

of the Interior Department has been shut down. So, again, hundreds of interns were sent home who were providing public services.

And then also in the other budget, agriculture, the job corps has been shut down. Thousands of young, at-risk people have been sent home. I don't know how many of my colleagues have ever gone to a job corps. It is the most inspiring thing. These kids are learning skills. These kids are high at risk. Many of these kids, young people, have been in trouble.

□ 1215

They're getting skills and they're getting jobs. They want to be there. They're working hard. They have been sent home. Some of them don't have a home to go to.

With that, I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank my friend from Texas for the compliment. You're always welcome in my home. I would suggest if we did more of that, we might get a little bit more cooperation on things that are important to the country.

Mr. DEFAZIO, I just wanted to comment on the issue you raised in regard to the World War II Memorial and the veterans who come out to get a glimpse of that, many of whom have never seen it before, some of whom have never been to Washington before, but they did in fact serve our country admirably, bravely, and heroically. They won World War II. As a combat veteran myself, I can tell you that I still get goose bumps when I hear about, and sometimes even talk about, what has become the Greatest Generation.

I think it's important for all of us to note that they're referred to as the Greatest Generation for a couple of reasons. One, and most obviously, they did a heroic job when they won World War II. There's no question about that. It was just an unbelievable feat. And the sacrifices they made were horrendous and something that we will all appreciate forever. And they won that war.

But they're also referred to as the Greatest Generation because, after winning that war, they came home to the greatest Nation in the world. They built this great Nation. And they built this great Nation for everyone, not for just the ones that they liked or just the programs that they liked.

We can stipulate that there are programs in the Federal Government that all of us may not think are the number one programs. There are programs in the Federal Government we all would like to see changes to. But the fact of the matter is, as our colleague from California pointed out, if you start passing them program by program, we've seen what's happened. Day five of the shut down and we've passed four programs—and only partially. It is absolutely ludicrous to think that we can do this.

We need to remember and honor that Greatest Generation, and we need to bring this budget that funds all of government—a government for all Americans, not just the Americans who are affected by the headlines today, not just the Americans who want to visit a memorial that's closed and we hear about it in the paper, not just an America who needs a medical procedure but that entity is closed so we're going to fund that one in the eleventh hour.

We need to fund government. We need to open government and get it back to work so we can be the greatest Nation. And we should do that. We should do it quickly.

I've said this a couple of times. This is a manufactured crisis. And nobody we represent at home or in anybody's district believes that we should operate in chaos, and that's exactly what we're doing right now. Talk to any of your business owners back home. They don't want to operate in chaos. Go to your universities, go to your small businesses, big businesses, schools. Nobody wants to operate in chaos.

We want to minimize chaos. The trains need to leave the station on time, as they say. The way to do that is to bring this continuing resolution to the floor for one vote, we open up government, and then we can get down to negotiating any changes that we might have.

You were successful in your plan. Eighty Members on the other side of the aisle signed a letter to my friend, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, to shut down the government. You were successful. Now let's open it back up. Let's bring these Federal employees back to work. And I'll repeat what the ranking member said. Federal employees that have been furloughed, they're home. They're not working. They're not keeping the World War II Memorial open. They're not keeping the wildlife refuges open. They're not at their job, yet we are paying them, according to the bill that the majority just brought to the floor and that was passed.

It's silly. It's ridiculous. This whole thing has gone on too long. Bring the CR to the floor. Let's get it voted on. It'll get strong bipartisan support. And let's open the government and then get down to the work that we were sent here to do.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would like to correct one thing the gentleman said. As I understand it, we are not paying them. We will pay them. For working today, they will get a hamburger on Tuesday, sometime, maybe, perhaps.

For a lot of people, that's a hardship. A lot of Federal workers are of modest means. I would point to our Capitol Hill police here. I've had conversations with a number of them. Leaves are canceled. Some of them have had plans for a very long period of time. They can't get sick. They are not being paid. They will be paid. They'll get a hamburger on Tuesday, maybe, sometime, depending on how long this whole thing drags on.

This has risen to the point of absurdity. It started out to stop ObamaCare from going into effect on October 1, and it went into effect. It then became chipping away at ObamaCare in ways they knew the President would never sign a bill to do.

But I heard just earlier today from a gentleman from Texas saying this is all about the debt and deficit. If it's all about the debt and deficit, this is pretty easy. Let's bring up the continuing resolution that would actually reduce spending from current levels, continue government for 6 weeks while we sit down and negotiate how we're going to deal with longer-term structural problems in our economy, dealing meaningfully with our debt and deficit. That seems pretty darn simple to me. It seems we're pretty close to agreement there. But, unfortunately, I think there's 30 or 40 Republicans whose agenda is still to stop or repeal ObamaCare.

So I believe the gentleman who spoke today was probably speaking out of school and not speaking for them. But what he said, and I believe a majority of Republicans want to do, could get Democrats to agree to in a minute. Bring up the continuing resolution. We're not very happy with the further reduction in spending levels across the board—it's a dumb way to cut—but we'll accept it for 6 weeks while we work out a longer-term deal.

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

#### THE REST OF THE STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, for the last hour, the minority in the House, the Democrat Party, has had the right to speak to the American people in their leadership Special Hour. I think the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from California did a good job of presenting the side of the story as they viewed it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the late Paul Harvey had a radio program for many, many years that many of us listened to, and in that radio program he would tell us "The Rest of the Story."

Well, Mr. Speaker, for the next hour, those of us on the majority side, the Republican side—most of us from Texas, although we're going to have some friends from Michigan and perhaps from Florida, too—are going to tell you the other side of the story, the rest of the story. And let's start by discussing this continuing mantra from the minority side that we ought to just bring up the clean continuing resolution, or CR, from the other body, the Senate, and life would be perfect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one tiny, small problem with that. And that is,

Mr. Speaker, that that continuing resolution funds the discretionary part of something that is legally called the Affordable Care Act, but most people in the United States are now calling it ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a huge new entitlement. It's not just another Federal program. It changes, fundamentally, the way we practice medicine in the United States of America. It changes, fundamentally, the rights of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare mandates—forces—every American to have health insurance, whether they want it or whether they need it. It's a huge new right taken away, a freedom. Heretofore, we've said that people had the right to choose whether they wanted health insurance or not. And now we're going to tell them, at the Federal level, they to have it. That is not a trivial right to take away from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, mandates that every employer that has at least 50 employees must provide health insurance. Heretofore, health insurance had been considered a fringe benefit. Some employers provided it, some employers did not. Now, according to the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, you have to provide health insurance.

