

the point that we're not borrowing a single cent. We need to get to that point. Our goal, for those on the other side who can't figure out what a goal is, our goal is fiscal responsibility, fiscal endurance and sovereignty, preserving freedom, free people and free markets. That is our goal for this Nation and doing it in a responsible way.

I've got a great niece who is due this month, and when Georgia Kati Graham arrives, I don't want her to be looking at a mess of a Federal Government. Right now, her share of the national debt is \$53,000. Every newborn who is going to arrive: welcome. With your citizenship, here is what you owe.

That is not responsible. It is why we come to this floor day after day. It is why we continue to say to the Senate, Negotiate with us. Work with us. Sure, let's look at the short-term funding issues, let's look at the long run. How do we preserve this great Nation? How do we get this spending under control? I would offer, Mr. Speaker, we don't do it by going out and borrowing \$2 billion a day. We don't do it by having the Fed monetize \$75 billion worth of debt each and every month. We do it by saying we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. And it is time that we put the components of that problem on the table and negotiate our way through it so that we're looking at long-term fiscal health and fiscal solvency, not just for this year or next year, not just for the next decade, but for the next century. Let's put our focus on how we return to certainty, how we return to predictability with our Federal regulatory agencies and our Tax Code.

The time to tackle the problem is now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

AMERICAN NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the three recipients of the Nobel Prize in medicine for 2013. All three work at American universities.

Dr. James E. Rothman chairs the cell biology department at Yale University. Dr. Randy W. Schekman works at the University of California at Berkeley. Their German counterpart, Dr. Thomas C. Sudhof, is on the faculty of Stanford.

The Nobel committee has recognized the importance of their lifesaving work. The question is: Why don't the House Republicans?

On the very day that three researchers at American universities won the

Nobel Prize in medicine, the House Republicans continue their siege against the Government of the United States, and their siege includes the National Institutes of Health, where the American people through their Federal Government support medical research and path-breaking, basic research in the difficult search for cures.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that Dr. Rothman of Yale received two grants under the Obama Recovery Act for his work in developing a better way to study cells. Of course, he would have received none if the Republicans in Congress had had their way. More to the point, the Republican shutdown has jeopardized hundreds of research projects like Dr. Rothman's, Dr. Schekman's and Dr. Sudhof's. The Republicans have essentially shut down the National Institutes of Health, which has told researchers that they cannot process their grant applications, which eventually will bring federally supported research to a halt.

I count more than 30 research projects underway just in Ohio at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland and at least a dozen more at the Cleveland Clinic and at the University of Toledo Medical University—cutting-edge research, peer-reviewed research, research that could save lives.

Thanks to the Republican Congress, these are "dark days for medical research." So says the Atlantic Magazine.

Between the sequester and the shutdown, repeated hits to research funding may have serious consequences for scientific advancement.

That's not something you see in the flash of but one day. But it erodes America's real strength over time.

□ 1030

Almost three out of four employees at the National Institutes of Health are sitting at home, thanks to the Republican Congress. They're not allowed to do their work of finding cures and stamping out disease. The Republican Congress locked them out. Two hundred patients at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center were turned away due to the Republican Congress' throwing its little temper tantrum over losing the Presidential election again. Many of those 200 people are cancer patients, and 30 of them are children, paying a heavy, heavy price for Republican intransigence. The Republicans told them, Go away.

Mr. Speaker, even if the Republicans lack any empathy whatsoever, at least you would think they would care about jobs in America. Research and development, including research and development in biotechnology, provides a competitive advantage for the United States. It's a very promising sector for economic development and job growth. Just come to Cleveland to see the new Health Innovation Center, or look at the neuropsychiatric research being conducted at Case and the University of Toledo Medical Center. Look at

what it draws around it. Yet The Atlantic magazine says the sequester is killing 20,500 jobs this year in the life sciences field, and the government shutdown threatens to ground medical research into cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and disabling neuropsychiatric disorders.

