

honor of chairing several conference committees. Conference committees are set up when there's a disagreement between a House-passed bill and a Senate-passed bill. You sit down with your list of differences and you start sawing away at them, if you will.

That's, in fact, what the House has been doing the past 2 weeks in the midst of this shutdown. We've been finding some things, such as military pay, science, civilian furlough issues, and health-related issues—things that are less controversial and on which we can agree—so we can get some momentum to come up with a big agreement.

Indeed, the gap is large. We have disagreement on ObamaCare because it's one-sixth of the American economy. It's very big.

Secondly, we have a disagreement on the debt ceiling. Do we continue along the path of spending that we are on or do we make corrections?

Thirdly, we have a \$90 billion gap between our spending level between the House and the Senate.

These are big issues. Sometimes, a long journey starts with small steps. That's why I urge our friends in the Senate to pass the legislation which the House has sent over to them, and then we can start focusing on the larger issues.

□ 2000

#### OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas know that when the cattle starts stampeding, you're really in trouble; so my friends on the other side of the aisle haven't realized that the cattle in the United States is stampeding: 57,000 seats of Head Start are going; veterans centers will be closed in a couple of days; Federal courts are looking at whether or not they can stay open past October 15; U.S. attorneys are laying off various U.S. attorneys across America, up to 4,000.

We actually have rules in this House, the rules that brought about the agreement in the beginning of the year where we actually agreed to the 986 number that the Republicans had. We agreed to the tax reform that the Republicans had and Democrats agreed. But now they want to throw on us another supercommittee—fool's folly—talking about discretionary spending, the debt ceiling, and entitlement reform—all decent ideas, but open the government first.

Get the bill on the floor that is clean. Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling to pay our bills. Let the American people get back to work. Let our veterans get services. Stop throwing down another committee. We don't catch cattle. We don't go after cattle in Texas by throwing down a committee. We get it done.

Let's get the job done. Let's stop the stampede.

#### SPEAKER BOEHNER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, October 8. October 8. We are now 8 days into the shutdown of the government of the United States of America, presumed to be the strongest Nation on this Earth, presumed to be the greatest economic power, presumed to be the world's oldest democracy—perhaps oldest, but not functioning.

Why? Why are we in this situation? Eight days without a functioning government. What in the world is the Republican Party doing to this Nation? And why? Why? It's hard to say why because every day the goalpost changes. Every day a different demand. And today yet a new demand.

But what's the result of all of this? What does all of this mean? It means that this Nation is humiliated by this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go. Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go and vote. Why not? We think there's a majority. Let's see here. There's 198 Democrats that will vote for the re-opening of this government tonight. Call us back into session, Mr. BOEHNER, 198 Democrats. And by the public record, there are 23 or more Republicans that have said they would vote for a clean CR. Mr. Speaker, let your people go and vote.

What does it mean that the government shut down? What does it mean to Americans? I'll tell you what it means in my district. It means that the day care centers, the early childhood education programs, the levee improvements, indeed, even today we've learned that the burials of those brave men and women—men, in this case—that have recently been killed in the war in Afghanistan, their families will not receive \$100,000 that's been set aside for them.

Oh, I know we have a vote here. This is the eighth day of the shutdown, and we have, in this House, passed eight bills to appropriate pieces of this government.

These are the 12 appropriation bills. These are the 12 appropriation bills that fund every function of government, whether it's the military, whether it's the farm programs, the day care programs, the health care programs, the Centers for Disease Control. Here they are, more than 1,000 specific items. And in 8 days, our Republican colleagues have put before us eight bills to fund eight of the more than 1,000. At this rate, it will be 2020 before this government fully is functional. How foolish. How stupid. How humiliating for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on reopening this government. The votes

are there. A simple blackboard will tell you the votes are there. Tonight, call us back to session, and tomorrow morning the people of America, the people across this world will see the strongest Nation in the world, the government of that Nation functioning once again.

How do I go back to my district and tell the people at the Dixon National Cemetery that those burials aren't going to take place? How do I go back to my district and tell them—yeah, maybe we ought to see this.

In California, northern California, it's hunting season, opened on Saturday, but the refuges across this great Nation are closed to hunters, the duck hunters, the men and women that want to recreate in those areas. And if you're not a hunter, maybe you're a fisherman, but don't go to a refuge. Don't go to the Bureau of Land Management fishing areas. Don't try to put your boat in the water at the national parks. You can't do it because this government is shut down.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us all vote. Let us reopen this government.

We have several of my colleagues with me tonight. We're going to cover this issue. How much I would prefer to be here with my colleagues from New York and other States to talk about putting Americans back to work. And I guess we are, in a way, putting the Federal employees back to work.

Mr. PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York, thanks for joining us once again.

Mr. TONKO. My pleasure. I appreciate the gentleman from California bringing us together tonight in thoughtful discussion about what is chaos here in the Nation's Capitol. So, Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together with Representatives from New Jersey and from Connecticut and from Pennsylvania, and others who will probably join us that will speak to the unnecessary pain that has trickled into the lives of far too many working families across this country and impacting so many small businesses from coast to coast with the ill effects of a government shutdown—a Republican government shutdown simply because, as you just heard the gentleman from California indicate, we need to vote on a CR, a continuing resolution, a bill that allows for the budget to continue into a date certain as mentioned in that bill, most likely 2 months—8 weeks—as an extender into perhaps mid-December.