What that's done, Mr. Speaker, is caused many small businesses to reduce their workforce, to change their work hours. Many employees that were full-time, 40-hour employees, have become 20- or less than 30-hour part-time employees. Again, a huge change in the way Americans have conducted their business.

Mr. Speaker, there are many mandates in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, that relate to how you practice medicine. Many health care practitioners have told me in my district that they're not going to practice. They're going to retire. They're not going to put up with all the mandates. They're not going to put up with all of the paperwork. Again, something that is fundamentally changing the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, there are all kinds of mandates on what has to be included in insurance, how the insurance companies have to provide it, what premiums they can charge. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, many insurance companies have raised their premiums. Many insurance companies have changed their policies. Again, a fundamental change.

So, Mr. Speaker, when our friends in the minority on the other side say, Just bring up a clean CR and we'll vote for it, they don't point out that that clean CR includes funding for ObamaCare. It is, again, a fundamental change, Mr. Speaker. Most of us on the Republican side, the majority side, don't want that. We want the freedom to choose.

I would ask my friends on the minority side, if ObamaCare is so great, why

does it have to be mandatory? Let's make it voluntary.

Republicans happen to support many of the things in it. We support coverage for preexisting conditions. We support allowing young adults to stay on their parents' life insurance until they reach the age of 26. We support the concept of the public exchanges. In the Republican alternative, when ObamaCare was passed, we had something called "co-ops." Not exactly like these health exchanges, but certainly similar.

So, again, if this act is so good and so great and everybody loves it, let's make it voluntary. How about making it voluntary for a year and just let the people choose? If these health exchanges are great, people are going to flock to them. If all of these mandates are really worthwhile, make them voluntary based on free choice and the market, and most of those will be accepted and implemented. So that might be an alternative at some point in time to consider. Take all the mandates away, leave the structure of the law, and let the American people choose whether they wish to participate.

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this story. In the next 50 or 55 minutes, the Texas delegation on the Republican side, with some help from friends in other States, are going to tell you the other side of the story.

With that, I would like to yield to Congressman WEBER from Friendswood, Texas.

□ 1230

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

You know, it's interesting. We see that in 2010, the other side of the aisle—the Ds—had no problem passing this humongous takeover of health care. Funny, they had no problem that the Republicans were against it; they had no problem that the majority of Americans were against it; and, Mr. Speaker, they had no problem that the majority of the business community was against it. They had no problem that there wasn't any bipartisanship involved, and now they have no problem blaming others, as a result of this government shutdown, of this failed legislation, this not-ready-for-prime-time hostile takeover of almost a sixth of the economy.

In short, the other side has no problem. I guess that's right. Now the Affordable Care Act is the American people's problem, and yet they continue to blame us. They continue to demagogue and say it's all about us.

We have a President who will not negotiate. He will negotiate with terrorists; he will get his foreign policy from the Russian President, Putin; but he will not come to the House of Representatives and negotiate.

The majority leader in the Senate and the Executive in the White House want this House of Representatives, the Republicans, to unconditionally surrender and roll over and forget that

it is the American public that has the problem—this huge entitlement that the gentleman from Texas was just alluding to. This is our method of getting negotiations going about fixing that problem.

Interestingly enough, today we heard in speeches on the floor of the House the analogy of the Republicans' attempt to go ahead and fund those crucial parts of the government while they play their games. They bring up a game analogy called Whac-A-Mole. They say that our policy is akin to Whac-A-Mole. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I recall in recorded history that someone has actually made a molehill out of a mountain—a Whac-A-Mole analogy.

I would submit that the "Unaffordable Care Act," as I like to call it, is a lot larger than the 900-pound gorilla in the room. Our colleagues on the other side are ignoring the 900-pound gorilla and paying attention to moles, that proverbial molehill. That's so interesting.

In some of their comments today they have been decrying the fact that hunters in their own States may not get to hunt. Well, that seems really peculiar to me. The party who is in favor of gun control, who seems to be anti-Second Amendment rights in my opinion, all of a sudden are interested in hunters' rights. As Mr. Rogers from the old TV show used to say: Can you spell hypocrisy? Sure you can.

It's very interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, at this juncture in the game, that all of a sudden they're interested in those rights that heretofore they had no interest in and somehow it's the Republicans' fault.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as the American people, that of the last 17 shutdowns in the last 30 years, 15 of those shutdowns occurred when a Democratic majority was in control of this House of Representatives. You never heard the terms "terrorists," "holding a gun to the head," "refusing to negotiate." You never heard that back then.

But because of this Affordable Care Act, as the gentleman from Texas has already eloquently stated is a huge mandate, because this seems to be their signature legislation—to make Americans have health insurance—now we're hearing that all of a sudden they're in favor of these other things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since March 23, 2010, when President Obama signed that hostile takeover of health care into law, we have seen key promise after key promise made to the American people broken.

The President said, "The Affordable Care Act is designed to make it easier for younger Americans to obtain and maintain health insurance." Well, I'm from Texas. We believe in being truthful with people. In Texas, you get in trouble for making those kinds of false statements. We still believe in truth, justice, and the American way even though we're from Texas.

In reality, if ObamaCare is implemented in Texas, health insurance premiums on the individual market will see an increase of 53 percent for young males and an increase of 11 percent for young females. That doesn't sound like such an affordable deal. To top that off, those who live in Texas could see premiums increase up to 43 percent in the individual market and 23 percent in the small group market.

