

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.

If they wish to do away with ObamaCare, they should go through the legislative process and repeal it; but no, they are holding us hostage on the budget.

BLIZZARD IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, a record blizzard hit my State of South Dakota. Some places in the Black Hills saw almost 4 feet of snow in just 2 days. Thousands were without power. Thousands are still without power. Emergency vehicles were stranded along with the people that they were trying to rescue.

The damage from the downed trees, the downed power lines covered with heavy, wet snow is monumental. On top of that, with warm weather expected this week, we expect to see massive flooding that could bring even more damage.

On the plains in western South Dakota, ranchers are still trying to recover from losing cattle in the drought last summer, which was the worst drought that we had seen since the Great Depression.

□ 1045

We've heard now that they've lost tens of thousands of cattle in this fall blizzard. We've heard that tens of thousands of cattle have been lost in the snow. They're being found frozen, smothered by the high drifts and injured from wandering in zero visibility in 70-mile-per-hour winds.

We talked with one rancher near White River, South Dakota, who found over 50 cattle who had died in one spot near a dam.

Another rancher north of New Underwood was finally able to locate his entire herd of 63 cows who'd taken refuge in a shed for protection, but none of them survived.

Another story is from a rancher near Union Center who said, "It's bad. It's really bad. I'm the eternal optimist, but this is really bad. The livestock loss is catastrophic. It's pretty unbelievable."

He said cattle were soaked by 12 hours of rain early in the storm, so many were unable to survive an additional 48 hours of snow and winds up to 60 miles per hour.

See, this blizzard came so early, cattle hadn't even had time to grow their winter coats. "It's the worst early season snowstorm I've seen in my lifetime," he said, and he's 60 years old.

Another rancher said, "This is absolutely, totally devastating." He's 52 years old. He's from Caputa, South Dakota. "This is horrendous. I mean the death loss of these cows in this country is unbelievable."

This man said he estimated he had lost half of his herd, but it could be far more. He was still struggling to find

snow-buried cattle and those that had been pushed miles by winds that gusted over 70 miles per hour on Friday night.

An emergency management director in Butte County said that the trail of carcasses is a gruesome sight across the region. They're in the fence line. They're laying along the roads. It's really sickening.

And none of the ranchers that I have talked to can remember anything like it. Not only will this be devastating for this year's business, but also it will take years to rebuild what has been lost.

Yet another rancher, near Scenic, couldn't find his cattle over the weekend, and said he nearly killed a horse trying to get through the snow while searching for his cattle. He turned back, and yesterday, with the help of a pilot friend, flew over land south of the Badlands.

He found what he called the "trail of death." About 200 of his 600 cows were dead, leading up to and throughout a draw. The calves that were still alive were standing by their mothers. The rest of his cows and calves are alive, but he can't get to them.

Those are just many of the tragic stories that we've heard. Our lack of a comprehensive farm bill leaves these ranchers without the protection of a livestock disaster program that would come in in these situations and blunt just a small portion of the loss.

I fought hard to include livestock disaster programs in the farm bill, which would cover these producers retroactively.

It's time we finish our work on the farm bill. It's time we go to conference, have a negotiation on the most reform-minded farm bill that has been put together for decades. Getting the farm bill done could give those in western South Dakota more certainty during this very, very difficult time.

THE ISSUE THAT WILL NOT GO AWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I do want to share with my colleagues an issue that will not go away.

What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word "redskin" is considered a very offensive racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have yet to master the English language. But I want to share again and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans all over America why our Native American Indian community considers the word "redskin" as

very offensive, and clearly, the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term "redskin" is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for the killing and scalping of people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, I submit, Mr. Speaker, were called "redskins."

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that the word "redskin" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people."

Mr. Speaker, again, I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that that redskins scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or your son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children. They are not animals.

Our colleague, TOM COLE, from Oklahoma, the cochair of our Congressional Native American Indian Caucus and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states:

This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, D.C.

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota, as cochair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, says this "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of Mr. Dan Snyder," the owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multibillion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that 'redskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect,' is a statement of absurdity."

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise, Mr. Dan Snyder, "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, yet who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians."