

wanted. And so in 31 minutes on this floor, they would have the opportunity to introduce that legislation, have it pass by a majority of this House and have the President of the United States sign it.

But instead of that, they want headlines like in the *Houston Chronicle* that has a mother, Talisha, asking: How am I going to feed my children? Because they're going to be cut off in the month of November for the funding for food stamps, even though it has suffered a horrible blow by this House of Representatives with a cut of \$40 billion, but with the House not ceding to the will of America, a government shutdown, they won't be able to get that minimum support, so a mother says: How am I going to feed my children? And then, of course, someone else indicates what is going to happen to mothers with newborn babies and others. That is the problem that we face today.

Let me talk about the NIH. I am a cancer survivor, and I am very concerned about those who are dependent upon research. Just a few weeks ago, I was engaged with a number of children who are impacted by the disease. I represent the Texas Medical Center and MD Anderson and the Texas Children's Hospital. Why would I want to vote against the NIH? But this own body has already cut \$1.55 billion because we have already been under sequester which is a devastatingly odious process, and it already accounts for the loss of 1 million jobs and already some \$2 trillion-plus being cut from this budget. Already, the economic pundits say that's the absolute wrong way to go because it does not create jobs, it takes away jobs. But I will tell you that Mary Woolley, president of Research!America, says:

On a micro level, this particular approach of allegedly funding parts of the NIH does not work. We are concerned that an incremental approach to the shutdown disrupts lifesaving research by other Federal agencies.

Benjamin Carr, the director of public affairs for the American Society of Biochemistry, also disagrees with this piecemeal funding, and Chris Hanson as well.

Now the leader in the other body has been charged by doctors, people showing up in a doctor's uniform at a press conference, saying he said something negative about children with pediatric cancer. He did not. What he said is he responded to Senator SCHUMER's comment that we shouldn't do a piecemeal type of approach, and he agreed with that. "Why should we do that?"

And so we should not be going against each other, we should be going toward each other. NASA is concerned about monitoring of the space station, and the Affordable Care Act is working. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer an olive branch as well. That olive branch is let's stop calling each other names, and let's start working on behalf of the American people and vote on a clean CR.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and talk about the things we're doing here in this House to continue to fund government and keep the government open. If you look at what has been going on the last couple weeks, Mr. Speaker, you have seen more than four bills passed by the House of Representatives to fund all of government. You've seen us send bills over to the Senate to keep government open. But what you've also seen, Mr. Speaker, is the President of the United States and the leader of the Senate refusing to take up the bills because they're not getting everything they want. The Senate President, HARRY REID, said he's not going to budge an inch—not an inch—from his position. He'd rather shut the government down than to move one inch. President Obama said he won't negotiate. He refuses to negotiate with Republicans unless they give him everything he wants. He won't budge an inch. So what we've done in the House, Mr. Speaker, during that time is say: You know what? We're going to put a lot of options on the table because we do believe we ought to fund government properly. We ought to address the problems facing our country and get our economy moving again, and address all the problems that the President's health care law is facing.

But we also know that we live in a democracy, and when you've got divided government, Mr. Speaker, that means both sides ultimately have to come together. That's what our laws actually demand. And yet you've got a President saying it's my way or the highway; if I don't get everything I want, I won't budge. And then you've got Republicans saying: Let's pass bills to keep things going; let's actually negotiate and work out our differences.

I think the American people are realizing that, Mr. Speaker. They're seeing the unreasonable approach of President Obama. If you look at what has happened in the House the last few days, you're actually seeing a groundswell not just of Republican ideas to keep government funded. We passed a bill to fund veterans. Shouldn't we all, while we've got all of these other disagreements on government—there are actually areas where Democrats and Republicans agree. You don't hear a lot about it, Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of those.

So we've started putting those ideas on the table and saying we have some real disagreements over health care policy, but shouldn't we at least fund our veterans? Shouldn't we at least fund cancer treatment for those patients that are struggling through cancer that aren't looking at this from a Republican or Democrat issue; they just want their treatment? And so we passed a bill, and it got bipartisan votes in the House. It was not a par-

tisan vote. A lot of Democrats joined with Republicans to say let's at least fund cancer treatment while we're negotiating these other differences. And the Senate majority leader's answer was: Why would we want to do that? How shameful, Mr. Speaker, that you would have the Senate majority leader saying he would rather hold them hostage unless he gets everything he wants. Nobody gets everything they want in a democracy. And so we continue to pass bills to address these problems.

We passed bills to fund our National Guard troops. Again, large bipartisan votes—a growing number, by the way, of Democrat votes that have been joining with Republicans—to take a reasonable approach to this, because again, "my way or the highway" is not how you govern in a democracy. You send those bills over to fund our veterans and to fund our National Guard and to fund cancer patients. And you literally, on a party-line vote, have the Senate leader saying he's going to kill those bills until he gets everything he wants, and is forcing every Democrat in the Senate to vote with him, to play some kind of partisan game. That's not how our democracy works, Mr. Speaker.

And where's the President's leadership on this? You should see the President standing up and saying stop these games; stop punishing people; stop taking hostages. And yet he's so afraid to stare down the Senate majority leader that he sits on the sidelines and continues just to throw rocks at people instead of getting in the fray and saying, as all adults in a room, let's get together and work out our differences. The President continues to say he won't budge an inch.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue moving forward in the House. As a tropical storm enters the Gulf of Mexico, we're going to take up a bill that says we ought to fund our emergency response in FEMA. Shouldn't again we at least be able to put partisan differences on the side on other issues that are unrelated and say at least we ought to take care and respond to disasters. That bill will be on the floor. And I'll predict, Mr. Speaker, that you'll see broad bipartisan support to vote that bill out of the House and pass it over to the Senate. Maybe, just maybe, let's all hold out encouragement that the Senate majority leader will finally put his partisan differences on the side and say let's at least agree to do that. Don't hold hostages.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what the President has been doing with these monuments, punishing the American people. The World War II Memorial is a great example of the greatness of America, the Greatest Generation, a tribute to those men and women who risked everything. You had heroes in their 20s that stormed the beaches of Normandy. They stared down the enemy. They didn't blink. Of course,

they came earlier this week to the World War II Memorial to see the memorial that was built in their honor, and they're faced with Obamacades blocking off that memorial. I'm glad they stared it down, they didn't blink, and they took that memorial.