Promise number two, broken, the President said, "If you like your current health care plan, you'll be able to keep it." Promise number two, broken.

The fact is, ObamaCare incentivizes, as the gentleman from Texas stated, employers to drop coverage to avert taxes and fees that would be imposed on those small businesses and large businesses if they were to continue to provide their employees coverage. Home Depot, UPS, to name a few, have dropped tens of thousands of covered employees from their plans just at the outset of this. According to the CBO, 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored coverage, nearly double the previous estimate of 4 million.

In 2012, the Texas State Comptroller, Susan Combs, and her office surveyed Texas members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses and received replies from over 900 Texas businesses, large and small. In that report, only 3.4 percent of those business owners believe that the President's health care would be good for their business. In fact, fines and penalties paid by those same Texas businesses with more than 50 employees for fiscal year 2010 through 2019, those fines were estimated at \$9.3 billion.

Not only have there been broken promises, there have been major delays of the law. It is simply not ready for prime time; and the truth of the matter is, folks, it will probably never be. As more and more Americans get that, they understand how imperative it is that we make changes in that law. In fact, since the law has been in place, there have been 22 actions to defund, revise, or repeal parts of that overburdensome law.

To the other side, I would say this. Let's use the President's words: Knock it off and move on. Fifty-nine percent of the American people want this law defunded. Why does the President and the majority leader keep ignoring the American taxpayers?

In my district, I have constituents sharing their heart-wrenching stories about the negative impact ObamaCare has already had on their family. There's been hundreds of responses. Take Susan Gay from Beaumont. She said:

My husband and his coworkers lost their overtime 2 years ago from the vote for ObamaCare. We are now still frightened he may lose his job, as he works for a small business man locally in Beaumont.

Susan, I hear you. The Republicans hear you. We're fighting for you, fighting for your husband and his coworkers and millions of others that have al-

ready been negatively impacted by the President's hostile takeover of the health care system.

Folks, your House Republicans are making every effort to get rid of this law. We have introduced replacement bills that will empower the individual and make affordable health care more accessible for everyone.

Folks, there is a better way. It is high time that the President and the Senate get on board with us in the House if they truly want to help and listen to the American people.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and I'm proud to be a Texan.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you, Congressman WEBER.

Before I yield to my friend from far north Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, of the First District of Michigan, I want to read into the RECORD a comment that I received on my Facebook page. Now, most of these comments are from Texans, some of them are not. I'm not sure of the location of this gentleman, Mr. Dave Guss, Jr. This is a Facebook page comment received yesterday or this morning:

Just got a letter from my provider that my policy will end and I need to purchase a new one. When I called and asked why, I was told that my current policy does not meet the required coverage for ObamaCare because it has no prenatal coverage. I am a male. The new policy will cost me \$500 a month, the old one I had was \$200 a month.

We have a number of these stories, Mr. Speaker, that I will be putting into the RECORD as this Special Order continues. But now I would like to yield to the gentleman from the First District of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I want to thank my colleague from Texas. I feel a great affinity for my Texas colleagues, and I'm an avid fan of western swing, especially Bob Wills.

I didn't know how we would end up in a shutdown. I never really wanted to have a shutdown in the government. I wanted to reach a compromise with the Senate and have business go on. The problem is that, in the House, we've passed four different pieces of legislation that would have prevented a shutdown. I mean, I can see, for example, the first thing that we sent to the Senate was a plan to fund the government and defund ObamaCare. Okay. I can understand that the Senate isn't going to maybe significantly budge on that, but maybe we would get out of the Senate some votes. Maybe some Democrat Senators would vote for it. We would see what kind of support we would have on the Democrat side in the Senate.

So then we sent to the Senate a piece of legislation which simply delayed the President's health care law for a year. The President had already delayed components of his law for some people or for some time. So let's try this. Maybe we would get Democrat votes in the Senate to support that. Well, those two propositions, they weren't even voted on. They were tabled in the Senate. They voted to table them and not

have any debate about the merits of those two proposals.

So then we sent to the Senate a proposal not to defund the President's health care law but to continue to fund the President's health care law, but to change the law so that it affected all Americans the same. The President, by executive order, changed his own law. Contrary to the law, he wrote an executive order to change the nature of the law so that employers were exempted from their mandate. In other words, the law mandates that employers provide insurance for their employees or suffer a fine. The law also demands that individuals buy insurance or suffer a fine. Well, the President saw fit to change the law so that major employers don't have to pay a fine, delayed the enforcement of that part of the law for a year, despite the fact that the law doesn't go for that.

And when is the President allowed to change a law by edict, by his signature? We change laws in this country by statute. Should we allow a President to change the law at his whim?

Another aspect where the President changed the law is he changed the law to give special privileges to Members of Congress, that the Members of Congress who have to go to the exchange would be afforded a subsidy—unlike anyone else who has to go to the exchange. So how is the President changing the law to give special privileges to Congress something that the American people should be for?

□ 1245

I think that the American people want the law to apply to everyone the same.

The third thing that we asked for from the Senate was simply change the law so that the law applies to the Congress, to the President, and to the Vice President, the same as it does to every other American, and to afford individuals the same delay in the law that the President granted to his big manufacturers, some of his favorite unions—not all unions got it. Why not all Americans?

So that is what we asked for in the Senate. Not even to defund the President's health care law, but simply to make the law abide with all Americans.

How is it that we have become a country where the law applies only to certain people—that the President by a written statement can exempt certain people from the law? Is that what this country is becoming? Is that the United States of America that we grew up in? I don't think so.

I think what we asked for, which funded ObamaCare and simply changed the law to apply to everyone, was certainly a reasonable compromise from our initial piece of legislation. And they tabled that.

Our fourth effort to keep the government open was simply to ask the Senate to come talk to us. So if you won't agree to make the law the same for everyone, will you at least come to us

and talk about what you will accept? That is why we are in this impasse we are today.