Why do we need to do that? So that we can bring stability into the process, allow government to be funded, allow for the doors to be opened, allow for the lights to go on and reopen government. That's the first step in the sequence.

Secondly, another cornerstone bit of legislation coming quickly upon us, giving the green light to America to pay her bills. America's working families understand what that's about.

They know that they play by the rules. They roll up their sleeves. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their beloved country to do the same thing. Our second step in the process.

Then thirdly, buying this 8 weeks of time allows us to immediately name those individuals who will be the representatives for the majority and minority parties in each of the Houses of Congress to sit down and nail down a budget in those ensuing 8 weeks to make certain that stability again is the outcome. That's what we're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker not only to the Tea Party, not only to the Republican Conference, but to the entire House, the United States House of Representatives. Let all of us vote on what is a clean CR, which has been approved by the United States Senate—and, by the way, in negotiations to date, accepts your number, the lowest number in the process. We're not happy with that number, but we're going to cave to your request to allow for government to be refunded, to be reopened, and for us to move forward. That's what it's about.

We're asking for dignity to be expressed for America's working families. We're allowing for certainty to be the outcome for our small business community so that we can grow our economy, allow for the climate that produces both public and private sector job growth that allows us to move forward with a sense of hope. That's what the request is here.

Why don't you let us vote on a clean CR? Are you fearful that it might pass? Are you fearful that you don't get your way? Because you know, in the 45 votes that have been taken on a debt ceiling limit vote since the days of President Ronald Reagan, those 45 measures have been approved 38 times without any bells and whistles—and certainly unprecedented to have attached to the vote some sort of clutter that deals with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Never have we reached to that sort of negotiated outcome where we are repealing the law of the land—in this case, the law of the land that is 3 years old, was approved by a majority in the House of Representatives, was approved by a supermajority in the United States Senate, was tested, because of your concern, before the highest Court of the land, and the Supreme Court gave it thumbs-up in meeting the constitutionality test. What more do we need to do to convince you?

Let me just say this, Representative GARAMENDI, quickly so we can get to our colleagues. I want to share with you some of the results in these few 8 days already—but painful 8 days for far too many.

By the end of this month, food pantries like the one in my district in Co-hoes, New York, may not have the money to stay open. That is the situa-

tion with many of our food pantries. This is a facility that helps feed 215 hungry families in the capital region of New York State.

Projections are that one of the providers of electronics for our fighter jets, our submarines, and our helicopters in Saratoga Springs, New York, in the 20th Congressional District that I represent, have grinded to a halt as inspectors can't complete contracts and new orders cannot come in.

We also have impacting us a forensic meteorology business in Niskayuna, New York—again, in the 20th Congressional District of New York—that works each and every day with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, that helps bring benefits to all of us from the devastation of Mother Nature. These are jobs that are meaningful—meaningful to the quality of life of people across this country, that are meaningful to working families who are now without jobs, people who are not getting paid and showing up to work. These are devastating consequences to the economy.

We implore the leadership of this House, we implore the Speaker to call for a vote on a clean continuing resolution that embraces your number, the lowest number in negotiations that we will settle upon. We will offer our votes for that kind of measure, only give us that chance so that America can have her government funded, we can move forward to advance the debt ceiling limit bill vote that will allow for America to pay her bills, and then finally move to that conference table, where representation from both parties in each of the Houses will nail down a budget in the ensuing 8 weeks.

□ 2015

That will bring stability to the economy and will bring economic and social justice to the people of this great country. Let's move forward with that sense of fairness.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, the gentleman from New York.

I would like now to bring to the microphone our friend from the great State of Connecticut, JOHN LARSON.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this hour, and I appreciate the eloquence of our colleague from New York, both of whom have addressed the most important issue of the day, in fact, the last 8 days, as Mr. GARAMENDI has articulated.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves dealing with the issue "de jure." Each day the goalposts move, each day the American public sits in utter amazement and disgust with its elective representatives. It is astounding to them to see the greatest Nation in the world brought to its knees.

Our forefathers were very prescient—and certainly George Washington, who Daniel Webster, the Senator from Massachusetts in this Chamber—well, actually, it would have been down the hall—got up on the 100th anniversary

of George Washington's birth and talked about the President's admonitions. Amongst his keenest admonitions was about that of "excessive" party spirit.

Now, in Washington's day, there weren't political parties, as we know them. It wasn't Democrat or Republic; it was Federalist or anti-Federalist. He knew very well and was concerned deeply about what factions could do. He warned about the outside influence of party. But what he was most concerned about is what happens within a government if people in that very government are at war with their own existence, are working against the interest of the government and therefore the people.