The Nobel committee gets it. The American people get it. A recent poll showed that 83 percent of the public believes investing in medical research is important for our economy.

So why don't the Republicans get it? As NIH Director Collins told The Atlantic last week:

We will not know what grant that was going to lead to the next breakthrough in cancer research didn't quite make the cut. We will not know what brilliant scientists, who were going to win a Nobel Prize, basically gave up because of the failure to get support from the current system and decided to do something else or move to another country, which some of them are doing already. We won't know. That is the sad tale that is wrapped up in all of this.

The good news is that three scientists working on the frontier of scientific research—three scientists at American universities—did not give up, and they have captured the Nobel Prize in Medicine for 2013.

The bad news is that House Republicans apparently have given up. They apparently don't care whether the U.S. keeps distinguishing itself by winning such prestigious awards. They apparently don't care whether we support the research that will help humankind and eliminate diseases and save lives. They don't care if the United States remains the global leader in medical and scientific research and enjoys the millions of jobs that it will create in the future—what a shame—and how easy it would be to bring up a clean continuing resolution and put the government of the people of this country back to work.

ATF CENSORS FREE SPEECH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk and discuss and debate the issues of the debt ceiling, of the continuing resolution, there are still things taking place in government. Some of them aren't so good.

Just to give a little background, which you are certainly aware of, we have our Constitution with the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a section in the Constitution that protects citizens from government abuses.

The First Amendment is first because it contains the most important rights. If those rights are abridged, the rest of the Bill of Rights—to me—is meaningless, and we all know that two of those provisions have to do with the freedom of speech and the freedom of press. We traditionally honor those because they are so important.

Historically, the most controversial of all speech and press was political

speech and religious speech. Those are especially protected in the First Amendment, and there are historical reasons for that. The colonists, our forefathers, they were an ornery bunch, and they were constantly hammering, through the press and through speech, King George III, Great Britain, and their abuses on individuals in the Colonies—and rightfully so.

Therefore, when our Constitution was written and the Bill of Rights was written, we wanted to ensure that, under our philosophy and under our democracy in the United States, freedom of speech, and freedom of press were protected.

Over the years, the Supreme Court has ruled on free speech and press cases; but they have gradually limited speech, which is another issue. The prevailing rule is that, if there's a compelling State interest—whatever that means—and we'll talk about that some other time—then speech can be prohibited. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment doesn't say anything about limiting speech when there's a compelling State interest.

But the Supreme Court said, if there's a compelling State interest, speech can be limited, and, of course, the Supreme Court decides what that compelling State interest is.

There are also two types of punishment for speech. One is censorship, which is the most egregious. That is to prevent someone from saying something or publishing something. Then there's the other type of punishment for speech, after the speech is made. Then there is punishment sometimes for what is said, such as a threat or yelling "fire" in a crowded theater. But the most egregious is preventing someone from saying something or printing something or publishing something. That is censorship.

So that brings us to what is taking place. We've all heard of Fast and Furious. That's the situation where our government sent guns to Mexico under the theory that they're going to track the guns. Americans were killed; Mexican nationals were killed. We're over in court because Eric Holder won't give us information about Fast and Furious. Now one of the ATF agents wants to publish a book, called, "The Unarmed Truth," and it's about Fast and Furious. He is an agent in the ATF and whistleblower.

The ATF has a policy that says, Well, we, the ATF, decide whether someone in our organization is allowed to publish or have some type of outside employment, and we use our own discretion. It's just up to us. We don't have any policy rules. We just arbitrarily decide. And they have decided that because Dodson wants to publish this on his own time, not on company time, or government time—he went and tried to get permission—they said, You can't publish that book. Here's the reason he was given, Mr. Speaker. The reason given to him was, well, it might hurt the morale in the ATF.

Now, do you think that's a compelling State interest to prevent a person from printing something and violating his right of free speech because the government says it might hurt the morale in the ATF?