We have taken steps to reopen the government. We have passed targeted pieces of legislation that will fund critical portions of our government—FEMA, national parks, WIC, Veterans Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the National Guard. We even passed legislation that furloughed employees will be paid once the shutdown ends.

The Senate and the administration have given exceptions to their allies, big businesses, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

We have heard a lot about a clean CR. I don't know, I don't see how it is so clean when it allows the President to change a law by edict. I don't see that as a clean piece of legislation. I think that is a piece of legislation that allows unfairness in the law to continue. To me, it is rather unclear.

I am willing to talk to the Senate to come to some sort of agreement, but it just strikes me as really, really disingenuous to call what they are calling a clean CR "clean" when in reality it is allowing the President to change the law at his whim. I think that the administration and the Senate certainly should come to the bargaining table and talk to the House. The "power of the purse." We have the power of the purse. Shouldn't our consideration be taken into account? Shouldn't we have conversations to make sure that the country stays open?

I just wanted to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those listening, how I feel and why we are here. I would ask your support in that.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Florida, I want to read two more comments into the record from my Facebook page.

The first one is from Kevin Hussey, H-U-S-S-E-Y. Kevin says:

It's doubled my premiums. Simply put, how is that "affordable?"

And Laren Engel Schmude comments:

My mom is facing having her hours cut, or being laid off all together, not to mention that her company is dropping health insurance for part-time employees all together.

Again, these are comments from folks on my Facebook page.

I would also like to point out that my wife, Terri Barton, is the marketing director for Ennis Regional Medical Center in our hometown of Ennis, Texas, and it is her job to help the hospital get ready to implement ObamaCare. I have texted her this morning and asked her how that is going, and she has replied that the counselors are all trained and they are ready to help if people call in wanting to sign up. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a certified application center, but so far very few people have called and tried to sign up.

That is on the front lines. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a hospital approximately, I think, 60 or 70 beds, in a town of approximately 18,000 people, in the suburbs of Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas. It is on the front lines of ObamaCare as we implement it, if we do implement it.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I appreciate you wearing our stripes on your tie today. That is apropos.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address all of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, but more importantly, the American people, for they are the ones that we all need to listen to. They are the ones that will hold us accountable. We were sent here to represent the people. I represent approximately 700,000 citizens in north Florida's congressional district and had approximately 65 percent plus support of that district.

One of the things I ran on was preventing the Affordable Care Act from being implemented, and I have voted to do all in my power to prevent this ill-conceived legislative malpractice of a bill from being a burden to the American citizens I represent.

I also ran on the rule of law and the adherence to the Constitution. So when I hear my colleagues on the left—I mean, excuse me, to this side of the Chamber—say the Republicans want to shut down the government, I find it somewhat disingenuous.

I am voting the way the majority of the people I represent have instructed me to do, as have my colleagues.

Since we are the House, the people's House, we are the voice of the people. So when my Democratic colleagues say the Republicans want to shut down the government, keep in mind that it is the voice of the people that we represent whose voice you are hearing. That is the way a representative Republic works.

Another issue that belittles this body and lowers our approval rating—I read the other day—with the American people, equal to or less than a root canal or a colonoscopy, is the drama, the theatrics, and the name-calling. Understand, no one on this side, as is true for your side, wants children, veterans, old people, or widows to starve or to be deprived of health care. We, as you, will take care of the needy, the truly needy.

The name-calling, I have to admit, seems to emanate from one side more than the other side. I have heard childish, angry words like "jihadist," "terrorist," "anarchist." Today, I heard "Whack-a-moles," "teabaggers" and "Tea Party radicals."

Now, it is interesting, the word "Tea Party" reminds me of a time in our history. In fact, it was a pivotal point in this country in gaining its independence from a tyrannical government under the rule of law by the King of England. I am so thankful that the

colonists at that time rose up—rose up—in opposition to a minimal tax placed upon all the tea sold into America. That led to the Boston Tea Party.

So isn't it ironic that after 237 years, we have created a government that not only says you must pay the tax, but you also must buy our tea? Can you say the "Affordable Care Act?" Is it any wonder that today there is a new Tea Party in America with a mindset of limited government, fiscal responsibility, free enterprise, personal responsibility, and the Constitution?

The Tea Party is a movement. It was a spontaneous movement that happened throughout this country. There is no national leader, there is no national headquarters. The American people said they were tired of Washington and the gridlock and politics as usual, and that led us to where we are at today. They said, like I did: "I had enough."

Now, as far as shutting down the government, nobody I know wants to shut down the government, because in the shutdown who pays? The American people pay. Therefore, it would behoove us to negotiate a settlement to keep the government up and running for the benefit of these people and for this great country.

The Republicans have offered at four different times CR legislation that represented the voice of our constituents to keep the government open. Two of those offers were outright rejected by the President himself and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID.

We worked through last Saturday up here until 2 in the morning and passed more legislation to resolve this issue and compromised. We did not hear back from either side—the President or Mr. REID. Many of us in the Republican party were on the Senate steps of the Capitol on Sunday afternoon asking for a chance to sit at the table just to negotiate in conference to stop this gridlock and get America back to work again. Again, silence from the President and Mr. REID. We did not hear from the President or Mr. REID until Monday afternoon. Their answer was "no negotiation," which translates to "our way or the highway."

On one other point, to clarify, is for the House and Senate to go to conference over the budget. Yet the Senate didn't offer a budget for over 4 years, the last 4 years. But now all of a sudden it is a problem if we don't go to conference.

Again, one side is being disingenuous to the American people, because a budget does not fund our government. A budget is a wish list of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and the President. Appropriations are what funds this government, and the House has passed four appropriations bills, and the Senate has failed to bring those up for approval by the Senate and then send over to the President to sign. So again, America, you are being fed misinformation.

That is why this government is shut down. The American people need to

hear the other side of the story. They need to hear that we amended our bills, the CR bills, four times from the House to negotiate with the Senate. They need to know that we requested to go to conference to resolve our differences, the way a Republic is supposed to work, the way differences have been resolved in this esteemed body since its inception.