So we find ourselves this evening as Members of the minority coming to this floor and asking for one simple thing from the majority, and that is a vote. Now, we understand that we have asked for votes on this floor—we have asked for votes to put the country back to work. As the gentleman from California has articulated on many occasions to come here and talk about making things in America and allowing a vote to put us back to work, we have been denied that opportunity. We have been denied the opportunity here to vote on nutrition and funding and making sure that important bills like the agriculture bill, that the very poor amongst us and the very needy are fed. We have been denied an opportunity to vote on immigration, as you heard CHARLIE RANGEL talk about so nobly earlier this evening. We have also, most importantly, been denied a vote here that is fundamental to our democracy.

The most fundamental thing and the most patriotic thing that we do in a society is vote. Yet here, because of the tyranny of the majority, 200-plus Democrats are not allowed a vote. More importantly, the American people are not allowed a vote on the continuing of its government. As the gentleman from New York pointed out, not only is it the continuation and shutdown of government, but on the near horizon defaulting on the full faith and credit of the American people. This is unconscionable.

But Washington was prescient when a few, dangerously are at war with their own government, who seek to bring that government down, who seek to bring the government down through a shutdown; and then by not paying the bills that this body and the other body have racked up, the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. We need to be able to express the will of the people. All we ask of the majority party is for a vote, a simple vote, as the gentleman from New York said, on a continuing resolution unencumbered that does nothing more, and at the levels that they have requested, but put the Nation back to work and then respond quickly to the need to pay our debts without being held hostage.

You are not holding Barack Obama hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are not

holding the Democrats in Congress hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are holding the people of the United States hostage. For the sake of fairness and being responsible, bring the bill to the floor for a vote. Allow the minority the opportunity to vote.

If you don't have the votes, let it be so, and let the world know, and let every American citizen know, where their Members stand on this issue. Stand with your country. Do not let it be shut down. Do not let it default. At least give us a vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. LARSON.

Mr. Speaker, a vote—that is what democracy is all about. We are asking for a simple thing: the opportunity to vote on extending the operations of the American government.

Now I would like to turn to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. I thank my colleague from California and my colleagues from New York and Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, many of us that you will see on the floor tonight, we are not regulars, we are not people that come to the floor often to speak. But I think many of us feel it is important for the American people to understand the nature of this task, this battle, that we face on their behalf.

We hear a lot from Republicans about the President not wanting to negotiate, not wanting to talk. The Democrats don't want to negotiate. They have been pretty good at saying that over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker. But what they are not telling the American people is the nature of the negotiation that they want to have. I think it is important that that be revealed.

What makes me so angry—and the reason I am here tonight—is what we face in the country right now is completely a manufactured crisis. There is no structural economic reason that our country should be facing default come the 17th of this month. There is no reason that 800,000 Federal employees aren't working. There is no reason for this to happen.

This is being manufactured by a party because they are trying to get something that they have not been able to get at the ballot box. We have divided government. The Republicans control the House of Representatives, the Senate is controlled by the Democratic party, we have a Democratic President.

The Republicans had two goals going into this manufactured crisis. One was to destroy the health care bill. Now, this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed the Senate, it was signed by the President, it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had a Presidential election and their candidate said on day one of his new administration the first thing he would do if elected was to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That gentleman lost by 5 million votes.

What they can't accomplish at the ballot box they now were looking for a way to accomplish here. But it couldn't be done through the regular process, Mr. Speaker. It couldn't be done through the regular order.

So now comes this ingenious idea, hatched by the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party, to say: Here is what we will do. We will wait until the end of the fiscal year to come, and we will say we are going to shut the government down unless you repeal ObamaCare.

I was on this floor a couple of days ago and read something on the floor that I saw on the Internet by a young man by the name of Judd Legum. I hope I have said his last name correctly. He put an analogy about what we were actually facing. He said it is sort of like if someone comes up to you and says, I want to burn down your house, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he says, well, I just want to burn down the second floor, and you tell him, no. And he goes, well, what about your garage, can I burn your garage down? And you say, no. And the guy says, well, let's just sit down and talk about what part of your house I can burn down, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he goes, you see, you're not compromising.

This is what we are facing in this so-called "rigged" negotiation. What Republicans are saying is, defund ObamaCare, we will open up the government. We said, no. Then they said, we will delay ObamaCare for a year and we will open up the government, and we said, no. Then they said, well, just get rid of that individual mandate—which effectively kills the health care bill—and we said, no. Then they said, well, will you just sit down and negotiate with us and tell us what part of the Affordable Care Act we can get rid of, and we said, there are 20 million Americans that are counting on this bill, it is the law of the land, the answer is no.

And they look at us and say, the Democrats don't want to negotiate; the President doesn't want to negotiate.

Well, I got news for my friends over there: we are not going to negotiate the rights of 20 million uninsured Americans because they can't get this done at the ballot box.

So now, Mr. Speaker, what is the new strategy? They have shifted off of the health care bill now because the American public, by margins of over 70 percent, have said we don't want you to shut the government down to try to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

So now where have they moved? To the Ryan budget. What is the Ryan budget? It is a budget that keeps us in sequester, it is a budget that does not invest in our infrastructure, it is a budget that does not invest in the education of our children, it is a budget that makes it impossible for this economy to grow, and it is a budget that threatens the social safety net that many of our senior citizens depend on.

