordable,'' I emphasize that again.

—effective January 1, 2014. This plan meets all the Affordable Care Act requirements. If we don't hear from you or you don't take any action, we will automatically enroll you into the 2014 Affordable Care plan below.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The current plan, the one that they're on, the 2013 plan, Georgia Managed Choice Open Access Value 2500—that's what the plan is called—if you go ahead, as they said, by November 25, 2013, and sign up, you re-up for that plan that you like—and the President said, If you like your plan, you can keep it; remember that one?—then your monthly premium will be $364.

Your other choice, the 2014 Affordable Care Act plan, Aetna Classic 3500 PD, $634 a month, Mr. Speaker. Remember, the 2013 plan, I said $364. If you buy the affordable care plan mandated by the government in 2014, it's double.

So anybody that thinks that the insurance commissioner, Ralph Hudgens, of the State of Georgia didn't know what he's talking about several months ago when he said that the Affordable Care Act, in some instances—and this is Aetna giving us their information—the premiums are going to go up as much as 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we're talking about. We just absolutely cannot afford the Affordable Care Act.

The President assured us that this was paid for and that it was not going to cost more than $900 billion over 10 years. The CBO now says, Mr. Speaker, that it's at least twice that much in cost.

Look, at midnight on October 1, as you heard my colleagues from the other side of the aisle just a few minutes ago in their leadership hour talking about the Federal Government shutting down, indeed, at midnight on October 1, appropriations for the Federal Government did expire. By law, Congress must agree on a funding measure or the government will shut down.

As Washington has been run by Democrats for the past 5 years, Mr. Speaker, it's become a dysfunctional disaster. Americans expect, and they deserve, their elected officials to work together to find solutions. President Obama and Senate Democrats have drawn red lines and they refuse to negotiate or even talk to those who disagree with them unless, of course, it's President Vladimir Putin of Russia or Hassan Rouhani of Iran.

In fact, House Republicans have passed three continuing resolutions, or temporary spending bills, to keep this government open and to either defund or to delay ObamaCare—which the majority of Americans support. They were against it 3½ years ago; they are against it today; and they support what we are doing in the Republican House of Representatives.

I praise and commend Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and the leadership of ERIC CANTOR and KEVIN MCCARTHY for the strength that they have had in regard to this and for being so inclusive for every single member of our caucus.

□ 2130

All of these proposals, Mr. Speaker, that were submitted to the Senate were rejected. They were rejected by HARRY REID and Senate Democrats.

This morning, in the wee hours of this morning, the Senate voted 54–46 against coming to the negotiating table with House Republicans. I'll refer my colleagues to this poster. I would like for all of you to take a close look at this poster because this says it all in these hashtags: Let's talk. If the President can talk to Putin and the President can talk to Rouhani, why in the world can't the President talk to conferees in the House of Representatives, just sit down and talk?

You've rejected not one, not two, not three, but four of our proposals without even a response, without even a counterproposal. And what the Speaker has said is: Let's talk. I have appointed—and he has appointed the best and brightest minds on the Republican side of this Chamber to discuss this issue with the conferees. But Mr. Speaker, HARRY REID, the majority leader, has refused to come to the table, has refused to appoint conferees.

In fact, look at hashtag number two in regard to what we have been asking as just some compromise in regard to passing a CR and keeping this Federal Government open. We have nobody on our side of the aisle—nobody, Mr. Speaker—wanted this government to shut down. But here is what was rejected by the House, by the Senate Democrats, by HARRY REID, the majority leader.

Look at this second hashtag: Fairness for all. Fairness for all. If the President, Mr. Speaker, can say to large employers across this country who went to him and lobbied—big lobbying shops with the ability to do this, that said, look, we're not ready; January 1, 2014 does not give us time to prepare the documents that we need to prepare that are required by the Affordable Care Act—and the President, by Executive order, granted them a year delay with no fines, no penalties, no nothing. Everything the same as it was prior to the passage of ObamaCare.

So we say: Fairness for all. Why not do that same thing for middle America, for the men and women that are struggling, working every day, sometimes two jobs, to support their families. You're going to say that for them, no waiver, no special treatment, no fairness. If you don't have a health insurance policy—and one that is dictated to you by the Federal Government in regard to what it has to entail—then we're going to fine you $95 if you're an individual or $295 if you're a family. That was one of the things that we asked of the Senate in regard to extending the CR, fairness for all—summarily rejected by HARRY REID.

Then the last point: no special treatment. You know, colleagues, Mr. Speaker, you know exactly what I'm talking about here. Members of Congress, by law—this was put in on the Senate side. But by law, Members of Congress and their staff no longer, come January 1, will be in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan. They will be part of ObamaCare. They will have to get their health insurance in the exchanges. By law, they're not eligible, unless their salary allows it—maybe some entry-level staff members would be eligible for a subsidy, but certainly no Member of Congress.

Well, the people in Georgia, the people in my district, when they found out about that, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, they were absolutely livid. This is a fairness issue. This is absolutely something that anyone can see is wrong.

We should be treated—we, the democratic majority, not we Republicans—but Congress enacted this law, and to say that we should get a dispensation from it and then cram it down the throats of the American people who never wanted it in the first place, that is grossly, grossly unfair.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that I've been joined by another colleague of mine in the House GOP Doctors Caucus. This is the gentlewoman from North Carolina, a registered nurse. Her husband is a general surgeon. She is a great Member of this body, and I'm proud to yield to Representative RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much to my distinguished colleague from Georgia. This is such an important day. We have reached day one of the ObamaCare exchange being up.

If you look at the chart that we have up, very similar, Congressman GINGREY, to that same chart that you are showing, it is what North Carolina is seeing today. For any North Carolinian who is going on the Web site, it is not ready for prime time.

I rise today to talk about the failures of ObamaCare and why we have persisted for so long to remove this terrible law. It is law, we get that. We understand it. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. However, it is a bad law. It is bad for America, it is bad for the economy. It is bad for health care. And as it is right now, it will not be improved. There's no way that we can change it, that we can improve it at this point.

The exchanges being up, 32 States that are showing the same screen to those who are going online, those who have been promised this exchange so that they can check and see what kind of coverage they will have available to them, this is what they are seeing.

Coupled with the government shutdown—which we all tried to avoid with every effort possible—there again, the Senate not cooperating with us, the President staying committed to ObamaCare going forward when we know the structure is simply not in place.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I ran for office a couple of years ago. I was elected in 2010. My whole goal has been to repeal ObamaCare because it is not only, again, devastating to the American people, to our economy, but to health care itself. When you have devoted your life to something and you see that it is just being taken apart in front of you, you know that you have to act. Nevertheless, here we are, day one of ObamaCare, day one failure.

For 3½ years, countless administration officials have testified before us in subcommittee hearings in Energy and Commerce over and over and over again. The question has been posed to them: Will the exchanges be ready October 1, 2013? Repeatedly, consistently we heard from administrators of those agencies: Yes, we are right online; everything is moving completely the way that we would envision it to move. Yeah, there may be some glitches here and there, but we are ready to go October 1. And this is what the American people are seeing.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentlelady will yield to me just for a second, I will yield right back to her.

Even the Hispanic language Web site is not available to these people that need to get that vital information. The Web site for the Hispanic is down.

Mrs. ELLMERS. You know, and that gets to the greater point that the gentleman points out. This objective, when President Obama put it forward—I go back to the summer of 2009. I was not in any position to ever considering running for office; working as a nurse with my husband in his general surgery practice, trying to take care of the patients back home. When we were learning about what the President was proposing, we said, you know what, we just can't simply sit back and watch this happen to us, we have to speak out. Because there were many in our medical community who said, you know, this is wrong, this is wrong. We know that there are reforms that are needed. We know that we have so much to fix in health care. But this approach, this government takeover of health care, is only going to lead to socialized medicine. We know that. And that's not a winning health care system, not when you have the best health care system in the world.

So we did, we started speaking out. We got on the road, we talked to people, we explained to them how dangerous this was. The very conversations I was having then are being realized today. The fears that we were discussing, the issues that we were discussing about where this would take us in health care, are now being realized.

The quote that's on the chart, ''The system is down at the moment. We are working to resolve this issue as soon as possible. Please try again later.'' That is what the people who are in need of health care, that's what they're reading. And for the hardworking taxpayers of America, that is what you're paying for, a complete and total failure of the Federal Government.

We agree, the system is down. That is why we fought so hard for a delay. That is why we felt that that reform was a very essential piece moving forward. That is why we're fighting today for every American to have the same health care coverage, the same options that we in Congress have.

Every American should be treated fairly. Every American should have the same opportunities as everyone else. You cannot just simply hand out waivers to those that you pick and choose.

You know, when big businesses have the ability now to have that mandate put to the side for a year, why does the individual—the individual who needs it more than anyone, the one who's going to that site looking for health care, they can't even be helped by that right now. Meanwhile, we're telling them, oh, and by the way, you're going to pay for this.

If you're a young adult male in North Carolina, your premiums are going to quadruple. If you're a young woman, your health care premiums are going to triple. That is who is going to pay for this. And the system is down; it isn't even working.

As my colleagues and I have been saying over and over again, this law is not ready for prime time, and it never will be. It is unworkable. It will continue to remain so. And for months, again, HHS, IRS, CMS, all of these agencies have repeatedly said that when today comes, October 1, it would be up and running.

I do want to share with you just one of many, but one phone call we received today from one of my constituents, Rachael Burt from Fuquay Varina, North Carolina. She called our office and spoke to one of my staff. And she was emotional, she was concerned, and she was afraid. She said: ''My husband's premium is going up 155 percent. We are shocked. I am on maternity leave, and I am afraid to know how much mine will go up. I'm sure the letter is on its way though.''

In anticipation of this, this poor woman is waiting to receive that information. And what she said was: ''ObamaCare seems to be nothing but a punishment on those who are trying to do the right thing.'' Rachel, I can't agree more. That's what the problem is here. That's why we're working so hard to fix it.

We will remain committed to this issue. We will continue to pursue a delay. And by the way, we will continue to pursue avenues for health care coverage that really are truly affordable, that really do give more coverage to Americans, that really are patient centered, such as the RSC plan, the American Health Care Reform Act that Members of our own conference worked on—eight Members to be exact—to give the American people a choice other than this failure on October 1 of ObamaCare.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina and the very fine points that she makes in regard to this law.

□ 2145

And the problems that the American people are facing here—as I say, 3½ years after enactment of the law—Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine it taking me 3½ years to get something right and not have enough time.

But just listen to this: it does not instill confidence that the administration was scheduled to certify the security of the health IT system—information technology—people's health information—just hours before millions of Americans are expected to upload their personal information—health care information, financial information. That is a pretty scary prospect, my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to think just hours ahead of time.

What is more important than one's personal health care information? Not even their financial information. Because we are talking about life and death issues here, Mr. Speaker. It has given waivers and delays to politically favored friends, but left the rest of America to bear the full weight of the law. That is what we were talking about in this poster that I want my colleagues, once again, to focus on in regard to ''fairness for all''—''fairness for all.'' We are not getting it.

To quell the public's growing discontent, the President is actually now marketing efforts to protect families from this looming train wreck as ''crazy.'' The American people face costly and onerous mandates, small businesses struggle to keep up with the rising costs, doctors—my colleagues, my former colleagues in Georgia where I practiced for 26 years obstetrics and gynecology in Cobb County, Marietta, Georgia, the heart of the Eleventh Congressional District—doctors frustrated with the challenges of a government-run health care system, and the security of America's health and financial information is unknown.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the doctors know, they know this is just a first salvo. They understand that the intent was to have a single-payer system, not unlike the UK or Canada or Australia. That is what the leading Democrats—the Democrats that have been in this body for 20, 30, 40, and in some cases 50 years—have been trying to literally force-feed to the American people who absolutely don't want it.

Add October 1 to the list of dates on which the Obama administration pretends an unworkable health care scheme is precisely what the American people were promised—an admission not yet made, but inevitable nonetheless. Mark down October 1, 2013, as a day in infamy, as a day in infamy.

This behavior, Mr. Speaker, is not what Americans deserve, and it is a reminder that we need new leadership. We need new leadership in the White House and in the Senate. We need a new Senate majority leader. After 2014, I think we are going to have one. House Republicans will continue working day and night to return the United States Government to business as usual—to business as usual.

I oppose a government shutdown. As I said at the outset of the hour, Mr. Speaker—as I conclude our time—I oppose a government shutdown, and I am fighting, yes, to repeal ObamaCare, as I have for the last 4 years.

In the meantime—in the meantime—I do agree with President Obama that implementation of this flawed and disastrous health care law must be delayed, it must be delayed. However, Mr. Speaker, the President has only delayed ObamaCare for his political friends—a few privileged Americans and big corporations.

That is where we disagree. If we cannot repeal the law, I believe that it must be delayed for all Americans. We have spent the last 50 minutes, Mr. Speaker, talking about that, explaining to our colleagues in this Chamber and to the American people that this law is not and will never be ready for prime time.

It was flawed from the very beginning. Has it brought down the cost of health care? Is there anything in the law about medical liability reform that the President promised? Has it fulfilled the pledge from the President of the United States that ''if you like your health insurance, you can keep it, nothing has to change''? Has it fulfilled the mandate that it has strengthened Medicare?

How, Mr. Speaker, can a law strengthen Medicare when $750 billion was taken out of that program for our precious seniors—our parents and our grandparents—that are struggling, it is struggling. Statistics show that if we don't make some changes by as early as 2016 that claims will not be honored. When that happens and when we continue to cut reimbursement to our providers, there will be no primary care doctors to take care of our most precious seniors.

So these are the things that from the very beginning you are robbing Peter to pay Paul, you are taking money out of one entitlement program to create a whole new entitlement program—I guess you could call it, Mr. Speaker: Medicare for all from cradle to grave. But really what it is is national health insurance.

We are talking about health care in this country is one-sixth of our economy. Do we want the Federal Government—think about it, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, think about it—do you want the Federal Government, that entity that runs Amtrak, that entity that is responsible for the U.S. Postal Service, do you want that entity to run one-sixth of the economy, and that one-sixth dealing with life and death and the health of a Nation? No, no, Mr. Speaker. We don't want that; the American people don't want that, just voted loud and clear.

It just astounds me that this Democratic majority in the Senate and this President won't even agree to basic fairness issues, like I have here on this poster, won't even agree to go to conference with the conferees that our great Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has appointed to just sit down and talk. The President goes all over the world talking to people that I wouldn't talk to. In a New York minute I wouldn't talk to them; I wouldn't trust them. But we can trust each other.

The men and women in this House on both sides of the aisle, the men and women in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, the leadership, these are honorable people. And to just stand in the way of sitting down and having a conversation and saying, look, you disagreed with our ''fairness for all'' issue; you disagreed with our ''no special treatment.'' Please let's talk.

That is what Speaker BOEHNER is saying to Leader REID. I think, Mr. Speaker, I think if we do that, I think if we do that, we can solve this problem and move forward with the financial security of this Nation.

We are at a physical cliff. We owe $17 trillion. On October 17, the Treasury says we are going to have to borrow another God knows how much. Is it $1 trillion, is it $2 trillion, is it $3 trillion? I don't know. But we can't kick the can down the road anymore. This can won't even move, it is so crunched up.

It is time for us to come together, as the Speaker says, and let's talk.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3163. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical, Physical Readiness, Training, and Access Authorization Standards for Protective Force Personnel [Docket No.: DOE-HQ-2012-0002] (RIN: 1992-AA40) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3164. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Human Reliability Program: Technical Amendments (RIN: 1992-AA44) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3165. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report on New Federal Maritime Commission proposed systems of records subject to the Privacy Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3166. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC803) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3167. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC771) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3168. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Abbreviated Framework [Docket No.: 13032296-3642-02] (RIN: 0648-BD10) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3169. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Closure of the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XC782) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3170. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Reef Fish Management Measures [Docket No.: 120907427-3652-02] (RIN: 0648-BC51) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3171. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0811] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3172. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Baltimore Harbor; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0529] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3173. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lafourche Bayou, Larose, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0243] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3174. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hudson River, Troy and Green Island, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0257] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3175. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Escape to Miami Triathlon, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0688] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3176. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North Atlantic Ocean; Virginia Beach, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0755] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3177. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0262; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17548; AD 2013-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3178. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aerospace, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0448; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-17542; AD 2013-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3179. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0207; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-17530; AD 2013-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3180. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Port Limits of Indianapolis, IN [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0006] received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3181. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Fee; Guidance for the 2014 Fee Year [Notice 2013-51] received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3182. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Treasury Regulations Pursuant to Section 939A of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act [TD 9637] (RIN: 1545-BK27) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3183. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Conforming Changes to Regulations Regarding Medicare Determinations and Income-Related Monthly Adjustment to Amounts to Medicare Part B Premiums [Docket No.: SSA-2012-0011] (RIN: 0960-AH47) received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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. SALMON (for himself, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. RADEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COOK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3225. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3226. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in South Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3227. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in South Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 3228. A bill to establish the Office of the Constitutional Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3229. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, 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. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 72. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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. SALMON:

H.R. 3225.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3226.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 3227.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3228.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3229.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.J. Res. 70.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.J. Res. 71.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 72.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 342: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 541: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 609: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 647: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 685: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 846: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 905: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1074: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1186: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1250: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1263: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1317: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1354: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1413: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1590: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1779: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1830: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1844: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1856: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1861: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1982: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2213: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2300: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2485: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2502: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2504: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2539: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2607: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2697: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2800: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2809: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 2874: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2881: Mr. CARTRIGHT.

H.R. 2894: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3067: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3076: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3111: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3128: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3131: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3132: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3137: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3140: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3152: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3160: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3166: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3170: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 3215: Mr. POLIS and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3223: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KIND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3224: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. ESTY, Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 147: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 327: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. LANKFORD.

H. Res. 353: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 356: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 365: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 70, the National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 71, the District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 72, the Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013 No. 133

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Be merciful to us, O God. Because of Your constant love, because of Your great mercy, wipe away our sins of commission and omission. During this legislative stalemate, help our lawmakers to test all things by their own conscience, seeking to do right as You give them the ability to see it. Stir their hearts, making them bold to follow Your ways. In these days that try our souls, strengthen our weakness, replacing cynicism with faith and cowardice with courage.

We pray, in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we expect to receive the House message momentarily. I will move to table this motion when it arrives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist on its amendment to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H.J. Res. 59) entitled ''Joint Resolution Making Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014, and for other purposes,'' and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table the motion from the House, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Crapo	Kirk
Ayotte	Cruz	Lee
Barrasso	Enzi	McCain
Blunt	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Flake	Moran
Burr	Graham	Murkowski
Chambliss	Grassley	Paul
Chiesa	Hatch	Portman
Coats	Heller	Risch
Coburn	Hoeven	Roberts
Cochran	Inhofe	Rubio
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Thune	Toomey	Vitter
Wicker		

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask this consent agreement under the background that the government is closed. All over America Federal employees were given 4 hours this morning to clear out their e-mails, computers, and close down their offices. All over America they were asked to come to work at 8 o'clock this morning, but by noon they will be out of their offices.

The government is closed because of the irrationality of what is going on on the other side of the Capitol. That is unfortunate, but that is the way it is. I will have more to say later.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m.—one-half hour after lunch time—with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Well, Mr. President, Democratic leaders in Congress

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

Printed on recycled paper.

finally have their prize—a government shutdown that no one seems to want but them. House Republicans worked late into the night this weekend to keep the government open, and Senate Democrats dragged their feet literally for days. They refused to pass anything. News reports suggest the majority leader was even working behind the scenes to block any bipartisan negotiations from taking place.

Then, after doing essentially nothing all weekend but obstruct, with just hours left to go, Democrats voted again and again to reject reasonable legislation. Every piece of legislation the House sent over would have kept the government from shutting down—every single one of them. Each one represented more of a compromise than the last. And get this: Last night Senate Democrats went so far as to reject legislation that would have kept the government running under just two conditions—just two—that families get the same 1-year relief as employers and that Congress has to follow the same rules on the ObamaCare exchanges as their constituents. That is how extreme the Democratic position is. They won't even accept basic fairness as a principle under ObamaCare.

Today they have gone even further. They have now said they won't even agree to sit down and work out differences. They won't even talk about it. They literally just voted against working out a compromise. They seem completely opposed to negotiation or compromise on a law that is killing jobs, driving up premiums, and driving people out of the health care plans they already have and like, and they do not even want to talk about it.

So we know the Democrats who have shut down the government will yell and point fingers. They have already started that particular routine. They will say it was the mean old Republicans or the tea party or FOX News or maybe even George W. Bush. They shut down the government, and now they are praying the American people will think somebody else is responsible. They are doing this because they would rather see the government shut down than do anything to protect the American people from the consequences of ObamaCare despite the stories we see every single day about the pain this law is causing all of our constituents.

Now, I will say this: I appreciate yesterday's bipartisan action to ensure that servicemembers currently defending us are going to be paid on time. The brave men and women who defend our country deserve no less. But now we need to do the same for the rest of the American people.

The House legislation has been perfectly reasonable. It didn't have everything Republicans wanted. It didn't have everything Democrats wanted. But it represented compromise, and it reflected the will of the American people, who don't want a government shutdown and who want to tap the brakes on ObamaCare—good folks who just think the middle class deserves a bit of a break. Senate Democrats could have passed any one of those compromises and averted this mess. Instead, they chose to shut down the government.

Well, it is past time for Senate Democrats to listen to the American people. The House has already done its job to fund the government again and again and again.

I know the Democrats who run Washington want to extract as many political points as they can from this manufactured shutdown, but they owe our country more than that. They need to understand that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time—not ready for prime time. Their stubborn refusal to even discuss temporary relief for the middle class was a staggering act of political arrogance. So this morning I am calling on the Democrats who run the Senate to sit down with the House and negotiate, to come to a reasonable solution that cancels their shutdown and pass it because no one wants a shutdown, it seems, but our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader spoke as if George Orwell wrote his speech. This is ''1984,'' where up is down, down is up, east is west. All one needs to do is look at the press. We have a situation where we have a good day for the anarchists. Why? Because the government is closed. Speaker BOEHNER and his band of tea party radicals have done the unthinkable: They have shut down the Federal Government. Now, for us, that is hard to comprehend as being good. For them, they like it.

In Nevada today—7 o'clock in the morning out there—they are closing the Great Basin National Park. There will be some security folks around, but the visitor center will be closed. The Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Las Vegas where we have 600,000 people a year visit—not anymore—it will be closed. The Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area—over 1 million people go there every year. No, the visitor center will be closed.

This situation involves people who work cleaning offices, people who are security folks for our Federal buildings—they will probably be able to hang around—people who really need a job. I talked last week a little on the floor about a woman who came to my event last Thursday. She works for the National Park Service. She has worked there all of her adult life. She knows what it is like to have a government shutdown because she was there when the last one occurred. They never got that money back. She is struggling because she doesn't make that much money, and now her job is gone. It is that way all over America. And why? To extract political concessions through hostage-taking over one issue—one issue—ObamaCare.

The exchanges in Nevada kick in today. Approximately 600,000 Nevadans will be eligible for ObamaCare. These are 600,000 people who have no health insurance. Today they can search around on the exchanges that have been developed there by a Republican Governor, and they can get a policy for as little as $100 a month—$100 a month—and then if they get hurt they can go see a doctor or go to a hospital and not be embarrassed because they have no money.

What the American people must understand is that the House of Representatives did not close the government. It was the Republicans in the House of Representatives who closed the government. The House of Representatives has 435 Members, but, no, they were not allowed to vote on keeping the government open; they are so fixated on ObamaCare. But that is happening all over America today, and that is one thing not being heard. The President has said it is going forward full bore, and that is welcome news for as many as 30 million people in America who have no health insurance. So Members of the House of Representatives were unable to vote to keep the government open—only the Republicans.

PATTY MURRAY, who is from the State of Washington and is chair of the Budget Committee, has worked hard, leading the Senate in passing a budget. She did that 6 months ago. The budget she passed is different from the one that passed the House of Representatives.

For generations, for hundreds of years in the Congress of the United States, when there have been two separate pieces of legislation, we have gone to conference. This is something you learn about in elementary school. When the House has passed something and the Senate has passed something, what do you do? You sit down together in an open forum and work out the differences. That is how we have always done it—until the tea party took over.

Senator MURRAY has asked to go to conference 18 times. The senior Senator from Arizona has asked eight times himself. By the way, the senior Senator from Arizona is a Republican. But there has been an objection. No conference. And this has gone on for 6 months. But as the clock ticked past midnight and the Federal Government officially barred the doors and hung a ''closed for business'' sign out, Speaker BOEHNER demanded the very conference they have shunned us on for 6 months. This display, I would hope, would be embarrassing to House Republicans and Senate Republicans. What a deal.

So I say to the Speaker: We are happy to negotiate a budget. We have been trying to for months. And we have not only Senator MURRAY, who has been anxious to get to the budget, but we have had Senator MIKULSKI, a powerful chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who can't do anything until we get a budget. So if the House passes the piece of legislation they have over there to keep the country

functioning again, to reopen government, we will be happy to go to conference. Why wouldn't we? We have been trying to do it for 6 months. Hopefully that would lead to a long-term responsible budget agreement with our Republican counterparts. That is what conferences are all about. We have been asking to do that for months and months—but not with the government closed.

Every day that the Speaker refuses to pass the bill they have over there, the resolution they have over there, and reopen the government, the American economy loses billions of dollars—billions of dollars.

The conservative business community has warned of the grave consequence of this shutdown. This shutdown couldn't come at a worse time, just as the economy is beginning to gain steam. The shutdown has furloughed half of the civilian workforce. At Nellis Air Force Base, one of the largest military installations in America, the civilian workforce there is coming to work today to close their offices. There are some exceptions, but certainly three-quarters of them.

The Centers for Disease Control has basically ceased their functions as to what happens if there is a bad flu epidemic someplace or some kind of an outbreak that they control.

Checks will go out for Social Security and our disabled veterans will get their checks. But if you have just come back from Afghanistan or Iraq, sorry, no new applications will be received. No passport applications will be processed. That is pretty important for tourist economies such as Las Vegas. No small business loans will be issued. We talked about the national parks. Millions of Federal workers will be sent home without pay. Thousands and thousands in Nevada are sitting home today, waiting for Congress to act.

As this economic reality kicks in, we need the Republicans also to kick in as to what is reality. I have had a number of Republican Senators come to me and say, You have got to give them something on ObamaCare. What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong with the fixation on a law of this country that has been a law for 4 years? I remind everyone again, the United States Supreme Court said it is constitutional. What is wrong with this picture: We will be happy if you give us something to hurt ObamaCare?

No matter how many times they try to extort the American people and the Democrats here in the Senate, we are not going to relitigate the health care issue. We are not going to do that. If they have problems with that bill, we will be happy to sit down and talk with them about a reasonable approach. But we are not going to do it with a gun to the heads of the American people.

Frankly, it is too late to avert the worst effects of the shutdown, but it is not too late to send the Federal employees back to work. The solution is as clear this morning as it was last night: Reopen the government. Let all 435 Members of the House of Representatives vote on the legislation they have from us. Then if they want to sit down in a sensible way and talk about PATTY MURRAY's budget, we will do that; if they want to talk about the appropriations bills of Senator MIKULSKI, we will do that—as soon as the House takes a simple, reasonable action; that is, put the American Federal workers back on the job and we can begin the process of negotiating a long-term budget deal. We have been trying to do it for 6 months through the regular order of conference committee and continue to want to do that. But there is no time to waste. Every minute the Federal Government is closed shuts down American families, it costs jobs. Every week the Federal Government is shut down, the economy loses more than $30 billion. It is time for Republicans to stop obsessing over old battles.

I say to my Republican friends, ObamaCare is over. It has passed. It is the law. And all over America today and for the next 3 months millions of people will sign up. Remember what I said about Nevada: You can buy a policy in Nevada for $100 a month. In the State of Alaska, I was told there is no premium. It varies State to State. People who have never had health insurance will be able to get it.

I talked here on the floor 1 or 2 days ago. I know what it is like not to have the ability to go to a doctor or hospital. I know that. People have to understand that is not good. It is hard when you or a loved one is hurt or sick and you have nowhere to go. That is what this is all about.

I have respect and admiration for my Republican friends. Every one of them is an accomplished person or they wouldn't be in the Senate. But don't say to me that we are happy to open the government if you give us an arrow we can put in our quiver and say we hurt ObamaCare. It is the law.

I repeat what is a fact: The Republicans hated Social Security and they hated Medicare. How do people feel about Social Security and Medicare today? They feel really good. And that is the same with ObamaCare. People understand how good ObamaCare has been already if you are old and want to get a wellness check or if you have to buy pharmaceuticals. In the sparsely populated State of Nevada they have saved millions of dollars on drugs because of ObamaCare. You can stay on your parents' health insurance until you are 26 years old. That is a pretty good deal. You can finish college, maybe even start your life and not have to worry about that.

People got refunds in Nevada and around the country. Why? Because as part of ObamaCare, AL FRANKEN from Minnesota stuck a provision in the bill—that at least most of us voted for—saying if an insurance company doesn't provide 80 percent of their premium for health care, to having people get better, then they have to refund that money. This year, all over America hundreds of millions of dollars were refunded to people because insurance companies didn't spend 80 percent toward having people get well. They gave bonuses and all kinds of overhead that weren't fair. ObamaCare is so important.

I say to my friends here in Congress, how many people have come up to them someplace and said, Thank goodness for ObamaCare. My daughter is a diabetic, and now we don't have to worry about her. She is insured.

I have had someone tell me—and this is why I usually include this in my remarks—I have a son who is an epileptic. Has anyone ever seen someone with an epileptic seizure, your little child, and you can't get health care because they have a preexisting disability? That is what ObamaCare is all about. You can't be denied insurance if you have a child who is an epileptic.

We will negotiate, as we have, on going to the budget and talking about a long-term agreement here. We have tried. The President has tried. They are only concerned about ObamaCare—ObamaCare—because they know that everything they do to try to throw monkey wrenches into the wheels of government as far as ObamaCare is good for the people who don't believe in government. They want it to fail. That is why they are doing all this. Each day that goes by—and now it is harder and harder, because on October 1 the exchanges are open. There will be a few glitches and there will be changes. That is the way it was with Social Security. That is the way it was with Medicare. But by the first of the year when millions of people are signed up on health insurance, it is good for everybody and it is good for America. And it is good for America because our country—this great country—will no longer be the only industrialized nation that doesn't have health care for everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I won't be long, I say to my colleagues. I wish to thank our Leader REID for bringing back a sense of history, for putting this fight over the new health care law into context.

I did some research on what Republicans said about Social Security when it came up before in the Senate and the House: This is the end of the world. It was socialism. It was going to destroy mankind. I have the quotes. They are in the RECORD.

No, Social Security proved to be the most successful antipoverty program in America. People love it. But they keep trying to take it away.

Under George W. Bush they tried to privatize it and we Democrats stopped it. Then you go look to the 1960s when Lyndon Johnson talked about Medicare and the fact that our grandmas and grandpas at that time were being supported by their children because there was no health insurance available. This was the end of the world. Even Bob

Dole in the 1990s said, I was there fighting against Medicare. Bob Dole, a wonderful man, a Republican: I was fighting against socialism. And now even tea party members put signs up: Don't touch my Medicare.