Mr. Speaker. Let's add an air of dignity to this damaged body, let's end the name-calling, let's end the bickering, let's go to conference on a continuing resolution, hash out our differences and get this government up and running again, and let's focus on the ensuing tsunami that is coming called our debt ceiling.

This is a time for us not to be Republicans or Democrats; this is a time for us to be Americans. It is what the American people expect, it is what the American people deserve, and it is what I came to Washington to do.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a couple of more comments from my Facebook page that have come in in the last days.

This is from a gentleman named Richard Lay:

Since ObamaCare my insurance rates have gone through the roof. Every teacher I know has seen their monthly insurance rates increase by more than \$200 to \$300 per month. One teacher's went up by \$400.

Mr. Anthony Rhodes from Arlington, Texas writes:

My rates have increased over 15 percent a year for the last 3 years. Last year and 3 years ago, my deductibles also went up 20 and 50 percent respectively. There has been nothing affordable about my health care for the last 3 years. I have less coverage and it costs me more, and even if I wanted to cancel it, I am better off paying the high prices because I get hit with a penalty tax if I cancel. I get fighting mad just thinking about the mess of legislation that was passed so that we could "find out what's in it."

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the 11th District of Texas, Mr. MIKE CONAWAY, from Midland, Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague from Ennis, Texas. I appreciate his hosting this hour.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, or as most of the folks in District 11 want to refer to it, the "Unaffordable Care Act," was passed in this House by the slimmest of margins in March of 2010 and then passed without, frankly, one Republican vote. It was also passed in the Senate by parliamentary tricks that were used to avoid the 60-vote issue that they lost. Once they lost the Ted Kennedy seat to Scott Brown, it eliminated their ability to cram it through there. They had to resort to some parliamentary issues. Again, with not one Republican vote to make that happen.

While our colleagues on the other side may say that this is currently the law of the land, that was 3½ years ago.

Today, poll after poll is showing that the American people are expressing themselves that they do not want this bill and the underlying requirements and costs associated with it crammed down their throat. Much like those now infamous words of Speaker PELOSI when she said that we were going to have to pass this bill before we would know what is in it, the American people are going to have to suffer through this flawed rollout in order to understand what is in it that they do not like as part of the implementation of this deal.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we've had to resort to a government shutdown, quite frankly, to try to get this President's attention and HARRY REID's in order to force them to come to the table. It is almost unconscionable to hold the American people through their government hostage like that, but that is exactly what this President and HARRY REID have wanted to do.

We have time and time again, as has been recounted already on this floor today, to find common ground with this President and the majority leader in the Senate and to come to agreement on those parts of funding the government that are unrelated to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, areas in which we thought we could agree.

One of the first ones was the bill that passed unanimously in the House to fund the Department of Defense and the related contractors while this shutdown is going on so that they would not be impacted by it. We then sent a series of bills across this House floor for which we've gotten good bipartisan support.

We've had 25 Democrats agree with us on continuing the funding of pediatric research. We've had 23 Democrats agree with us that we should reopen our parks and memorials. We've had 35 Democrats agree that veterans benefits should not be impacted by this. We've had 36 Democrats agree with us that the National Guard and Army Reserve should be paid for their monthly training. We've had 23 Democrats join us on disaster relief. Then, just today, we had 189 Democrats—100 percent of those voting—agree with us to pay furloughed Federal employees once this conflict with the White House and the Senate is over; and 184 of them agreed with us that the Federal Government should continue to provide religious services to our Armed Forces while this is going on.

In addition to these efforts, the House passed by voice vote a bill that would allow the District of Columbia to continue to operate using its own resources, not Federal general revenues. It was UC'd, as that phrase is used in the Senate, and it was passed by the President.

So this President and HARRY REID have had a very checkered pattern of supporting some issues that we

thought we had common ground on, but not supporting others, including HARRY REID's now callous comment with reference to children with cancer as to why would we want to continue that funding during this time frame.

Mr. Speaker, analogies are always dangerous, but this one, I think, fits. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union built a wall in Berlin, separating East Germany from West Germany. I would argue that we are in another cold war today with this President and with HARRY REID in the Senate. This is a cold war that they are also building a wall of, but their flat-out refusal to negotiate with House Republicans—except, of course, when it benefits a constituency that they believe is important to them on these issues—is their building of a wall of obstinance, a wall of hardheadedness and a wall of stiff-neckedness, if that is, in fact, a word. It's a little hard for somebody in west Texas to get his tongue around that one. Nevertheless, that is a wall in that they are refusing to listen to the American people.

To paraphrase those wonderful words of Ronald Reagan's when he was speaking to Gorbachev, I will try to use those same comments to this President and to HARRY REID, the majority leader of the Senate:

Mr. President, tear down this wall of obstinance. Tear down this wall of stiff-neckedness. Tear down this wall of not negotiating with House Republicans. Listen to the American people, and tear down that wall so that we can get this government back to operating and so that we can deal with a bill—and now a law—that the majority of Americans do not want.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield to the Congressman from the Fourth District of Texas (Mr. HALL), let me read a few more comments into the RECORD from my Facebook page.

This is from Kevin Jones:

It hasn't hurt me yet, but it will. I don't have medical insurance; don't want medical insurance; don't need medical insurance. I pay my own way. Because I am self-pay, I am able to negotiate some nice discounts on my medical bills. ObamaCare will just be another tax on me.

This is from a lady named Theresa Stone:

I had a job that I did well in, but because I was expensive and getting old—I'm turning 54 in January—to save money, I was let go in February for absolutely bogus reasons. I am collecting unemployment, but that ends in January. I lost my insurance when I lost my job. I can't afford my bills—house, food and insurance—so I am uncovered. I will never sign up for ObamaCare—ever.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Rockwall, Texas, the Fourth District of Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, a decorated World War II veteran and, in my opinion, the absolutely nicest man in this Congress.

Mr. HALL. I thank you for those compliments. You read them out just exactly like I wrote them for you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, too, and I thank you for being here when most everyone else has gone.