They couldn't get it passed in the regular order. They couldn't get it passed in their own House of Representatives for a long time. They were afraid to put the bill on the floor. They certainly couldn't get it passed in the Senate, and they knew the President wouldn't sign it.

So what is the strategy now? This new rigged negotiation that we are being asked to have with our friends is: Give us pieces of the Ryan budget, and in return we will open up the government and we will raise the debt ceiling, but only if you give us what we want in the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, we want to have a budget negotiation with our friends on the Republican side. The House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget. The numbers—there is a great disparity in the numbers. Democrats believe in investing in America. We want to rebuild our roads and bridges and sewer systems. We want to invest in the education of our children. We want to protect our seniors and our veterans. It costs money to do that, Mr. Speaker, so there is a difference.

But we are ready and we are willing to appoint conferees tomorrow to sit down and have a negotiation. I want the American public to understand that we have asked 18 times to appoint conferees to negotiate the differences in the Senate budget and the House budget, and all 18 times the Republicans in the House have said no.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say if there's someone in this House that's not willing to negotiate, it's our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. The American people deserve a budget negotiation where we sit down and settle our differences. We're not going to get everything we want, Mr. Speaker; it's divided government. The Republicans are going to get something in this budget negotiation, the Democrats are going to get something in the budget negotiation. But the country moves forward, we pay our bills, and we live to pay another day.

In closing, let me say to the American people, we will not be part of a rigged negotiation where Democratic priorities and principles aren't allowed to be discussed, only that which the Republicans couldn't get in the ballot box that they're trying to get now by holding a gun to our head. That's not how you do business in the United States of America. That kind of behavior has to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of the American people, I hope Republicans will come to their senses, pass a clean CR, and let's sit down and negotiate a budget agreement for the American people and move this country forward.

I thank you for yielding me this time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DOYLE, thank you so very much. The Republican shutdown has to end. It has to end, and how correct you were about the negotiations just this evening. They put a

proposal on the floor to create some sort of a negotiating committee that did not have all of the issues before them, as you so correctly pointed out, only their set of issues were to be allowed to be discussed by that negotiating committee, none of the issues that we care about on the Democratic side. That's hardly a negotiating opportunity.

I now yield to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for bringing us all together tonight. I couldn't stand with better Americans than I am standing with tonight. I mean that.

Mr. Speaker, the latest supercommittee plan that folks on the other side of the aisle gave us today is really absurd. In fact, as a member of the Budget Committee, this new-found Republican insistence on negotiations, referred to by Mr. DOYLE from Pennsylvania, is mind boggling, since my colleagues have spent the last 6 months avoiding negotiations. And I didn't come here tonight to water the wine, so we're going to say it like it is.

My fellow Americans, this House of Representatives passed its budget over 200 days ago on March 21. Then the Senate passed its budget 2 days later. Now, think about what I just said. What happened to it? Well, the usual protocol is the two sides name conferees, they come together in conference, and they work out a budget. That didn't happen. That's 6 months ago. We've been asking to go to conference so we can resolve our differences, and there are always differences within parties, between parties, you name it. We want to fund the government. We want to get rid of sequestration, like Chairman ROGERS said on July 31, 2013:

I believe the House has made its choice. Sequestration—and its unrealistic, ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Mr. ROGERS is the chairman, a Republican, he said it. He said that; I didn't say that. He said it better than I could ever imagine saying it.

So what happened? Democrats attempted to go to conference 20 times. The Republicans objected every single time. Fact check this: over here in the House, we have almost 200 Members who signed the discharge petition calling for a conference on the budget. We tried four times to bring the resolution to the floor. Leader PELOSI even went so far as to name conferees. Some of them are in this room. Some of us are conferees. She did that on June 27. What's the date today—October 8? June 27. So why, after this stalling, have the Republicans finally found religion and now they want to negotiate?

I'll tell you why: we've just discovered we have a phantom government in the United States. Every Congressman, every House Member, every Senate Member should be concerned that they're elected by the people of this

country, be they Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, it doesn't matter, they've been elected. They stood for election. We respect that, regardless of denomination, because we know that neither party is ever perfect. Come on, we all share in the pluses, we share in the minuses. There's never one party that has all of the answers. We know that. But why?

Well, just this past Saturday, October 5, we had a front page story in The New York Times. It was mind boggling—mind boggling—that article. Here's the title of that article, "The Federal budget crisis months in planning." Well, I don't remember planning this. I don't know if any Republicans were out planning this. Who in God's name are they talking about? And this is what it says in the article in the second paragraph, which refers to a manifesto—a manifesto—put together by non-elected people in this country. Hear me, America, hear me.