So now we have the next reform, the Affordable Care Act. Republicans have called it ObamaCare. The President embraces it. In California today people are so excited. Millions of Californians who are uninsured will have the chance to get affordable health care. And, I might say, you go to coveredca.com, and you see the platinum plans that are the more expensive plans, you see the bronze plans, the least expensive, the silver plan. Who is going up there? Not people who already have insurance—it is about 80 percent—but those who don't. And in my State, the working poor will have a chance to get a Medicaid card.

Thank God we have a Governor and a legislature with compassion, unlike other States where the Governors are saying, No, we don't care; we think it is going to cost too much. Well, the fact is we know, and the reason the Affordable Care Act ObamaCare saves a lot of money over time is because people get the health care they need and they get it early.

We have a horrible day here today. I have 169,000 Federal employees, and about 80,000 of them are going to get furloughed. These are hard-working, good people who work for the Border Patrol, who work for the FBI, who work for NASA, who work for the National Park Service, who keep our Federal buildings clean and open, scientists, caseworkers who do important Social Security cases, Medicare cases, food inspectors, small business loan officers so important to the small business community—they are going to pack up and go home. To my Republican friends who brought this Republican shutdown, these are hard-working people.

I don't have one Republican on my bill who would take away our pay in a shutdown. Not one Republican. But they are ready to take away everybody else's pay. As a matter of fact, yesterday—to a person—they voted to take away the employer contribution from their own staff for the health care. I couldn't believe it. By the way, they don't need a law to do it. Senator VITTER's bill: Take away your health care—you don't need to take that employer's share. Give it back to the government. Call in your staff if you think they deserve this treatment and tell them you are going to reduce their salaries, and send the check back to the government. You don't need legislation to do it. That is how mean-spirited it is around here. So we face a nonsensical shutdown.

I want to talk about exactly where we are. The House sent us a 6-week bill that keeps the government going at certain levels of spending. Then the Republicans say, well, the Democrats won't compromise. I have news for the Republicans. We don't like those numbers in that continuing resolution. We think they are way too low. We think they are hurting the economic recovery. We see the deficit's down by 50 percent. We don't have to bring about this austerity. We think it is hurting jobs and the economy, but that is not enough for them.

They have a victory on the number, but they want to add other things to the budget that have nothing to do with the budget and have everything to do with their obsession with repealing health care reform, just like the Republican Party has had an obsession for years. I forgot to say, remember Newt Gingrich's famous line on Medicare, ''It is going to wither on the vine'' and PAUL RYAN's budget, which destroyed Medicare as we know it.

It is our main responsibility to keep the government going, to pay our bills. Instead of sending us a clean bill, they send us a bill with lower numbers than we want, we accept the numbers, and then they tack on these mean-spirited amendments to hurt people—with the exception of the repeal of the medical device tax, which would blow a $30 billion hole in our deficit. They repeal it. They have no way of making up for that money that would be lost to the Treasury.

I could not believe it. Yesterday, their first take was to take away women's health care. Three of us went up to the gallery and we said: You continue your war on women. They actually, in the House, repealed an existing law that gives women cancer screening, gestational diabetes screening, and making sure they have the correct supplies and the counseling to breast-feed their children, and birth control. They actually took that out, repealed it. We went up to the gallery. They left that little thing alone. They gave up on that.

But what are they doing now? Now they are saying their own employees have no right to an employer contribution. This is mean-spirited. This is hurtful. Send us a clean CR for 6 weeks and then vote to go to the budget conference, as Senator MURRAY has asked. But Senator CRUZ keeps appearing on the scene and objecting to appointing conferees to deal with the yearly budget because he says he doesn't want to have them discuss the debt. Who is he to say what you can discuss or not discuss? The last time I checked, there is free speech in this country, including in a conference committee.

That leads me to think they are going to play even worse games with the debt ceiling, about which Ronald Reagan—who asked for it and got, 18 times, an increase in the debt ceiling—said even thinking about defaulting is a horrible and dangerous thing. No President has had this kind of difficulty. They are obsessed with the health care law and they are obsessed with hurting this President.

Let's face facts. I have served with five Presidents; three of them were Republicans. Did I agree with everything Ronald Reagan believed in? The Presiding Officer and I served in those years together. Remember those days of the nuclear weapons proliferation? We had our battles and, yes, we made a symbolic vote once in a while not to raise the debt ceiling. That is fine. But we never purposely brought down the government, ever—ever. The last time Newt Gingrich and the Republicans did it, it was a disaster and they have done it again.

I listened to the majority leader. The majority leader said the Republican leader's tale and his spin is similar to the book ''1984.'' Let me just say, it is ''Alice in Wonderland.'' It is not accurate.

Let's pass the bill we sent over, the clean CR for 6 weeks. Let's go to a budget conference. Let's resolve our problems. This is too great a country to have us suffer like this, a self-inflicted wound that does not have to be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if we need evidence that there is a parallel universe in America today, on one hand is Washington, DC, and the bubble that seems to occur around this place, and then the rest of America. If we need evidence of that parallel universe, all we need to do is listen to the comments of the majority leader this morning who said, in the presence of these folks in the gallery in the Senate, ''The government is shut down. The government is shut down.''

That is clearly false. You know what. There are a lot of Americans who think that Washington is a train hurtling down the track, out of control. Who can blame them? When they look at our national debt, $17 trillion, more than $50,000 for every man, woman, and child in America; when they see our unsustainable programs such as Medicare and Social Security, which the majority leader and the distinguished Senator from California hold so dear—we do too. Those are important programs. So why would we not want to try to fix them?

The most amazing thing I heard today is the majority leader said that ObamaCare is sacrosanct. It is the law of the land. You cannot touch it. Over the last 3 years the Obama administration has repeatedly and unilaterally issued waivers, granted exemptions, and announced delays relating to this sacrosanct law known as ObamaCare. Since when is it beyond the power of the Congress to change existing law by amending it or repealing it or defunding it? It is absolutely unprecedented to have a majority leader of the Senate, someone who knows this institution as well as anyone, say Congress is powerless to act when our constituents tell us they want us to act because they do not believe ObamaCare will perform as advertised.

The best evidence is the unilateral actions of the President of the United

States, who granted waivers, exemptions, and delays for his preferred constituents. Meanwhile, the rest of America has to live with this monstrosity that will not work as advertised. Again, all we have to do is compare the President's promises to what has actually happened. He said if you like what you have you can keep it. That is not true. Millions of Americans are being dropped from their employer-provided coverage into the exchanges they do not want to be on because they would prefer to have their employer-provided coverage. When the President says the average family will see a reduction in their health care premiums of $2,500, that is not true because they have actually gone up, on average, $2,400. For many young people, such as my daughters, they are going to have to pay more so my generation will have to pay less, even though they do not need the government-approved, gold-plated health care plan, nor want it, nor can afford it.

We know that ObamaCare is, in the words of some of the leaders of organized labor, doing permanent damage to full-time work because people are being moved from full-time work to part-time work in order to avoid the employer sanctions, and it is doing damage to our broader economy. All of us have listened to the small business men and women for whom we work, who are our constituents, who say: We cannot afford ObamaCare, so we are not going to hire more people. In fact, we are going to cut back in order to avoid some of the sanctions associated with it or, you know what. At some point I am tired of working for the government instead of working for myself, my family, so I am just going to close business and shut her down.

Despite all that, the majority leader has the temerity to come on the Senate floor and say this is the law of the land; we can't touch it; it is perfect, couldn't be better. That is like whistling past the graveyard. Senate Democrats have refused to make any changes whatsoever, even in those provisions they themselves believe are flawed or defective in ObamaCare. They are refusing to abolish the medical device tax, which is a job killer and kills medical innovation that saves lives, even though 79 Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted against the medical device tax on the budget resolution.

They are refusing to delay the individual mandate, even though the President of the United States has given businesses a 1-year delay in the employer sanction. Yet Democrats voted against delaying the individual mandate for average Americans. How can that be fair?

Most remarkably, when it comes to the ObamaCare exchanges, Senate Democrats have toed the line—you might say walked the plank last night, at the insistence of the majority leader—and they refused to treat Members of Congress the same as all other Americans. That is what one of the votes we had last night did.

If I were a Democrat running for reelection in red States in 2014, I would be very worried about that. This is a toxic vote for them because Americans, although they may not be able to quote Federalist 57, know what it says in their hearts and spirits because it is fundamental to our democracy; that is, that Members of Congress should be treated no differently, certainly no better, than the rest of America when it comes to the law of the land. Those who cast that vote, who walked that plank last night, will be held accountable in the 2014 election.

You know what. I believe all of this points to the fact that the majority leader and President Obama want a government shutdown because they are reading some of the polls that say they think this will benefit them politically. They are willing to risk a shutdown of the Federal Government in order to gain political advantage. I am not so sure about that. I certainly did not believe that a shutdown—it was not my first choice. I thought surely cooler heads would prevail. When it came to the individual mandate, when it came to the medical device tax, when it came to eliminating the special carve-out for Congress, surely we can find some common ground somewhere. When there is plenty of evidence that the President and his administration have acknowledged the flaws and the defects and the unkept promises of ObamaCare, surely we could find somewhere we could find common ground.

Our colleagues in the House have now passed multiple bills to keep the government open and allow ObamaCare to remain funded, even though clearly our first choice is to repeal and replace this devastating legislation which is killing jobs, running up costs, and falling out of favor with even its most ardent advocates such as organized labor. Unfortunately, the Democratic Party, from the President of the United States to the majority leader of the Senate, to all Democrats in this body, have become the party of no: no compromise, no negotiations, no changes. It is all perfect. We would not change a thing. Life is good.

But the Government shuts down and invariably some people get hurt. The President of the United States was thinking about holding a meeting of congressional leaders at the White House. The report in one of the newspapers in Washington is Senator REID, the majority leader of the Senate, shut it down. The President wanted to demonstrate some leadership. He should demonstrate some leadership. People expect leadership out of the President of the United States, but HARRY REID shut it down. So HARRY REID shut down the Government and got what he wanted.

I think it is about time the President overrule HARRY REID. He was elected by the American people. For many of us he was our second choice, but he is the President of the United States. He needs to demonstrate some leadership. Instead, the Democrats have doubled down on their strategy, hoping to gain political advantage at the expense of the people hurt. The shutdown was not my first choice, but there are many of my constituents who are calling me, telling me: Look, we are worried. We are scared about our future. We are scared not only about our ability to find jobs, we are scared about our children and their future. My generation was the beneficiary of the sacrifice and hard work of the greatest generation, the World War II generation, people who risked everything so we might have a better life.

I am hearing from a number of my constituents back home, and they are saying, look, we are willing to risk some hardship if that is what it takes to get the American people, the Democratic Party, and the President to wake up and say: We need to work together and fix these problems that we all know exist, the national debt, lower median income, unsustainable Medicare and Social Security, for which the Democrats offer only higher taxes and more regulation. No wonder the economy is growing so slowly. The triple whammy is ObamaCare, which is killing jobs and hurting the economy.

We can do better than that, and we certainly can by working together. Now is the time for the President to call that meeting in the Oval Office.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the process has failed us in the last week for my friends in the House and in the Senate who, as I did, when we ran for these jobs, said we would do everything we could possibly do to not go down this path where the government gets between people and their doctor. Those are heartfelt and sincere views. If we were in the majority and had a President on our side, we would have already taken care of this issue.

For those who mistakenly thought if we didn't have any appropriations bill that somehow the President's health care plan wouldn't move forward, we now see today that was a mistaken view of what would happen. Most of the President's health care spending is mandatory. It is something the Congress doesn't even vote on. The way not to move forward is to change the law, but we have not had any opportunity to change this law. We didn't have an opportunity when the Presiding Officer and I served in the House together to change the law. This is a law that never was amendable on the floor of the Senate or the House.

It is hard to imagine that we have decided to restructure 1/16th of the whole economy and everybody's health care relationships without ever having a chance to amend the law. Surely my friends on the other side who have supported this bill, are supportive of this

law, understand the frustration we have when there has never been a possibility to bring an amendment to the law and say: Let's see if we can't make this part of it work better.

What was the amendment yesterday? The amendment yesterday to the law that the House offered the Senate—the principal amendment was: Let's not have the individual penalty for a year. The President, on his own, decided we won't have the corporate penalty for a year, that we wouldn't have the business penalty for a year. This is sort of a strange place for us to wind up. On this side of the Senate we are saying: Don't give job creators—we like to talk about job creators on this side of the Senate aisle—a break and not give people working at those jobs a break.

The President, on his own, can apparently amend the law without us. This is also pretty unusual, that the President, on his own, without us, thinks he can amend the law, but we have no avenue to amend the law. The President, on his own, said: We are going to eliminate the corporate penalty. We are going to say that for this first year, businesses that have more than 50 employees don't have to offer insurance or pay a penalty; that is what the law says was supposed to happen on January 1. But the President said: No, we are not going to do that; that is too hard to do. We are going to take a $12 billion hit in funding this program because that is what the estimated penalties might have been. Frankly, that might have been low because a lot of businesses that were offering insurance I think will not offer insurance when we get into the requirement to offer insurance.

I think that was probably a low number, but it was a number. It was $12 billion. Our friends in the House sent something over here that said: If we are going to waive $12 billion, let's waive $4 billion. Let's waive the penalty for individuals if they don't have insurance. By the way, many of those individuals were led by this law to believe they were going to get insurance at work. The President said there is no penalty for not offering insurance at work for this first year, but we are still going to penalize individuals who don't have it. If you are an individual and for whatever reason you can't afford or don't have insurance, you will have a $95 penalty the first year, and it goes up after that. That was a chance to amend the law in the right way. The House would have voted, the Senate would have voted, and the President would have signed a bill. Imagine that. The House votes, the Senate votes, and the President signs a bill. I think that is the way the process is supposed to work. How we could have a $12 billion waiver for the employer and have a $4 billion penalty for the employee doesn't make any sense to me.

This law was not amendable, so, sure, would it be better not to amend it on a resolution to support the government? Absolutely that would have been better. Would it have been better for the Senate to pass a single appropriations bill of the 12 that were supposed to be passed before the spending year begins? Absolutely. That would have been a lot better. Would it have been better for the Senate to prioritize anything?

Senator MIKULSKI, the chairman of my committee, the Appropriations Committee, as was mentioned earlier, voted out most of the bills. Some of them were voted out on a partisan vote, some of them were voted out on a bipartisan vote, but only one got here, and it was one the leader knew couldn't possibly pass. So we haven't passed one bill. It would have been better to do it that way. We wouldn't be at this moment if in fact we passed the appropriations bills and agreed with the Senate.

Then the majority leader talks about the hardworking chairman of the Budget Committee, and said we can't do our work because we don't have a budget conference. Last year the majority leader said we don't even need a budget. It is too late for the budget. The spending year has begun. That was months ago when that should have happened. Why didn't that happen? Because the House passed a budget that obeyed the law and the law says we can't spend more than $967 billion. That is the law, like it or not. Just like on my side of this discussion, ObamaCare is the law, like it or not.

Apparently that is a law we have to enforce, but we don't have to enforce the Budget Control Act because the Senate budget was over $1 trillion—$1.038 trillion was the Senate budget. Of course we are not going to have an agreement if we are $70 billion or $80 billion apart and one side obeys the law and the other doesn't.

Essentially for a week now Republicans in the House have been negotiating with themselves because there is nobody who is willing to negotiate. The President says negotiating on the debt ceiling is blackmail. It has never been blackmail before. In fact, we wouldn't have the Budget Control Act if we hadn't negotiated on the debt ceiling.

So it is blackmail to negotiate? This is a process where the House, the Senate, and the President are supposed to work together to move forward. The debt ceiling has been used over and over to talk about spending. It has been used a number of times to talk about things that weren't spending. Usually Congress is controlled by Democrats with Republican Presidents. And they said, ok, the President doesn't want to talk about this issue without the debt ceiling, so we are going to add it to the debt ceiling discussion. But more often than that, it has been used to talk about spending.

If you go to the banker and say: I have spent all the money you have given me, used up my line of credit, so I would like to extend the line of credit, I guarantee your banker will say either no, you have already exceeded what we told you you could borrow from us to spend, or if we are going to do that, let's talk about your spending habits. Show me a plan that shows you will spend differently in the future than you spend now. But the President says that is blackmail. More than anybody else in the United States of America, the President of the United States is in a position to figure out what he is for that the Congress would be willing to do. That is not happening, and that has not happened.

There is plenty of blame for the fact that there is no funding today, but there are also plenty of victims. Everybody who depends on the government is a victim. Social Security checks are going to go out, but you can't apply for Social Security if you don't have it. If your check is lost or didn't go out, you can't find out why that happened. People in harm's way: The border control agents, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement people are out there, but their paycheck for their family is not coming.

How could we have solved that yesterday? I am confident that one of the ways we could have solved that is by saying, okay, we won't collect this $4 billion from individuals just as we are not collecting the $12 billion from companies.

The reason this health care law continues to be such a problem is it was never amendable, and it was never discussed. Even the President said, as he does some of these unilateral things, if this were a normal circumstance, I would go to Congress and ask them to change the law, but it is not a normal circumstance. I can't find that anywhere in the Constitution where the President gets to decide if the Constitution applies or doesn't apply.

Everybody is to blame here because the Congress is not doing the work Congress is supposed to do and the President is not leading. Americans are going to suffer because the Congress and the President haven't done their job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as my colleague from Missouri said, as we are here on the floor today, much of the Federal Government has been shut down. It is shut down because of the Democrats' unwillingness to compromise on keeping the government open and delivering fairness to all Americans.

While employers got a pass from the President on his health care law, the American people still face a mandate that they start signing up for Washington-approved health insurance and the exchange is open today. The House of Representatives took the reasonable and responsible step of keeping the government open while eliminating the health care law's unfairness.

It is unfair that the mandate for health care law will not be delayed for individuals for a year but does delay the mandate for businesses. It is also

unfair to refuse to eliminate special exemptions under the health care law for Members of Congress. That wasn't in the health care law at all. Yet the President has granted special exemptions that I believe show the unfairness of the approach by the Democrats.

President Obama saw that other parts of the health care law won't work and weren't ready. He has currently signed seven different bills which will repeal and defund other parts of his law. In the interest of fairness, he should deal with these parts that are seen all across the country as very unfair.

The President has allowed exemptions and changed the laws for specific groups. He has delayed the employer mandate for a year. The question is: Why does he oppose delaying the individual mandate for a year as well? Why do the bosses get an exemption but not the workers? That is what someone asked me at a health fair in Lovell, WY, over this past weekend.

The American people already know the health care law is unaffordable, unworkable, unpopular, and now families are also saying the health care law is unfair. The House has asked us to treat all Americans fairly, but the President and the majority leader refuse to do that. If you look at their rhetoric over the past week or so, Washington Democrats seemed eager for a government shutdown. Well, they got their wish. Meanwhile, the administration is still promising people great benefits from the new government-run health insurance exchanges. Today hard-working Americans get to see which promises are kept and which have been broken. I think what people are going to learn today can be summed up in two words: Buyer beware.

Here is how the Wall Street Journal put it yesterday. This is their front-page article: ''Late Snags on Eve of Health Rollout.''

The article says the Obama administration officials are scrambling to get the health law's insurance marketplaces ready to open on Tuesday but keep hitting technical problems, while government-funded field workers across the country say they are not fully prepared to help Americans enroll in the program.

The reports in the news today show a system failure across the country as the exchange goes live. Remember what the President said in his address to the Nation Saturday. He said they are opening on Tuesday no matter what—no matter what, they are opening today.

Well, I think the people across the country are going to have more than just technical problems. First of all, people are going to see significantly higher costs. Last week, the President promised to give Americans, and I quote, ''high-quality affordable health care for less than their cell phone bill.''

Remember, the average monthly cell phone bill is $71. In Cheyenne, WY, the least expensive plan a 27-year-old man can buy will be $271. The President said less than $71. Why is it $271 a month in Cheyenne, WY? And that is for a healthy 27-year-old. So before the health care law, before the exchanges, they could buy a plan such as that for $82; now, $271—a lot more than a cell phone bill.

The White House isn't even disputing anymore that prices will be higher for many people. Now the White House is arguing that consumers will spend more, but they will get, as they say, better insurance.

The administration is also saying that prices are going up less than they had previously estimated. They previously estimated they were going to go up a lot. Now they are estimating they are not going to go up quite as much as a lot, but they are still going to go up. A smaller increase isn't what the President promised. He said families could pay $2,500 less a year. That is what the President promised. It is not what is happening.

Prices in the exchanges are up all across the country. In California, the cheapest plan at the silver level will cost a 40-year-old in Los Angeles $242 a month. That same person, because of something in the law called community ratings, buying the same plan in Sacramento, CA, would pay $330 a month. I see the astonishing looks on faces of folks in this Chamber. They can't believe it. They say, How can it be true? Perhaps they should have read the law, read the bill before they voted to pass it. The price is 38 percent more in Sacramento than in L.A. for the same identical policy, for the same 40-year-old person.

In addition to the higher cost of insurance premiums, there are also higher out-of-pocket costs, higher copayments, higher deductibles—all things that are going to make people look at this and say, Cheaper than my cell phone bill? Not a chance. All of that means more money out of the wallets of hard-working Americans and more sticker shock.

The second thing people are learning today as they sign up in the exchanges is that many of them will actually lose their doctor. I practiced medicine for 25 years. I know how important it is for patients to have a long-term relationship with their caregivers. The exchanges—the mandates coming out of this President's health care law—break that bond. That is because insurance companies needed to find ways to keep rates from going even higher. So what they have done is limited the doctors and limited the hospitals that patients can visit.

In New Hampshire, Anthem BlueCross BlueShield is excluding 10 of the 28 hospitals in the State from the exchange. A young mother may not be able to keep seeing the pediatrician whom she knows and trusts with her children's care. That wasn't supposed to happen. The President promised that if you liked your doctor, you could keep your doctor. Today, many Americans are finding out that is just not the case.

On Sunday, a few days ago, Howard Dean, the former head of the Democratic National Committee, admitted that one of the unintended consequences of the law is that small businesses are going to dump their employees into the exchange. The people who work at those small businesses don't get to keep the insurance they had, and they may not get to keep the doctor they had either.

A third thing people are going to start to see today as the exchanges open for business is that there is a definite risk of fraud and identity theft. How can that be? The administration has hired so-called navigators—people to help enroll consumers in the exchanges. It turns out that these workers aren't well trained or even subject to consistent background checks. Even the Obama administration has been warning that con artists will take advantage of confusion over the law to steal people's identities. As I said earlier, buyer beware. Security may also be inadequate in the giant government ''data hub.'' These are the huge databases of detailed personal information about everyone in the exchanges. The information will be available to people in many different government agencies, in the whole chart of all the different places that this data is going to be sent all throughout government. The administration promises that the data hub will work, but they will not talk about what they have done to ensure that it is secure.

Finally, we know that today there are going to be a lot of customer service system failures. President Obama said that buying insurance through the exchanges would be like shopping at Amazon.com. It is shaping up to be much less consistent than that. Instead of simply clicking a few buttons online, many people are spending hours following up with phone calls, e-mails, and faxes. Faxes?

As recently as two weeks ago, government software couldn't reliably tell people the correct price for their insurance. Late last week, the administration delayed enrollment of some of its small business exchanges. Washington, DC, said last week that parts of its exchanges also weren't ready. In the State of Oregon, State officials say the software problems will force them to delay their Web site. People there will have to find other ways to get help for signing up.

That is not how Amazon.com works. That is not what the President promised.

It didn't have to be this way. The American people knew what they wanted from health care reform. They wanted lower costs and more accessible, quality care. President Obama could have drafted a law that actually addressed Americans' concerns. Instead, he forced through a law making health care more complicated, more uncertain, and more expensive.

Now is the time for the American people to hold the President to his promises. Coverage in the exchanges, as he said, should cost less than your cell phone bill, be as easy and secure as Amazon, and let people keep their doctors. How well those promises hold up will be the real legacy of the Obama health care law.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. 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. LEE. Mr. President, yesterday when the President of the United States addressed the American people, he was very clear about what a shutdown would mean. He said:

> Office buildings would close. Paychecks would be delayed. Vital services that seniors and veterans, women and children, businesses and our economy depend on would be hamstrung. Business owners would see delays in raising capital, seeking infrastructure permits or rebuilding after Hurricane Sandy.
>
> Veterans, who have sacrificed for their country, will find their support centers unstaffed. Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty, immediately closed. And of course, the communities and small businesses that rely on these national treasures for their livelihoods will be out of customers and out of luck.

I share the President's concerns about what will happen to the American people—about ''real people,'' as one of my colleagues put it yesterday—during and in connection with a government shutdown.

I wish to focus our attention in the coming hours and days on these people. I think it is also important that we continue to focus as well on those who are already hurting—hurting for reasons that don't have to do with the shutdown.

So I would like to turn for a moment to people who are and for a number of months have been already feeling the negative effects of another government policy the President and his allies in Congress staunchly defend.

ObamaCare happens to be the No. 1 job killer in the country. A recent analysis documented hundreds of businesses that are cutting back hours to avoid the crushing cost of ObamaCare's severe mandates. As a result, major unions have said ObamaCare could destroy the 40-hour workweek—the backbone of the American economy. People are losing their health insurance. Just a week ago Friday, 20,000 people—employees of Home Depot—were informed they would be losing their health insurance. UPS is no longer going to provide health insurance for spouses of employees. The grocery store chain Trader Joe's has dropped health care coverage for part-time workers altogether.

For everyone who has been furloughed by the government shutdown, the change hopefully will be temporary—perhaps lasting a few days, maybe even a few hours—if the Democrats decide to negotiate. For everyone who has lost a job, had their hours cut, their wages reduced, or who no longer receives health insurance, the change could well prove to be far more permanent. Do we not have an obligation to do something for those people? I think we do. So let's look for the path forward. Let's return to the President's concern about those who are hurt by a government shutdown.

One positive and encouraging step was taken yesterday in response to action taken by the House of Representatives late Saturday night. Late Saturday night, of course, the House of Representatives passed a bill to ensure that all Active-Duty military personnel—the brave men and women in uniform who serve us bravely—will continue to get paid. Yesterday the Senate took up that measure and passed it unanimously. It did so in a matter of minutes, in a seemingly effortless legislative act.

I think we can do the exact same thing with a number of noncontroversial spending bills that fund aspects of government that Americans overwhelmingly support, that Americans acknowledge we need, and that are completely unrelated to ObamaCare. My plan, in other words, would involve setting up segmented continuing resolutions, appropriations measures that would keep the funding going at current levels to various areas within government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, military construction, CJS, which includes funding for the Department of Justice, the Federal Court system, the FBI, NASA, the National Weather Service, for example, and also the U.S. Department of the Interior, which includes our national parks.

I mention national parks with special interest because today is the first day of what we hope will be a short, quickly resolved government shutdown. We have at least two Honor Flights coming in from around the country bringing World War II veterans—members of the ''greatest generation''—to Washington, DC, who plan to visit the World War II veterans memorial, a memorial designed specifically for them. When they arrive, if nothing changes between now and then, they will painfully discover what we have learned this morning, which is that those parts of the National Mall have been fenced off and barricaded. They will not be able to get in. They will not even be able to get very close. This is unfortunate and, just as important, it is unnecessary. We can act. We should act. We must act today to resolve this. There is absolutely no reason this noncontroversial aspect of our Federal Government's operations should continue 1 more day or even 1 more hour, for that matter, without being funded.

This is an effort to compromise, an effort that is badly needed, an effort that comes in the wake of other efforts to compromise that have for the most part failed. The House of Representatives has tried now three different times to avoid a shutdown, passing three different measures to make sure our government would continue to be funded. Senator REID and those Members of his conference who support him have rejected all three plans, rejected all three offers to keep the government funded, accusing Republicans of playing games with ObamaCare.

In light of that, let's leave ObamaCare for another day and not hold the vast majority of government functions hostage when the vast majority of government functions do not have anything to do with the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare. We did it yesterday. We did it. It worked well. It was seamless. It was done with absolute unanimous consent. We did it with respect to Active-Duty military pay yesterday. We can do it for veterans benefits, for border security, for national parks, and for many other government agencies. We can keep government open. We can keep those aspects of our Federal Government funded. We can do so. We should do so. Together, we will do so.

I look forward to having these discussions in the coming hours to make sure we can continue to work together as colleagues. We may not agree on everything, but in those areas where we should agree and where we in reality do agree, let's keep the government funded.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time during any quorum call be equally divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today is a day of enormous promise and needless tragedy. The promise is the

beginning, another step forward, in America's progress toward providing all America with affordable health care. It is a welcome day because Americans can now enroll in health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. But it is a needlessly tragic day because, in the midst of a tragic economic recovery, millions of Americans are out of work now—an extremist faction having sworn to its followers the Affordable Care Act would never be allowed to stand have now shut down the government because they did not get their way.

I wish to begin by talking directly to the people of Connecticut. Today is an enormously frustrating one for me because in the years and decades of public service I have sought to provide to people in Connecticut, never have I been barred, as we are today, each of us in this Chamber, from serving those needs individually, from phoning them and proactively putting staff on issues that concern them.

Due to the shutdown of the Federal Government, our office operations in both Hartford and Bridgeport are severely reduced, as well as in Washington. If a constituent needs help, if there is an emergency, if there is an issue that is time sensitive, you can reach our office and we will provide help. We will endeavor to meet any issue that concerns the health and safety and lives of the people of Connecticut and in no way is our commitment to you diminished.

I regret that our staff will be handicapped by the legal constraints. Indeed, we are, in many instances, not permitted to work in the ways that we have. But I can assure you we are continuing to serve you.

Today, in Connecticut, enrollment in our health exchanges will ensure access to more affordable quality health care for millions of middle-class families. Access to affordable quality health coverage is a basic right. We cannot deny it and we cannot turn back the clock. We need to work together—Republicans and Democrats—to improve and strengthen it and to bring down the cost of health care. The task ahead is to reform health care delivery to bring down the rising—in fact, the astronomically increasing—cost of health care, and to build on the work that has already begun under the Affordable Care Act and before it.

There is a real difference between an America with affordable health care and one that lacks it. It is an America where being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition, where a family who is responsible and pays for health insurance knows when they arrive at the delivery room they will not be bankrupted by the bill, and where children are not denied care because they happen to get sick.

We are at an impasse in Washington because of a matter of principle. The kind of hostage-taking we see here cannot be allowed to take place. It has no legitimate role in a spending bill. The bill before us would enable government to continue the people's work, to continue to do business for the American people. That is our job, and the attempt has been to attach to that resolution a completely unrelated demand that the Affordable Care Act be defunded or delayed or destroyed. To tie health care repeal to a funding bill is akin to tying immigration reform to the National Defense Authorization Act. It is a dangerous precedent and it cannot be permitted. If we accept this take-or-leave-it approach that led to this shutdown, we will be forced to govern this way—or fail to govern this way—in the future.

In fact, the resolution before us already involves compromises—less money than is necessary, for example, to rebuild our roads and bridges, to engage in infrastructure, repair and rebuilding. Rather than nation-building abroad, more nation-building here at home has to be done and more investment is required. The compromises in this funding bill have been made in the amounts of money included in it.

The impacts of this shutdown will be felt throughout our economy, in all 50 States, and in thousands of jobs in Connecticut if the shutdown continues for weeks or months. There are millions of families nationally and thousands in Connecticut who will go without paychecks. There are 9,000 Federal employees in Connecticut who will be affected. Their work is important, but the ripple effect is equally important. The losses of income and diminished consumer demand will further inhibit economic growth. Defense contractors will lose their contracts or possibly fail to receive checks when they need them.