ObamaCare was forced through the Congress without a single Republican vote. Just think about that for a second—not one Republican vote. I don't know if that has ever been done. I think Charles Krauthammer says it best in an article from yesterday's Washington Post.

He said:

From Social Security, to civil rights, to Medicaid, to Medicare, never in the modern history of the country has major social legislation been enacted on a straight party-line vote—never. In every case, there was significant reaching across the aisle, enhancing the law's legitimacy and endurance. Yet ObamaCare, which revolutionizes one-sixth of the economy, regulates every aspect of medical practice and intimately affects just about every citizen, passed without a single GOP vote.

Mr. Krauthammer is not alone in being concerned about this country. We are concerned about, not the Members of this House or of the Senate, but of everyone who has children or who cares about children.

Let's talk about jobs. There are no jobs now whether you are educated or not educated. They don't look to a job. By the time this President exits, they're not going to find any employers. That's how serious it is. This is a real problem, Mr. Speaker, and I'm afraid it's going to bankrupt the families and bankrupt the businesses in the Fourth Congressional District, which was the third largest user of manufacturers in the entire United States Congress—House or Senate—in 2011. I have not seen the words for 2012.

We are forcing people to buy insurance that they can't afford; and if they opt out, we fine them. Then they can't even afford the fine. What a train wreck. Go ahead and go to the Web site and sign up. There are reports from all over the country of glitches and of the confusion and frustration from those who have tried. Now we're hearing that the Federal Government will be shutting down the Web site for repairs. You would think, after 3 years of planning, it would at least be able to sign people up. This is clearly not the case, and they are clearly not ready for prime time. I think this is a sign of things to come under ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

I am also concerned about data security in this system. Given the government's track record, I am worried that people's personal information could get out. All of us have good and honest relationships with our doctors. We trust each other. We do not need the government to get in the middle of that relationship. The push for ObamaCare was to cover all Americans; and now, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 30 million people will still not be covered in the year 2022. So what's going on here? This is just one giant tax on the American people. If you don't sign up, you get taxed. If you do sign up, your rates will go up, and some reports are saying it will be by as much as 400 percent.

In closing, I'll just say another push for ObamaCare was to bring down the

cost of health care. According to the American Action Forum, health insurance rates for people between the ages of 18 and 35 will go up substantially. Premiums for this group before ObamaCare averaged about \$62 a month, and now the premiums for these youngsters will be on the average of \$187 a month. That's triple the cost. How is this helping? My constituents are opposed to this bad health care law. My mail is 100 to 1 against it, and I am opposed to it.

The folks on the other side of the aisle should listen to the majority of Americans and repeal, defund, or delay ObamaCare. The Senate had four chances to prevent this shutdown. They selected none of them, and we shut down.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from the Fourth District.

I would point out to the Speaker that, yesterday, Congressman HALL was one of the Texas Congressmen who went to the World War II Memorial to make sure that our veterans on their honor flight were allowed in to see it.

I want to read one more email into the RECORD before I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, Dr. BURGESS. This has come in as we've been doing this Special Order, Mr. Speaker.

Katie Hoffman of Minneapolis, Minnesota, says:

Hi, Joe. Keep up the good battle today. I am tuned in to C-SPAN with a close eye. I received notice last week under the Affordable Health Care Act that my insurance will be doubling almost from \$113 a month to \$207 a month. I am a 35, nonsmoking, healthy female. Who am I paying for? I've had enough. I'm working hard to cover the non-working society—frustrated. Keep up the fight.

Then one more from a gentleman named Tim Ruschi:

Dear Representative Barton, I just want to express my support for your efforts. I am watching you right now on C-SPAN. My wife and I received a certified letter recently from our insurance provider, Cigna, informing us that our health insurance plan is being dissolved, effective January 1, 2014. I believe the President knew he was lying when he boldly proclaimed many times that, if people liked their insurance coverage, they could keep it—period. He knew or should have known full well that the Affordable Care Act would cause many insurance plans to shut down, and now this has become the sad reality. I cannot trust anything the President or this administration says anymore.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, in Denton County, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President.

Mr. BARTON. If I may let the Speaker know, this was an email sent to me from an American citizen. I was just reading something an American citizen wrote. These are not my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President, including by reading into

debate matter that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank Mr. BARTON for bringing this hour to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that this is the Texas hour. People look to Texas for leadership. Certainly, from an economic standpoint, Texas enjoys a AAA rating. The United States, unfortunately, does not.

If you look at Texas between the years 2009 and 2011, it gained nearly a million new residents. Other times when there have been vast expansions of populations in a State, the rate of uninsurance has also increased, except in Texas. During that time period from 2009 to 2011, the rate of uninsurance went down.

Why is that?

It's because people were moving to Texas because they could find a job, and accompanying that job typically was employer-sponsored insurance. The reason for that is, of course, that Texas has a long history of utilizing the energy resources inherent in that State. In fact, it's Texas that has gone a long way towards redefining our national energy policy and making us an exporter of energy rather than an importer.

But our purpose today, here, is to talk about the Affordable Care Act. It has already been referenced that the other body passed this late on a Christmas Eve in order to get out of town right before a snowstorm. Now, the chairman of the Finance Committee in the other body when talking to the Secretary of Health and Human Services earlier this year said, Madam Secretary, I am worried that we are seeing a train wreck.

I wanted to provide for Members of the House of Representatives what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Ladies and gentlemen, the House and my colleagues, this is where we were last Monday night—the two locomotives bearing down on each other with smoke trailing out of each of their smokestacks. This is a train wreck right before it happens, and that's where we were on Monday night. A train wreck was fixing to happen, and we were trying to do everything possible to prevent it. We had passed four bills and had sent them over to the Senate to allow funding for the government. Each one had been rejected. In fact, with the last one, in the spirit of compromise, we said let's just sit down and talk; and the Senate rejected that as well.

When you stop and think about the history of this thing, you say, Why has it been so hard to implement this? The reason it has been hard to implement this is that this was never intended to become law.