They sat down one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret. Wow. And came—little noticed—a blueprint. This is what they said, Mr. Speaker. A blueprint to defunding ObamaCare signed by—oh, you're going to love this, Ed Meese. Boy there's a name that pops up. I can't believe it. Ed Meese. It's not funny, it's serious; a phantom government. Leaders of more than three-dozen conservative groups, and I will put in the RECORD tonight who those groups are, and I got part of their manifesto. Listen to this. This is what they put together. And I'm sure there are only a few Congressmen on the other side who even knew about this. It says this:

Conservatives should not approve a CR unless it defunds ObamaCare. This includes ObamaCare's unworkable exchanges, unsustainable Medicaid expansion, and attack on life and religious liberty.

They said that February 14, 2013. This did not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't just happen. It wasn't an accident; it was planned. That is the lowest thing you could ever read about a government that wasn't even elected. Who the heck are these people to decide what we're going to do?

Now we know why Mr. RYAN did not want to go to conference. Now we know why Mr. BOEHNER did not want to go to conference, because that was not the plan. Read it. Judge for yourself. Judge for yourself.

It also said that these 30 groups, and the names of each group besides Mr. Meese's, are right here. You've got every right-wing group in the universe. They go into this manifesto on Medicaid expansion, permanent appropriations, implementation. They want to run the government. These people actually wanted to run the government.

My friends, the Republicans don't want to negotiate. They want to use this shutdown and the threat of default to invalidate the results of—oh, an election last November. These people weren't elected, we were elected. And I love debating people from the other

side who are elected. That's their God-given right. That's what liberty is all right. Why don't they come in here, this shadow government, this phantom group, why don't they stand there and tell us who they talked to within the Republican Party. Tell us. America has a right to know.

Don't you talk to me, Mr. Speaker, about let's have transparency in government when you have this vagabond group out here funded by—guess. I'll give you three guesses. No, I'll only give you one guess: the Koch brothers. They think they're running this government. The Supreme Court heard another case today—isn't that interesting. This is mild compared to what would happen if they were able to do and spend as much money as they want.

I did not come here to water the wine. You better listen to it, and every member of the staff better listen because they tried every trick in the book, putting your own health care in jeopardy, saying that you get a subsidy from the government when it's just like any company that in some way contributes to your health care. Somebody gets hired by the Federal Government to be a secretary, making \$20,000, \$25,000 a year, the cost of their health care will go up between \$5,200 and \$12,000. How are you going to live on that being a staff member here on the floor or back in your districts. They will stop at nothing, nothing, to bring the government down at any cost. At any cost.

The November election apparently did not occur in their minds. We are dealing with dangerous people. Either they are on hallucinogenic drugs or they just lost their minds. This is what we're dealing with. To bring us to this precipice only a few days away, something's wrong. This is not how we debate things in the United States of America. This is not in any manner, shape, or form. As President Obama said, Democrats are willing to negotiate, but not with a gun to our heads. Never. I'm from Paterson, New Jersey; you never put a gun to my head, I've got news for you.

Let's end this irresponsible shutdown and default threat, and let's get back to work. That's what we were sent here for.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI for your patience.

Signed:

Edwin Meese III, Former Attorney General, President Ronald Reagan; Chris Chocola, President, Club for Growth; Jenny Beth Martin, Co-Founder, Tea Party Patriots; Penny Nance, President, Concerned Women for America; The Honorable J. Kenneth Blackwell, President, Constitutional Congress, Inc.; William Wilson, President, Americans for Limited Government; Duane Parde, President, National Taxpayers Union; Susan Carleson, President, American Civil Rights Union; Andrea Lafferty, President, Traditional Values Coalition; Alfred S. Regnery, President, The Paul Revere Project; Lewis Uhler, President, National Tax Limitation Committee; Brent Bozell, President, ForAmerica; Matt Kibbe, President, FreedomWorks; Marjorie Dannenfelser,

President, Susan B. Anthony List; David Williams, President, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

The Honorable David McIntosh, Former U.S. Representative, Indiana; David Bozell, Executive Director, ForAmerica; Colin Hanna, President, Let Freedom Ring; Stuart Epperson, President, Council for National Policy; Heather Higgins, President, Independent Women's Forum; Cindy Chafian, President, The Mommy Lobby; Gary Bauer, President, American Values; Mike Needham, CEO, Heritage Action for America; David Bossie, President, Citizens United; Mathew D. Staver, Chairman, Liberty Counsel Action; James Martin, Chairman, 60 Plus Association; Erick Erickson, Editor, RedState.com; T. Kenneth Cribb, Former Domestic Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Becky Norton Dunlop, Former White House Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Grace-Marie Turner, President, The Galen Institute.

Myron Ebell, President, Freedom Action; Craig Shirley, Reagan Campaign Biographer; Rev. Lou Sheldon, Chairman, Traditional Values Coalition; Richard Rahn, President, Inst. for Global Economic Growth; Lee Beaman, Businessman, Nashville, TN; Bob Reccord, Executive Director, Council for National Policy; Angelo M. Codevilla, Professor, Emeritus, Boston University; Tom Donelson, Chairman, America's PAC; Brian Baker, President, Ending Spending; Kay R. Daly, President, Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Don Devine, Senior Scholar, The Fund for American Studies; Gary Aldrich, President, Patrick Henry Center for Individual Liberty; Ralph Benko, President, Center for Civic Virtue; Andresen Blom, Senior Strategist, Center for Civic Virtue; Joe Gregory, CEO, Gregory Management Co.; Rebecca Hagelin.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PASCRELL, thank you very much. Whether you're from New Jersey or wherever, I'm not about to threaten you. But I would like to welcome to this microphone our friend from the State of Massachusetts, who is probably just as tough as the gentleman from New Jersey, and that's Mr. CAPUANO.