A shutdown does nothing to address our need to agree on a responsible budget and replace the slash-and-burn, across-the-board sequestration cuts that are continued in this resolution.

A shutdown undermines one of the key engines of economic growth in this country, research and innovation, such as the research done at the Coast Guard's Research and Development Center in New London, CT. What if the studies in that facility led to better ways to secure our borders, to rescue people lost at sea. Who knows what future innovations will be sacrificed at the National Institutes of Health across the country and in companies around Connecticut.

The lifeblood of our economy—job creation, research and innovation, investment in the future—is undercut and undermined by this shutdown. In fact, even as we go through this process in Washington, the Northeast region is seeking to recover from a shutdown in train service that occurred just days ago. That shutdown has been remedied to some extent—an inadequate degree—so that half or slightly more of the service has been restored. The failures in the feeder cable that led to this shutdown are directly due to a failure of investment in infrastructure, just as the derailment and collision that was caused months ago reflected a failure to invest in infrastructure. Right before our eyes, as we engage in this kind of conduct in Washington that led to a shutdown, are the consequences of investment failure in our roads and bridges and train system.

With displaced workers struggling to get back into the labor market and businesses in need of specific skills, it is shocking we should cut back first on job training through these unresolved sequester cuts that are projected to force Connecticut's job training services to assist 9,360 fewer job seekers than they otherwise would.

We need to come together now. The message to Speaker BOEHNER has to be: Let the House vote. There are reasonable minds on both sides of the aisle who say let's have a simple, straightforward spending bill without these unrelated demands, without the blackmail and hostage-taking tactics. Let us come together on that kind of simple, straightforward way of continuing the people's business and the government's work for the people.

Many of my colleagues and I listened with great interest to the Senator from Alaska and others on the other side of the aisle saying we should let common sense and compromise prevail and deal with the issues relating to the Affordable Care Act, for immigration, separately and distinctly. They are measures that deserve and need attention, and there are ways to strengthen and improve many of our laws. But let's deal with them on their merits, not as demands or conditions for continuing the people's work by their government.

I truly believe, as we look back on this day, it will be with pride in another step forward for health care reform in this country. A lot of work remains to be done. Bringing down the cost of health care is a task, an unmet challenge that needs to be addressed, as well as other ways to strengthen and improve our health care system and the law itself. Let the House vote on a measure that provides simple, straightforward funding to continue the work of government for its people and allows the economy to continue its recovery and growth, that allows job creators to do their work, and that allows our working families—middle-class families—to have the benefits of education and Social Security and the veterans' benefits they vitally need. These essential functions must continue.

Let the House vote. Let reason prevail, and we can return to the work that government should be doing for its people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I think the American public overwhelmingly opposes ObamaCare. Every survey shows that, and all of us traveling back and forth to our States hear it. But they also support keeping the government open.

We have had an opportunity over the course of the last several days to deal with both of those issues. In fact, in order to avoid a government shutdown, you have to have people who are willing to work together and come to a solution. The House of Representatives has not once, not twice, but three times sent to the Senate proposals that would fund the government and that would make some changes to ObamaCare that would provide the same sort of relief to every American that big businesses have received from the President by virtue of some of his waivers and exemptions. On all three occasions that was turned down—tabled—when it got to the Senate.

So what did the House of Representatives do? Their most recent proposal advanced to the Senate was to allow the House and the Senate to go to conference, to work out the differences. They asked the Senate to appoint conferees to a conference committee, where Senators and House Members might be able to sit down, Democrats and Republicans, and actually hammer out some sort of solution to the challenge we face in front of us. That got tabled this morning. That is the first time I have ever seen that happen in my time in the Congress—and maybe the first time it has ever happened—where one body has asked for a conference and asked for appointing of conferees and it was tabled.

It was not just turned down. We didn't say: No, we are not going to do it now; we will do it another time. But we actually tabled the motion—tabling a motion of the House of Representatives to have a conference on how to work out the situation and in a way that will allow us to keep the government open and hopefully provide middle-class Americans some relief and the economy—the taxpayers and employers across this country—some relief from ObamaCare.

So we are where we are now—with the House of Representatives having suggested to the Senate that we sit down together in a conference committee and work out our differences—and the Senate having rejected that.

We could all argue about how we initially got where we are. I think it all starts when we don't do things the way they are intended to be done around here—in other words, taking the appropriations process and moving those bills forward.

Here in the Senate we had an opportunity, as we do every year, to move the individual appropriations bills. There are 12 separate appropriations bills that historically have been the way in which we have funded the government. This year we didn't move a single appropriations bill through the Senate. The House of Representatives moved four of the bills through the process. They didn't get through all of them, but at least they got some of the appropriations bills completed. But here in the Senate, we didn't do a single appropriations bill.

We all saw this coming. It is not as if there is any secret or surprise. So what happens is there is a calendar, and when those deadlines aren't met, we get up against the end of the fiscal year, the way we are right now, and we have this huge push to try to keep the government from shutting down, and we generally do it in the form of a continuing resolution. But the fact is, if the Senate had done any of its work earlier this year, if we had taken up any of the appropriations bills and passed them, we wouldn't be in this crisis moment we have in front of us now.

Why is it that so many Republicans in both the House and Senate—and, I would daresay, Democrats as well, although they haven't demonstrated it with their votes—are concerned about what is happening with ObamaCare? Obviously, as more information becomes available about ObamaCare, the more concerns, the more frustrations, the more questions the American people have.

I mentioned this previously, but in my State of South Dakota, according to the report put out last week by the Health and Human Services Department, if you compare the premiums that a 30-year-old male and a 30-year-old female would pay in the State of South Dakota for a bronze plan in the exchanges, the increase in premium for people in that age category would be for a man 393 percent and for a woman 223 percent. So for a 30-year-old female in the State of South Dakota, the annual increase in insurance premiums would be $1,500, and if you are a male in the State of South Dakota, the annual increase would be $2,000. So there is a real concern about the impact this will have, as these exchanges get up and running, on what people are currently paying for health care coverage.

There is also a lot of evidence and data out there now that suggests it doesn't apply just to a 30-year-old male or female in my State of South Dakota, but it also applies to families. There are many families across this country who are obviously concerned about how this is going to impact the cost of health insurance for them. If we look at what health insurance costs have done for families since the President took office, they have gone up on average about $3,000. Since ObamaCare passed, those premiums have gone up for families by about $2,500. So we have seen premiums going up already.

We have a lot of concerns as these exchanges get up and running starting today about what impact they will have on premiums for middle-class Americans. That is why there is a lot of concern and anxiety across the country today with regard to the impacts of ObamaCare.

We also have a lot of concerns about how this will impact jobs and the economy. We have already seen that a majority of the jobs created this year are part-time jobs. There are many reasons for that, but if we talk to employers, one of the things they will point out is that the requirements in the new health care law are that if they have 50 or more employees, they have to offer government-approved health care or pay a penalty. So a lot of employers are trying to stay under that 50-employee minimum or threshold so they don't have to face that requirement. So what happens? They either don't hire people they were otherwise going to hire or they look at ways to reduce their workforce.

It applies in another way because the definition of ''full-time employee'' in the law is 30 hours per week. Again, employers will be subject to the same sorts of penalties, so what many are doing is instead of hiring full-time workers, they are hiring part-time workers, 29-hour-a-week workers. Obviously, 29 hours a week doesn't give you the kind of pay that would allow you to meet the needs your family has. So more and more people are working two jobs, and we see the impact and the distortion this new law is creating in the workplace and for a lot of employers.

There was a lot of anxiety and angst about that, which I think was voiced to the President and to his administration. So what does the President do? The President decided to delay the employer mandate in the law for 1 year. I think employers took great comfort at least in knowing it is not going to be there for this year, but they are also still very worried about what will happen when it does kick in in the following year.

But there are all these employers, and people may say: Who are these people? I don't know how one can travel their State or anywhere else outside of their State and not hear from employers who are expressing concerns and asking questions about what this is going to mean for them and expressing grave reservations about the impact it is going to have on their ability to create jobs.

So as we speak with these various employers and get lots of anecdotal evidence—last week there was an interview done with employers in my State of South Dakota. A person was asked about how this would impact them, and he said: I guess we are probably not going to hire as many people as we otherwise would have hired. He said: I think that is going to be happening with businesses all over the country.

That is one example from my State of South Dakota, but if we look at sort of the aggregate, according to Investor's Business Daily there are some 300 businesses that have said they are going to reduce the size of their workforce or not hire people they otherwise might hire as a result of the impact of ObamaCare. So we see more and more of the experience, the evidence that we get day to day speaking with employers in our individual States, but we also start seeing this cumulative effect and more and more businesses expressing those concerns.

When we look at the economy today and where we are, we find out very

quickly that the unemployment rate, which has been at north of 7 percent, 7.5 percent for a long time now—when we add back into that equation the number of people who have either stopped looking for work or who are working part time when they would rather be working full time, the actual number is much higher. We have about 22 million Americans, and the unemployment rate climbs quickly into the double-digit territory when we add those people back. The labor participation rate—which is the number of people in the workforce relative to the number of people who could be—is at the lowest level literally in 35 years.

So we have a historically low labor participation rate, fewer people actually looking for work, some just flat having given up on it. We have a very soft economy. I don't think anybody would describe the economy today as being robust. We have a chronically high unemployment rate, jobs that are being created being part-time jobs, and so we have the overall average household income in this country actually going down. In fact, if we look at the statistics since the President took office, the average household income has gone down by about $3,700 per family—$3,700 less income for the average household—$3,000 higher in health care costs, and we can see how middle-class families are getting increasingly squeezed by what is happening as a result of ObamaCare.

One of the more recent suggestions that came over from the House of Representatives last evening came back with a funding resolution to fund the government and there were a couple of provisions that dealt with some of these more onerous provisions in the ObamaCare law. One had to do with the individual mandate.

The whole theory behind giving people relief from that is to give them the same treatment, to be fair, that employers get. If the President has chosen to waive the employer mandate for big businesses—which he has for 1 year—why then require individuals to have insurance?

There is going to be a significant cost associated when everybody has to buy insurance. It is about a $12 billion cost to people across this country. The question then is, If you are going to give the temporary relief to the business community, why would you not in a fair way at least make sure individuals are treated the same way?

That seemed to be a pretty compelling argument. If you are going to do something that actually does impact in a favorable way people across this country who are going to be suffering even more from the harmful effects of ObamaCare, it would strike us as at least reasonable to suggest giving a 1-year delay to people under the individual mandate—the same delay the President has given big businesses under the employer mandate.

The other provision attached to the continuing resolution proposal advanced by the House last night had to do with treating Members of Congress, their staff, and people here in Washington, DC, the same as everybody else. It strikes me again, at least, that if we are going to have these policies, everybody ought to be treated the same way.

Frankly, my hope would be that we could relieve everybody. I would love to see us permanently delay this so that no American would be subject to the harmful impacts and effects of ObamaCare. But for sure, for certain, people here in Washington, DC, should not be exempt. There should not be a separate carve-out or separate treatment for people here in Washington, DC, compared to other people around the country.

So the legislation that came over from the House last night included a 1-year delay in the individual mandate—trying to treat individuals and people across the country the same way as businesses are being treated in terms of the way the law is being applied—and secondly, make sure people here in Washington, DC, Members of Congress and their staff and others, are treated the same way as everybody else around the country. In other words, there is no exemption, there is no carve-out, there is no preferential treatment for people here in Washington, DC. Those were the two things that were attached to the funding resolution last night. That got tabled here in the Senate.

So having sent now three different proposals over, I think the House of Representatives has decided, OK, clearly the Senate doesn't like any of our ideas. Let's get together and have a conference committee.

So that was proposed, and—again, something I have never seen done before—there was a motion to table a request to go to conference. We get a lot of requests to go to conference. Sometimes those are not adhered to, and you have a debate about various conference meetings on various pieces of legislation that we deal with here in Congress. But I have never seen a tabling motion on a request to go to conference. It is a pretty clear indication that the Senate has no interest in resolving this matter; otherwise, they would at least sit down with our counterparts in the House of Representatives and say: What can we do to find that middle ground? What can we do to find that consensus? How can we resolve the differences we have here in a way that will keep the government up and functioning and hopefully provide some relief for people who are struggling under the impacts of ObamaCare?

So that is where we are today. What is interesting about it is our colleagues on the other side, the Democrats—not all of them because they weren't all here at the time, but those who were all voted in favor of ObamaCare. There isn't a single Republican who was here at that time who did, nor are there any here today who would. In fact, every time we have had an opportunity to vote to repeal all or parts of it, everybody on this side of the aisle has voted for that.

Now, our colleagues on the other side continually hold out this argument that, after all, this is the law of the land. Frankly, they are right. It is the law of the land. But it is pretty obvious that at least in the President's view there are parts of the law that don't need to be applied right away; otherwise, he wouldn't have extended a 1-year delay or a 1-year waiver under the employer mandate.

So it is pretty clear that the President has a different view than perhaps his allies here in the Senate with regard to what that law actually means. He has been perfectly willing on not just that occasion but on other occasions to take portions of a law and not apply them, to waive them and provide exemptions for particular groups of people—namely, those here on Capitol Hill and also big businesses around the country. So there is a very discriminate way in which the President is approaching this law. It seems to me, at least, that in fairness he would give the same favorable treatment to individuals that he has given to big businesses.

The other thing that is really interesting about the folks on the other side of the aisle saying this is the law of the land is that there are many things that are the law of the land. The Budget Act is the law of the land. The Budget Act, which was passed back in the 1970s—1973 or 1974—is the budget law that Congress has been under now for the past almost 40 years. Yet for 3 consecutive years in a row the Democratic majority didn't even pass a budget, didn't move it through the committee, didn't bring it to the floor, just said: We don't need to do it. We will just ignore the law. That happened for 3 years in a row.

So I would suggest that our colleagues on the other side who are quick to say that ObamaCare is the law of the land are very willing, when it serves their purposes or they find it convenient, to completely ignore other laws that have been on the books for a much longer period of time. So that argument really misses the point.

I guess what I would say is that I hope this can be resolved. It needs to be resolved. I think we need to provide some relief for the American people from the impacts of ObamaCare. Clearly, our economy needs a break. The American workers and middle-class families need a break. Employers have already been given a break—big businesses, by the President, have been given a 1-year delay under the law.

Why not apply that to others who are going to be hurt in an equal fashion.

Just to put a fine point on why it is important, we think, to have some delays—today is the day they roll out the exchanges. But if you look at what the reports are about, whether or not those things are ready, up and ready to go, it is pretty clear they are not ready for prime time. We hear about glitches,

which is the President's word—I think that is a kind word—malfunctions, inaccuracies, bumps in the road. We have heard them described all those different ways. But the clear reality is that this thing is not ready for prime time. Why would we not delay it?

There was a story yesterday in the Wall Street Journal and the headline was ''Late Snags on Eve of Health Rollout.''

Nonprofit groups and brokers that will help enroll consumers in the marketplaces, known as exchanges, say they haven't yet had a chance to preview the systems. Technical problems have limited certification for some nonprofit workers involved. And some of these groups say they haven't fully staffed up for the influx.

The exchange software that determines whether people get . . . subsidies was returning accurate determinations about two-thirds of the time late Friday, up from less than 50 percent earlier in the week.

At least they are trending in the right direction.

Additionally, one Web broker agreement with CMS to sell Federal exchange health plans, announced that it will not be able to offer those plans on October 1, blaming CMS delays.

The point is this is clearly not ready for prime time. Last week the District of Columbia said they are experiencing a very high error rate. Error rates, malfunctions, inaccuracies, bumps, glitches—these all seem to me to suggest that this is something that needs to be delayed. I think that would make the most sense, given the President has already acknowledged that for big businesses, for employers. It ought to be delayed for a year.

I think there is bipartisan support for giving individuals and families relief just like businesses have been granted. We have a Democratic Senator, a colleague from West Virginia, who said last week a delay for individuals would be very reasonable and sensible. But this week Senate Democrats voted in lockstep with the President and refused to give low-income and middle-class families that same relief that has been provided to big businesses and to some of the President's allies.

We are now in a holding pattern. It seems to me at least that the ball is in the Senate majority leader's court. The House of Representatives has asked for a conference, which has been rejected. The response was we are not going to sit down, we are not going to negotiate this. The President has said we are not going to negotiate. We are not going to sit down. We do not believe there is any room here for negotiation.

I think the American people are going to perceive that to be an unreasonable position because I think most people understand when we come here we have differences of opinion. But the way you resolve those is you sit down and work out those differences. You try to come to some resolution that would allow everybody to move forward.

What we have seen here is that time after time, the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate proposals. Those have been tabled here, and the House has sent back another one. I said three times now that has happened. Finally, the House of Representatives said: OK, we get it. You do not like what we are sending you. Let's sit down and see if we can work this out. Let's have a conference and see if we can work out our differences. That was tabled by the majority leader earlier today.

What is coming out of the White House, what is coming out of the Democrat majority is: Sorry, we don't negotiate. We are not going to sit down. We are not going to try to find common ground. We are not going to try to find a bipartisan solution to this. We are going to have it our way, and you can take it or leave it.

I don't think that is what the American people sent us here to do. I think they sent us here to do the people's business. I said before, when I started my remarks, I believe the American people overwhelmingly dislike ObamaCare and the effect it is having. I think they overwhelmingly believe the government should stay open. I think we can accomplish both of those objectives, hopefully sooner rather than later, if both sides will sit down in good faith and actually try to work out a solution.

That is certainly not going to happen as long as the President continues to stay dug in. It appears he has drawn a line in the sand. That seems to be the tactic and the approach that is being taken by the Senate majority, by the Democratic leader. That is not going to get us to an answer. That is not going to get us to a solution. All that is going to do is to provide even more frustration, even greater disdain and cynicism from the American people when they see the in-fighting that is going on here and a lack of a willingness on the part of the Democratic majority to sit down with House Republicans and figure out what is in the best interests of the American people as we move forward.

I hope we can do better. The American people deserve better. Future generations deserve better from us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this government shutdown is disappointing to me. It's disappointing to those who are affected by it, and I'm sure it's disappointing to the American people. Because they're seeing their government not function in such a visible way.

What is especially disappointing to me is the unwillingness of the President and Senate Democrats to make a reasonable effort to resolve the real differences of opinion that exist here.

It's not unusual, Madam President, that we have differences of opinion in Washington, DC. In fact, the Founders created a government here with the expectation that it would kick up to the Nation's Capitol the disputes we couldn't resolve in our own families, disputes we couldn't resolve in our city councils, in county commissions, and our State legislatures and State government. And the Founders intended that those disputes, which are in this body, not be resolved easily by creating a system of checks and balances: A Supreme Court, a Presidency, and a Congress.

And by creating, in this body, the rules that make it very difficult to come to a result.

The idea was that we didn't want a king.

A king is efficient. Tyranny is efficient.

Our Founders didn't want that.

They didn't want a despot. They wanted a way to get, eventually, to a result. They sought to avoid the tyranny of the majority by creating these checks and balances and these rules in the Senate. They sought to create a situation where the majority couldn't ride roughshod over the minority.

But I do not think the Founders envisioned a system of checks and balances that produced a permanent stalemate on issues that are important to the American people. Even in the most contentious of issues—and there have been many issues in our history much more contentious than anything we are dealing with today.

They didn't envision that the government would simply shut down or stop operating or stop trying to come to a result. That is why I find the attitude of the President and the Senate Democrats so disappointing.

By any fair measure, the proposals by the Republican House of Representatives to bring this to a solution are reasonable proposals. Let's look at what they've proposed.

They proposed that we continue funding the government. Every single proposal the House has made to this body is that we continue funding the government. And they've proposed that we also, at the same time, No. 1, be fair to the middle class by delaying the individual mandate in the new health care law for a year.

Now, the President has already himself delayed seven major provisions in the new health care law that is supposed to take effect today. These include the employer mandate, which is $12 billion over 10 years for corporations. Yet the President and Senate Democrats are saying we can give the employers a $12 billion break by a 1-year delay, but we're going to stick it to the middle class of America by fining them $95 if they do not buy health care and sending the IRS out to collect it next year if they fail to do it.

What we suggested was, since the President himself has already delayed seven major provisions, since the regulations aren't written, let's also delay

the individual mandate for a year. That would be fair to the middle class.

No. 2, the House has suggested that we can continue funding the government and be fair to those who are ill by repealing the medical device tax. Seventy-nine senators have voted for the medical device tax repeal, including a large number of Democratic senators.

No. 3, the House Republicans have said, let's continue to fund the government and be fair to the American people when it comes to health care. Treat the American people the same way Congress is treated.

And finally, most recently, the House Republicans have said, let's continue to fund the government and can we not just sit down and talk about it? Have a conference?

Which is the way, under our rules established by the Constitution, we're always supposed to resolve disputes. And the answer has been no from the Senate Democrats.

No, to giving the same consideration to the middle class, the people who are required to buy health insurance; no, to giving fairness to those who are ill by repealing the medical device tax; no, to giving fairness to the American people by treating them the same way Congress is treated; and no, to giving fairness to the system in saying can we not just sit down and talk in a conference, which is our way of resolving disputes.

And the answer by the President and the Senate Democrats is no, no, no.

The President's role is to bring us together. He said that during his campaigns. He has a great capacity for persuading the American people that he is right. He seems to be able to talk with the Iranian rulers, but not to the congressional leaders.

Our goal is fairness for the middle class, fairness for the taxpayer.

Our latest offer from the House of Representatives was, let's keep the government running and let's sit down according to our rules and have a conference and talk about it.

This stubbornness in the face of reasonableness will not be good for our country, will not be good for either political party, it will not help us to achieve the kind of result on this and other issues that the Founders intended by creating a system of checks and balances in our democratic form of government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield first to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives holds the key to reopen the Federal Government. It is an easy key to use. In fact, it is very simple. The key is to allow 435 Members of the House of Representatives to vote to reopen the Government, and do it now. It is not too late to avert the worst economic problems that this shutdown relates to. But you see, I am not the only one calling for the Speaker to open the government. I am not the only one calling on him to do the right thing.

This is what Republican Congressman SCOTT RIGELL, from Virginia said. He said it this morning. It is a direct quote:

> We fought the good fight. It is time for a clean CR.

That is a Republican Congressman. If the House votes to reopen the government, Democrats will gladly go to conference. Unfortunately, I read that Speaker BOEHNER and House Republicans are engaging in silly political stunts instead. What he is going to do is have some Republicans, Members of the Congress, sit down for a photo op across from empty chairs. That is really unique. Has that ever been done before? Maybe only five or six thousand times since I have been in Washington. What they are really sitting down to instead of empty chairs is an empty stunt. I say to the House Republicans, it is time for the photo ops and those silly stunts to end. Shutting down the government is not kid stuff. That is kid stuff. Shutting down the government is deadly serious.

The business community has warned of the economic consequences of the shutdown. It is now being proven. For every day the Speaker refuses to use the key to reopen government, it costs the American economy billions of dollars—every day. The solution is as clear this morning as it was last night: Reopen the government. He holds the key to putting millions of public servants back to work. Once that happens we are happy to go to conference. But only if the government is reopened.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator CARDIN, the Senate recess as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I see my colleague from Tennessee just left the floor, and I was listening to his comments. I know he is having a hard time—as many of our Senate colleagues are—understanding or justifying the actions of the Republicans in the House.

Make no mistake about it, this is a House Republican shutdown of the government. The majority leader was talking about the consequences. The House Republicans have tried to hold all of us hostage, but it is not going to work.

When they talk about negotiating, the majority leader is absolutely right: We have tried on numerous occasions to get to a conference on the budget only to find objections from the Republicans to sit around the table to talk about the budget of the country. We are not going to yield to extreme measures. We should have the government open, and then we should be negotiating the issues that are important.

I take this time to talk about our Federal workforce and to talk about the impact this shutdown will have on Federal workers and the people of Maryland and the people of our Nation. I am proud to represent Maryland in the Senate.

Once again Federal workers are going to be asked to make sacrifices on behalf of their country, but this time they don't understand it. This shutdown will have a negative impact on them and on our country. For 3 years Federal workers have been working without a pay increase or an adjustment of salary. I had my staff check some of the statistics on the number of Federal workers we have today compared to the historic numbers. We actually have fewer workers per capita today than we did in the 1950s. We are asking our Federal workforce to do more with less, and we are asking them to continue to work under sequestration when many have been furloughed.

Now our Federal workforce has been furloughed in great numbers and are uncertain as to whether they will receive a paycheck. There are Federal workers who are working today and they don't know when they are going to get their paychecks. It is wrong, and it is going to hurt families. They are going to have to try to figure out how to pay their bills without getting a paycheck.

This goes well beyond the Federal workers themselves. Look at the reductions we see in the Federal workforce here in the Washington area. What do you think is happening to the retail establishments, the small businesses, and our economy? We estimated in Maryland that we would lose $15 million a day for every day the Federal Government is closed.

Mark Zandi said the impact of a Federal shutdown will increase unemployment by half a percent. In 1995 to 1996, the last time we had a shutdown, OMB estimated it cost the taxpayers $1.4 billion. This is wasting taxpayers' money, and it is putting people under incredible stress as to how they are going to pay their bills. For what? To move an extreme agenda, to try to see if hostage-taking works in the Congress? This will have a major negative impact on our economy.

The private sector has recently created 7.5 million jobs over the last 42 months. There are more people on private nonfarm payrolls than at any time since September 2008. Jobless claims are close to a 5-year low. The second quarter of 2013 marked nine consecutive quarters of economic

growth, the longest stretch since before 2008. And now because of the House Republican shutdown, we want to reverse that? Do we want to go back to a failing economy? That is what is at stake here. Do we want to cost our taxpayers money with the inconvenience we are causing the people of this country by a government shutdown? Talk about life-threatening delays. The researchers at NIH are being compromised. The inability of NIH to take on new patients as a result of a shutdown absolutely affects the welfare of the people of our country. Small businesses are unable to get SBA loans. How do they run their businesses during this shutdown?

In my State of Maryland—and I know this is true around the country—the backlog on veterans getting their disability claims heard is tremendous. That will now grow as a result of this government shutdown.

The FDA is responsible for food safety. I could talk about a lot of different agencies. Forty-five percent of the FDA's workforce, or 6,620 employees, will be furloughed. The FDA will be unable to support the majority of its food safety nutrition and cosmetic activities. The FDA will also have to cease safety activities such as routine establishment inspections, some compliance and enforcement activities, monitoring imports, notification programs, et cetera. That is what this shutdown will cause. Do we want to make sure we have a safe food supply? Well, today it is not quite as clear as it was yesterday.

We know about the national parks and the zoo being closed. That makes no sense at all. People will be inconvenienced, but people's health will be put in jeopardy because of this House Republican shutdown. It is totally illogical.

We have tried to go to conference on the budget. There are three problems we have before we get a workable budget for this fiscal year. First, we have to keep government open; second, we have to make sure we pay our bills; and third, we have to get rid of sequestration. That is what we have to get done. And, yes, we have to sit down, Democrats and Republicans, to work out a budget for this fiscal year, but we can't do it while the government is closed.

When we fail to pass a budget—and quite frankly, it is the Republicans who have been unwilling to sit at a table to come up with a budget. The regular order is to pass a continuing resolution that continues the budget so the government can operate until we have a budget. We have always done that at the current level.

Well, the Democrats are willing to go even further. We are willing to take the Republicans' reduced budget number because of sequestration, and they can't even accept that because, quite frankly, there are too many on the other side of the aisle in the House who want a government shutdown. That is not the way we should be operating.

I am proud to represent so many Federal workers. I am proud to represent the people of Maryland, and we are going to continue to fight on behalf of the right policies. We are going to fight to make sure Federal workers are made whole when this is over, and that they are able to get their paychecks with full pay. It is going to be a struggle because of the attitude—particularly from the Republicans—in the House, but we are going to continue to fight for what is right for our Federal workforce and for the American people.

Let us pass a resolution to keep government open. Let us sit down and work out a budget for this coming year. Let's do what is right for the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

The Senator from Illinois.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time that is consumed under the quorum call be equally divided between the Democrats and Republicans, and all subsequent quorum calls be equally divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to continue the discussion on the situation in which we find ourselves, which is that the entire Government of the United States of America has been shut down, and those Federal employees who are working are working without pay.

This is a terrible situation. I implore the House to pass a clean short-term continuing funding resolution that the Senate sent over to them 4 days ago so we can reopen the government. Let's reopen the government. Let's reopen the Government of the United States of America. The way we reopen the government is to pass the Senate continuing funding resolution.

What would it do? It would fund the government at fiscal 2013 levels. That doesn't mean it adds new money; so there is no new money. It is keeping us at current spending levels. We would have a short-term continuing resolution until November 15 while we work out other issues, and then we can get over the speed bump of raising the debt ceiling. I believe that is the path forward.

Where we are now has terrible consequences. It has terrible consequences for our economy. It has terrible consequences for our standing in the world. It has terrible consequences for the functioning of our government.

We are speaking now about a shutdown of the government. Right now, there are hundreds of thousands of men and women who work for the Federal Government who signed up to do a job in the service of their Nation. They have literally, with the passing hours, had to either take a furlough—and a furlough means we have essentially laid them off; we have laid them off—or they are working because their work is essential, such as an FBI agent, but they are not getting paid. We are paying them with IOUs. This is not the United States of America.

I am thinking about those people who are working every single day. Let me paint a picture for my colleagues. In my own State, we are the headquarters to the National Weather Agency. People who watch TV think they get their weather news from either the Weather Channel or they get it from their local TV or radio station through doppler radar. It is terrific. But guess where they get their information. They get it from their Federal Government. They get it from the weather forecasters at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who work hard every day predicting the weather and getting out the information that news people can use in their own community. So if a person is a farmer, he is getting that information. If a person is a waterman who works on the Chesapeake Bay and he has to make sure the storm is not coming while he is out there crabbing or oystering to keep his business going, he needs to know the weather. Whether a person is a county executive or a mayor, people need to know what their weather is going to be. So they have been on the job, whether they have been predicting hurricanes or tornadoes or giving us the basic day-to-day information. The weather forecasters are at their duty station, but what are we saying to them now? Guess what. Be there, but we are not going to pay you except through IOUs.

Yesterday I spoke about the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration in my State. There is another major agency which is not in my State but very important to the functioning of our country: the Centers for Disease Control. Right now, they are working down there in Georgia. What is the Centers for Disease Control? What is their job? Their job is exactly that: disease control. When veterans and other people were ill and getting sick in a hospital in Philadelphia, they were called in because they are our top biosleuths in America. They are our own bioforensic scientists, our own bio-CSI team. They were the ones who found out about something called Legionnaires' Disease, and they helped those people who got sick in that hotel, and were able to put out that information. They are the ones who are standing sentry to make sure there is no emerging surprise or pandemic in the world. They are the ones who are gathering information now to know the latest threats to the health and safety of the United States of America.

What is it they are doing? If a person is a pediatrician, they are watching the CDC to see what are the latest causes of ear infections that could be infecting children and the right treatment to help them, the right treatment for their doctors to be able to know. That is what they do. When their labs are being closed, it leaves States on their own—State health departments—to be able to look out for antibiotic-resistant viruses and other infectious diseases, and a variety of other kinds of things. We need the Centers for Disease Control. They employ thousands of people in Atlanta, GA. Yet we are telling them: Well, maybe not the way we need you.