The House of Representatives never had a single hearing on what at the time was known as H.R. 3590. It was passed in the Senate without a single Republican vote at the midnight hour

on Christmas Eve, and every Senator thought, We'll get a chance to go to conference and fix it. We know there are problems, but we'll get a chance to fix this. They didn't because they lost their 60th vote in Massachusetts, and the Senate majority leader told the Speaker of the House at the time, There is nothing else I can do. I've put everything into it. I can't pass this again in the Senate. It's because he lacked one vote.

I will just ask people in this body on both sides of the aisle to think back. Lyndon Johnson was a Member of this body. Lyndon Johnson was the majority leader of the Senate. Lyndon Johnson was President. Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing the Civil Rights Act because he lacked one vote? Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing Medicare because he lacked one vote? No. He would have exercised Senate leadership or Presidential leadership, and he would have gotten that vote, and he would have made it happen.

□ 1315

Both of those, by the way, passed with bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate. So don't fault the House of Representatives because of how bad this thing is. Don't fault the Representatives because the people of the United States do not like this thing. Don't fault the United States House of Representatives because they couldn't even get their informatics piece correct with 3½ years and billions and billions of dollars.

Why did the site crash in the first couple of days? They knew it was coming. They knew there would be great interest in this. Amazon is able to do that. Amazon handles how many millions of hits a day? Facebook—certainly a nonessential site on the Internet—how many transactions does it handle a day? How could they not be ready? This is, after all, the President's signature piece of legislation.

I get criticized because they say Republicans haven't tried to fix it. Republicans have tried to fix it. We have passed seven pieces of legislation that have modified the Affordable Care Act, and the President has signed them. The President himself has laid portions of this law down not to be enforced for whatever period of time he says.

Certainly, people can't sign up for preexisting condition coverage now. They have to wait until the first of the year. That window has been closed since February 1 of this year. The employer mandate went away right before the Fourth of July weekend. Reporting requirements were also suspended right after the Fourth of July weekend. The President has put more pieces of this law on hold than any Member of this House could ever do.

I appreciate so much the gentleman from Texas holding this hour. I'm privileged to have been a part of it. I did want to remind people what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in this Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to Mr. STOCKMAN, I want to apologize to the House for reading into the RECORD comments from citizens of the United States exercising their First Amendment rights. One of those citizens made a disparaging remark about the President of the United States, and we understand that Members, ourselves, cannot personalize these issues. Some of our citizens that are commenting don't understand the rules, but I do, and I want to apologize to the House because I do understand the rules.

I now yield to Congressman STOCKMAN.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the fact that we're talking here today about things that impact our Nation, and I want to talk about our Speaker who, as you know, or many of you know, I voted against and didn't want to be the Speaker. Today, our Speaker has been vilified after offering opportunity after opportunity to negotiate. The President, on the other hand, said he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

The Speaker grew up in Ohio in a working-class community, and has negotiated many times with the President. It's most puzzling to me why now the stance of no negotiation. Every time we had a shutdown—I was here in the last shutdown—we negotiated. The President at that time, President Clinton, negotiated. In all the shutdowns, we always had negotiations. That's the way this body works is that we work on compromise.

The President wrote a letter to this individual who is the head of Iran. He's negotiating with the head of Iran, who wants to eliminate Israel. He's willing to negotiate with him for nuclear weapons.

The President also wants to negotiate with the head of Syria. This individual gassed his own people, tortured his own people, and killed his own people. I don't understand why he's willing to negotiate with him, but he is. Again, he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

Next, the President is also willing to negotiate with the Taliban. The President ordered the release of several prisoners prior to even negotiations to get "the negotiating to start." Again, let me remind the body that the Speaker is not to be negotiated with, but the Taliban is. Now the President says, I'm willing to negotiate if you give up your position. That's not negotiation.

I would like to show you, Mr. Speaker, some of the words that have been used against our Speaker and the Republican body. We've been called by this administration: terrorists, anarchists, suicide bombers, blackmailers, fringe, extortionists, ideologists, gang-

sters, extremists, bombs strapped to their chest, guns held to their heads.

We're not talking about the terrorists who the President is negotiating with, but we're talking about the working-class gentleman from Ohio.

I call on the President to tone down the rhetoric. I call on the President to respect this body and to negotiate in good faith. It's time to end the government shutdown, and let's do it in a positive manner.

I would like to point out, too, while these names were hurled in insult to the Speaker, never once has the Speaker ever used that kind of terminology against our President.

I would like to see this body turn down the rhetoric and get back to the business of negotiating and making compromise. It's the fair thing to do, it's the proper thing to do, and I just appeal to the Nation to stop using this kind of rhetoric against people in this body. We deserve better.

I praise the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, for allowing me this time to speak to unifying the body and negotiating in fairness. We ask the President just to sit down.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we've appointed conferees to negotiate. To this date, they've never shown up on the other side. We can't negotiate unless there's someone else. Anybody in a family knows that it takes a husband, a wife, a spouse, or a partner to make a deal. It takes two people. You can't do it unilaterally.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, to my friends in the body, this is a serious issue. ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, as I said at the start, is a huge new entitlement. At a minimum, we would have a real debate about it. As has been pointed out, it barely passed the House on a partisan vote. No Republicans voted for it, and some Democrats, I think, voted against it. I think it passed by one or two votes. It passed the Senate only because they were able to get around the 60-vote requirement to end debate. It is the law of the land, but it was passed with all Democratic votes and no Republican votes.

Before it is fully implemented, I think it is worthy of a debate and it is worthy of the type of situation that's going on now. As I said at the top of this Special Order, if the Affordable Care Act is such a great thing, let's make it voluntary for the next year and let the American people choose whether they want to implement it as it is currently structured. If they don't, let's work together, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Speaker, to change it.

No one wants the Federal Government to shut down. That's obvious. The Republicans in the House are bringing bills to the floor on a daily basis to try

to open up as much of the Federal Government as is possible. Our friends on the Democrat side some days are with us on that and some days are not. They were with us today on paying furloughed Federal workers when they come back to work. Hopefully, next week, they will be with us on paying the veterans, opening the VA, the national parks, funding cancer research, and some of the things that earlier this week they were against.