Mr. CAPUANO. For the first time in my life, I have no intention of being as passionate as the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I was going to walk people through this because to me, good people can disagree. Reasonable people can disagree. Even people I disagree with vehemently, that's what politics, that's what government, that's what life is all about. But you're not entitled to forget history or to ignore facts. And for me, there have been lots of misrepresentations in the last week or two because there's a lot of passion, a lot of emotion. But I need to back up a little bit, educational value.

When I'm told that the Democrats have to come to the table and compromise, my answer is: We have, repeatedly. And we will do it again, if necessary.

And people say, Well, no, you haven't. The President is saying no, you won't negotiate.

Well, no, we won't negotiate on this issue at this point in time because we have already gone far enough, and here's why. 2011, the last supercommittee, where did it come from? It

came from the budget impasse. We couldn't come to an agreement. We couldn't make a deal. We had taken our corners. What did we do? We created a supercommittee and it was said if the supercommittee doesn't work, do something like Simpson-Bowles or whatever they would come up with, then we would institute a sequester. And a sequester, for all intents and purposes, is an across-the-board cut of roughly 8 percent per year every year for 10 years in a row. That's what it is. At the end of that 10th year if you don't do anything, you would be spending approximately 48 cents of every dollar you were spending when you started.

Now I understand that some people want a government that does that and the programs that would pay for. I don't agree with that, but that's a reasonable position to take. "I don't want senior housing. I don't want childhood nutrition." I don't agree with it, but it's a reasonable position to take, and we should argue about that and we should debate about that, and the American people should have an opportunity to elect people that agree or disagree with them on those types of issues.

□ 2045

We couldn't come to an agreement, so the sequester took place; and the sequester set out numbers each year for 10 years. This is as much as you can spend unless you come up with some sort of agreement to get around it. We haven't been able to do it. We've had the first year of sequester and are about to enter the second year of sequester.

Pursuant to the law that was passed in 2011, a law, by the way, I voted against—I don't like the concept of sequester—but the majority ruled and it passed. Pursuant to that law in this coming fiscal year, we would have been allowed to spend a little over a trillion dollars. Remember, that number is based on an 8 percent cut from the prior year. So this already represents a cut, and, by the way, it represents a massive compromise between Democrats and Republicans to pass that sequester. So it was a Democratic compromise with Republicans to cut the budget for 10 years in a row. That's where we start.

This year, Republicans passed a budget of \$967 billion, \$100 billion below what the sequester allows. They're entitled to do that. Again, I can disagree, but I respect their viewpoint. If you really think the government can operate and provide the services the American people want on that number, fine. I will disagree, we will vote, pass it, and we'll move on. Of course, the Senate didn't agree with that number. The Senate passed another number. Here we are today.

What's happened? The last week or so, you have heard pretty much every Democrat, pretty much every Democrat say we want to vote on the clean

CR, the continuing resolution, that the Senate passed. The average American has no clue what we're talking about. Here's what they passed. They passed a budget that would allow the spending of \$986 billion. To me, if you're going to talk about a compromise—sequester allows a little over a trillion. Republicans want \$967 billion. The compromise is here, a little over a trillion dollars. That would be a compromise on a compromise. But, no, the Senate says not \$986 billion. That's a compromise on a compromise on a compromise. What did the Republican House leaders say? No. \$967 billion, our number. By the way, no health care.

For those of you who thought Democrats haven't been compromising, I'm here to tell you, in my opinion, not only have we compromised; I think we have compromised too much from my philosophical viewpoint. I know that I'm the minority view in this House. So be it. I think the sequester was too much. I certainly think \$967 billion is too much, and I think \$986 billion is too much. You know why? My constituents want senior housing, they want children fed, they want young people educated, and on and on and on. They want veterans benefits. They want all the things that we do. Of course no one wants to pay for that. I get that. I don't either. I pay taxes. I wish everything was free. I'm going out to dinner in a little while, hopefully to watch the Red Sox win the series, and I don't want to pay for dinner, but I guess I'll have to.

Reasonable differences of opinion, no matter how dramatic they may be, a \$100 billion difference, are realistic, they're honest, and the American people have a right to take sides. They don't have a right to say Democrats haven't compromised. This was a compromise. This would have been a compromise. This is a compromise. This is not. This is uncompromising. That's why I wanted to come up here.

By the way, there's one little point of historic note. I've been in the House 14½ years. This is my first Special Order. And, as I said, I probably missed the first inning of the Red Sox game, which in my district is close to a cardinal sin. But this is more important.