Yesterday, the President passed a bill to guarantee military personnel be paid on time. We support that. But what is missing from the bill is important. The intelligence community, made up mostly of civilians, will not be covered. It means that over 72 percent who work in our intelligence agencies will either face furloughs or will be working with IOUs.

Who else involved in our national security is not covered? We didn't cover border security. We didn't cover FBI. We didn't cover DEA. We didn't cover the U.S. Marshals. What are the marshals doing? It is not like Wyatt Earp. Marshals aren't just out there like cowboys in a Wild West movie when we watch a miniseries. The Marshals Service is very important. Do my colleagues know what they are doing in Maryland right now? First of all, they provide security in the courthouse. They do the security to protect the judges. We have some of the most violent gangs and criminals coming in and the marshals need to protect those who are enforcing the law through the judicial system.

They are also going after the sexual predators. They are the ones who track all of the evidence and go after sexual predators to make sure they are not loose in the neighborhoods, and they are working with local law enforcement.

They also go after missing fugitives. We know about the big signs that say ''Ten Most Wanted.'' Well, guess who goes after them. The Marshals Service. That is one of their primary responsibilities. That is what Federal law enforcement is. These employees are also critical to national security.

Trying to do this piecemeal—oh, we have looked out for our troops. We should look out for our troops. But while we look out for our troops, we should look out for those who come back home.

I know the Presiding Officer and others have been strong supporters of our veterans. I am a strong supporter of our veterans. Many of the services being performed by the VA are open, such as VA health care, but there are other services where we have to delay the backlog on veterans' cases, veterans' disability benefits. Through appropriations, we have actually put money in the Federal checkbook to deal with more training, more overtime to reduce this backlog.

When we speak about shutdowns, I want to take a moment to talk about my own office in relationship to veterans. I am the longest serving woman in Senate history. It is a great honor. In my 25 years as a Senator and after 25 years as the senior woman here, I have only closed down my office twice: once in 1995 and this morning. I cannot express to my colleagues the heavy heart I had when I talked to my staff. My staff is a great staff. Whether they are working in Maryland or whether they are working here in Washington, we are a local phone call away to 6 million Marylanders. Of those people who work for me, one is a young lady. I hope I don't embarrass her if she is watching TV. Her name is Denise. Denise has worked for me for 30 years, back when I was in the House of Representatives and now as a Senator. She is a caseworker, a constituent service worker. For 30 years she has specialized in helping me respond to the needs of veterans. Veterans all over Maryland love her. They depend on her, and I depend on her so that I can help those veterans.

I know my time has expired, but Denise's time on the job shouldn't expire. I want to make sure Denise is on her job. I want to reopen my office. I want to make sure we reopen government. We can do that if we pass the Senate continuing resolution.

Hello to the House. Don't send us piecemeal. Let the House vote on the Senate bill. No gag rule in the House. Free the House, open the House, open government, and let's get the job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I would like to quickly begin by saying that last night at the stroke of midnight the government faced its first partial shutdown since 1996. There has been a lot of partisan talk back and forth about who is to blame, but our constituents are demanding action and rightfully expect us to resolve this situation. We need to act swiftly to get the government up and running again.

Let me turn to another matter. Today's date is October 1, 2013. Since the passage of the so-called Affordable Care Act in 2009, millions of people have looked forward to this day, probably with more dread than anticipation. That is because today is the day the ObamaCare health insurance exchanges—where millions of Americans will be required by law to purchase health insurance—are open for business.

Perhaps I should say they are supposed to be open for business. President Obama, in his futile effort to sell his health care law to the American people, has been trying to paint a rosy picture about what will happen starting today. He has claimed that today will mark the first step in a process that will provide health coverage for millions of Americans. Sadly, now that we are here, the picture is much cloudier than the President would like to admit. Indeed, as the exchanges begin to go live, we have more questions than available answers. We know the exchanges have been met with significant delays—delays for large businesses, delays for small businesses, and even some delays for some of the State exchanges themselves. We know about other technical and logistical problems facing the exchanges. I will talk more about those in a few minutes.

What we don't know is what will happen to the average American trying to sign up and navigate his or her way through the ObamaCare exchanges. I wish to take a few minutes to talk about that today and, in doing so, I wish to talk about someone we met during the 2012 election campaign. Her name is Julia. We all remember Julia. She was the faceless character created by the Obama campaign to symbolize the cradle-to-the-grave support women would receive under President Obama's administration, including under ObamaCare. She was supposed to be the embodiment of President Obama's compassion for women and his opponent's lack thereof.

Unfortunately, President Obama's ''Life of Julia'' outline was short on some details, particularly when it came to Julia's efforts to obtain and keep health insurance through the ObamaCare exchanges. Today I will try to fill in some of those details. However, it will be difficult because, as I said, there is still much we don't know about how the exchanges are going to work.

As we follow Julia into the exchanges, the first question that comes to mind is: What brought Julia to the exchange in the first place? Is she one of the millions of Americans who will

end up losing employer-provided health insurance as a result of ObamaCare? Is she now a part-time worker after her employer had cut her hours to avoid the employer mandate? Perhaps she was laid off so her employer could keep their number of employees below the threshold required to be considered small business under the law.

In any event, Julia has come to the exchange looking for health insurance because that is what the law requires her to do. The next question is, Who will explain to Julia how she is to sign up for insurance under the exchange? What we know is that she will be assigned to a navigator, a person employed by a private organization tasked with assisting the uninsured in determining what type of coverage they qualify for. This person, who is not a government employee, will have access to her personal information, including her Social Security number and household income data.

Sadly, there is no telling whether this person will steal that information and use it for nefarious purposes. That is because the administration, in the drafting of the rules for the certification of navigators, cut corners on things such as training and background checks, putting consumers and patients at increased risk for fraud and identity theft.

I came to the floor to discuss this a couple of weeks ago. This was something that Members of Congress warned the administration about months ago. Sadly, our warnings have been ignored. So the bottom line for Julia is that before she even enters the exchange, an unqualified navigator or perhaps an imposter posing as a government counselor may have easy access to her private personal information, allowing them to steel her identify and create a nightmare for Julia to fix. Somehow, I do not think the authors of ObamaCare had this in mind when they created the navigator program.

The next question Julia will face is whether the exchange in her State will be ready. This, of course, will depend on where Julia lives. Not all of the State exchanges will be ready to launch today. Idaho, Minnesota, Oregon, Colorado, and the District of Columbia have already announced they will be delaying the launch of their exchanges.

The New York Times ran an article about the delays and glitches facing the exchanges this past weekend. According to the article, ''Many of the 16 directors of State-run exchanges are describing October as a soft launch period when Americans can start exploring their coverage options—but on Web sites that may be incomplete, vulnerable to glitches, and perhaps not ready for an onslaught of customers.''

In other words, Julia, depending on where she lives, may not even be able to sign up for insurance today because of the problems and delays—problems and delays many of the exchanges are now facing. But for the sake of discussion, let's assume Julia is able to sign on to the exchange and select a health insurance plan. Now that she has picked a plan, the question is, Will her personal information be secure?

In order to sign up and purchase an insurance plan, Julia will have to hand over a virtual mountain of personal information, including her Social Security number, her tax return, and the like. All of this data will be entered into the Federal services data hub, a new information-sharing network that allows State and Federal agencies to verify her information.

The problem with the data hub is that it has not gone under any independent review to determine if the data that is entered is secure. The administration announced that the data hub had passed internal testing on September 10, a mere 3 weeks before it was set to go live. Sure, they may claim the data hub is operational and ready to go, but no independent watchdog such as the Government Accountability Office, for example, has had a chance to verify the security operations or make recommendations to better safeguard the privacy of consumers.

Absent an independent review, there is simply no way of knowing whether the exchanges have adequate safeguards in place to protect enrollee's personal information. For Julia, this means her personal and financial records may be at serious risk of becoming available to data thieves or just plain crooks. Obviously, this is not something the Obama campaign mentioned about Julia when they planned out her life for her.

The next question for Julia is whether she will be eligible for premium or cost-sharing subsidies. Depending on her income, Julia may be eligible for a tax credit designed to defray the cost of purchasing health insurance on the exchange. These credits are both advanceable and refundable, meaning that the IRS will pay them first and verify them later.

My gosh, what a system. This is what some have referred to as ''pay and chase.'' The problem with this method of determining the eligibility for the subsidies is that there is an increased likelihood that applicants will receive larger subsidies than they actually qualify for. For Julia, that could mean, if she receives a subsidy, she could end up owing the IRS money next tax season. That is not a highly advertised element of the exchanges or the subsidy program, but that is the reality people such as Julia will be facing.

Once Julia's plan and potential subsidies are in place, the question then becomes will she have the same quality of health care she had before that she was promised by the President. The Obama administration has made some misleading claims on this front. According to the White House, consumers and States with Federal exchanges will have an average of 53 plans to choose from. However, this number does not tell the full picture. According to an analysis undertaken by my staff on the Senate Finance Committee, 75 percent of States with Federal exchanges will have fewer plans available than the average touted by the White House.

In addition, there will be fewer provider networks in the exchanges, because in an effort to keep the cost of premiums down, insurers are reducing the number of doctors and hospitals covered by the plans in the exchanges. For example, there is only one insurer in the New Hampshire exchange. Their plan will exclude—get that word ''exclude''—10 of the 26 hospitals in the State.

Another example is Blue Cross Blue Shield of California. Their exchange plan also covers only 53 percent of the doctors and 74 percent of the hospitals that are included in their broadest non-exchange plan. According to the New York Times '' . . . many insurers are significantly limiting the choices of doctors and hospitals available to consumers. . . . from California to Illinois to New Hampshire and in many states in between, insurers are driving down premiums by restricting the number of providers who will treat patients in their new health plans.''

In short, this means that on the exchanges, Julia may very well have fewer choices for health care providers, potentially leaving her with limited access to quality care.

The final question Julia will face on the exchanges is perhaps the most important. I call it the final question, but I am sure there are others. Will Julia have to pay more for her health insurance under the exchanges than she did before this wonderful ''Affordable Care Act''?

This, once again, depends on the specifics of Julia's situation. If, like most Americans, Julia previously had employer-provided health insurance, she will likely be paying more for her insurance on the exchange than she did through her employer. While some enrollees may be able to find cheaper insurance through the exchanges, the majority of Americans will pay more for health insurance under the exchanges than they do now.

The Manhattan Institute found that individual market premiums will increase 99 percent for men and 62 percent for women nationwide with the exchanges in place. The bottom line for Julia is that depending on her plan, she may very well end up paying more out of pocket for her health care than she did before ObamaCare was in place.

As you can see, the reality of Julia's experience on the health insurance exchanges does not resemble the pretty picture President Obama painted for her during the campaign. She will almost certainly face a number of difficulties just navigating the process. I do not blame President Obama. He was just told what to say by so-called experts on health care. Those experts have been wrong, wrong, wrong too many times.

In the end, it will likely end up costing Julia more to buy insurance on her exchange. Of course, Julia is not a real person. Her problems are imaginary. However, the problems that real Americans, including people from my State of Utah, will be facing as the exchanges open today are very real, as I have described them. Put simply, these exchanges are going live today with too many unanswered questions and too many unsolved problems.

We should have never gotten to this point. The Obama administration should have acknowledged the ample warnings, signs and problems in the exchanges and heeded the many calls for delay. The administration was all too willing to delay the pain businesses will suffer under ObamaCare. Sadly, the American people got no such special treatment.

All I can say is that those of us in Congress will be watching these exchanges closely. The American people will be watching them too. They will be experiencing them, which may not be very pleasant, in light of the promises that were made to them. If what we have discussed or witnessed so far is any indication, I do not think we or they or Julia will like what we see.

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. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I come to the floor this afternoon as the chairman of the Intelligence Committee in order to speak about the effect the government shutdown starting to have on the community and what effect it will have if the shutdown continues.

Let me give the most important figure up front. Across the intelligence communities, 72 percent of the civilian workforce is being furloughed. This means that with the exception of a few intelligence agencies that have a significant number of military personnel, the lights are being turned off and the majority of the people who produce our intelligence, analyze that intelligence, and provide warning of terrorist attacks or advise policymakers of major national security events will be prevented from doing their jobs. Simply stated, this is unacceptable. The failure of this Congress to perform its most basic functions means that our country is at heightened risk of terrorist attack.

Intelligence provides this Nation with its first line of defense because long before a threat makes it to our shores, the men and women in our intelligence community learn about it, sound the warnings, and often take the steps to neutralize that threat. Before the President or the Secretary of State makes decisions on U.N. Security Council resolutions, such as a resolution to end Syria's chemical weapons program, they review the intelligence and they seek the advice of intelligence analysts.

Finding Osama bin Laden in a house in Abbottabad and removing a bomb from an Al Qaeda operative in Yemen aren't things that just happen. They require the dedicated work of a huge array of professionals. Good intelligence requires the following: CIA officers on the ground and around the world meeting with sources; technical wizards who collect signals and imagery information; engineers who put together the systems to bring the information back to Washington and who convert the ones and zeroes of computer code into meaningful, actionable intelligence. Today, 72 percent of the civilian workforce will not be doing these jobs. Our shutdown is the biggest gift we could possibly give our enemies.

I understand and I support continuing to pay our military men and women, operating both at home and abroad, including tens of thousands still deployed to Afghanistan. By furloughing our intelligence workforce, we put our uniformed men and women at risk as they, too, rely on the intelligence agencies to tell them where the next assault may take place or where the next IED is hidden.

We have Ambassadors in threatened capitals. I can guarantee that our Ambassadors in Kabul and Baghdad and Sanaa and Islamabad rely on their intelligence briefers and the tactical intelligence support to their security teams as much as they rely on the marines who guard front gates.

I met earlier this spring with Ambassador Anne Patterson in Cairo. I saw the gates and walls of our modern Embassy that had been overrun by the same crowds protesting down the street in Tahrir Square. I met with the CIA, NSA, and other intelligence officers who give the Ambassador and her team warning when the extremists are looking to try to attack our Embassy again.

Some of these intelligence professionals will obviously remain on duty and are absolutely essential, but by furloughing the majority of the intelligence civilian workforce they rely on, we are preventing them from effectively doing their job.

I spoke yesterday with Director James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence. At my request, he sent me a short report on how the shutdown will affect the largest intelligence agencies. In addition to the 72 percent overall figure, his report lists how the shutdown will cripple the CIA, the NSA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, to include the National Counterterrorism Center.

Every single agency I listed will lose the majority of its civilian workforce. Many of them don't have a sizable military component that is exempt from the shutdown. The numbers are still classified, but any Senator who wants to see how our failure to fund the government is harming the intelligence community is welcome to find out and read this report. It is in the intelligence office on the second floor of Hart. The intelligence agencies at the Departments of State, Treasury, Energy, and Homeland Security are hit even worse.

I wholly regret that we are in this situation. I regret that across the country national parks are closed and Federal safety inspectors are sidelined. For 4 years we have squeezed the discretionary appropriations levels to the point that every part of the Federal Government has had to cut back and make do with less. What we are doing now puts American lives at risk. It is an abdication of congressional responsibility.

I wanted to come to this floor to make clear to every Member of this body that what we have done directly damages our national security.

I also would like to take the opportunity to speak on some of the cutbacks that are in process in the area of energy and water.

Since 2001 I have served as chairman of three different Appropriations subcommittees: Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, the Interior Department, and today the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. Over the years I helped make a lot of tough choices on which programs to fund, which not to fund, et cetera, but never have things been as bad as they are today. The cuts we are making to our appropriations bills under sequestration are strangling programs that must be funded. These are programs that are vital to our country, vital to public safety, and programs that promise to deliver the next breakthroughs in energy research.

I will speak about some of the negative effects a shutdown and continued sequester would have on my subcommittee.

The agency within my subcommittee that may have the most direct impact on the public is the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps safeguards our dams, our levees, and our drinking water. It keeps our harbors open for cargo ships, and it maintains more than 4,000 recreation sites. Most people don't know that. Simply put, a government shutdown would mean the termination of a wide range of Army Corps of Engineers activities.

Let me mention flood control for a moment. Work is stopping on virtually all construction projects, studies, and activities related to flood control and navigation across this country. These projects protect tens of millions of Americans. A shutdown may mean the Corps stops work on improving dam safety projects, including the dam at California's Isabella Lake, which is the dam most at risk of failure in our State.

Halting these projects endangers citizens and ultimately increases the cost to complete this work. What is more, these projects actually reduce overall costs to the Federal Government. Damage prevented by the Corps' projects—this is only damage prevented—exceeds $25 billion a year. It is indeed a big deal.

Other Corps projects interrupted by the shutdown includes the strengthening of levees and flood walls to reduce the risk of loss of life and economic loss from flooding and coastal storms.

Work could stop on improvements to flood protection levees along the Mississippi River, levees that experienced record flood levels in 2011.

Projects in Boston, Kansas City, and Seattle could be suspended. Even worse, these construction delays would come at a time when severe storms are causing damage with greater frequency.

Even dam safety projects could be affected by a shutdown.

One example is California's Folsom Dam, where the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation are working to increase dam safety. A shutdown would likely cause the Corps and Reclamation to suspend contract activities, delaying this vital project.

The Folsom Dam is a major component of the Central Valley Project, which provides clean water to more than 20 million Californians, and should not be put at risk by a government shutdown.

A shutdown will also have dramatic impacts on water-borne commerce.

More than 2.3 billion tons of cargo moves through our marine transportation system. Improvements to channels, harbors and waterways ensure this vital traffic flows without pause.

Projects at Oakland Harbor in California, Savannah Harbor in Georgia, and Charleston Harbor in South Carolina could be impacted by the shutdown, meaning higher construction and transportation costs.

The country's vast system of inland waterways could also suffer from the shutdown.

More than 600 million tons of cargo move through our inland waterways on commercial ships. A shutdown means this cargo could be slowed, and the use of locks would likely not be available at all to recreational boaters.

While facilities on lakes that combine flood control and hydropower should continue to operate because of safety issues, hydropower operations will likely be curtailed.

This means 353 hydropower units operated by the Corps—which provide roughly one-quarter of the country's hydropower—would operate at reduced capacity. This would cut into the $1.5 billion in payments the units generate each year.

There are also major permitting and operational impacts that will be immediately noticeable.

Processing of regulatory permits under the Clean Water Act, which the Corps handles, will be suspended.

In a typical year, the Corps processes more than 80,000 permit actions. This means anyone from an individual building a dock to a community planning a major development would not be able to move forward because they won't be able to secure a permit.

The Corps will also be unable to provide enforcement actions on existing permitted activities, which could harm sensitive environmental or aquatic resources.

Another visible effect will be the shuttering of recreation areas.

The Corps of Engineers is the largest provider of outdoor recreation among all federal agencies. They maintain more than 4,200 recreation sites at 422 projects in 43 States, with more than 370 million visits each year.

Those visitors spend more than $18 billion annually and support 350,000 full-time or part-time jobs. All this will be impacted by a government shutdown.

The Department of Energy could also face severe limitations under a shutdown.

Research grants to national labs and universities could be suspended. These grants fund important clean energy challenges related to biofuels, supercomputing, and materials research.

The output of world-class science facilities on cutting edge research and product development may be significantly reduced. With U.S. leadership in science threatened by China, Japan and Europe, now is not the time to suspend major scientific research.

Regarding the national security missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, a government shutdown may delay important nuclear modernization activities.

A government shutdown may disrupt and delay efforts to replace aging components in every single nuclear weapon in the stockpile. For example, delays in replacing aging components in the W76 submarine—launched warhead—which makes up more than 50 percent of the Nation's nuclear deterrent—would have serious impacts to the Navy's nuclear deterrence mission.

Upgrades to aging infrastructure related to uranium, plutonium and high explosives capabilities would also be delayed. Delays of just days can add millions of dollars to a project's bottom line.

A government shutdown may also delay the design of a new nuclear reactor for the Ohio-class submarine. A shutdown may also delay refueling one of only three training nuclear reactors for sailors, which is critical for supplying sufficient numbers of sailors to man the U.S. submarine fleet.

Lastly, on this matter, the shutdown will delay and increase costs to clean up and remediate nuclear contamination at former nuclear weapons and nuclear energy research sites. These activities should be completed as quickly as possible to protect human health.

Finally, Madam President, I just wanted to say a couple of things about the much-beleaguered health care plan and what is happening so far.

During the first 3 hours today, the Federal health care Web site—healthcare.gov—with information about exchanges across the country logged 1 million visitors. As of 9:30 this morning, in Kentucky, the health exchange had 24,000 visitors and processed more than 1,000 applications.

I am anxious to provide the west coast numbers, although not able at this time due to the 3-hour time delay.

There were 2 million visits to New York's health exchange during the first 2 hours of the launched site. Even at 11:30, Connecticut had 10,000 visitors and 22 people enrolled.

Let me just end with this one story. Paula Thornhill, a mother of seven who lives in Virginia, was the first to apply for coverage today in her county, which is Prince William. She is quoted as saying: ''I am relieved that they did come out with this affordable health care. I am relieved.''

So far so good today, and I am hopeful that this tyranny of the minority will end shortly.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I come back to the Chamber to urge the following. I hope as we try to resolve this important spending bill that a key part of that resolution is to live by existing law under ObamaCare and make sure that Members of Congress and our staff aren't treated far differently and far better than the American people.

That is what the congressional portion of my ''No Washington Exemption'' bill and amendment is all about. It is a pure and simple principle. I think it is a first principle of democracy, and American democracy should work by that first principle: What is good for America is good for Washington. And what Washington imposes on America, it must live with itself: No special exemptions, privileges, subsidies or rules. The same rules. I think that should be the rule across the board for whatever part of law we are talking about. It should certainly be the rule under ObamaCare.

Indeed, it is the rule under ObamaCare under the statute. What I have been fighting is an illegal regulation promulgated by the Obama administration to get around the clear language and the clear intent of the statute. As the Chair knows, during the ObamaCare debate this issue came up, it was debated, and language was passed here in the Senate and put into the statute. That language says, pure and simple, every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges for their health care, the same as other Americans who are going to the exchange. No special treatment, no special exemption or rules or subsidies. That is the clear language and that was the clear intent.

Amazingly—and I was happy to see it at the time—that language, which I fought hard for, along with many, many others, led on the Senate side by Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY—was adopted. That became part of the statute that passed into law. But, apparently, it was an example of that old NANCY PELOSI quote—we have to pass the law to figure out what is in it—because that language that did pass as part of the ObamaCare statute, when lots of folks on Capitol Hill started reading the details and they got to that section, they said: Oh, you know what. We can't live with this. We can't have this. This is a crisis. This would actually apply—the exchanges—to Members of Congress and our staffs, just as they are applied to millions and millions of other Americans—8-million plus who are losing their previous employer provided health care, against their will, and being forced to go to the exchanges.

So when that happened, after the passage of ObamaCare, furious scheming and lobbying started going on behind the scenes. This included lobbying of the administration. HARRY REID and many others got involved in asking the President to get personally involved to bail Congress out, to prevent this clear statutory language from having its clear force and effect. And sure enough, that worked. President Obama, according to numerous press reports, got personally involved. He literally picked up the phone, had conversations personally with folks in his administration about this rulemaking—pretty unprecedented—and, sure enough, a rule was issued conveniently right after Congress left town at the beginning of the August recess to flee the scene of the crime.

That rule, the so-called OPM rule—completely illegal, in my opinion, because it is contrary to the statute—does two things. First of all, the rule says: Yes, the statute says all Members of Congress and all official congressional staff go to the ObamaCare exchanges for health care, but we don't know who official staff is. We have no idea. We can't figure that out, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to figure out who among their employees is official staff for purposes of this section, and we are never going to second-guess any decision by any Member of Congress, even though this could result in up to 535 different applications of the law.

I think we should all be able to agree that is flat-out ridiculous. The law is written. It is written clearly. It uses the words: Official congressional staff. For OPM to say, through this rule, we can't figure that out, we will leave it up to each individual Member of Congress, is ridiculous, particularly since that would allow a Member saying no one who works for me is ''official staff'' for purposes of this section. What? They can completely get around the law with regard to staff that way. That is just flat-out ridiculous.

The second thing this illegal OPM rule does is to say that even for Members of Congress and their staff who do go to the exchange for their health care, they get to take with them something that no other American from a big employer in that sort of situation gets to take—they get to take with them their previous Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan subsidy—a huge taxpayer funded subsidy that no other American at that income level would get. That is completely separate treatment not envisioned by the statute in any way, and not mentioned in the statute in any way. In fact, there are plenty of parts in the statute contrary to that. But they get to take that with them to the exchange.

Is that available to any other American in that situation at that income level? Absolutely not. So again, that is flat-out ridiculous and flat out at odds with the clear statutory language and intent of that provision of ObamaCare.

Ever since we came back into session after the August recess and had the opportunity to correct this egregious illegal OPM rule, I have been fighting alongside others to do just that. I have been fighting along with a number of Senate colleagues, and I thank them all for their active involvement. I have also been fighting alongside Congressman RON DESANTIS of Florida, who is leading the House effort, and many, many other House colleagues who are all for this measure.

I want to make clear and underscore, because this is important, that with regard to Members of Congress and staff, this isn't demanding some new law. This isn't demanding some change to ObamaCare. This is saying let us simply live with what the law is. Let us simply live with the clear statutory language. That is what we need to do, and we need to do it because it is fair and right for the American people. We need to do it because Americans are sick and tired, quite frankly, of Washington elites treating themselves like a higher select ruling class.

That is exactly the concept the American revolution was founded on. That is exactly the mindset that led to our breaking away from Britain, which was a monarchy and was governed by that mindset. Yet here we are, as in many other cases, Washington is reintroducing that principle. That is a thoroughly un-American principle. And the first principle of American democracy—and we should affirm it—is that what Washington passes onto America, it lives with itself. Same rules, no special exemptions, no carve-outs, subsidies, or bailouts. What is good for America is good for Washington, and it should be applied equally across the board. Simple concept. Basic concept.

As I said, I would call it the first rule of American democracy, but it is being trampled on in this instance. It is being trampled on as yet again Washington sets itself apart and above the American people as a select elite ruling class. That is wrong, and it is as wrong as yet another of a number of exemptions from ObamaCare; it is wrong as yet another example of special treatment—a carve-out, waivers, or exemptions.

The President often says: This is the law of the land. He is right. So why don't we apply the law of the land as it is written across the board, no exemptions, no waivers, no illegal rules that are contrary to the clear language and intent of ObamaCare. Why don't we start by applying ObamaCare just as it is being applied to America in Washington. Why don't we start by living by the letter and the spirit of the law in saying all Members of Congress and all congressional staff go to the exchanges for their health care and do not take any special taxpayer funded subsidy with them that is unavailable to any other Americans at that income level.

That would be leadership, and that is what we need to do. That is not changing the law. That is living by the law. We need to do that and we need to do it now as part of any resolution to these spending bill disagreements.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to gather around this principle. I urge my colleagues to vote right on this issue. I assure my colleagues they are going to get the chance to vote one way or the other. I am going to continue to demand a clear, clean up-or-down vote on the Senate floor on this issue. We have not had it. I have fought for it for about 4 weeks now. But because of the extraordinary efforts—quite frankly, including threats and intimidation and bribery—of the majority leader, we have not been allowed that clear up-or-down vote. I will assure my colleagues we are going to get it.

I don't know when, I don't know how, because I don't control that, but I am going to make darn sure we are going to get it. And not much, if anything, of substance is going to happen until we do. This is overdue because this goes into effect today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, what we have is the tea party Republicans' version of Elizabeth Kubler-Ross's five stages of grief. More than 40 years ago, Dr. Kubler-Ross laid out the five different emotions experienced by people when they faced what they considered to be an awful, unacceptable fate: Making affordable health care available for millions of Americans is anathema to today's tea party Republicans. They

cannot accept it. They shut down the government to try to stop it.

The tea party Republicans cannot handle the fact that the Affordable Care Act will guarantee that millions more Americans are going to have access to quality, affordable health care coverage; that being a woman is no longer going to be a preexisting condition—women cannot be charged higher insurance rates just because of their gender; no one is going to go bankrupt just because they get sick.

Before the Affordable Care Act, medical bills contributed to more than 60 percent of all personal bankruptcies in the United States. That all ends with ObamaCare, which lifts lifetime caps on insurance coverage. Mr. President, 6.6 million people on Medicare have already saved more than $7 billion on their prescription medicines. The tea party Republicans are in the grip of the political equivalent of the five stages of grief. It is the American people who are getting squeezed.

The first stage, denial. The tea party Republicans refuse to accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is the law. They have tried to repeal it more than 50 times. It has been ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court. They ignored last year's Presidential election in which the Republican candidate who promised to repeal the Affordable Care Act if he was elected was soundly defeated. The tea party Republicans deny the decision by the Supreme Court that found the Affordable Care Act constitutional.

The second stage, anger. The tea party Republicans are enraged that the Affordable Care Act is going to work. We know it is going to work because we have 7 years of experience in Massachusetts, where now 97 percent of all adults and 99 percent of all children are covered. We have a poll conducted in April of this year by the Massachusetts Medical Society. It indicates that 84 percent of Massachusetts residents are satisfied with their health care. They like their health coverage under the Massachusetts system, which is the very model of President Obama's plan.

The tea party Republicans cannot stand the fact that the Affordable Care Act will finally make health care a right and not a privilege in our country, in the words of the great Ted Kennedy. The tea party Republicans are so angry about ObamaCare that they closed down the Federal Government today, sending hundreds of thousands of Federal workers home without pay.

The third stage, bargaining. The tea party Republicans are doing a lot of bargaining these days. They are using the entire Federal budget and soon the full faith and credit of the United States as leverage in their negotiation to try to gut ObamaCare. Bargaining rarely provides a sustainable solution, especially in this case. That is because the tea party Republicans do not want to negotiate. They want to eliminate the Affordable Care Act and the benefits it provides to millions of Americans. They say they want to bargain, but they don't. They say they want to negotiate, but they don't. They just want elimination of the health care program and that is not going to happen.

The fourth stage, depression. The tea party Republicans are clearly depressed that they are getting blamed for shutting down the government, that public opinion is sharply turning against them and that many Republicans are repudiating their tactics and their extremism. Republicans are fighting amongst themselves, struggling to find a way out of the mess they have made for themselves.

Finally, the fifth stage, acceptance. The tea party Republicans have not yet reached this final stage of acceptance. They still do not fully understand the backlash that they are facing from the public, which will justifiably blame them for the Republican tea party shutdown. The tea party Republicans do not yet regret their destructive ways. They certainly are nowhere near acceptance.

So I say we are witnessing the tea party Republicans in the throes of their grief over losing the last election and losing the battle over health care reform, but it is the American people who are paying the price for this political psychodrama that is tearing the Republican Party apart and hurting our country and hurting the health of millions of Americans in our country. Now is the time for them to get over it. Now is the time for ObamaCare to be the law of the land. It is not going away.

Now is the time to join together to ensure that it works for the American people. Now is the time to move forward to pass a budget that funds our government. Now is the time to get our economy back on track, create jobs, and build a bright future together for all Americans. Now is the time for the tea party Republicans to accept what the American people have voted to make the law of our land and the person whom they voted to make the President of our country.

I yield the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. 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. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the shutdown that has now occurred.

To say I am outraged is an understatement. What we need is for the folks down there at the other end of the U.S. Capitol Building to open this government. The economy of this country is at risk and they have done it to advance their own narrow extremist agenda.