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

#### OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, in information that came out after close of business yesterday, there was a report from CNBC about the 99 percent of ObamaCare applications that hit a wall. This report said:

As few as 1 in 100 applications on the Federal exchange contains enough information to enroll the applicant in a plan, several insurance industry sources told CNBC on Friday. Some of the problems involve how the exchange's software collects and verifies an applicant's data.

"It is extraordinary that these systems weren't ready," said Sumit Nijhawan, CEO of Infogix, which handles data integrity issues for many major insurers including WellPoint and Cigna, as well as, multiple Blue Cross/Blue Shield affiliates.

Experts said that if Healthcare.gov's success rate doesn't improve within the next month or so, Federal officials could face a situation in January in which relatively large numbers of people believe they have coverage starting that month, but whose enrollment applications have not been processed.

"It could be public relations nightmare," said Nijhawan. Insurers have told his company that just 1 in 100 enrollment applicants being sent from the Federal marketplace have provided sufficient verified information.

The article goes on:

One insurer reported a better, but still stunningly low, rate of enrollment applications containing enough data to process for coverage. "It's about half of what we've received," a source at that insurer said.

"We're getting incomplete data—about half of the applications we haven't been able to process," said the source, who used the term "corrupted" to describe the batch of applications received.

The article goes on to point out what a huge problem, after 3½ years to get ready for ObamaCare to be the law of the land, after repeated refusals to negotiate whatsoever on delaying anything except for what the President has signed in the way of exemptions and waivers, hundreds of times himself, as he and Chief Justice Roberts completely rewrote the original ObamaCare bill. There has been a refusal to allow everyone in America to stand on the same fair, level playing field as the friends or supporters of the President have gotten through their

waivers and exemptions, including people in Congress, which many of us here in this body have refused to accept if Americans don't get them as well.

□ 1330

One person in the article said he blamed the exchanges' software, which is allowing too many people to finish the process online without making sure they provide answers needed by the insurers processing the applications. But the article also mentions there are going to have to be people who go back and try to get information from these individuals that did not complete the application process—it sounds like through no fault of their own, just for the impropriety of the software programs, themselves.

And it's not difficult to see what a nightmare that will be, as it opens wide the door for identity thieves to start making calls or sending emails telling people they did not adequately complete the process, and they need this information or that information. It's going to be tough for people to know, Am I sending information to the government, or am I sending it to a proper contractor, or am I sending my information to an identity thief?

The process was not ready for prime time, and it's just going to get worse as we move toward January in the problems that are occurring.

Here is an article from Dr. Susan Barry. This was dated October 3, talking about Secretary Sebelius:

The woman who is behind the controls of ObamaCare was unable to convince even one person from Kansas, the State she used to govern, to sign up for it.

Though HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius is the former Governor of Kansas, Representative Tim Huelskamp was informed by an insurance provider in his home State that none of the 365,000 uninsured people living there successfully signed up for insurance on the ObamaCare exchange on the first day.

Now in the midst of all the chaos, all of the broken promises where people have lost their insurance, they have lost the coverage they had, even when they keep their insurance, insurance prices have spiked for the vast majority of Americans in this country.

They did not get the \$2,500 cheaper insurance the President promised. They either lost their insurance altogether or it has spiked dramatically. They didn't get to keep their doctor. We're hearing from those people constantly. And at the same time, when here in the House, we have sent compromise after compromise before the shutdown occurred down to the Senate, which normally, in a functioning Senate, would have the Senate—if they didn't like what we proposed—send back an alternative. And at that point, after an alternative is passed in the Senate, then the Speaker can appoint negotiators called conferees. The head of the majority in the Senate, HARRY REID, could appoint negotiators, and then come together, and they work out an agreement. And then that comes to the House and Senate for an up-or-

down vote, non-amendable, straight up-or-down vote in each House.

But the Senate was playing games. It is now clear that there was no intention of having any agreement, that the conventional wisdom in this town for the last 3 years say that, Gee, if there is a shutdown, then Republicans will likely lose the majority in the next election. So whatever it takes to shut down the government, go ahead.

That was borne out by the fact that the first 21 mainstream stories completely faulted the Republicans, failing to point out the compromises that were sent down the hall and the Democrats' refusal to even entertain them. And then on the fourth, the ultimate capitulation said, All right, all right. Basically, we're appointing conferees; just appoint people to sit down and talk about it. We can probably have this worked out by morning. But it was clear they wanted damage from a government shutdown.

We've learned that as these telltale signs emerged—and one park ranger was quoted as saying that it was disgusting. But as park rangers, they had been instructed to make life as difficult as possible for people.

We're getting stories in from around the country about how this abusive Federal Government that wants to tell you what health care you can have, what surgery you can have, who wants to supervise everything about your private life, they want every page of every medical record about you they can get their grimy hands on so that bureaucrats can decide if you're doing something they don't like, how to jerk you around, as the IRS has been caught doing now, as we've gotten reports of other agencies—whether EPA, FEC, others—being abusive. And we find case after case now, since the shutdown, of this government funding park rangers to go out and create as much chaos for Americans as possible.

We have this administration, where the buck stops with the Commander in Chief, that has now made clear to Catholic chaplains of the military that are independent contractors that you are not to show up and conduct mass on Sunday. And if you do, you may be arrested or subjected to disciplinary action.

There was a time in this country when we believed in volunteerism, where no matter what happened, Americans would step up and make sure things that needed to happen actually got done. Now we have an abusive administration so intent on, as the park ranger said, making life as difficult as possible for people in such a mean-spirited way that it would go shut down facilities that don't take a dime of Federal money just to hurt as many people as possible.

And those same people that are calling those shots want to decide what you can have in the way of health care, Mr. Speaker. No, thank you. I am opting out. I will pay the penalty. I am not going to have the government telling me what I can or cannot have. I