I'm not trying to convince anyone that my side is right or the other side is wrong. People have their opinions. I know that. You're probably not going to change them. I am here to say that there is a difference between compromise and capitulation. We have compromised one, two, three times to get where we are. To get to this number would be the fourth. To get rid of health care would be fifth; and not just fifth, it would be the ending. As far as I'm concerned, this Democrat will not compromise further on these issues. It's time for the other side to compromise off of what they think the world should be.

Thank you for yielding, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CAPUANO, thank you so very much. I think it's a

tragedy you've waited 14½ years to be so eloquent in explaining how we got to where we are and the fact that the Democrats have consistently cooperated, compromised, and watched those critical programs that we care so very much about being consistently hacked away at and reduced and, in many cases, all but eliminated.

Now, we are in the eighth day of the shutdown of the United States Government that used to be thought of as the most powerful democracy in the world. At the moment, it's a democracy that's not working. As pointed out by my colleagues, there was an election last November in which these issues were all fundamental in that debate, and the American people voted to fully enforce the Affordable Care Act and to provide the services, whether they're education, transportation, health care, and the rest. Here we are, the minority party in this House and actually a minority of that minority party, driving an agenda that is anathema to those things that I believe we need to do and completely contrary to last November's election.

I would like now to call upon Mr. RYAN of Ohio, a gentleman who often joins us on these evening discussions. We'd like to talk about jobs, and we'd like to talk about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. We know that can only be done when the United States Government is operating.

I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate my colleagues' words here tonight. There's not a whole lot left to cover, whether it was the gentleman from Pittsburgh or the gentleman from Paterson or the gentleman from East Hartford or the gentleman from Somerville in the Boston area, and also the gentleman from upstate New York. We've seen them cover many of the issues here. They've been broken down. I would just like to maybe touch on a point or two.

A lot of Members have come to this floor. On all the TV shows they talk a lot about, We've got to pay our bills, we've got to pay our bills. I think everybody here agrees that we've got to pay our bills. It's important for us to remember the bills that were racked up that we have to go out and pay, those appropriation bills, off-budget many times, were to fund two wars. They went right on Uncle Sam's credit card, both of them. They were not paid for, and many of our colleagues on the other side never came to this floor and said, Oh my, God, how are we going to pay for all of this?

Economist after economist would come back and say this is going to be maybe \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion, \$400 billion, \$500 billion today. If we factor in all the veterans that are coming back, these wars are going to be \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion when it's all said and done. I don't remember being here watching a Member come up on the other side of the aisle, get in the well, and make an argument

that we need to pay for these wars if we are going to go. There was not one.

Today, they want to talk about being responsible. They want to talk about us meeting our obligation. Now they want to say, Oh, yeah, we ran up those credit cards. We swiped them, and we kept swiping them. Then we doubled down. We need a surge. Let's double down. Let's run that credit card one more time. Now today they're saying, We're not going to pay the bills. We're going to default unless you repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then we'll have a conversation.

It's the height of irresponsibility.

Another thing that I find humorous is how over the past few years we've been lectured to by many members of the Tea Party about the Constitution of the United States and how they're the only Americans, this 20 percent, 25 percent, maybe 30 percent, are the only Americans who have read the Constitution, and they're the only ones who adhere to the Constitution. Yet when we talk about the political process that we need to work through, and as Mr. CAPUANO was just saying, you can have a reasonable position. If you don't like it, go to the ballot box and win the election. Yet those very same Members are now thumbing their noses at the political process that the Founding Fathers set up for us to adhere to.

We were here during the Iraq war. I was. I wasn't for it. I campaigned against it in my first campaign. Guess what? I didn't win. I didn't win the argument in 2002 and 2003. I didn't win it in 2004 or 2005. I came to this floor night after night after night. We finally won the House and Senate in 2006. We tried to stop the war. We didn't do it, but we took it to the people and we won the House and the Senate back. In 2007 and 2008, we took it back to the street, won the Presidency. Then, longer than any of us wanted, we finally started winding things down. We went through the political process. We didn't shut the government down. We didn't say we're going to default on the credit card bills that previous Congresses ran up, even though we disagreed with how they spent the money.

What's happening is radical. These are radical acts here in the House Chamber. To say we are here to negotiate, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, is ludicrous. It doesn't make any sense. Have the guts to go to the American people and make the argument. For the life of me, I can't figure out why you wouldn't let the Affordable Care Act get set up. If it's so awful, if it's so bad, set it up, and let it go. President Obama has his fingerprints all over it. The Democrats have their fingerprints all over it. If it fails, you'll win the Senate in 2014; and if it's so bad, you'll win the Presidency in 2016. You can then defund it, dismantle it, and put 30 million or 40 million people out of the health care system, make sure you can get denied health care for having a pre-existing condition and put the insurance companies be-

tween the doctor and the patient. Fine, you won the elections. You're perfectly capable of doing that.

Have the guts to go to the street and make the argument. Seventy percent of Americans are saying do not shut the government down to try to end the Affordable Care Act.

I will say what I think's happening here. I think the House leadership on the Republican side has Stockholm syndrome. I think they have started to identify themselves with their captors. The Tea Party has now convinced the leadership in the House of Representatives that they should have sympathy and empathy towards their captors, so the whole country at this point is being shut down because of this.