Mr. President, tear down those Obamacades. Let our veterans into the World War II Memorial.

FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to speak from the heart of a true story that's happening really right now in my district. It's a story of an innkeeper, Bruce O'Connell, who's operated the Pisgah Inn since 1979. It's an inn on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and that inn has been operated really at no cost to the Federal Government for years and years and years. In fact, as he operates it, he sends money to the Federal Government. So this government shutdown shouldn't have anything to do with the Pisgah Inn. The Blue Ridge Parkway is open for business. It continues to allow cars to go both ways on the parkway. But yet what we see is under the direction of this administration, the edict has come out to close the inn down.

Yesterday, they had to close it down at 6 clock. So I got a call this morning from Bruce, and he says Congressman MEADOWS, I just want to let you know that I'm going to open my inn back up.

Now I expected to hear all kinds of just heartfelt hurt and concern from Bruce. But what he said is that you're fighting for the right thing. You're fighting for our future. You're fighting for our children. You're fighting for our grandchildren. And I'm going to open back up knowing that the cost of this particular thing may cost me a business that I've had for many, many years. But you know, Congressman MEADOWS, it is the right thing to do, that we must stand together and fight. We must make sure that what we do is, our voice is heard. So I want to say thank you to a patriot who is willing, at great cost to himself, stand and fight for what he knows is right.

And I'm going to close with this because this fight is not a new story. On the back of the Delaware quarter is a horse and rider. Many people think it's Paul Revere, but indeed it is not. It is an unknown or little-known patriot by the name of Caesar Rodney. His statue is in this very building. It's on the back of a quarter commemorating what he did because, actually, he got on a horse when the founding of our Nation was there, he got on a horse and rode through the night, through driving storms, to arrive in Philadelphia to cast the deciding vote that created this great country.

Now why do I share this story? Because across his face was a green scarf

that covered a cancer that could be best operated on back in England. So he knew that by signing that document, he potentially was signing his death warrant.

It is that kind of patriotism, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing day in and day out. It is exemplified by the men and women across this country—World War II veterans who have come in and crossed a barricade. They fought, and many patriots died, for the cause of freedom. And I just want to say thank you to the patriots across this great land that are standing up to fight on behalf of this great country.

FUNDING NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 4½ minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we have this debate over opening the government, I want to talk about an agency that people are not thinking about.

The National Institutes of Health started in 1887 in one room, the Public Health Service Hospital in Staten Island, New York. It was modeled on something that the Germans had been doing for a number of years that was called the Laboratory of Hygiene.

In 1891, it came to D.C.

In 1901, they built the first building. The appropriation was \$35,000. It was for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases.

In 1912 in St. Louis, 12 kids died when they got a diphtheria vaccine that was contaminated with tetanus. At that point, they decided they would pass the Biological Control Act, and that was given to the Institutes of Health. Joseph Goldberger, a doctor, discovered the cause of the pellagra, which was a scourge of the South in this country, a dietary deficiency because of bad diet. That came from the Institutes of Health.

In 1930, a Senator from Louisiana by the name of Ramsdell started the National Institute, one, the National Institute of Health. It was to give fellowships to physicians to study problems in the health care system. That situation went on from that day to this day.

Now they tried to do it in the private sector. After the First World War and all of the problems of chemical warfare, the Congress said let the private sector figure out how to do it, and they couldn't do it. They couldn't find anybody to finance it, and so they came and established the National Institute of Health in the government.

In 1937, they added the National Institute of Cancer. And in 1938, they built the first building up in Bethesda, Building 6.

Now until the Second World War, they discovered and worked on various things, and then the war came, and they spent an enormous amount of effort trying to figure out the health

problems of this country. People don't realize, 43 percent of the people who were inducted or brought forward to be inducted into the Army were rejected because they were unfit physically. The National Institutes of Health went to work on that. There were a whole variety of issues—diet, teeth, syphilis, all kinds of things that were not being done in this society, and they did the initial research on that.

In 1946 after the war, they decided we've got to expand this thing and they began creating new Institutes of Health. One was arthritis and metabolic diseases. That's where we started working on diabetes. Then they did allergy and infectious disease, which is what went on to deal with AIDS.

In 1970, there were 15 Institutes of Health. Today, there are 27. All over this country in every university and everywhere you look, there are scientists and physicians who are submitting grants to the Institutes of Health on issues that affect all of us. It has been the practice until very recently that one out of five of them is accepted. One is good, four are not so good. We're going to pick the one that's good and put our effort there. We are down at the point where we are now doing 6 out of 100; 6 out of 100. This country that boasts about our health care system is killing it by this kind of bill, by squeezing the National Institutes of Health to death.

Mr. Speaker, bring out a clean bill and let's start up the National Institutes of Health.

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 49 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

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, today, give our lawmakers the wisdom to do what is right, led by You instead of political expediency.

Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes.

Lord, illuminate their minds so that they will find a solution to the current impasse, embracing Your purposes and doing Your will.

Continue to sustain our law enforcement agents and first responders, inspiring us to emulate their patriotism