All of this is due to a relatively small group of lawmakers down in the House of Representatives—some 40, maybe 60—who are intent on having their own way on a personal agenda. They are refusing to work with their fellow Republicans, as well as Democrats, down in the House of Representatives, and the result is a forced government shutdown that is doing a lot of damage to a lot of people. That is why it is important for the American people to say they have had enough and they want these folks to stop this nonsense.

We ought to be keeping government open, but, we need to consider a couple of things. For example, the National Institutes of Health are now unable to bring in 800 patients they were going to start to give medical treatment in breakthrough medical techniques and developments. At the same time, the National Institutes of Health—one of the premier agencies in all of this alphabet soup of agencies that we talk about—they have had to furlough 70 percent of their civilian workforce.

A few minutes ago, we heard the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, explaining that the Director of National Intelligence has told her he has had to furlough 72 percent of the civilians in the intelligence community. That is ridiculous. We have terrorists who are trying to do us harm, and he has had to furlough 72 percent.

Take, for example, NASA. NASA had to furlough 97 percent of its civilian workers in the space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Would my friend, the distinguished Senator from Florida, yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. NELSON. Of course I will. I wish to thank the majority leader for his leadership and for standing firm to stop this nonsense.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I thank my friend. We served together in the House.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 2642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2642, entitled ''An act to provide for reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes,'' with an amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree in the House amendment and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and

the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees with a ratio of seven to five on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Presiding Officer appointed Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each for debate only; and at 6 p.m. I ask that I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NELSON. As I understand what the majority leader has just done, the Senate has appointed conferees on the farm bill. That is an example that when there is a political will, we can get together and get things accomplished.

The National Institutes of Health, NASA, and all of the intelligence agencies—72 percent of all the civilians in the intelligence agencies, including the CIA, are furloughed. We are in a war with those people who are trying to do harm to us. We are having these people furloughed all because of a small group, the tea party, in one House of one branch of government who are intent on their agenda. It is irresponsible and reckless.

The truth is, if the Speaker would just bring up what we call the continuing resolution, which is all of the appropriations bills put together up to a date certain, November 15, it would pass overwhelmingly with Democrats and Republicans both voting for it, not the extremist small group down there, but the Speaker doesn't bring it up.

What I see happening—if this lasts for more than a day or two—is that the American people will be so irritated and upset that their lives are disrupted because they can't get government services they are going to insist that their government open once again.

I have an example. The fine work the people I have the privilege of working with and what they do for the people of my State never ceases to amaze me. It is not unusual when I am going into a meeting or airport or walking down the street when I am in the State of Florida, it is commonplace for people to come up and say to me: I want you to know that I appreciate so much what you did to help me or my mother or my son or my brother who is a veteran.

When they say those things, they are talking about all of these dedicated people whom I have the great privilege of working with to help the people of our State on the day-to-day necessities of their daily lives, such as an emergency situation, they realize their passport has expired or they lost their passport or didn't get their veterans payment or need help getting their brother into a veterans hospital or something happened to their Social Security payment or they need information about this particular piece of legislation or they are concerned about somebody they saw whom they thought was doing things and they need them to be referenced to the correct agency on a security matter. It goes on and on.

These wonderful people we have working with us—some young, some old—many of the ones who have been with me for years are so dedicated and work day and night. They work their fingers to the bone. They know exactly whom to call or to e-mail to get things done for people back home in need. We know what is going to happen. When they call any one of our offices in Florida, they are going to get a recording of my voice, telling them what has happened and how all of these folks have been furloughed and giving them an emergency contact as the one lifeline we can provide.

What happens next? If reasonable people were doing this, we would have never shut down in the first place—people who are bipartisan, who have some common sense, who recognize we can't have it our way all the time but in the best of American tradition respect the other fellow's point of view and then work out differences to achieve a consensus in order to gain a workable solution. If those kinds of reasonable folks had been operating, then we would never have shut down in the first place.

We have heard about this over and over in the speeches today: I voted for, in the Budget Committee, a budget. It came out of committee and came to the floor. We had over 100 amendments. It took hours and hours. We finally passed a budget which was the outline for the appropriations for the next fiscal year. We passed that in the Senate 6 months ago. The House did the same. They passed out a budget. But when we asked to go to a conference committee to get agreement for working out the differences between the two, that small group would not let the conference not only not convene but even be appointed.

I think the majority leader of the Senate will tell us we are ready to meet right now, but they have to open the government again. We have to put back to work these people who are trying to serve the American people and to protect the American people. Hopefully, if the American people hear these messages, they will get sufficiently agitated and insist that, once again, the crowd that has shut us down instead should open the government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to call for an end to the senseless government shutdown and urge Members of the House to set aside political games for the betterment of the country.

The American people are tired of our country being held hostage and our economic recovery threatened just to score political points, and justifiably so. There are real consequences for this irresponsibility.

Shutting down the government for 3 or 4 weeks would reduce real gross domestic product by 1.4 percentage points in the fourth quarter alone, and a shutdown longer than 2 months would likely precipitate another recession.

But my colleagues don't have to take my word for it. Here is what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce said in a letter on this very topic: . . . ''it is not in the best interests of the U.S. business community or the American people to risk even a brief government shutdown that might trigger disruptive consequences or raise new policy uncertainties washing over the U.S. economy.''

David Cote, the chief executive officer of Honeywell, stated that if you want to create economic disruption and uncertainty for businesses, then a government shutdown is a great way to do it.

I couldn't agree more.

The truth is we simply can't afford another self-inflicted wound to our economy, especially not at a time when things are finally turning around. We had big news in our State this month. The unemployment rate is down to 5.1 percent. National unemployment is at 7.3 percent. That is the lowest point since December of 2008. The housing market is bouncing back with existing home sales reaching a 6½ year high in August. Retail sales are up, and so far this year we have added 1.5 million private sector jobs. We are not where we need to be, but we are moving in the right direction and it is clear that now is not the time to take a step back. Yet here we are again, right in the middle of another manufactured crisis.

On Friday, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running that is free of any ideological policy provisions. The Senate bill would fund the government at the same level as last year through November 15 and would give Congress and the President time to negotiate a balanced deficit reduction plan.

The commonsense next step would be for the House to take up and pass the Senate's bill. That is democracy. They should put the bill before the House and, by most beliefs, it would pass and it would end the shutdown. Instead, the House has sent us four separate versions of the legislation with full knowledge that the Senate would not agree to them and the President stating he would veto them. Each of the House proposals would have delayed

implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

So here we stand with the Federal Government shut down just so the House Republicans could again attempt to relitigate a law that both the House and the Senate passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court upheld.

That doesn't mean there will be no changes to the law going forward. I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from the great State of West Virginia, has some ideas and I have some ideas, but they must be made in a rational manner, not as part of poison pill partisanship.

House Republicans don't seem to understand or they choose not to care about the negative impact on businesses and families that a government shutdown would have. Here are some examples of how my State will be impacted, and I know the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, is here, and I know he has some examples as well. This is the story in Minnesota: According to the Small Business Administration, in 2012 their loan programs approved 53,847 applications and supported 571,383 jobs for an average of just over 1,000 applications per week. What does this mean for Minnesota? Well, my State is home to 115,000 small businesses, and I wish to ensure that the SBA loans keep coming through.

All lands managed by the National Park Service in Minnesota would be closed. They are closed. These include Voyageurs National Park, the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, the North Country National Scenic Trail, the Pipestone National Monument, and the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway. Closure of the parks would result in the loss of tourism revenue. Last year, more than 600,000 visitors enjoyed these parks, an average of more than 1,600 visitors per day. According to the National Park Service in 2011, visits to these parks in Minnesota contributed $37 million in economic benefits and generated 665 jobs in my State.

In a State such as Minnesota, where tourism is our fifth largest industry and the source of 11 percent of our private sector revenue, we simply can't afford for this to happen. We simply cannot afford for this critical industry to be hamstrung by political posturing.

In the shutdown, the Food and Drug Administration will furlough 7,000 people, roughly 55 percent of the agency's workforce. That means the process for approving life-saving drugs and treatments and devices—something that matters a lot in my State—would grind to a halt, and shipments arriving at our ports from overseas will no longer be monitored by the FDA.

The shutdown also has the potential to slow down research at the Mayo Clinic. The bulk of Mayo's funding for research comes from the National Institutes of Health grants.

In the government shutdown, 70 percent of NIH staff is shut out, as Senator MIKULSKI has said on this floor many times, 70 percent of the National Institutes of Health staff. That represents about 19,000 American scientists, researchers, and others who are working to develop a cure for Alzheimer's, working to develop a cure for muscular dystrophy, working to develop a cure for autism.

Staff from the Mayo Clinic said if the government shuts down, the NIH will not be reviewing new grant proposals, and that is starting today.

In addition, it means funding for recently approved grant projects won't be released, and new patients will not be admitted to the NIH Clinical Center or allowed to begin new clinical trials.

We must also be willing to do the right thing for the safety of our people. That is, all in all, in my belief as a former prosecutor, the No. 1 duty of government—to keep our people safe. When it comes to homeland security, counterterrorism, and Federal law enforcement, rest assured those protections will continue, but in the event of a shutdown, the Federal officers who continue going to work protecting the public from violent crimes, gangs, and terrorists won't be getting a paycheck. Instead, they will be getting an IOU. So basically what we will be saying to these people, and what we are saying as of midnight last night, is: Thank you for putting your lives on the line but we can't pay you right now because there are some people in the House who want to delay the Affordable Health Care Act, and if you are lucky, maybe you will get backpay when all this is sorted out.

My colleagues in the House like to talk a big game about how uncertainty is hindering real economic growth. I believe uncertainty hinders economic growth. So it is quite ironic that they are now creating this economic uncertainty and are willing to threaten our economy on a political gamble.

Shutting down the government is not a negotiating tactic. If the House were to take up the Senate bill to fund the government, it is expected to pass and the shutdown would end. During that time, over the next 6 weeks, it will give us that time to truly negotiate a long-term debt deal done in a balanced way. Instead, critical services and the economic recovery are being threatened with poison pill partisanship.

To my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, I say this: Let's get this done. We owe it to the people we were elected to serve. We owe it to the country. Let's end this government shutdown now.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today is October 1. Today is the day that has long been known as the day when the Affordable Care Act will first come into force and exchanges across the country will begin to be open to citizens of all different backgrounds and walks of life for them to seek affordable, accessible insurance on these exchanges, the next step in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. On one level, it is a good day, because tens of millions of Americans are today gaining access to quality affordable care. I am told that since midnight, nearly 3 million people visited healthcare.gov, 80,000 or more have called a hotline, and 60,000 have requested live chats for applications, and enrollment in these marketplaces is moving forward at a record pace. So, on some level, this is an important day, because millions of Americans across dozens of States are getting access to quality affordable health care.

On the other hand, as the Presiding Officer well knows, this is an embarrassing, difficult, and disappointing day. The Federal Government of the United States is shut down. As of midnight last night, the President, the Office of Management and Budget, directed all the different executive agencies and offices to begin shutting down. As a result, 800,000 Federal employees are spending today at home—not helping small businesses with loans from the SBA; not helping move forward grants that invest in improving our infrastructure; not moving forward federally funded research that might find a cure for cancer or for MS or for autism; not helping applicants get college loans; not helping disabled veterans get access to the benefits they earned through their service to our country. We could go on and on about all the different ways these Federal employees—these public servants—are today not able to help our constituents, our fellow citizens.

I have gotten a fair number of contacts today—phone calls to my office, e-mails to my office, folks connecting with me on Facebook or through Twitter, or directly or indirectly, to convey how frustrated and upset they are.

I want to try to put all of this in some context for the folks who might be watching. What is it we are fighting over? As best I can understand, a few Members of this body and a few Members of the House of Representatives have shut this government down in an effort to try to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That is what this is all about. They have refused to take up and pass a bill that would fund the continuation of the U.S. Federal Government. In so doing, they are doing about $10 billion a week in damage to our economy. They are doing all of that damage I referred to in terms of hundreds of thousands of Federal employees not able to help improve our communities or keep us safe or move our country forward.

So why are we doing this? I think it has been said for many years that the definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. Well, the House of Representatives has tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act I think 42 times now.

As best I understand, this bill, which was passed by both Chambers and

signed into law and then challenged at length in the Supreme Court and upheld and then was the central issue of the last Presidential election, which was not particularly close, this law of the land, which is moving forward in its implementation today, will not be stopped by shutting down the Federal Government.

This is a strategy that never really had a serious chance of success. Despite very long, quasi-filibuster speeches on this floor, despite all sorts of public pronouncements, this strategy has no chance actually of working. So what is the point? Why is this Federal Government shut down? It seems to me that it is simply a demonstration of a temper tantrum, a fit by a small number of folks who promised people back home that they will not allow this government to go forward with the Affordable Care Act.

I think what we should be doing instead is working together across the aisle to improve the Affordable Care Act. It is not perfect. Of course it has blemishes. There will be hiccups and there will be inconsistencies and issues that need to be worked out as this law is implemented. We ought to be working together across the aisle, the Senate and House together, to make sure it is done in an affordable, sustainable, and positive way rather than a small minority digging in their heels and imposing all of this wreckage for their own partisan goal.

Let me share some of the thoughts I have gotten from folks at home who are not exactly happy about our having a Federal Government shutdown today.

First, Ray White of Ellendale, DE, wrote:

> I am a veteran and a US government employee. The furlough and sequester we already went through back in August of this year cost me 20 percent of my paycheck for over a month, causing my bills to get out of control. I would like to know how to make ends meet when I have no money to pay my bills, and lawmakers in the Capitol want to put me out of work again.

To Ray and your family, I am sorry. I am sorry for the fact that we have a few folks in the House of Representatives who will not take up a bill to keep our government open. As the Senator from Minnesota recently related, if the Speaker of the House would just let that bill get to the floor, it would pass. There are more than enough Democrats and Republicans in the House to pass that bill if the House would just take it up. I don't think there is any question who caused this shutdown and why.

CWO2 Christopher Slicer of Newark wrote me to say:

> As a federal technician and Army National Guardsman, I find it ridiculous that those we have elected as our representatives cannot do their jobs. If I wasn't doing my job, I would be fired or reprimanded. There is no excuse. I don't care which party it is for not passing whatever it is that needs to be done to have a budget. For our government to shut down shows how incompetent our government is to the world and worse its own citizens. There are thousands of us federal employees who have had to endure furloughs already, and you are telling me that we may have more.

Well, to CWO Christopher Slicer, I apologize that this Congress is unable to come together across this partisan divide and that we have another needless, manufactured crisis that just a few irresponsible Members insisted on to make a partisan point.

I think CWO Christopher Slicer makes a particularly important point: that this government shutdown shows our weaknesses in our inability to get together across this partisan divide not just to our citizens but to the world. At a time of real instability and real threat to our national security around the world, I think this government shutdown is not just harmful to our communities, our families, and our economy, but to our country and its standing in the world.

Last I will read, if I might, a note from Laurie Tonkay of Dover. Laurie wrote me to say:

> It seems like we just got through the government furloughs and now there is a good chance you're going to shut down the government.

This came yesterday.

> My husband is employed with the Civil Service on Dover Air Force Base. This makes it difficult for ordinary families to make ends meet. I am getting discouraged with the way things are being done in Washington these days. America is in debt because we overspend, then you make your average hard-working employees pay the price for it repeatedly.

She concludes:

> Morale is low, and frankly, I have lost confidence in the bureaucracy. I wonder if things would be different if this were an election year. Would you shut the government down? I think not. Show you care and get something done now.

Well, to Laurie, I am sorry for the impact this shutdown has had on you and your family. But it is the result of a few irresponsible Members of the House of Representatives. If the Speaker would just put on the floor for a vote what has been passed here in the Senate, we would have a government reopened today and we could get back to the business of this country. We could get back to conference on the budget and make progress on investing in making our communities safer, our families stronger, our schools and our students better educated, and doing the investment in our infrastructure and research we need to move our economy forward.

Let me conclude by sharing this. I have a number of wonderful folks on my staff who work in my offices in Delaware and in Washington whose real focus is constituent service. If folks call my office and they have a problem or an issue at home that we need to help with, they do an amazing job.

One young man, Brendan Mackie, recently joined my staff. He is a two-tour veteran of Afghanistan and Iraq. He works tirelessly to make sure the veterans who contact my office get the help they need.

A staff sergeant recently contacted us. He was wounded in Baghdad in 2007 by an IED. He lost the documentation for his Purple Heart. Well, Brendan dove right in and did all sorts of work—collected sworn statements and medical records, submitted everything to the relevant Army review board—and has managed to get his Purple Heart reissued.

That is the kind of case work my folks do day in and day out, making sure that whether it is accessing veterans' benefits or disability benefits, Social Security, or medals earned in service to this Nation in combat, the men and women of Delaware who contact my office and rely on me and their services for great constituent support can get that help. Sadly, Brendan is home today and not able to serve the people of Delaware, not able to do his job.

If I might, I would close by saying this: This is the latest in a series of manufactured crises, of completely senseless, self-inflicted wounds. It is up to the Speaker of the House and to the folks in the House of Representatives to take up and pass the bill we sent them days ago that would allow this government to reopen and allow the leaders of this Chamber and the other Chamber to move forward on dealing with the real issues facing our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it appears the Republicans understand finally that the government is shut down, but now they are focusing on trying to cherry-pick some of the few parts of government they like. They do not like it all, but they like a few parts of it. Just another wacky idea from the tea party-driven Republicans. You can tell that the tea party Republicans still want to keep the government shut down. If they wanted to reopen the government, they would simply reopen the government by bringing the Senate's bill to their floor and letting it pass with a majority vote. We could reopen the government in a matter of minutes if Speaker BOEHNER had the courage to stand up to the tea party.

I said the word ''we''—they.

We support veterans and parks. We support the FBI. We support the Federal Government. That is our job. That is what we do. But we cannot and we will not be forced to choose between parks and cancer research or disease control or highway safety or the FBI or, as we have heard here today, on and on with examples from the National Security Agency, which has cut by more than 70 percent its personnel. The Republicans seem willing to fund veterans, but what about the rest of the government?

First, we need to end the government shutdown and then Democrats will be happy to agree on funding for specific items. We would be glad to do that. We

would be happy to agree to fund priorities as soon as Congress enacts legislation to reopen the government.

The Republican plan is not a serious plan. It is not a plan to run the country. It is not a plan the American people sent us here to do. This is just as clear as the Presiding Officer seated before me—wide-shouldered, Former Governor of West Virginia, someone who has been in government for many decades. It is so clear, here is what it is all about. They have it in words.

Here is their plan. Some of the rabble-rousers over there have said what they want to do, which is take little bits and pieces of the Federal Government, send something over for veterans today, parks tomorrow, maybe security agencies tomorrow and the next day, and this will go on for weeks. Well, what will not get funded? ObamaCare. Now, it is so obvious. In fact, one of the Senators said this. In fact, I am paraphrasing part of this. This appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune.

It is obvious we cannot end ObamaCare, so we are going to have a different approach.

In light of the fact they cannot end ObamaCare, here is the quote: ''In light of that, let's leave ObamaCare for another day and not hold hostage the vast majority of government functions.''

The Utah Republican has claimed credit for kick-starting the effort to use the Federal budget as leverage to halt funding for ObamaCare—a move that led to the impasse and the government shutdown. So they could not do that, so now what they want to do is nitpick these little things while the government is shut down and wait until the end and there is nothing for ObamaCare in spite of the fact that millions of people now have health care today that they did not have yesterday because of the exchanges coming online.

We need to reopen the government. The key to that still remains over in the House of Representatives. It is the Senate-passed clean bill for the whole government. If Republicans were serious, they would pass that bill. Doing anything else is just sour grapes. This is not serious. The government is shut down. If they think they are going to come and nitpick us, it will not work. It will not work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the latest Republican proposal is a cynical one that pits important priorities against each other. People should not have to choose between health for our veterans and cancer research. We should not have to choose between keeping our highway projects going and cleaning up toxic waste areas. We should not have to choose between visiting our national parks and enrolling our kids in Head Start.

As we said a thousand times, we are happy to discuss how to fund the government but not with a gun to our head. Open up all of the government, and then we can have a fruitful discussion.

You know, it gets a little tiresome. It is game after game, gambit after gambit from the other side of the aisle. They keep trying new things, new tricks. Some of them have to do with ObamaCare, and some of them are unrelated to ObamaCare. They are trying as they might, Speaker BOEHNER, to wriggle out—Speaker BOEHNER is trying to wriggle out of the box in which he has put himself. On the one hand, he knows shutting down the government is highly unpopular and hurts America. On the other, he is so used to giving obeisance to the hard right that he is afraid not to. He is betwixt and between.

But I will tell you, today was a bad day for Speaker BOEHNER and those who want to shut the government down. Polling data is overwhelming. Americans 3 to 1 support opening the government even if it means keeping ObamaCare going.

Americans think that the Republican Party is being irresponsible and not living up to what it should be doing. Americans are telling Republicans in the House: Vote now. Open the government by putting a clean continuing resolution funding bill on the floor.

They will have new games, but we are not going to go for them. Sooner or later, they are going to have to say: OK, we will fund the government. Then we will discuss things, but—as has been said over and over—not with a gun to our heads.

Democratic unity is as strong as ever, from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to just about every Member of the House of Representatives and to all 54 Members of this united Democratic Caucus. This is great because it means that there is hope.

The bad news about today is, of course, that many innocent people were hurt. There are 800,000 Federal workers who depend on paychecks to feed their families and they were told they can't come in to work. They are dedicated to their jobs. They want to come in to work. They can't and, of course, they are not getting paid.

Millions more are affected as well. We had furloughs at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station in Buffalo of defense employees, many of them civilian. We fought hard to keep that base open. Now we are telling the people: Go home, you can't work today—as important as that base is to the security of America.

Senator FEINSTEIN was here earlier. Three-quarters of our intelligence people at the NSA are not working. That is an abstract concept, but it relates to every single one of us and our security.

The idea of shutting this government down may sound good to the hard right in the abstract, but even when their constituents learn of what specifically it means, they are going to run away from that concept.

To my colleagues, particularly from Texas, the junior Senator from Texas, who has evidently come up with this new plan, face it. The Senator is not going to get us to give in to extortion. The Senator is not going to take as hostage millions of innocent Americans and succeed in getting us to do something that he wants but we don't and they don't.

I saw in the Salt Lake City paper that the junior Senator from Utah said: Maybe we should forget about ObamaCare and look to spending cuts.

Well, good morning. That is what we have been saying all along. We may not like the spending cuts in certain areas that they proposed, but we are willing to discuss them. That is how a budget works, how appropriations works, and how our government is run. But to take an extraneous issue and to say unless we get rid of it, they are going to shut down the government, no way.

I wish to tell my colleagues if they think they are having a rough time here on shutting down the government in terms of the politics, in terms of where people are, and in terms of their base of support, wait until they try to shut down the debt ceiling.

Senator CRUZ, Senator LEE, it is going to be 10 times worse. The dangers are even greater to America. The pressure on all of us will be even more severe, and that will not work either.

I have a simple suggestion. Let's in one fell swoop fund the government, allow the government to pay its bills, and begin debating the spending issues that we should justly debate instead of putting America through these paroxysms because they know, we know, and the American people know they will not succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we were notified just after lunch of the new strategy that is coming out of the Cruz control that we are facing on Capitol Hill.

It turns out that Senator CRUZ is going to pick and choose those departments of government that he wishes to open. That's right. The junior Senator from Texas is going to go through his priority list of Federal agencies that he thinks should be open and funded.

We closed down virtually all of them at midnight and, sadly, some 800,000 Federal workers have been furloughed across the United States, some of them going home without a paycheck for as long as this goes on.

The height of irresponsibility is that the junior Senator from Texas now wants to pick and choose those agencies he wishes to reopen. One of those agencies, not surprisingly, is the Department of Veterans Affairs. Of course, we owe that obligation to our veterans. They wish to open the Department of Veterans Affairs, but perhaps not other departments.

Let me remind the Senator from Texas of a couple of realities. They may fund the Department of Veterans Affairs with a short-term appropriations bill, but this bill will not help

bring back the paychecks of the 546,000 veterans who currently work for the Federal Government—546,000, over half a million.

To help the Department of Veterans Affairs, they are ignoring half a million or more veterans who are Federal workers. More than one in four Federal workers is a veteran and more than a quarter of veterans employed by the Federal Government are disabled.

The Senator from Texas is picking and choosing those veterans he wants to help. The disabled veterans working for our Federal Government are not going to get the help. Those working at the Department of Veterans Affairs will.

This is the height of irresponsibility, and it is the height of arrogance. Then, of course, he decides, since he has heard all the speeches about all the national parks that have been closed, we are going to open the national parks. That is a good thing. I would support that.

But let me ask the Senator from Texas—who is now deciding what is important in our Federal Government—does he think maybe the medical research at the National Institutes of Health is important? Does he think maybe the efforts that these scientists and doctors are undertaking to find cures for diseases, the next drug, the next medical device, the next surgical technique to save his life or the life of someone he loves is important? You bet it is.

The list goes on and on. It is reckless for the junior Senator from Texas to decide: Well, OK, tomorrow veterans and national parks. Then maybe later on we will get around to medical research, or maybe we will get around to criminal administration in the Department of Justice.

Maybe we will get around to bringing the people back to the intelligence agencies who are monitoring terrorists all over the world who threaten the United States.

I sure hope we make the wish list of Senator CRUZ when it comes to our national security. To think that this Senator has the nerve to try to decide what is really, really important for America—I will state what is important for America. It is important to end this irresponsibility and this recklessness.

It is important to realize these are real lives and real people doing work for the United States of America. Using them as political pawns is an embarrassment. It is an embarrassment to this institution and those who are pushing this agenda. We know this problem can be cured and solved in a matter of moments.

If Speaker JOHN BOEHNER would have the nerve to put the spending bill that passed the Senate on the floor of the House of Representatives, it would pass in a minute. The Speaker knows it would. That is why he will not call it.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. Through the Chair I say to my friend from Illinois, during all this prioritization that they are doing, this agency and that agency, the government is closed, isn't it? The government is closed.

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct. As of midnight, the notice went out that the government agencies were closed. There are some that are doing important jobs that are absolutely essential—air traffic control, for example—but the agencies of government have been closed.

Please listen to Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland. I wish Senator CRUZ would come to the floor and spend a few minutes listening to her about the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, which due to this reckless strategy by the Republicans, have closed today. Really? Closing the doors on medical research in the United States of America. What a moment of great pride for the tea party to be able to claim they closed down the National Institutes of Health.

Now they are going to pick and choose. Maybe it will make the list. Perhaps not this week but next week we will get back into the business of medical research. On the greatest Nation on Earth we are facing this. It not only makes the Nation look bad around the world, it harms our economy. Think about it for a moment.

How much confidence would you have in the United States of America if its government is capable of shutting down, over a political squabble that is totally unnecessary, shutting down the government of the United States of America. What a source of pride for the tea party Republicans but not for the rest of America.

The rest of America knows that we need to roll up our sleeves and solve our problems. We have to stop these doomsday scenarios, these threats, this irresponsible, reckless strategy from the tea party Republicans.

It is time for the Speaker of the House of Representatives not only to lead the Republicans in the House but to be a leader for America. It is time for all of us to come together, to fund this government, and move it forward today—not tomorrow, not next week, not beyond and more.

When it comes to the debt ceiling, it is the full faith and credit of the United States that is at stake. The question is very basic. Will America pay its bills?

These same Members of Congress who voted for the spending now refuse to pay the bills. As Congressman Obey of Wisconsin used to say: They want to pose for holy pictures. Oh, yes, we voted for the spending, but we don't want to pay for it. We are not going to vote for a debt ceiling. My goodness, the word ''debt'' scares us and it may scare the voters.

They would see the United States default for the very first time in our history on our debts, fail to make payments on our debts.

What is the practical impact of that if families decide not to pay their debts, to skip a mortgage payment. They are going to meet their banker. They are going to call them and say: Pardon me, Senator, did you notice that you didn't make your mortgage payment? If you didn't notice, we did. It is going on your credit report. The next time you try to borrow money it is going to be at a higher interest rate because you are not very creditworthy.

Now multiply that into a nation of more than 300 million people. The next time we start to borrow the money after we have defaulted on our debt for the first time in history, what is going to happen to America's credit rating? Interest rates will go up.

Well, so what. A slight tick up in the interest rate paid by America for its debt consumes billions of dollars that could be spent on education, on research, and on building America's infrastructure. This is wasted money because of this wasteful strategy from tea party Republicans.

Over and over Speaker BOEHNER has sent us these bills to defund ObamaCare. Why were they so desperate to stop health care reform? Because October 1, today, is a big, big day across America. For the very first time we are providing Internet access to uninsured Americans so they can have, maybe for the first time in their lives, a chance to buy health insurance. Some of them have never, ever been protected by health insurance. Now they may have a chance at affordable health insurance. In the State of Illinois, 1.8 million uninsured people get a chance, a chance to buy health insurance that they can afford.

I heard at lunch today that more than 2 million people visited this Web site in the State of New York this morning. Do you think there is a pent-up demand for health insurance? It also is an indication of why tea party Republicans are in a fevered state over ObamaCare coming online.

This is going to work. It is going to finally give peace of mind and health insurance protection to people who have lived a lifetime without it.

I have met them, folks who have a child with diabetes, a child with a mental illness, a child with asthma. This is fairly common. These are people who can't get health insurance because some member of their family has a preexisting condition. ObamaCare finally wipes that off the slate and says they can't discriminate against people because of preexisting conditions. Well, you listen to Senator CRUZ and others, and they say we want to do away with that protection.

I hope the Senator never has to face that in his own family. Some of us have. And once you have faced it, you realize what a heartbreak it is not to be able to buy health insurance because of a preexisting condition of someone whom you love in your family.

We are going to change that with ObamaCare. We are going to give people a chance to buy health insurance, and that is what frightens these Republicans—the notion, as that program takes root and grows in America, and people have the confidence and peace of mind of health insurance protection, it is going to be a program they cannot wipe away with the back of their hand.

So all of the things we are seeing, the political gymnastics coming from Senator CRUZ and the tea party Republicans notwithstanding, we know the bottom line is this: This is a good, strong Nation, where Democrats and Republicans need to work together to solve our problems together, not with threats, not with guns to our heads, but with a common purpose of serving this great Nation.

I am troubled that now we are going to get the Senator CRUZ list of his favorite agencies. He starts with the Veterans' Administration. Let him start with the Federal workforce, where over 500,000 members are actual veterans and a quarter of them disabled. If he really cares about veterans, have him call the Speaker. Let's get this government up and running again tomorrow. We can reflect on what happened during the last 24 hours if we do, but let's not continue this embarrassment to the United States. It is irresponsible, it is reckless, it is damaging to our economy and a lot of innocent people. We need to put an end to this government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I regret also we are now experiencing a partial shutdown of our Federal Government. Through no fault of their own, some citizens who are visiting Washington are also being denied government services and access to memorials that their tax dollars support. I hope we can soon eliminate any inconvenience that is being caused by this shutdown for visitors and citizens who planned trips into our Nation's Capital.

The effects of the shutdown are real and they are being felt in practical ways, well beyond the Nation's Capital. But certainly here in Washington we witnessed an example of the unintended and sometimes absurd consequences of the Congress and the President's inability to reach an agreement.