Absolutely not. You've got somebody that wants to tell the truth about the ATF, and it's a violation of his constitutional right not to be able to discuss openly what took place. It's a denial of the First Amendment freedom of speech. It is a denial of freedom of press.

These individuals of the ATF, censor police, ought to be furloughed. They ought to be sequestered, specifically those that are denying the freedom of press, the freedom of speech to someone who just wants to talk about what took place in the ATF. This ought not to be, but that's what has taken place by the ATF coverup squad. Unchain the freedom of speech and press.

And that's just the way it is.

DEBT CEILING INCREASE

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the irresponsibility of the Republican Party in holding hostage the full faith and credit of the United States.

As hundreds of thousands of Federal workers go without pay, as home buying slows to an eventual halt, and as Federal agencies remain unable to complete the important work of implementing the Wall Street Reform Act, Republicans are threatening another crisis that could have significant impacts on our financial markets and the economic security of all Americans. They do this in pursuit of an ideological agenda. The result is continued instability and uncertainty for our economy and fragile recovery.

We should not default on our obligations. The ramifications of doing so would be serious. The underpinnings of the entire financial system could be affected, with the possibility of triggering a financial crisis reminiscent of the days following the failure of Lehman Brothers—only this time, it would be far worse.

If the U.S. defaults on its debt, lending—the lifeblood of our economy—would dry up. The dollar's value could drop, and we could see dramatic increases in interest rates on everything from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards. Not only that, but every U.S. corporation and municipality would likely see their borrowing costs climb as well. Unemployment rates would rise precipitously just as we're beginning to recover.

If Congress cannot do its job in a timely manner, in the future, the government's ability to pay its debts will be looked upon with uncertainty by investors and markets, leading to higher borrowing costs in the future and, in turn, an increase in our Nation's def-

icit. Worst of all, we could see another dramatic loss of wealth for working Americans.

History tells us that even the threat of default can send shock waves through our financial system. In 2011, just the prospect of defaulting on our debt caused a drop in consumer and business confidence, a 17 percent decline in the S&P 500 index of equity prices, and increased volatility in the stock market; and, of course, we received a downgrade in the U.S. Government debt.

The drop in equity caused by the 2011 debt ceiling fight had serious consequences for American families. The months following saw a \$2.4 trillion decline in household wealth and an \$800 billion drop in retirement assets. The cost of homeownership also increased, as risk-averse lenders increased the cost of borrowing to purchase a home. The 2011 debate showed us the very serious consequences of even debating whether we should pay bills already incurred.

But no one knows with certainty the full extent of the damage to the economy should the U.S. actually default on its debts. We have heard speculation ranging from bad to the catastrophic. I, for one, do not want to find out.

What I do know is that everyone from Wall Street CEOs, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, to small business owners, and prominent conservative economists are concerned with the significant damage that could result from a debt ceiling standoff. Warren Buffett, Ben Bernanke, Hank Paulson, and the heads of the Nation's largest financial institutions have been outspoken about the need to end this hostage crisis now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been through enough. We remain in the midst of a government shutdown with no end in sight. It is hurting real people and damaging our economic recovery. At this tenuous time, defaulting on our Nation's debt could create the perfect storm that may roil financial markets and undermine the credibility of the United States; but, most importantly, it could be devastating for American families who are already suffering in the aftermath of a major recession, foreclosure crisis, and now a government shutdown.

So I urge my colleagues to stop using the debt ceiling to push extremist ideology and vote now on a clean debt limit increase.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee said she doesn't know what we mean when we talk about a "clean debt limit increase." I think she knows. She knows that they should not try to do away with the ACA—that is, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare—and hold us hostage because they don't like it.

The ObamaCare legislation was passed. It is in law. President Obama was absolutely supported by the citizens of this country when they voted the President to be reelected once again. The Supreme Court supported it.