Today, for example, a large group of World War II veterans from my State of Mississippi caught an early flight from Gulfport to Washington as part of the Honor Flight program. These flights allow veterans who might not have the ability to come here on their own to visit the national World War II Memorial that was built to honor their brave service—service that saved the world from some of the greatest evils ever known. Confronted with barricades, however, that were erected this morning around the open-air memorial, as a part of the shutting down of the Federal Government, the citizens from my State carefully removed the barriers and made a path so they were able to walk on to the memorial and lay a wreath beneath the memorial's Mississippi column.

I am very pleased the visit of these veterans to Washington was not ruined by the government shutdown, even though there were some obstacles. But I hope their experience reminds all of us—Federal agencies, Members of Congress, and others who live here in the Nation's Capital—to not make this situation more difficult than it has to be for veterans or other visitors who are coming to the city. For some this may be the only time in their life they will be able to do that.

So I take this opportunity to thank the veterans from our State for their calm, cool, and collected demeanor during what could have been a frustrating experience, and I salute all veterans for their service to our Nation and the access they have even on a day where the agencies are ''closed.'' There are certain premises that should remain open and available for visitation and visibility.

I thank the Honor Flight volunteers for their calm, cool, and collected demeanor and their support for the freedoms of our country. I am sure they will all receive a very warm welcome tonight when they return home to Gulfport.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his remarks about these Honor Flight veterans. We just had a group come down from Rhode Island, including one gentleman who was 100 years old. It was so meaningful for them. In Rhode Island, it is particularly the fire chiefs and the firefighters who have been helping to organize these honor flights, and Chief George Farrell and others took immense pleasure and meaning out of having brought these gentlemen down and enabling them to have this recognition.

The tide of time is sweeping that ''greatest generation'' into its dying years, and while they are still among us, it is a wonderful thing to do. So I thank the Senator from Mississippi for that.

I came to the floor to, I guess, say: Welcome to tea party shutdown, day 1. We do not know how long this is going to go, but it is already having, I will say, miserable impact in Rhode Island.

We have as many as 7,000 Federal employees facing furlough. We just got word that at Naval Station Newport 800 men and women have been furloughed. Our Rhode Island National Guard let us know they are anticipating 300 furloughs. These are people who work hard for our Federal Government. They do important jobs, particularly with respect to the National Guard and Naval Station Newport. They support our troops. It is not fair to them that the tea party extremists over in the House would insist on putting them out of work in order to force a way around the constitutional process of government here in Congress.

The key to putting those 7,000 Rhode Islanders, the 800 Naval Station Newport, the 300 civilian guardsmen employees, back on the job is a very simple one, and it is in the hands of Speaker BOEHNER. All he has to do is call up the continuing resolution. All he has to do is take the measure the Senate passed and put it before the House for a vote. Just give it a vote. That is all it takes.

Why does he not do that? He doesn't do that because there is this peculiarity over in the House called the Hastert rule. It is not a real rule; it is just called that. It is a practice. It is a practice named after former Republican Speaker Dennis Hastert. The practice is that if your own caucus won't agree on a bill—if the Republicans, all by themselves in a room with no Democrats present, won't agree on a bill—then the Speaker won't even give Democrats a chance to vote on it. It will never come to the floor. It is the most partisan rule or practice that exists in this body, in my estimation, and it has been a problem for the Republicans before. There have been times when Speaker BOEHNER has had to use that key he has to simply put a measure before the body without clearing that partisan prescreening by his Republicans. He has done it over and over to protect the Republican Party from itself, when they were going to force choices that would be terrible for the country and terrible for the party, ultimately.

The first was on the fiscal cliff. Remember the hair's-breadth antics that led up to the fiscal cliff? Well, finally, Speaker BOEHNER put the fiscal cliff bill to a vote in the House and it passed 2 to 1. The Republicans voted against it in the caucus, so we know it flunked the Hastert rule test. But it passed the House with a bipartisan vote of Republicans and Democrats, and it spared us then from going off the fiscal cliff.

That was the right call for the Speaker to make. It was the right call for the country. It was the right call for his party because they didn't want to own that debacle and he made a good decision at that time.

The next was the Violence Against Women Act. Over and over we have passed the Violence Against Women Act in bipartisan fashion in the Senate, and it has been passed in bipartisan fashion over in the House. We passed it again in bipartisan fashion in the Senate, but it was going to fail in the House. Well, how do you go back to your voters, if you are a reasonable House Member, and say: We refused for the first time to pass the Violence Against Women Act? It came over in bipartisan fashion from the Senate. It had strong support here, but we refused to pass it.

Well, they couldn't.

So once again Speaker BOEHNER waived the so-called Hastert rule—this practice of having to have his caucus have a pre-veto on anything that comes to the floor—and he brought the Violence Against Women Act to the floor, and once again it passed. It passed with Democratic and Republican support.

The third time was the disaster bill for Sandy. Many of our States were hit darn hard by Sandy. New York and New Jersey took really crushing blows. But the House Republicans didn't want to fund this particular disaster recovery. In fact, they voted 3 to 1 against it—3 to 1 against disaster recovery for their fellow Americans. That is how they voted over there. But Speaker BOEHNER knew how much trouble he would be in with, among others, Governor Christie of New Jersey, so he called it up anyway. He violated this so-called Hastert rule and he brought it up for a vote, and it passed again in bipartisan fashion.

Today, tonight, tomorrow, the next day—any time he chooses—Speaker BOEHNER can turn the key and unlock the government tea party shutdown. He can do that. He has done it three times before. Of course, that got all his tea party folks all excited and they started making new threats and new challenges and new demands, so he is reluctant to go down that road again. But he has done it before, and it remains in his hands. I would submit it is the right thing to do for our country, and that he should put that first.

The first way they fouled up the continuing resolution was to try and stall the Affordable Care Act on it. Well, we voted that down over and over, and cooler heads may be beginning to prevail. But I would remind everybody there are two pretty distinct, I guess we will call them ObamaCares now, since that is the word that is being used—two ObamaCares out there. One, to use Majority Leader REID's phrase, is a punch line. It is the punch line ''ObamaCare'' that revs people up at rallies, that sends that rightwing e-mail chain into vibrations, but which is mostly a product of a fertile and overheated imagination.

The real ObamaCare, at least the real one we see in my home State of Rhode Island, is actually something we like a lot. Seniors are getting protection from the dreaded doughnut hole and are saving over $1,000 each on prescription medications, on average. They see the Affordable Care Act as something that is having a real benefit in their lives right now.

Parents, such as myself, who have kids out of college and under 26—and I hear this from everybody across Rhode Island—are saying: Thank gosh the Affordable Care Act is there, because my daughter is out of college and she hasn't been able to find a job yet that has a health care benefit, so I can keep her on my policy and I don't have to worry if she gets sick the whole family could be bust. Having her on my policy makes me feel so good. Thank you for that.

That is what I hear. That is a real and good thing for actual Rhode Islanders. It is not the imaginary ObamaCare. It is the real ObamaCare.

Families who have a child with a preexisting condition—what do you do about that? You could spend down and give up all your resources, everything you have worked for and earned, so that your family can go on Medicaid—that is one way—or you could stay in the same job forever because the minute you try to move from your employer's health care plan to a new employer's health care plan, your child's preexisting condition doesn't get covered any longer. So you are trapped. Across this country, people are spared that agony by the Affordable Care Act.

We had Peter Orszag in the other day to talk to our caucus. He said that if you extend out the cost of Medicare to the future, it is already down $1.2 trillion from the savings we see from reforms that are happening in red States, in blue States, in Massachusetts, where the Presiding Officer is from, in Utah, in Pennsylvania, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, in California, in Rhode Island—all across the country. It is not political. It is about a better health care system, and we are already seeing the savings.

That is what they want to take away. That is what they want to stop. One thousand dollars out of the pockets of seniors and back to the pharmaceutical companies—that is what the result would be; parents having to lose the protection for their kids at 26; families trapped with a child with a preexisting condition never able to leave the company they work for; and the savings that we are already seeing beginning to evaporate. Why do you shut down the country and harm people in those ways? It makes no sense. The tea party shutdown has to stop.

I ordinarily come to the floor at this time to discuss the appalling way the Senate and the House are blissfully ignoring the evidence all around us of what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans. There is a clear connection between the problems we are in today that have caused this tea party government shutdown and our inability to face the facts about carbon pollution as a Congress. There are some similar characteristics between those two problems, and I would like to discuss them briefly.

One characteristic is an inability to face and address present or looming problems—real ones. In the case of the tea party shutdown, they have actually created a massive artificial problem—a government shutdown for our country—at the same time that the tea party members prevent us from getting together to take the Senate budget and House budget and bring them into conference and agreement in the ordinary process like adults. It is all in the service of the pretense I just discussed: that the Affordable Care Act isn't actually good for our country. It is a triple phony-problem whammy for our country. This inability to face and address real problems is the first characteristic.

The second characteristic is that inability is based on opposition that stands on false or fanciful arguments based more on propaganda than facts. In the case of climate, the fanciful argument—the falsehood—is that the jury is still out. The evidence is not only real, but it is overwhelming right now.

The third characteristic is that the opposition that gives rise to this inability to face and address real problems is fomented by small interest groups wishing to exercise undue influence without due regard for the harm they cause to their fellow Americans.

That is our DC trifecta these days. We can't deal with real problems. We have an atmosphere of phony arguments and propaganda that foul things up, and it is based on opposition that is driven by small but powerful special interests.

I hope and pray the American people will send a strong message to the tea party to knock off the tea party shutdown that is closing and fracturing our government. I hope the response of the American people is a wake-up call to them. As one faction of one party in one House of Congress in one branch of our separated powers of government, they don't get to have everything their way. That is not the way the Constitution was structured. And that is particularly true when the public doesn't agree with them—and the public doesn't agree with them. They just lost an election on this exact issue.

We are going to have other disagreements, and if we just roll through this one and then bang right up against the next hostage scenario—very likely on the debt limit, which, if we blow that and go into default, will be even more catastrophic than the accumulating economic harm of a government shutdown—if we keep going into one hostage scenario after another, then we won't have solved the real problem: We cannot work like responsible adults when a minority—a faction of one party in one House in one branch of government—is having the procedural equivalent of a tantrum.

And true as science and real as Mother Nature, we have the problem of carbon pollution bearing down upon us. Will the polluters prevent action on that? Will we fail to do our duty as representatives of the American people? Will we be unable to face and address this real problem because we are opposed by false and fanciful arguments, with the strings pulled by special interests, instead of us looking plainly at the problems and coming together for a reasonable solution?

This has been a different day than my usual ''time to wake up'' speech. It is time to wake up to the problems of carbon pollution and climate change. It is also time to wake up to the peculiar

way that special and narrow interests are able to tie this body in knots and do damage to the American public for their own benefit. That larger problem is something we are going to have to reconcile ourselves with. If we just look at this as one problem—the tea party shutdown—and we get through it, we will simply go on to another unless we have decided that our Constitution matters for something, that the structure of government the Founding Fathers put together gave us a procedure to work out our differences and that we should follow that constitutional procedure even when we have strong feelings about something. That is the legacy of the men and women who founded this country. It is the legacy for which men and women have fought and bled and died. It besmirches that legacy to have a tiny faction of one party in one House of one branch of government break the whole mechanism just because they want everything their own way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I think the Senator from Rhode Island had it exactly right calling it a tea party shutdown. It is unnecessary, it inflicts pain on far too many Rhode Islanders and people from Massachusetts and Ohioans. It is all so needless. It is so simple: Open the government.

I think Speaker BOEHNER needs to make a decision: Does he want to be Speaker of the far right wing of the Republican Party or does he want to be Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? If he chooses to do the latter, it will mean putting what is called the continuing resolution to reopen the government on the floor in the House of Representatives down the hall, allowing all 430-something Members of the House to vote—Members of both parties, all duly elected in November, all sworn in on January 3 of this year—allow them to vote. If they vote, I am confident that Democrats and Republicans together will reach a strong majority, that legislation will then be sent to the White House, the President will sign it, and the government shutdown will end. It is irresponsible not to let the House of Representatives vote.

Yesterday or earlier today the President said: One faction of one party of one House of one branch of government shut down the government. This whole lurching from one crisis to another by design, by sort of a manufactured crisis that we have seen over and over, is something that simply doesn't work for the American people.

I come to the Senate floor from time to time and read letters from constituents. I won't read letters today because the Senator from Arkansas will be speaking in a moment, but I will tell a few quick stories.

A number of working Ohioans—from the small business owner in Lima, in western Ohio, waiting for a loan, to the farmer in Chillicothe looking for help from the USDA, to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, employees on the base and contractors off the base—are all affected by this.

Ninety-one World War II veterans who stepped off an Honor Flight in Washington, DC, on Tuesday to visit the World War II memorial—their memorial—are affected.

I have been to those Honor Flights when they visit. They visit Arlington and the World War II memorial, which is a fairly new memorial on the Mall. Many of those soldiers and sailors and air men and women who have come from my State have never been to Washington before. This is their first trip. They are often in their eighties.

Those 91 World War II veterans—many in wheelchairs, many with walkers—came anyway even though they heard the place was shut down. They weren't letting a government shutdown prevent them from paying their respects to their brothers and sisters who died during World War II or fought in that war and have died since. They persevered just as they had fighting in World War II.

These organizations give back to the men and women who gave so much to our country.

These 91 World War II veterans prevailed even though the memorial was shut down. They pretty much forced their way in, with help from a number of others.

But too many Ohioans will be hurt.

Sharon Purdy of Spencerville, OH, wrote to me, concerned about the status of this weekend's National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service held each year in Emmitsburg, MD. Her husband Lee was killed in the line of duty in the year 2000 and was memorialized there 12 years ago. Sharon goes back every year to pay her respects. Two Ohio firefighters killed in the line of duty will be honored this year—Michael Burgan from the Sugarcreek Fire Department and Rocky Duncan from the Niles Township Fire Department. Thousands of firefighters and their families will be coming from across the country to pay their respects, but presumably the gates will be closed. That is how government is repaying them for their sacrifice because some people want to score political points instead of doing their job and are irresponsibly shutting down the government—the so-called tea party shutdown.

I received a letter today from Judith Cowan, the president of the Ohio Energy and Advanced Manufacturing Center. She is building a state-of-the-art manufacturing center in Lima, OH—investing in new electromagnetic forming technology. She has been partnering with the Economic Development Administration to build the center.

She received a notice today that her reimbursement check from EDA is on hold due to the shutdown. EDA is not allowed under the law to do that. Because they can't pay the bills, they must stop because of this irresponsible tea party shutdown of the government. Her project is in midconstruction, supplies have been purchased, concrete has been poured, and workers' time has been set aside. She told my office she makes an effort to hire local contractors and use small businesses in her supply chain. She is concerned that these small businesses that live paycheck to paycheck depend on her. Think of the people who poured the concrete. Think of the small companies that did the ironwork. Think of the other companies that have sold to her for this EDA-financed project and you realize some of these small businesses are going to face very hard times, again because of this hard-headed, far-right tea party shutdown which was simply unnecessary.

Contrary to the political games the far right in the House, the radicals, are playing, this is not a game. These are real people facing a real and devastating impact. They do not deserve to be punished for the political ideology of a few.

Remember, one faction of one political party in one House of one branch of government has held hostage the whole rest of the government and these hundreds of thousands of Federal employees and the millions of people affected by them. This is not about whether we will or will not agree to go to conference on the budget. This is about whether Congress in this country can continue to govern.

Senate Democrats have compromised on funding levels. According to reports, the Senate-passed resolution comes at a level 18 percent below what the President proposed 5 years ago. It is 17 percent below what the Democratic Congress proposed 4 years ago. It is 10 percent below what Republicans proposed 3 years ago and 3 percent below the debt ceiling of 3 years ago. This is not about spending. This is not about fiscal issues. This is about attaching one party's—in this case the Republicans'—political platform—presumably out of the 2012 Republican Convention—to simple legislation to make the government work, to keep the government going.

It is a waiting game they are willing to play. The American people are not willing to play. For some it is OK to hurt 1,000 small businesses as the SBA loan program is furloughed. For some it is OK to put 50,000 Ohio Federal employees and hundreds of thousands more around the country out of work. For some it is OK to deny senior citizens, in Mansfield or in Ravenna or in Youngstown, a new Social Security benefit.

It is not OK with me. It is not OK with most of the Members of the Senate. It surely is not OK with the American people. It is time to stop these political games. It is time to put the American people first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I rise to say I have disappointment and frustration and that is what is causing me

to speak today, because this is the day I worked very hard to prevent. I think many in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle but particularly on this side of the aisle, have worked very hard to prevent this day from happening. Our government has shut down. It hurts our economy just when we are turning the corner, and this is something I think the economists are talking about. When we talk to our colleagues, not just in this Chamber but around the country, when we talk to Governors and talk to State legislators and businesspeople, people we know from all around the country, they are so disappointed that it has gotten to this point.

I think most people express what I heard about 10 days ago when I was in Arkansas. I was at a big dinner to raise money for cancer research at the University of Arkansas for medical sciences. By the way, they raised about $1 million that night. It was a great evening. They honored my parents, which was very nice. But nonetheless, when we were there, I bet I had a dozen people come up to me and say: What is wrong with the House? Have these people lost their minds? What are they doing over there?

This is back about 10 days ago when they voted the way they voted recently on the farm bill. That was on a Thursday. On Friday, they took that step that was leading to where we are today on shutting down the Government.

What I tell the folks in Arkansas is: Look, hyperpartisanship has taken over here. This is one of those situations where if we look at the track record of the Senate—I know it is not true in every single case—but if we look at the track record of the Senate in our Chamber, we try to work in a bipartisan way. Because of the nature of the rules, because of the size of the body, because of the traditions, quite honestly because of the Constitution, because of our DNA, we tend to work together in this body. That has been a key to the Senate for years and years.

What it has led to in this particular case is we have passed four what I think of as very responsible measures to keep the government open. These are four responsible measures we voted on fair and square. They came to the floor. The votes were not all 100 to nothing, but nonetheless people are working together to try to get this resolved.

You go down the hall to the House and what you see down there is ''my way or the highway'' politics. My fellow Americans know it is true that these are dead-end politics. It is leading us nowhere.

We have to think of where we have been in the last few years. Think about how bad things were in the great recession. Think about the progress we have made since then. Look at our housing market. It is so much better today than it was 5 years ago. Consumer confidence is back, headed in the right direction. It is good. It is getting stronger all the time. Look at sales of trucks and cars in this country. They have reached their fastest pace since November of 2007, before the crash.

In the private sector, month after month they continue to add jobs all around the country. Those are good results. Why in the world does the House want to put this all in jeopardy? I have been concerned because in the last few days I have had reporters who kind of stalk us out in the hallways on our way in and out of the Capitol or when we are voting—I have had more than one stop me and say: You realize when we go down and cover the House, they talk about red State Democrats. They talk about your race in Arkansas.

It is going to be a very sad day in this country when we learn this is all about politics. I sincerely hope it is not all about politics. I hope we do not have people down in the other Chamber who have elevated politics above what is best, what is right for our country.

When I hear those questions from reporters, there certainly are people down there who are talking a lot about politics when this Nation is in crisis. I think we should all be concerned about that. I think we should make sure that is not the case. If they have a legitimate philosophical issue, that is one thing. But if this is all about politics, if these irresponsible set of votes to shut down the Government is all about politics, then shame on them. Because when we look at the impact this is going to have—the Social Security Administration will be forced to reduce staff. That causes delays for our seniors as they file for benefits and as they apply for replacement Social Security cards. The progress we have made with the VA—I have been very involved in trying to cut back the VA backlog of claims. That progress we have made there is going to stop. It is going to force our vets to wait even longer to get the benefits they have earned.

When we look at small businesses with the shutting down of the Small Business Administration, we are going to have hundreds and hundreds of small businesses that are going to lose their access to capital just in the next few days. The national parks, wildlife refuges, recreational areas—it is a terrible thing for American families who want to take their children out and want to take their families out to explore and experience the great outdoors here in America, some of the raw beauty America has to offer. But it is also bad for business. We have a lot of businesses in my State, we have a lot of businesses around the country that are around these areas. They thrive on things such as canoe rentals, camping equipment, et cetera. It could be bicycling, could be hiking boots, whatever it is. These businesses depend on that type of activity. They depend on those facilities being open, and they depend on Americans having the ability to go out and see and experience the great things in this country.

I am also chairman of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations. I know firsthand the devastating impact this shutdown will have on our agricultural industry. It is going to have negative ripple effects all around the Nation's economy.

One thing I have learned the hard way in Washington in the last 10 or 11 years, there are a lot of people inside the beltway who do not understand agriculture. They do not get excited about agriculture. They do not care about agriculture. Sometimes they take it for granted. But the truth is agriculture is one of the core strengths in the U.S. economy. It is something we do better than everyone else in the world. Everyone else in the world wants to be like us. It is something we can be proud of. It adds a lot to the Nation's economy. It is also great for our trade.

If we take my one State of Arkansas, it is our largest industry. It supports one in six jobs in my State. It also creates about $17 billion of economic activity, and overall, when we look at the State's economy, it is about 25 percent of the economy of Arkansas. That is going to be true—maybe those numbers are not exactly the same—that kind of ratio, those kinds of numbers are going to be true in every State in the Union.

I know Senator STABENOW is chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee. She talks about how everybody thinks about Michigan as heavy industry, the auto industry, et cetera, and all that is true. But the second largest industry in Michigan is agriculture.

It is just like if we go to a State such as Massachusetts. The mix of agricultural products in a State such as Massachusetts is going to be very different than what we have in the State of Arkansas, but it allows Massachusetts to utilize its natural advantages, natural resources. Things such as specialty crops are going to be very important up there. We have some of that in our State. But every State has a different mix and it is important that every State be very strong in agriculture.

One of the newer areas in agriculture, which is good, is organic farming and the like. Certainly, that is part of the future. That is something in the Senate farm bill. It is something we want to see get done. We don't want to see that brought to a halt or hampered in any way.

We don't want to see our food supply and fiber supply jeopardized by rank politics down the hall in the House of Representatives. The House has already created turmoil in this vital industry by shutting down the government. But to complicate matters, they have also taken another very irresponsible set of actions in the last few weeks; that is, they have allowed, because of their own problems down the hall, they have allowed the 2008 farm bill to expire.

Last night at midnight we went from the 2008 farm bill to the 1949 law. The United States of America is currently

under the 1949 agriculture law. The problem is there is no solution in sight.

God bless DEBBIE STABENOW. Senator STABENOW has been an amazing champion for agriculture. I mentioned her—agriculture is the second largest industry in Michigan—but she has worked so hard in the last couple of years to try to get this Chamber to do right on agriculture, and it has.

Last year we passed a farm bill. It went down the hall and died. This year we passed a farm bill. It went down the hall and they blew it up.

We see us working in a bipartisan way. By the way, that farm bill in the Senate got something like 66 votes, a good, solid bipartisan vote. But the House Members, they continue to wreak havoc with this economic powerhouse.

Right now, think about agriculture, one of the core strengths, one of the pillars of the U.S. economy. We see it facing a double whammy. They got the slowdown. Now they have the expiration of the 2008 farm bill.

What does that mean? If you are a farmer, you will know what this means. The Farm Service Agency, Rural Development, the Natural Resources Conservation Service—the county offices will all be closing. We had farmers today call us and say: Can I get this payment? I can make this happen? Can I apply for something? A lot of times the answer to that is going to be, no, because those offices will be closed. When they need help, there is not going to be anyone there to help them. When they go there, basically they are going to knock on the door and it is going to be locked up. They are going to be closed for business. This means that new USDA loans and grants are being stopped. This means the cutting-edge agricultural research that America is famous for is going to stop.

It also means that when it comes to food inspection and those workers, that is going to be in jeopardy as well. That is something we fought very hard on. I was allied with many of my Republican colleagues on that matter.

The worst part about this—and maybe the saddest part about this—is that it was all so preventable. We can still prevent it from happening. We can do something today to make this go away. But, nonetheless, here again the House refuses to compromise. It is this ''my way or the highway'' attitude, as I said before, that is leading us to a dead end.

About 2 weeks ago, several of us were fortunate enough to listen to TOM CARPER come and speak to us about some things that were on his mind. It was a bipartisan group. There were 15 or 20 of us there. Tom singled out one of our great colleagues, MIKE ENZI. MIKE ENZI has been a stalwart conservative, red rock Republican, but he is someone we all know, trust, and respect.

He talked about when MIKE ENZI and Ted Kennedy were paired up as chair and ranking member of the Senate HELP Committee. That is a very unlikely pair. They don't get any different than that in philosophy, personality, background or regions of the country. Nonetheless, those two Senators adopted what they called the 80–20 rule. They knew they didn't agree on everything so they said: Let's find 80 percent of the things we can agree on. Let's work on those and let's get it done and that is what they did. It is a great example of bipartisanship.

Senator Kennedy, as liberal as he was—he was a great liberal lion, and everybody knows that. He was very staunch in his views and very serious about how he took those views, but he was also very much willing to reach across the aisle. That 80–20 rule is what is missing down the hallway. We still have it in the Senate, to some extent but not as much as we used to. We need to make sure we reestablish this 80–20 rule and find areas of common ground where we agree so we can work with each other in every single situation we possibly can. But down the hall, that is gone, and that is the problem right now in Washington.

There are a lot of people in the Congress—some in the Senate as well but in the House and Senate generally—who say: I want 100 percent or nothing. If I can't have 100 percent, you get nothing. They will do everything they can to stop it, and that is exactly what happened. That is why we have this crisis today. It is completely manufactured by the U.S. House of Representatives.

I feel that I am elected by my people to make the hard decisions, do what is best for the country, do what is right, and use my best judgment. All of these are judgment calls, and they are tough calls, but that is what governing is about. It is about making those tough calls and showing some leadership.

So tonight I urge our colleagues in the House, all 435 of them, to stop the hyperpartisanship, especially those on the Republican side of the aisle who just can't seem to say yes when it comes to a bipartisan solution. I urge them to stop the hyperpartisanship and work with the Senate to reopen our government.

I will be working very hard to find a responsible agreement, and I sincerely hope we have a sufficient number in the House who will join me, and let's get this done.

With that 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. As chair of the HELP Committee—that great committee upon which the Presiding Officer also sits and a valuable member of that committee—I was just informed by our staff that as of this last hour, over 2.8 million people have gone on healthcare.gov to get information and sign up for the Affordable Care Act.

In fact, there were so many people online that at different places in the country, the Web site froze. Then I heard some of my Republican friends were saying: See, we told you it wasn't ready. The Web site is not working right. If very few people had signed up, they would have said: See, we told you no one is going to sign up for it. They are trying to have it both ways.

There were 2.8 million Americans on the first day logged on to healthcare.gov to get this information, and, again, to sign up. By tomorrow we will have some data and some statistics on how many people who not only inquired but have actually signed up on the Web sites. We will have some more information on that tomorrow. Obviously, the interest is there, and we knew it would be.

Leader REID told a story today about how years ago he went out and visited Google in California. At the time they were telling him that when they first started Google, they didn't realize how many people would be using it, and they kept crashing and freezing. So they had glitches of their own. There are some glitches in this system because a lot of people are coming on and wanting the information and wanting to sign up. That is the good news, and it is what we always knew.

We knew that when we passed the Affordable Care Act, if we approached it in a diligent, forthright way but cautiously and in an orderly manner, it would work, and that is why it has taken us almost 3 years to get to this point because we wanted to do it right. We wanted to do it in a way that would work.

I think today is a remarkable day in the history of our country in that we are now going to have affordable health care insurance for every American that cannot be taken away if you get sick. They can't deny it to a family because somebody had a preexisting condition. Everyone will have health care insurance that will be affordable and can't be taken away, and we will have a whole new suite of preventive care measures and wellness programs to keep people healthy and to prevent illness in the first place.

We have turned the corner on bringing health care to every American regardless of their health status, regardless of their economic status, regardless of whether they have a job or don't have a job, no matter how old, no matter how young, and no matter the circumstances. Everyone will be able to be covered by health care insurance.

I guess I might also say it is another red letter day because of the closedown of the government. We have the House of Representatives that, again, will not even put the bill on the floor of the House for a vote that will keep the government running. Think about that.

They will not even put it on the floor for a vote because they know if they put it on the floor, they will get enough Republicans and Democrats to vote for it, and it will pass.

So the tea party extremists in the House—instead of putting it on the floor and passing it tonight so the government could be back in business tomorrow—are trying to make a little deal. First it was to defund and delay ObamaCare. Now they have something they are doing on the House floor where they are going to fund some little TV programs. It is nonsense. This is not worthy of a great country.

I had a nice conversation with Secretary of State Kerry this morning—not necessarily just about this, but, of course, we talked about the government shutdown. I asked him: Secretary, you are close to this. How is this playing in other countries? Secretary Kerry said: It is painful for us in the State Department—representing the government of the United States in a nonpartisan way—to have other countries look at us, scratch their heads, and wonder why we are doing things like this. He was just pained, not for himself but for all of his wonderful diplomats and ambassadors all around the world who represent our country and what they must have to go through to have other countries see what we are doing and question our judgment.

That is what the tea party people are doing. They are driving this country down. What they are doing is very dangerous. It is ideologically driven obstructionism, and it has taken a dangerous turn.

Again, despite the efforts to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government, the House Republicans have shut down the government because we will not submit to defunding or delaying ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, whichever you call it.

It seems as though we see this crisis differently. I was reading a newspaper report that one Member of the House Republican caucus said with a big smile: We are very excited. It is exactly what we wanted, and we got it. This is exactly what they wanted, a government shutdown and they got it? We are excited, she said.

The article also notes the reaction of another representative who reportedly said: It is wonderful. We are 100 percent united. Again, that was from another tea party Republican.

What are they excited about? Are they excited about the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who are on furlough today? Are they excited about the closed monuments and the national parks? Are they excited about the delayed veterans' benefits, Social Security, loss of economic activity and jobs?

After more than three decades in Washington, it is difficult to shock me, but the sheer cynicism and fundamental lack of decency we are witnessing right now is nothing short of breathtaking.

As I understand it, this is just the first step. The tea party Republicans continue to threaten that if the Senate and President Obama don't submit to their demands, they will create another economic crisis by causing our country to default on the national debt in the middle of the month.

Who pays the price for this recklessness?

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. I would be delighted to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Iowa has the special responsibility of the authorizing and appropriating committee that deals with health and education and the National Institutes of Health, and so he understands medical research better than most.

I am sure he is aware now that the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, is making a list of those agencies of government which he and the tea party Republicans believe should be reopened. The first cut on that list includes the Veterans' Administration, but it doesn't include the 564,000 employees who are also veterans, one-fourth of whom are disabled veterans. He has included the National Park Service because of the embarrassment of international visitors coming to the Statue of Liberty and finding it closed, and he included the District of Columbia.

I note he has not included the National Institutes of Health.

I wonder if the Senator from Iowa has read the Wall Street article today. It says, as follows:

> At the National Institutes of Health nearly three-quarters of the staff were furloughed. One result: director Francis Collins said about 200 patients who otherwise would be admitted to the NIH Clinical Center into clinical trials each week will be turned away. This includes about 30 children, most of them cancer patients, he said.

My question is this: Would the Senator from Iowa join me in writing a letter to the junior Senator from Texas and the tea party Republicans begging them to include the National Institutes of Health on their list of agencies that they may consider reopening?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Illinois, I would be delighted to sign on to that letter because I am acutely aware of what is happening at NIH, but I might also tell my friend from Illinois that I would also like to include the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Mr. DURBIN. We shouldn't push our luck with the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. HARKIN. But I must say to my friend that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is out there keeping diseases from spreading, containing them where they break out, putting in prevention measures all over this country. They too are furloughing people. Just think what would happen if, God forbid, some virulent bacteria or virus were to break out and they have—as my colleague knows, the CDC is very good at containment. They know how to handle these situations. What if they don't have the people to do that?

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Iowa, we better not push our luck asking for both the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control from Senator CRUZ.

In all honesty, we are not sending any letters. This is reckless and irresponsible, to threaten the lives of people going for clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. To quote from a distant past in this Chamber, in this Congress, ''Have they no shame?'' Have they no shame, to shut down the Government of the United States of America, endangering the lives of individuals over a political temper tantrum?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend, it is shameful. It is not befitting a great nation. Maybe they would like us to be a Third World country.

I see this and I don't understand. The Senator from Illinois is right: Where is their shame? But where is their sense of responsibility? Where is their sense of being responsible to the people of this country, to have a government that works to protect them, to keep them healthy, that does the medical research that the Senator spoke about? I see that, and I don't understand why they don't grasp the kind of damage they are doing to our country. I don't understand it.

Mr. DURBIN. I will respond to the Senator from Iowa and then yield the floor back to him, and I see the Senator from New Hampshire waiting.

Our last best hope in this debate is that moderate Republicans will step up and say, Enough. This is not what the Republican Party is about. This is not what America should be about.

We need to be solving these problems on a bipartisan basis. If enough moderate Republicans would come to that empty side of the floor, which we have been witnessing all day today, and speak out, we could bring an end to this national embarrassment.

I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his input and his questions. I think the Senator has highlighted the kind of situation that begs credulity. People around this country must wonder, Have we taken all leave of our senses here?

People say we should sit down and negotiate. We are always willing to negotiate. We are always willing to talk about issues. But when the tea party Republicans in the House say, No, we won't even keep the government open unless we defund ObamaCare, which is the law of the land, that is trying to nullify a law by holding a gun at our heads and saying we are going to shut down the government unless we get rid of a law—not a bill, not a proposal before us, but the law of the land upheld by the Supreme Court, this is not the way to govern. It is the way to take

hostages, maybe. It is the way to commit blackmail, but it is not the way to run a government.

So I hope the moderate Republicans—and believe me, there are a lot of good moderate Republicans. On my own committee, I deal with good people who work together to get bills passed and to get them out of our committee. We just need them to say to the tea party: You are wrong. This is not good for us, it is not good for the country, and it is not good for the Republican Party, either.

I will have more to say about this later as well as tomorrow when I will bring some more figures to the floor on how many more people are excited about the Affordable Care Act and are going to healthcare.gov.

If I might, I wish to take one extra minute here to say that I was down at the World War II Memorial this morning to greet some Iowans who were coming in on an Honor Flight and I saw the barricade up there. I talked to one of the park officers and I said, This doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense because it is open. I have come down here at midnight and walked around. It is out in the open. I could understand it if it were a building where you had to go through a device and security. I could understand that because the government is shut down. Then some buses came from Mississippi. I had to leave before the Iowans could arrive. They went behind the barrier. They went in and everybody was fine. I heard this afternoon that the Park Police came down and now we are moving people out again and putting up the barricades.

Why are there barricades on the Jefferson Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the World War II Memorial, the Vietnam Memorial, or any of those where people walk around? It doesn't make sense to put up barricades around these outdoor memorials.

While this whole shutdown of government is nonsense, I don't think we ought to respond to nonsense with more nonsense. So I call upon the Park Service and the Department of the Interior, on those instances where it is open 24 hours a day, such as the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Memorial, or the Lincoln and Jefferson Monuments, why put up the barricades? People are there, they go there 24 hours a day. This doesn't make sense. I hope by tomorrow, whoever gave the orders to put those barricades up will have those orders superseded by someone higher up and get those barricades down. As I said, I can understand if it is a building where we have to have security, where we have to have guards and machines and equipment. I understand, with a government shutdown, that is not accessible. But for something that is open, as those monuments are, where people wander in and out 24 hours a day, it makes no sense to put up barricades. I call upon the Park Service to get rid of those barricades.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I came to join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon to talk about and to call on our colleagues in the House—those Republicans who have been taking this irresponsible action—to stop what they are doing and help us resolve this government shutdown.

We are involved in a completely manufactured shutdown of our government. This is something that didn't have to happen. Right now, there is a majority in the House ready to pass a bill to keep our government open, to start it back up again, to end this crisis. But here we are. We are in the midst of the first government shutdown in 17 years because a small minority of the minority party in the other House is holding this government hostage so it can pursue its agenda of trying to end the Affordable Care Act. I don't know why they don't want to make sure that people in this country can get access to health care. I am not going to talk about that this evening.

This is irresponsible. We are already seeing the effects of this crisis in New Hampshire and across the country. We have thousands of Federal employees in my State of New Hampshire who could face furloughs. That includes workers at our Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Those folks are from Maine and New Hampshire, but they are looking at furloughs.

We have already heard from over 300 civilian technicians for the National Guard in New Hampshire who were notified they are going to be furloughed. I have started hearing from constituents whose lives are affected by our inability here in Washington to address keeping this government open.

I heard from one of my constituents in Portsmouth, a man named Robert Cody. He writes:

> Dear Senator Shaheen,
>
> Please do not allow a government shutdown to occur. The consequences to individuals and the economy will be catastrophic.

He goes on to say:

> To put this on personal terms, my daughter just finished graduate school and began work as a consulting doctor at a Veteran's Administration hospital providing care to wounded veterans. If a shutdown occurs, she will lose her job and be faced with crushing student loan debt and no way to pay back the loans or her living expenses. The veterans who will be deprived of her care will be victims of the shutdown as well. Her situation is just one of many.

Robert, you are certainly right about that.

> Hard-working individuals must not be forced to suffer to make a political point.

He goes on to say:

> Please do the right thing! The consequences to the economy and unemployment will be far-reaching, and you will be blamed if you contribute to this looming disaster.

I say to Robert: I couldn't agree more with what you have said. I think we need to work together. We need to try to avoid any further harm to people who depend not only on the jobs—the people who are going to be laid off—but also those people who benefit from the services the Federal Government provides.

Salaries for our Federal workers aren't just important for them and their families; they are also critical to their local economies. When hard-working New Hampshire citizens aren't able to get their paychecks, they stop making their mortgage payments, they stop paying their utility bills, they stop shopping at local stores. That is what we are going to see if this shutdown continues. It will inflict serious consequences on the economy.

New Small Business Administration loans are not being originated. SBA loans are critical for job creation in New Hampshire. Our small businesses represent 96 percent of all employers. In 2012, SBA helped 630 small businesses in New Hampshire get access to over $130 million in loans. Now, because of this shutdown, businesses are not going to have access to those loans.

The Federal Housing Administration loans are slowing. Our housing market has really just begun to recover, but it is still fragile. Now, because of the shutdown, we are going to be holding up home sales because much of the FHA staff is furloughed.

Of course, this is terrible timing for the tourism industry in New Hampshire. We are just beginning our fall foliage season. It is a spectacular time to travel around New Hampshire. We have tourists who come from all over the world, who spend money in our local restaurants, who stay at our hotels, and visit our attractions. Many of our small businesses rely on this time of the year to provide the revenue they need to continue operating all year long. We know the tourists who come from overseas stay longer and spend more money. But if the shutdown in government means we are going to be turning away many of those customers, applications for visas are going to come to a halt. According to the Congressional Research Service, during the 1995–1996 shutdown, approximately 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for visas went unprocessed each day, and U.S. tourism industries—the airlines, the hotels, the restaurants, all of the affiliated businesses that depend on tourism—lost millions of dollars.

We also have a visa center in New Hampshire that works on those visas. They are shut down as part of this government closure. We have a lot of small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country that rely on Federal contracts as they grow and create new jobs.

I talked to one of those small business owners today—a man named Lou Altman with Globafone. I have known Lou for a long time. He has worked in New Hampshire and around the world. He called to express his deep frustration about our failing to pass a continuing resolution to keep this government open.

Globafone's satellite technologies help Federal agencies meet critical needs, in addition to providing technology for many developing countries. But with the shutdown, everything is up in the air for Globafone. They are not certain what this means for their government contracts. As a result their cash flows are uncertain. Since their cash flows are uncertain, their line of credit with the bank is uncertain. I do not blame Lou for being frustrated for wanting to know why we cannot work together to get this done.

I would say to my colleagues in the House, you cannot take this government hostage and expect that we are going to be able to negotiate. This government shutdown is bad for our economy, bad for middle-class families, bad for our country. Unfortunately, what we have seen this week is that some have decided they want to inflict another manufactured crisis as a tactic to prevent health care reform from going into effect.

The people that I talk to in New Hampshire do not think this is a good approach. They know that a government shutdown is serious, that it has consequences for our economy and jobs. Considering that impact, it is no surprise that economists have forecast that our failure to deal with this crisis will have a significant impact on our economy.

Even a 3- or 4-day shutdown could slow growth by 0.2 percent, according to economist Mark Zandi, and an extended shutdown could reduce growth by 1.4 percent. So holding the economy and critical services hostage to score political points is reckless and it is irresponsible. With the economy showing signs of improvement, this is the last thing we should be doing.

It does not have to be this way. I was a Governor for 3 terms. In two of those terms the other party controlled both chambers of our legislature. But we were always able to enact a budget before the fiscal year ended. We had a lot of differences along the way. But both sides understood that in order to reach an agreement, in order to pass a budget, in order to keep government operating, we had to compromise. It would have been impossible to imagine the New Hampshire legislature not getting a budget to my desk because they wanted to play political games or that they would have sent me a budget that they knew I was going to veto.

This Congress can certainly do better. We must do better. My colleagues have pointed out that the Senate in taking up the bill to keep the government funded, the continuing resolution, agreed to accept the dollar amount that the House wanted us to pass. So we compromised on this continuing resolution. What we saw for our willingness to do that was the House decided they were going to put all kinds of amendments on this bill to keep it from getting passed.

I certainly hope that we can pass this bill, that the House will take it up. All the Speaker needs to do is take up the clean bill that the Senate sent them because they have the votes to pass it. If he is so sure that the votes are not there, then let people vote on it and see what happens.

But we know that is not the case. We know that the votes are there to pass this bill. Because it is being held hostage to a small minority in the Republican caucus, this government is shut down and tens of thousands of people across the country are experiencing difficulties as a result. I certainly hope that we are going to see some action soon. I am going to continue to work for that. I am sure all of us in the Senate will try to see that something gets done so we can reopen this government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let me concur with much of what my colleague Senator SHAHEEN has just said. But let me begin by doing something we do not do enough and that is to say thank you to the 2 million civilians and 1.4 million men and women in the military in all of our 50 States, including some 5,000 in my own State of Vermont. So we have 2 million civilians who are working for the Federal Government and 1.4 million men and women in the military. We owe them a deep debt of gratitude. The work that they do is enormously important for our country.

They work to make sure that our drinking water and the air that we breathe is safe. It is not an accident that in many parts of this country, the air that people are breathing, that our kids are breathing, is a lot cleaner than it used to be. It took a lot of work to make that happen. We thank them for that.

We have Customs people patrolling our borders. We thank them for their work. We have Federal workers to protect the health and safety of working people all over the country. We have Federal workers who are working to educate kids with special needs. We have Federal employees who provide food to low-income pregnant women, infants, children, and senior citizens. We have Federal employees who are working in VA hospitals, and we have nurses and many other staff doing a great job for our veterans.

We have Federal employees who make sure that children receive needed care and services so that their parents can go to work. They repair our roads, bridges, dams, culverts, and sewers. They sweep the floors. They clean our bathrooms and make sure the places we work in are not infested.

Americans who work for the Federal Government are part of the backbone of this country. I personally thank them for what they do. But it is no secret that in recent years there has been a huge assault against the Federal workforce. For the past 3 years, the pay of Federal workers has been frozen at a time when the costs that they are incurring in terms of gasoline, heating oil, prescription drugs, and of everything else have been going up. But their pay has been level.

As a thank you for all of the work that Federal employees do here in Washington and Vermont, in Massachusetts and all over this country, our thank you to them has been to shut down the government and to tell some 800,000 Federal employees—these are single moms trying to raise kids, these are proud people, civilians in the military, people in our National Guard; these are people who are doing important work, who have families to raise, and who are dedicated to their jobs—we are saying: Sorry, you have to go home. They are going home, and they are not even sure whether they are going to be paid or when they are going to be paid.

So you are looking at tens of thousands of lives that are being radically disrupted because of this shutdown. I can tell you that in Vermont, we are very proud of the Vermont National Guard. The Vermont National Guard men and women served very heavily and bravely in Iraq and Afghanistan.

They helped us when we had the terrible Irene floods a few years ago. The thank you that the Vermont National Guard is getting today—this is true all over the country—is that in Vermont some 450 workers at the Vermont National Guard are going to be furloughed. I know many of these people. They are good people. They are hardworking people. They do not deserve this type of behavior from the Federal Government.

This affects people from all over the State, people who are trying to get homes, people who are trying to start businesses. That is not something that should be happening.

Let me just very briefly explain the dynamic of what is going on right here. It is not complicated. The Republicans in the House are dominated by a relatively small group of rightwing extremists.

What the Speaker there has said is that instead of bringing to the floor the bill that we passed here in the Senate, what is called a clean CR that will continue funding the government, instead of putting that bill on the floor of the House and allowing the entire 435 Members of the House to vote on that bill, what he has done is said to the House Republicans: OK, what do you want? The extreme rightwing has dominated that. What they have said is: We want to defund ObamaCare. That is the only legislation that you, Mr. Speaker, can bring to the floor of the House.

This is a moment of enormous importance for the Speaker of the House. He has to determine whether he is the Speaker of the Republican Party or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, whether he is going to be dominated by a minority of one party in one part of the government or whether he will allow the entire House to vote.

What many of observers have made clear is, if he puts that bill on the floor, it will pass and the government will reopen. I hope that he will do that. My political view, my progressive political views are pretty well known. My views on this issue are well known in Vermont and maybe elsewhere in this country. But what I want to do is very briefly to express what some Republicans are saying, people who are not rightwing extremists, who, in fact, have very strong disagreements with the Affordable Care Act but who understand that they cannot hold the American people hostage and they cannot blackmail the government in order to get their way.

So this is not BERNIE SANDERS talking. These are conservative Republicans, but people who are not rightwing extremists. Let me quote some of my colleagues. These are the public statements they have made. SAXBY CHAMBLISS, a Republican Senator from Georgia, this is what he says:

I'd love to [defund ObamaCare] too. But shutting down the government and playing into the hands of the president politically is not the right thing to do. Plus, it's going to do great harm to the American people if we pursue that course. We've been there. It didn't work.

Senator DAN COATS, Republican from Indiana:

Here's the hard truth: President Obama will not overturn his signature legislation so long as he is president and the Democrats have control of the Senate. Along with these political realities, refusing to pass legislation to keep the government funded will not stop ObamaCare from going into effect.

Senator TOM COBURN, Republican from Oklahoma:

It's not an achievable strategy. It's creating the false impression that you can do something when you can't. And it's dishonest.

Republican Senator BOB CORKER from Tennessee. The Washington Post reports that CORKER compared shutting down the government to the way buffalo were slaughtered in the Old West. ''I know when you get led into a box canyon what that means . . . Box canyon, here we come.''

Representative PETER KING, Republican from New York.

We should not be closing down the government under any circumstances. That doesn't work, it's wrong, and you know, ObamaCare passed. We have to try to defund it, we have try to find ways to repeal it. But the fact is, we shouldn't be using it as a threat to shut down the government.

Republican Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah.

My personal belief is the only way to get rid of ObamaCare is to be intelligent and smart about it and gradually just work on it, work it through . . . to expect the government to shut down is not the way to do it.

MARK KIRK, Republican Senator from Illinois:

I am one of those who says, let's not shut down the government just because you don't get everything you want.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, former Republican candidate for President of the United States:

In the United States Senate, we will not repeal, or defund, ObamaCare. We will not. And to think we can is not rational.

Senator ROB PORTMAN, Republican of Ohio:

I do think we need to deal with the underlying problem of overspending and we have to deal with the problem of Obamacare, but those ought to be handled outside of the context of a government shutdown.

Senator JIM RISCH, Republican of Idaho:

There isn't anybody that thinks that ObamaCare is going to get defunded. It cannot happen . . . We were elected to govern—you don't govern by shutting down the government.

I can go on and on.

There are many Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House who do not like ObamaCare. They understand that we don't shut down the government only to make a point. We don't throw 800,000 workers who work for the Federal Government, whose lives depend on a paycheck, out on the street in order to make a point.

I think JIM RISCH—Republican Senator from Idaho—had it right. I will repeat what he said:

There isn't anybody that thinks that ObamaCare is going to get defunded. It cannot happen. . . . We were elected to govern—you don't govern by shutting down the government.

Senator RISCH is exactly correct.

Where we are right now is that there are many Republicans in the Senate, there are Republicans in the House, and there are millions of Republicans all over the country who say they have disagreements with ObamaCare, but it was passed by the Congress almost 4 years ago and signed by the President. When it was challenged by the Supreme Court, it was upheld as being constitutional. We had a Presidential election where the Affordable Care Act was one of the major issues being debated. President Obama won by 5 million votes. We had Senate races, and Republicans lost two seats in the Senate. They lost seats in the House.

There are sensible Republicans all over the country saying: Look, there are ways to deal with this issue, but don't shut down the government. Don't punish 800,000 workers. Do not deny benefits and services to tens of millions of Americans.

I would like to go to another area and suggest—although I think the Presiding Officer well understands this—that what we are seeing today in terms of the attack on ObamaCare is not only some isolated act on the part of rightwing Republicans. I think many Americans are not aware. People may like ObamaCare or may not like ObamaCare. As we well know, today was the first day the exchange was open. Guess what happened. Millions of people went to the Web site. Guess what. When we have 48 million Americans who have no health insurance and millions more who are in need with high deductibles and copayments and they are given the opportunity to buy insurance, shock of all shocks, many of them are now going to the Web site. Our Republican friends are saying: No, no, we don't want to see that.

My point—and I hope everybody understands this—is that this attack on ObamaCare is only one small part of a rightwing extremist ideology which is incredibly reactionary and which really intends not only to repeal ObamaCare but to repeal virtually every major piece of legislation passed in this country in the last 80 years that protects the interests of the elderly, the children, the sick, the poor, women, the environment, and people who are vulnerable. That is what their agenda is.

I will give a few examples. The Environmental Protection Agency works hard to make sure the air we breathe is clean. There are many rightwing Republicans who don't want only to cut funding for the EPA, they want to abolish the EPA.

We have a major crisis in this country in terms of millions of American workers being forced to work for very low wages. People are working for 8 bucks an hour, 9 bucks an hour. They can't raise a family working for these very low wages. Many of us believe it is important that we raise the minimum wage. Do people know what the rightwing agenda is, the agenda funded by a family like the Koch brothers, a family worth $70 billion that is pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into these rightwing extremist groups? Do you know what they say about the minimum wage? They say: Let's abolish the minimum wage.

People think I am kidding. The view now of the majority of the Members, the Republican Members in the Senate and the House, is not only not raising the minimum wage, it is to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. What that means is that if you are living in a high-unemployment area and the wages that are being offered to you by an employer are 3 bucks an hour or 4 bucks an hour, those are the wages you will have to accept because there will be no Federal floor. The Federal floor is $7.25, and that is much too low. Get rid of that, and we will have people working for $3 and $4 an hour.

One of the most significant pieces of Federal legislation ever passed was passed in 1935—Social Security. Today we have over 50 million Americans who are benefiting from Social Security. If you go to the Texas Republican Party platform—their recent platform, and they are one of the most powerful Republican parties in the country—they are pretty up front about what they believe. They want to end Social Security. They want to privatize it. That is their goal.

The Veterans' Administration—and I speak today as chairman of the Veterans' Committee—today we have quite good VA health care through 152 medical centers run by the VA, 900 community-based outreach clinics, many vet centers. VA does, most veterans consider, a pretty good job in providing

health care. Do you know what some Republicans want to do? They want to privatize the Veterans' Administration. Check it out. This is the Texas Republican Party platform, which speaks for Republicans all over this country.

It is not only the VA and it is not only Social Security, it is many other programs. We recently saw our friends in the House cut food stamps by some $4 billion this year. That is what they believe. Meanwhile, we have more people living in poverty today than at any time in the history of the United States. Many want to make devastating cuts in Medicaid, food stamps, and many other programs that people in this country are living on.

I will conclude by saying that we could end this crisis in a very few minutes. All that needs to happen is the Speaker of the House has to bring up the clean bill we passed here in the Senate and give all of his Members a chance to vote on it. If he does that, this crisis will be over.

It is morally wrong and it is extremely dangerous from a precedent perspective to allow this government and our President to be blackmailed or for the American people to be held hostage. If we were to succumb to that blackmail today, I can absolutely guarantee that in 2 weeks, when the United States is going to need to pay its debts, and we don't, for the first time in the history of this country, have the money to pay our debts, and when the economists are telling us that if we don't pay our debts, there could be an international economic crisis leading to huge amounts of job loss all over the world, not only for the United States—if we surrender to them now on this issue, they will be back. They will be back and they will say: If you don't cut this and don't cut that, we are not going to allow you to pay the debts the United States owes. It will go on and on. Next year they will come back and they may say: Well, we are not going to fund the government unless you end Social Security or unless you cut Medicaid drastically.

This is not the way a government in a democratic, civilized society can operate. We have our disagreements. God only knows we have that. We have debates. But there is a process.

What the Republicans have not yet recovered from is the simple fact that they lost the Presidential election, they do not have control over the Senate, and they only have one body. They think that from controlling one body they have a right to control the U.S. Government. This is not how it works.

I hope that people all over this country, whether they are conservatives or progressives, Democrats or Republicans, will listen to what some of the sensible Republicans are saying. In essence, what they are saying—and I have read many of the quotes from JOHN MCCAIN and others—is this: Yes, we have differences of opinion, and, yes, some of them disagree strongly with ObamaCare, but there is a process you go through to make those changes. Do not shut down the government, impact the entire economy, throw 800,000 people out of work, and deny services to millions of Americans. That is not the way to run the government in a democratic society.

Let me conclude by hoping very much that the Speaker of the House will recognize that he is the Speaker of the entire House, not only of the Republican Party, and that he will let all of his Members vote on the legislation we passed in the Senate.

Mr. REID. Before the Senator yields the floor, I would ask permission to direct a question to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator from Vermont aware of the fact that Dr. Francis Collins today announced that scores of people are being turned away today from the National Institutes of Health clinical trials, 30 little children from clinical trials. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. SANDERS. I am aware of that.

The point the leader is raising, what the question speaks to is that this is not a game we are playing when we are dealing with whether kids and others get treatment for cancer. What we are dealing with are life-and-death issues. When the government is shut down and agencies such as the National Institutes of Health end cancer research—this is taking life away from people.

Mr. REID. I ask through the Chair, is the Senator aware that this new gambit across the hall in the House of Representatives is only another effort to defund ObamaCare?

Mr. SANDERS. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Let me make a point for the majority leader. Today was the first day people could go onto the exchanges. Maybe the majority leader would like to explain to the American people that, in fact, some of these Web sites actually crashed because so many people came on board.

Mr. REID. In response to my friend from Vermont, I had the good fortune of spending an hour several months ago with one of the founders of Google. He, with a twinkle in his eye—a young man still—and a big smile, talked about when they were trying to get Google started. They couldn't believe the people who wanted information. Their Web sites kept crashing because so many people wanted the information to which they thought they were entitled.

Around America today millions of people, in the first few hours of the opportunity to sign up, rushed and overburdened a number of places—the Web sites. This is good news for America.

I also say that these are the same people—I read a direct quote at an event earlier today. I am sorry I don't have it with me. In 1961 Ronald Reagan talked about Medicare. I am paraphrasing, but this is pretty close. If they do not stop Medicare, then his children and his children's children will look back at the day when America used to be free.

Can you imagine that?

Mr. SANDERS. What I would say to the majority leader—and I was on the floor the other day reading quotes—when Social Security was first created, we had quotes from Republicans who were talking about the end of life as we know it, slavery coming to America. It is the same thing with Medicare. It is interesting.

I would say to the majority leader that despite all of the anti-Affordable Care Act rhetoric we hear—you would think nobody would be interested in getting into the program—the first day out, over 2 million people went to the Federal Government's Web site. I am not quite sure why our Republican friends think that millions of Americans on the first day should not have the right to take advantage of a program that was passed by Congress.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the advocacy of my friend from Vermont for all Americans. This good man, the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, Senator SANDERS, is like me. I don't have a military record, nor does he, but that doesn't take away from the effort. We try to make sure veterans are taken care of. What this good man has done to protect American veterans already in a short period of time as chairman of this committee is outstanding. It is really remarkable how much he cares. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I wish the American people also to understand that we are going to win this struggle because of the determination of the majority leader, who is standing for tens of millions of Americans who not only want access to affordable health care but do not want to see our government blackmailed by a small number of rightwing extremists.

I thank the majority leader very much for his comments.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are going to go out in a few minutes, but this is my message to the House of Representatives, to the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives: Stop the games. The government is shut down. More than 70 percent of our intelligence community has been sent home. The National Institutes of Health has hundreds and hundreds of people home when they should be looking at their microscopes trying to cure diseases in America and around the world. Everyone in the world looks at the National Institutes of Health with jealousy, it is such a remarkably good institution.

The President has said as to these games they are playing now—he sends these little bits and pieces over here—he will veto them. We won't allow them to pass here anyway. We want the government open. If they will pass the legislation to reopen the government, we will then talk about anything they

want to talk about. We will have conferences on anything they want to talk about. And one of the things we would like to have a conference on is Senator MURRAY's budget that we have been trying to get to conference on for more than 6 months.

The American people deserve more than they are getting from the House of Representatives, the so-called people's House.

IRAQI SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am proud that the Senate unanimously passed legislation late last night to extend the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa—SIV—Program. This program offers nothing short of a lifeline for the Iraqi men and women who risked everything supporting the U.S.' mission in Iraq. Despite the fact that there are thousands of Iraqis still waiting for their paperwork to be processed, the program expired last night, and we must take immediate action to renew it. Given all that is on the line, I am hopeful that even in this difficult political climate, the House of Representatives will take up and swiftly pass this bill and we can send it to President Obama for his signature later today.

Congress created the Iraqi SIV Program in 2008 to allow some of the tens of thousands of Iraqis who served alongside U.S. troops the opportunity to seek safety and a new beginning in the United States. They were our translators and our guides. They were a critical resource to our troops, helping them navigate complex cultural, political, and geographic terrain. They literally risked their lives for us. Now, 5 years after the original legislation passed, less than 6,000 of the 25,000 available visas have been distributed, leaving many well-deserving Iraqi allies in danger and American credibility on the line.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on State Department and Foreign Operations, I worked hard to see that a reauthorization for the Iraqi SIV Program is in the National Defense Authorization Act. Unfortunately, that reauthorization will not pass in time to renew this vital program. We also made significant efforts to include that extension in the continuing resolution passed by the Senate last week, but a congressional stalemate has eroded that path. The only option that remains is for the House to take up and pass the bipartisan stand-alone bill immediately.

I am hopeful that we can do just that. I have joined with Members from both sides of the aisle in the Senate, including Senators SHAHEEN, MCCAIN, GRASSLEY, and GRAHAM, as well Members in the House, to resolve any concerns. We have compromised on the length of the extension and have covered any costs associated with it. Passage should be quick and straightforward. Lives are on the line. Our word is on the line, and it is time to act.

Among the many lessons of the Vietnam war is that we must not abandon those who risked their lives to help us. We made a commitment, and we must honor it. We must renew this critical program.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF STARR COMMONWEALTH

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, it is a great pleasure to join my colleague DEBBIE STABENOW in honoring Starr Commonwealth on a century of distinguished service to children and families across Michigan. Fittingly, they will mark this milestone with a Founder's Day celebration on October 6 in Albion, MI. This impressive community-based organization is, indeed, 100 years young.

''There is no such thing as a bad child.'' This simple yet profound belief, held fervently by Floyd Starr, the founder of Starr Commonwealth, has served as the guiding principle for everything Starr Commonwealth has accomplished from the very beginning. A century ago, Floyd Starr sought to create a place where troubled youth could find shelter, peace and the assistance they need to grow. He understood then, as we do today, that it is important to ensure that all young people, regardless of their circumstances, have an opportunity to flourish. Today, Starr Commonwealth is stronger than ever, and their strength-based approach to transforming the lives of young people has proven successful time and again.

Situated on 350 acres in Albion, MI, Starr Commonwealth has nurtured an environment steeped in natural beauty to serve as an oasis where troubled youth can begin the process of comprehensive, constructive change. This nonprofit, multiservice organization currently reaches more than 1.5 million people annually, including families across Michigan, around the United States and in more than 60 countries throughout the world. Starr Commonwealth operates dozens of programs with a focus on helping young people reach their full potential. These programs include residential care services, a therapeutic boarding school, community-based and home-based programs, a public access charter school, and an international learning network for professionals working in positive youth development, trauma-informed care and racial healing, among many others.

Organizations such as Starr Commonwealth play an invaluable role in communities across our Nation. They provide young people with the tools they need to succeed and become productive members of society. Helping young people face adversity and overcome challenges in a caring, positive way is a blessing Starr Commonwealth has bestowed not just on the young they nurture, but on the future of our State.

Success stories can be found in communities across our land. The lives of countless young people have been transformed; their families are healthier; and the communities in which they reside are stronger as a result of Starr Commonwealth's work. Senator STABENOW and I are delighted to congratulate all who have contributed to the success of this fine organization. Our young people, and our State, have brighter futures because Starr Commonwealth is there to help them along the way.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:33 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3174. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following as managers on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:53 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 1, 2013, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1567. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 264. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in State of Florida v. Lawrence, Denny, & Scarbrough; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1561

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1561, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees.

S. 1564

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1567. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. I am pleased to have Senators BOXER, BROWN, CARPER, FEINSTEIN, HARKIN, HEINRICH, HIRONO, KAINE, LEAHY, MIKULSKI, SANDERS, SCHUMER, UDALL (NM), and WARNER as original co-sponsors. This bill is a companion bill to legislation Representative JIM MORAN introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 3223. The bill is simple and straightforward. It requires that all Federal workers furloughed as a result of the lapse in appropriations that began last night at midnight receive their pay retroactively as soon as is practicable. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. Federal workers didn't cause this shutdown. Federal workers don't want this shutdown. They are dedicated public servants who simply want to do their jobs on behalf of the American people. They shouldn't suffer because so-called Tea Party Republicans, mostly in the House of Representatives, suffer from the delusion that shutting down the Federal Government will somehow prevent the Affordable Care Act from being implemented.

As the Congressional Research Service has reported, in ''historical practice'', Federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of a shutdown have received their pay retroactively ''as a result of legislation to that effect''. The language in our bill is the language used to provide pay retroactively to workers furloughed in the Newt Gingrich-led shutdowns in 1995 and 1996; that language was contained as part of section 124 of P.L. 104–56 (109 STAT. 553).

Mr. President, Federal workers already have endured a 3-year pay freeze and ''contributed'' over $90 billion to deficit reduction. That was before sequestration hit. On top of the pay freeze, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers have been furloughed because of sequestration. Their pay hasn't just been frozen; it has been cut. They have had fewer resources to carry out their missions and administer the programs they are responsible for.

Now, upwards of 800,000 Federal workers are being furloughed, again, and the rest of federal workforce is being compelled to work without pay. And Republicans are threatening that there won't be any retroactive pay. This is happening to hardworking, patriotic public servants, mostly middle class and struggling to get by like so many other Americans. Enough is enough.

Increasingly, Federal workers are asked to do more with less. According to the Office of Management & Budget, the size of the Federal civilian workforce relative to the country's population has declined dramatically over the last several decades. In the 1950s and 1960s, there were, on average, 92 Americans for every Federal worker. In the 1980s and 1990s, there were 106 Americans for every Federal worker. By 2011, the ratio had increased to 145 Americans for every Federal worker.

Since the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. population has increased by 76 percent and the private sector workforce has surged 133 percent, but the size of the Federal workforce has risen just 11 percent. Relative to the private sector, the Federal workforce is less than half the size it was back in the 1950s and 1960s. Now it just got smaller by another 800,000 workers overnight because of Republican action regarding the fiscal year 2014 continuing resolution.

The picture that emerges is one of a Federal civilian workforce whose size has significantly shrunk compared to the size of the U.S. population it

serves, the private sector workforce, and the magnitude of Federal expenditures. Yet Republicans are intent on making things even more difficult for Federal workers and their families across the United States.

Preventing Federal workers from doing their jobs doesn't just harm Federal workers; it harms all Americans because Federal workers patrol our borders, make sure our air and water are clean and our food and drugs are safe, support our men and women in uniform and care for our wounded warriors, help our manufacturers compete abroad, discover cures for life-threatening diseases, prosecute criminals and terrorists, maintain and protect critical infrastructure, explore the universe, and make sure Social Security, Medicare, and other social safety-net programs are functioning properly.

When Federal workers do their jobs, they are helping each and every American live a safer and more prosperous life. And I would argue that what Federal workers are able to do on behalf of the American people often redounds to the benefit of all humankind, whether we are talking about conducting ground-breaking basic scientific research or establishing the rule of law.

Our tasks here in Congress are simple—not easy, perhaps, but simple: we need to end the shutdown and put federal workers back on the job; we need to raise the debt ceiling so we can continue to pay our bills and maintain the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government; we need to return to regular order around here and negotiate a comprehensive budget deal that spreads the burden of deficit reduction in a fair way; and we need to hold Federal workers and their families harmless after subjecting them to so much harm over the past several weeks and months.

We need to stop demonizing and scape-goating and punishing Federal workers. We need to re-open the government, continue paying our bills, and replace the sequester with a rational budget. One of the greatest attributes of the American character is pragmatism. Unlike what some other Federal workers are actually doing, here in Congress, balancing the budget is not ''rocket science''. We know the various options. Former President Lyndon Johnson was fond of quoting the prophet Isaiah: ''Come, let us reason together'' That is what we need to do. We can acknowledge and respect our differences but at the end of the day, the American people have entrusted us with governing, with being pragmatic. Let us do our job so Federal workers can get back to their jobs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF FLORIDA V. LAWRENCE, DENNY, & SCARBROUGH

Mr. REID of Nevada (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 264

Whereas, in the cases of *State of Florida v. Lawrence*, Case No. 2013–CM–011301, *State of Florida v. Denny*, Case No. 2013–CM–011303, and *State of Florida v. Scarbrough*, Case No. 2013–CM–011311, pending in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit of Hillsborough County Court in Tampa, Florida, the prosecution has requested the production of documents and testimony from an employee in the office of Senator Marco Rubio;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to his official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ryan Patmintra, an employee in the Office of Senator Marco Rubio, and any other employee of that office from whom relevant evidence may be sought, are authorized to produce documents and provide testimony in the cases of *State of Florida v. Lawrence, Denny, & Scarbrough*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent employees of Senator Rubio's office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Housing Finance Reform: Fundamentals of a Functioning Private Label Mortgage Backed Securities Market.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 1, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 264.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 264) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in State of Florida v. Lawrence, Denny & Scarbrough.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony, documents, and representation in three related criminal actions pending in Florida State court. In these actions, protesters have been charged with trespassing on the Tampa, FL, office of Senator MARCO RUBIO, and refusing requests by police to leave the premises. The prosecution has sought testimony from an employee of the Senator's Tampa office who had conversations with the protesters on the day in question. Senator RUBIO would like to cooperate by providing relevant testimony and documents from his employee. This resolution would authorize that employee, and any other employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant testimony may be necessary, to testify and produce documents in this action, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 2, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to

date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until noon, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL SUSAN S. LAWRENCE

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional officer of the United States Army, Lieutenant General Susan S. Lawrence. Currently serving as the Army's Chief Information Officer/G–6, Lieutenant General Lawrence will be released from active duty after more than 41 distinguished years of active Federal service on December 1, 2013. From enlisted private to three-star general, Susan Lawrence has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, selfless service and dedication to country. Many of us on Capitol Hill have enjoyed the opportunity to work with General Lawrence on a wide variety of Army issues and programs, and it is my privilege to recognize her many accomplishments.

General Lawrence, a native daughter of Ida Grove, Iowa, joined the Women's Army Corps at age 18. After five years of exemplary service, at the urging of her mentor, Maj. Gen. Mickey Marks, then-Sergeant Lawrence decided to make the Army a career. She attended college, she earned a commission and she committed herself to the Signal Corps. Since that day in 1977, Susan Lawrence has positively impacted the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians, commanded at every level and done the nation's bidding around the globe. From Korea to Germany; from Operation Desert Thunder in Kuwait to three tours in Qatar under Operation Iraqi Freedom, General Lawrence has provided the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps, as well as our coalition partners, the Signal and information technology support essential to mission success.

For the past five years, General Lawrence has been deeply involved in modernizing the Army's network, including redesigning its infrastructure and greatly improving security and defense to ensure that soldiers and decision makers have the information they need when they need it regardless of their location. At a time when information technology has become ingrained in every aspect of the military's day-to-day and combat operations; and cyber warfare has moved from the realm of science fiction to one of the country's greatest real-time threats, Susan Lawrence has been out in front, pressing hard to make sure that the nation has a 21st century Army capable of defeating any enemy, whether face to face on the ground or in the ether of cyberspace.

Throughout it all, General Lawrence has paid special attention to the men and women who defend the United States. She has mentored countless military and civilian personnel, helping the Armed Forces to retain the best and brightest. And, she has shown special care for the families of those who wear a uniform, always striving to improve their quality of life and offering a comforting shoulder in times of need.

For 41 years, Lieutenant General Lawrence has provided outstanding leadership and sound counsel on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army and our nation. She is a truly remarkable officer and citizen. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Lieutenant General Lawrence and her entire family for the commitment, sacrifices and contributions they have made throughout her honorable service. Congratulations on completing an exceptional and successful career.

COMMEMORATING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF FATHER DUENAS MEMORIAL SCHOOL

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Father Duenas Memorial School on its 65th anniversary as Guam's premier Catholic all–male college–preparatory high school.

Father Duenas Memorial School was established on October 1, 1948, four years after the school's namesake, Father Jesus Baza Duenas, a Chamorro priest with unwavering loyalty to his faith, parishioners, and country, was martyred during the Japanese occupation of Guam. Father Duenas was born in the village of Håg̃tña on March 19, 1911, and ordained a Catholic priest in 1938.

As enemy forces began the occupation of Guam in 1942, American priests were taken as prisoners of war, leaving Father Duenas and the late Father Oscar Calvo to tend to the spiritual needs of more than 22,000 Catholics who remained on the island. Father Duenas was appointed Pro-Vicar of the Vicariate on Guam, putting him in charge of all Church affairs during World War II. Throughout the occupation, Father Duenas inspired many Chamorros to remain hopeful that Guam would be liberated from enemy occupation.

Four years following the Liberation of Guam by American forces, Bishop Apolinaris W. Baumgartner established Father Duenas Memorial School as a minor seminary for young men preparing to become clerics and a college preparatory education for others. FDMS opened on October 1, 1949 near the site where Father Duenas was executed.

Throughout its history, FDMS has educated many of Guam's young men who have made numerous contributions to our community. These young men continue a strong tradition of excellence and their work has contributed to Guam's growth in the Asia–Pacific region. Many FDMS alumni have succeeded in their chosen careers. Today, many of Guam's church and government leaders, business and medical professionals, military officers, and leaders of charitable organizations are graduates of FDMS. The school promotes in its students a strong sense of public service and commitment to improving the communities they live in. A key characteristic shared among FDMS alumni is their dedication to improving the quality of life for our people and our community.

Again, I join the FDMS community in celebrating its 65th anniversary. I wish FDMS continued success, and I am confident that this institution of faith and learning will continue its commitment to providing a high–quality education to the young men of Guam. May they always remain "Strong in the Faith."

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, Mississippi College—the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of Mississippi and the second oldest Baptist university in the United States—recently celebrated the opening of its 187th school year. Since 1826, Mississippi College has provided students from across the state and around the world an education informed by Christian values, and was the first co-educational institution in the nation to grant a degree to a woman.

The university has a long and distinguished history of educating future public servants, counting current leaders in federal and state government among her alumna, including Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant as well as both my wife, Sidney, and me. Through service to the Board of Trustees, U.S. Representative Alan Nunnelee and Order of the Golden Arrow recipient Gayle Wicker, wife of U.S. Senator Roger Wicker, have provided exceptional leadership to the university's presidents through the years. Located in Clinton, Mississippi, Mississippi College is a proud constituent of the U.S. Representative BENNIE THOMPSON.

For 64 years, students have received exemplary training in areas of speech, media, public relations, theater and related practices in the Mississippi College Communication Department. Founded in 1949 by Drs. Hollis and Julia Todd as the Department of Speech, the current Communication Department presented diplomas to hundreds of students who have subsequently experienced personal and career success in their chosen fields. Among its alumni, the department prides itself in seeing former graduates become leaders in fields as diverse as business and ministry, education and journalism.

The faculty of the Mississippi College Communication Department embodies dedicated and sustained service to the university and its mission. In fact, only three individuals have chaired the department over the span of its 64 years: Dr. Hollis Todd, Dr. Billy Lytal, for whom the annual student scholarship fund is named, and current chair Dr. Cliff Fortenberry. With a teaching philosophy built around the practical application of theory and curriculum,

departmental faculty are teachers first, individuals who view their service at Mississippi College as an investment in their students' lives and in their community.

The Mississippi College Communication Department currently enrolls undergraduates in interpersonal and public communication, journalism, mass media, public relations, and theater concentrations, and offers graduate degrees in journalism, health services communication, professional communication in sports, and public relations and corporate communication. Leading in innovative online classroom offerings, the communication department partners with other academic departments to offer unique degree programs to meet student and market demands.

With a current enrollment of over 5,000 students and future leaders, Mississippi College is known as a university recognized for academic excellence and commitment to the cause of Christ. The faculty, staff, students and alumni of the Mississippi College Communication Department are proud to fulfill this vision as the department enters its 65th year of service.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this reckless plan to shut down the Federal Government. House Republicans are playing games with people's lives—with hundreds of thousands of federal employees and with the people around the country who depend on the services they provide. And they are doing this in order to prevent millions of Americans from signing up for more affordable health care.

My colleagues know that this legislation cannot pass the Senate, and that the President will not sign it. That is why they have offered legislation to ensure that our military personnel and the Defense Department civilians who support their work will continue to get paid even in the event of a government shutdown. And while I support that measure, I would expand it to include all federal employees, whose work is no less essential to the operations of our government and, in many cases, to our national security. This bill ignores those federal employees who protect our borders, care for our wounded service members, work to discover treatments and cures for diseases, and provide vital services that touch virtually every American family. They should not be pawns in this political game, and should not go without pay because the Congress cannot do its job.

I urge the Speaker to bring up a clean continuing resolution without extraneous and unrelated poison pills so that we can avoid this shutdown and keep the government working for the American people.

HONORING DON SIMS

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Don Sims, President of the Thomasville-Thomas County Chamber of Commerce, on his retirement. He retires today, October 1st, 2013, after 25 years of valuable service to his community.

Mr. Sims has dedicated himself as a true public servant to Thomas County, working toward promoting economic and industrial development in the community. His outstanding career also includes honorable military service as a combat platoon leader in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor, Bronze Star for Meritorious Service and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Sims is a longtime Rotarian and serves on many educational and non-profit boards in Thomasville.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Don Sims on his retirement, and we wish him the best of success in his future endeavors.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW LIBERTY BAPTIST CHURCH OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the congregation of New Liberty Baptist Church of Detroit, Michigan as it celebrates seventy-five years of fellowship and service in its community.

New Liberty was founded in 1938 by a small and dedicated group of Detroit residents who sought a local house of worship where they join together in spiritual fellowship with their neighbors. From its humble beginnings, the congregation of New Liberty has grown and prospered with increasing membership and more outreach programs. In its mission to serve the Detroit community, the congregation of New Liberty has called many sites home, but regardless of its location, the members of New Liberty have never wavered from their determination to help their friends and neighbors. In its seventy-five year history, New Liberty has had just four pastors: its first pastor, Reverend J.B. Coates; Reverend E.A. Rundless; Reverend J.L. Stevenson and currently, Reverend Maurice Stimage, Jr. Together with his First Lady, Renita, Pastor Stimage has been providing spiritual guidance and leadership to the congregation of New Liberty since his arrival in 2006.

New Liberty has been dedicated to service, even when it requires sacrifice. Throughout its history, the congregation of New Liberty has not only worked to obtain a stronger spiritual bond, but also reached out into the Greater Detroit community to strengthen it and support residents that are in-need. To carry out its mission, the congregation has created many ministries that assist members and the broader community with a wide range of issues from bereavement and arts programs to youth empowerment and support of senior citizens. Through its commitment to service, the congregation of New Liberty has been able to impact the lives of so many people in Southeast Michigan and improved the vitality of the community.

Mr. Speaker, over its seventy-five year history, the congregation of New Liberty Baptist Church has been true to the tenants of the Baptist faith and service. At a time when face such significant economic challenges, congregations like New Liberty are on the front lines, holding neighborhoods together and caring for the community at large. I congratulate Pastor and First Lady Stimage, as well as the congregation of New Liberty on achieving this great milestone in their church's history and wish them success as they continue to make a difference in the lives of others in the Greater Detroit region.

COMMENDING HEALTHSOURCE RI FOR EXPANDING ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to report that HealthSource RI officially opened for business today, allowing individuals, families and small businesses across the Ocean State to begin enrolling in their health insurance plan of choice. While a majority of states opted not to operate a health insurance exchange of their own, Rhode Island chose to be a leader in creating a state-driven, integrated marketplace that will provide quality, affordable health insurance coverage for its citizens.

We have come a long way since passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it has been no small task to reach this critical juncture. I would like to commend the leadership, vision and collaboration of Lieutenant Governor Elizabeth Roberts, former Health Insurance Commissioner Christopher Koller, current Health Insurance Commissioner Dr. Kathleen Hittner, HealthSource RI Director Christine Ferguson, and countless others who have worked tirelessly under the auspices of Governor Chafee. I would also like to thank our health care partners throughout the community who have contributed their resources and expertise to this endeavor.

While many challenges remain in our mission to increase access to health insurance coverage for thousands across the state, it is one worthy of our best efforts. HealthSource RI will allow individuals and small businesses to shop for insurance based on transparent, competitive pricing. The online tools make it easy-to-use, and their staff is ready to field questions and concerns from Rhode Islanders who are shopping for health insurance. All Americans deserve high-quality health care, and the state exchanges will enable them to tap into those services.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE T. PAPPAS, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and close friend, Mr. George Theodore Pappas, Sr. Mr. Pappas passed away on September 21, 2013. Funeral services were held on Tuesday, September 24, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. at Bonaire First Baptist Church. He was interred in the historic Andersonville National Cemetery.

Mr. Pappas was born on January 25, 1936 in Washington, D.C. to the late Theodore and Constance Pappas. During the Vietnam War, Mr. Pappas proudly and honorably served his country in the United States Air Force.

Even after retiring from the Air Force, Mr. Pappas continued to serve his country loyally and devotedly. He served as Chaplain of the Disabled Veterans Association and worked tirelessly within the community to advocate and care for our Nation's veterans.

Most important to Mr. Pappas was his sturdy and enduring relationship with the Lord. He was a longtime member of Bonaire First Baptist Church.

Maya Angelou once said, ''A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies.'' We are all so blessed that Mr. Pappas passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. He leaves behind a great legacy in service to all the veterans, families, and members of the community whose lives he touched.

Mr. Pappas has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the grace of God and his loving wife, Priscilla; their children, Dorothy, Stacey, and George; grandchildren, Christina, Ryan, Cassaundra, Brendon, Austin, Alexa, Olivia, Tucker, Ella, and Lila; and sister Athena.

The race of life isn't given to the swift or to the strong, but to those who endure until the end. Mr. Pappas has run the race of life with grace and dignity and God has blessed him over his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Mr. George Pappas for his outstanding service to his country and to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Mr. Pappas' family, friends, and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

CELEBRATING THE 14TH ANNUAL COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ARTS SHOW

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 14th Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show, being held October 8–10, 2013, during Mental Illness Awareness Week

Congress established Mental Illness Awareness Week in 1990 to educate and increase awareness about mental illness. In Tucson, Arizona, the Community Partnership of Southern Arizona (CPSA) has proudly organized the Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show as part of Mental Illness Awareness Week for 14 years. The Arts Show, which is free of charge and open to the public, features the artwork of children and adults receiving behavioral health services, and individuals employed in the behavioral health system.

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that 50 percent of adults will experience a mental illness in their lifetime and that one in five children are living with a mental illness. In addition, 23 million Americans are facing the challenges of substance abuse. Countless findings confirm that mental health has a significant economic and societal impact. Mental health conditions are the second leading cause of workplace absenteeism, costing the U.S. economy $79 billion annually in lost productivity. Substance abuse can spread infectious diseases such as hepatitis and HIV/AIDS. Furthermore, substance abuse has a proven link to high crime rates, increased court costs, and overcrowded prisons.

Recovery programs integrating holistic therapies are respected for creating the most meaningful and sustainable outcomes. Providing an opportunity to create and showcase visual art fosters peer support, builds confidence, and reduces the intensity of symptoms, while providing a safe and supportive environment for adults and children who are recovering from a mental illness or substance abuse issues. The Arts Show also promotes mental health education, generates awareness and helps diminish stigma.

Effective mental health treatment and prevention benefits the community as a whole. On average, every $1 spent on taxpayer-funded substance abuse treatment yields a $7 return in reduced costs of crime and increased, taxable employment earnings. Mental health treatment and prevention increases health and wellness, reduces medical costs, and has a positive effect on overall productivity, which benefits individuals, families and communities

As the Regional Behavioral Health Authority for Pima County, Arizona, CPSA is dedicated to ensuring that individuals and families receive accessible, high-quality behavioral health services that are member and family driven, recovery oriented, respectful of cultural differences, and foster hope and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mental Illness Awareness Week and the 14th Annual Community Mental Health Arts Show.

HONORING MR. WAYNE BILLIE

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer Mr. Wayne Billie my best wishes on his 66th birthday.

Throughout his life, Wayne has been a strong, dedicated leader who has made significant contributions to the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians and the State of Florida.

As a judge of the Miccosukee tribal court, Wayne Billie led a distinguished career committed to upholding justice. Through his work to protect the Everglades, Wayne has helped to protect and preserve one of our country's national treasures for future generations.

As a tribal elder of the Miccosukee tribe, Wayne has continued to demonstrate the same love of community and commitment to public service that has defined his life.

Wayne is truly deserving of our greatest respect and admiration. Again, I offer him my best wishes on his birthday

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 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 $16,738,183,526,697.32. We've added $6,111,306,477,784.24 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE OAKLAND COUNTY CHAPTER OF JACK AND JILL OF AMERICA FOR THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill of America, Inc. as they celebrate thirty-five years of service to Southeast Michigan.

Seventy-five years ago, Jack and Jill of America was founded by Marion Stubbs Thomas, a mother and concerned member of the Philadelphia community, who organized twenty other neighborhood mothers concerned about the well-being of their youth during the Great Depression. From a small community group, the Jack and Jill organization quickly grew to ten chapters by 1946, and today there are more than 220 chapters across the United States with over 30,000 members. For the last thirty-five years, the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill has been an important part of the organization's infrastructure in Michigan, providing support to at-risk children and families.

Over its three and a half decades of service, Jack and Jill's Oakland County Chapter has been a leading voice in the Greater Detroit region in the effort to promote the development of youth with a strong appreciation of good citizenship and community stewardship. Jack and Jill has achieved this goal through its support of programs that advance the virtues of social, cultural, educational, recreational and community service opportunities for youth.

Specifically, as it creates projects that fulfill vital needs in the communities of Southeast Michigan, Jack and Jill carefully crafts those projects with service roles for both youth and their parents. Through the example set by their parents, youth are instilled with a deep appreciation for the value of helping their friends and neighbors.

The programs that Jack and Jill's Oakland County chapter supports have had a profound impact on the communities of Southeast Michigan. Each year, Jack and Jill sponsors a blood drive with the American Red Cross that provides local health services organizations with a vital lifesaving resource. Jack and Jill has also brought in resources from the Jack and Jill Foundation that have enabled local Boys and Girls Clubs and the Pontiac Library to better serve their communities, as well as assist the Southfield Field Zone Leadership program and provide community prep courses for college-bound students taking the ACT exam. Additionally, Jack and Jill supports college-bound students with scholarships.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to have so many outstanding community organizations like the Oakland County Chapter of Jack and Jill of America in my district, and it is with great appreciation for its ongoing commitment to creating a better future for the Greater Detroit region that I congratulate its members on thirty-five years of service.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this politically-manufactured government shutdown.

By shutting down the United States government, House Republicans have proven that they are willing to gamble with both the economic security of hundreds of thousands federal employees and of our nation.

A government shutdown is a serious matter, with real-world consequences.

While Social Security checks will go out to current recipients, the 180,000 people who visit a Social Security office will find that they are understaffed. Their questions will go unanswered.

The Small Business Administration's approval of loans will be put on hold indefinitely. Some 28 million American small businesses will no longer have access to federally-assisted loans or technical assistance.

This government shutdown has forced us to shut the door on the American people. The most vulnerable among us, our seniors, veterans, and our children, will suffer the most.

It is time for Republicans to put aside partisan politics and work with Democrats so that we can re-open the federal government for business and put our nation back on the road to economic prosperity.

I strongly urge the House to adopt the Senate-passed Continuing Resolution without delay.

PASS A BUDGET

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted to reject the Republican's short-term, piece-meal funding bills for some, but not all, of the federal government. While this effort has a superficial appeal, it is being used to prop up a terribly flawed policy that ignores the wide array of services that the federal government provides to families, to our children, to the environment, and to businesses across the country.

The Congress should instead take up a clean CR to fund our government, rather than holding it hostage to healthcare laws enacted three years ago and now going into effect—freeing families from insidious practices such as lifetime limits on health insurance coverage, providing coverage for individuals with pre-existing conditions, expanding coverage for children, and ensuring that all insurance policies cover basic, critical services.

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean funding bill and reject this cynical ploy.

RECOGNIZING MYKE REID ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION (APWU)

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Myke Reid on the occasion of his recent retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU).

Since 2004, Mr. Reid served as Legislative and Political Director of the American Postal Workers Union, advocating on behalf of our nation's postal service. In addition to serving as Legislative Director, Mr. Reid held various roles with the APWU and played an integral role in passing important legislation, including the Family & Medical Leave Act and reform of the Hatch Act.

Myke Reid began his career with the United States Postal Service in 1976 as a clerk in Norfolk, VA. From the beginning, Mr. Reid was an active member of the Norfolk local union, serving as newsletter editor, steward and local business agent. Mr. Reid's dedication and passion for legislative reform won the admiration of his fellow union members, and he quickly rose to the position of state legislative director and state president.

In 1984, Mr. Reid came to our nation's capital to work on a legislative campaign to protect Social Security. In 1985, he was appointed as a Special Assistant to then-President Moe Biller, and continued in that role until 1992, when he was selected to fill the newly created position of Assistant Legislative Director for the APWU. In 2004, he was elected to serve as APWU's Legislative and Political Director.

Mr. Reid worked tirelessly on behalf of our nation's postal workers to advocate for decent pay and benefits, safe working conditions, and respect and dignity on the job. Mr. Reid also played an essential role in passing reforms to the Federal Employees Retirement System Act, the Spouse Equity Act, the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act, and the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act. The enthusiasm that Mr. Reid brought to his work has earned him respect throughout the halls of Congress and with APWU members. He has truly set the bar high for those who follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Myke Reid on this occasion and in commending him for his service and his work to represent the interests of America's Postal Workers and working families across the nation.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF RANKIN RANCH

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw to the attention of the House of Representatives the 150th anniversary of the Rankin Ranch located at the end of California's southern Sierras in northeastern Kern County. This quiet "old west" community in the little mountain valley of Walker Basin is home to the historic 31,000 acre Rankin Cattle and Guest Ranch now under the operation of the 4th, 5th and 6th generation of the Rankin family.

The Quarter Circle U Rankin Ranch was founded by Walker Rankin in 1863. Walker married Lavinia Estelle Lightner in 1868, laying the foundation for the family that has made cattle their family passion for generations. The ranch has evolved with the nation, serving as a stage stop for the overland mail route in the 1870s.

The years have brought times of triumph and times of tragedy, including a car accident that claimed the life of Walker and Lavinia's son and daughter in law in 1929. Similarly in 1954, after the sudden death of third generation, Leroy Rankin, at age of forty-two, his wife Helen ultimately decided to continue her husband's lifetime work and was thrust into the family business. But her new perspective would prove useful to the business, when in 1965, Helen decided to diversify by adding a guest ranch to her cattle operation.

Today, Bill and Glenda Rankin and their children, and their grandchildren all live on the ranch, and run both the cattle and guest ranch businesses.

I am proud to recognize the Rankin Ranch and the six generations of Rankins that have worked to ensure the survival of one of California's oldest and largest family owned ranches. Like thousands of other guests at Rankin Ranch, I have fond memories of the beauty of the countryside and great respect for the hard work and dedication of the Rankin family. Since 1863 they have been superb stewards of this magnificent land and gracious hosts for a public anxious to experience life on a ranch.

Congratulations on the 150th Anniversary of Rankin Ranch—a true American treasure.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See the Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7065–S7103

Measures Introduced: One bill and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1567 and S. Res. 264. **Page S7101**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing Testimony, Documents, and Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 264, to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in *State of Florida v. Lawrence, Denny, & Scarbrough.* **Page S7102**

House Messages:

Continuing Appropriations Resolution: Senate continued consideration of the House Message to accompany H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, taking action on the following motion proposed thereto: **Page S7065**

Rejected:

House Message to accompany the joint resolution. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 212), Senate tabled the House Message to accompany the joint resolution.) **Page S7065**

Federal Agriculture Reform And Risk Management Act: Senate disagreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair was authorized to appoint conferees with a ratio of 7:5 on the part of the Senate: Senators Stabenow, Leahy, Harkin, Baucus, Brown, Klobuchar, Bennet, Cochran, Chambliss, Roberts, Boozman, and Hoeven. **Pages S7084–85**

Messages from the House: **Page S7100**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S7100**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7101**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7101–02**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7102**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—212) **Page S7065**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:33 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 2, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S7102–03.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine housing finance reform, focusing on fundamentals of a functioning private label mortgage backed securities market, including S. 1217, to provide secondary mortgage market reform, after receiving testimony from Martin S. Hughes, Redwood Trust, Inc., San Rafael, California; John Gidman, Loomis, Sayles and Company, Hull, Massachusetts, on behalf of the Association of Institutional INVESTORS; and Adam J. Levitin, Georgetown University Law Center, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

TRANSBOUNDRY HYDROCARBON RESERVOIR LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, after receiving testimony

from Carlos Pascual, Special Envoy, Bureau of Energy Resources, Department of State; Tommy P. Beaudreau, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management; and Jacqueline Savitz, Oceana, and Erik Milito, American Petroleum Institute, both of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 5 public bills, H.R. 3225–3229; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 70–72, were introduced. **Page H6102**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6103**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Holding to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6055**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:39 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6065**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H6065–66, H6091**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:43 p.m. and reconvened at 4:43 p.m. **Page H6070**

Suspensions—Failed: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Veterans Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 264 yeas to 164 nays, Roll No. 506; **Pages H6082–89**

District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: H.J. Res. 71, making continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2014, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 265 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 507; and **Pages H6077–82, H6089–90**

National Park Service Operations, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, and United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service Operations, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for fiscal year 2014, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 252 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 508. **Pages H6071–77, H6090–91**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H6065 and H6091.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6089, H6089–90, and H6090–91. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT OF EPA'S IG INVESTIGATION OF JOHN BEALE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Secret Agent Man? Oversight of EPA's IG Investigation of John Beale". Testimony was heard from the following Environmental Protection Agency officials: Bob Perciasepe, Deputy Administer; Arthur A. Elkins, Jr., Inspector General; Patrick Sullivan, Deputy Inspector General for Investigations; and public witnesses.

PERSPECTIVES FROM USERS OF THE NATION'S FREIGHT SYSTEM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation held a hearing entitled "Perspectives from Users of the Nation's Freight System". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in

awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine continued oversight of the ''Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act'', 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing entitled ''The Future of the CFTC: Perspectives on Customer Protections'', 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''Resetting the Force for the Future: Risks of Sequestration'', 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Wind Energy Production Tax Credit'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Challenge of Retirement Savings for Small Employers'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation, hearing entitled ''Perspectives from Users of the Nation's Freight System'', 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through September 30, 2013

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	112	118	..
Time in session	794 hrs., 23′	554 hrs., 19′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	7,064	6,053	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,409	..
Public bills enacted into law	9	27	36
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	..	..
Measures passed, total	255	256	511
Senate bills	41	11	..
House bills	32	147	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	12	10	..
House concurrent resolutions	10	12	..
Simple resolutions	159	75	..
Measures reported, total	* 174	* 234	408
Senate bills	111	4	..
House bills	7	180	..
Senate joint resolutions	2	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	1	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	4	..
Simple resolutions	53	46	..
Special reports	12	6	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	142	74	..
Measures introduced, total	1,874	3,719	5,593
Bills	1,566	3,224	..
Joint resolutions	22	69	..
Concurrent resolutions	23	57	..
Simple resolutions	263	369	..
Quorum calls	2	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	211	221	..
Recorded votes	..	283	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

* These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 111 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 240 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through September 30, 2013

Civilian nominations, totaling 413, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	170
Unconfirmed	237
Withdrawn	6

Other Civilian nominations, totaling 1,288, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	16
Unconfirmed	1,272

Air Force nominations, totaling 5,236, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	5,219
Unconfirmed	17

Army nominations, totaling 6,224, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	6,193
Unconfirmed	31

Navy nominations, totaling 3,833, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	3,828
Unconfirmed	4
Withdrawn	1

Marine Corps nominations, totaling 762, disposed of as follows:

Confirmed	761
Unconfirmed	1

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	17,756
Total confirmed	16,187
Total unconfirmed	1,562
Total withdrawn	7
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12 p.m. (noon).

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, October 2

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E1414
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1413
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1414
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1411
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1413
Garcia, Joe, Fla., E1413
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1413
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E1411
Langevin, James R., R.I., E1412
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1412, E1413
Austin, David, Ga., E1412
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E1411
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1412
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1414
Whitfield, Ed, Ky., E1414

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.