Lastly, let me say that the only successful moments in politics that our friends on the other side have had is when they divide the American people. Who's in a union; who's not in a union. Who's in a public sector union versus who's in a private sector union. Who's black; who's white. Who's gay; who's straight. Divide, divide, divide, divide; and here we are in 2013 a divided Nation that is ungovernable at this point because of the power that is held by the Tea Party in the United States House of Representatives.

I just want to say that there is a future waiting to be taken for this country, investments back in the United States into our infrastructure, into our research, into renewable energies, into expanding the grid and making it smarter, and into making sure everyone has access to the latest technologies such as three dimensional printers in schools, robotics, Legos. Get kids excited about learning.

We only have 313 million people in the United States. We're competing against 1.4 billion people in China, and we're sitting on our hands. We're not making the investments we need to be making, and there are colleges and universities and schools that need the investment. Every day that goes by, Mr. GARAMENDI, we see one more, two more, five more, 10 more situations where investments were made collectively by the public to benefit our country.

We need to end this lockout that's happening right now.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2100

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, thank you so much for bringing us just some sense of reality of what is actually happening here.

We're in the eighth day of the lockout. We're in the eighth day of the shutdown of the government of the United States of America. And it appears, from all that we hear from the Republican side, that this may go right up to the debt limit. What a tragedy it would be if we hit that and took down the entire economy.

I think it's time for me to close. I want to thank my colleagues. I would

ask the American people to pay attention.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us vote. Speaker BOEHNER, let us vote on a clean continuing resolution so that we can, once again, start this government. The votes are here. And if you don't believe the votes are here, put us up on the board. Let's see if there are 217 votes to reopen the American Government. We can only find out, Mr. Speaker, if you let us vote.

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

#### THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I am exceptionally privileged to be here on the House floor of the United States Congress this evening to speak on behalf of my constituents and in front of the Nation. It is an honor that few people realize, and it's worthy of mention.

I just want to also thank the fine gentlemen and ladies from the other side that were here this evening. I appreciate your impassioned pleas. That's what this place is all about. I might disagree with many of them, but I appreciate your passion and your willingness to serve.

I just want to talk about a couple of things and, at least from my side, Mr. Speaker, set the record, or at least kind of balance the record—maybe not set it straight in some people's minds because I'm sure some folks will disagree. But when the one gentleman said that he opposed the Iraq war and folks were here paying for it with a credit card and he was opposed to that, well, I wasn't here. So I can't really atone for the sins of the past, and there's a good chance that I would disagree with many of them, but one of the reasons I wasn't here was because I was in Iraq at that time.

And even though I think it is morally wrong to have spent this Nation into such debt over those conflicts, when you are attacked, you must respond, number one; and, number two, I think it kind of belies the fact that the current administration has nearly doubled that spending in half the time. So with all due respect, I think it's fair just to point that out.

And regarding another gentleman who talked about the interest of the other side to negotiate and agree to a compromise and to compromise, in looking at the numbers, the sequester came from the President of the United States out of another supercommittee that was created, and the President demanded the sequester, demanded the number. So this Congress has given it to him, and this Congress has held that number. It was demanded out of that negotiation. So by saying that they've

compromised, they haven't compromised on anything. That's where we all agreed to be at the end of that negotiation.

Now, there's been a lot of impassioned talk and yelling and wailing, and I don't really think that's helpful to the narrative here. We're all going to have to work together at some point and figure this thing out, and blaming one side or the other side, I just don't know where that really gets us.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the facts. And these aren't my facts; they're not SCOTT PERRY's facts. I've got The Washington Post here, because some people say this is unprecedented, it's never happened before, and only one party does this.

Well, there was a shutdown in 1976. Gerald Ford was the President. The Democrats held both Houses. It was ended by all sides coming together and working towards a continuing resolution.

The next one was in 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats held both Houses. Amazingly, it was resolved by both sides coming together and working on a Medicaid ban.

Then there was the shutdown of 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats were in charge of both Houses. They signed a temporary bill because they came together and worked something out. The 1977 shutdown under Jimmy Carter, Democrats were in charge, and they were doing what they thought they needed to do. They're elected by their people to do the work of this House, but they came together after 8 days and they resolved it.

The next one, 1978. Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats controlled both Houses. Eighteen days—eighteen days—but they resolved it after they got together. The President, the Senate, and the House, they got together.

1979, Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats were in charge of both Houses. Eleven days. What resolved it? They got together and they talked. Nothing happens here, and nothing will happen here, if we're not going to be willing to be civil with one another and get together and talk.

1981, Ronald Reagan was the President. The Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. After 2 days, they resolved it. Again, Reagan came down and signed a bill extending the current spending limit.

And then again, in September of '82, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans held the Senate. Democrats held the House. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. But they resolved it in just 1 day because they got together. Both of them were out that evening having fundraisers, both parties. They let the government shut down, but they got together and moved beyond it.

1982, Tip O'Neill again the Speaker. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. Ronald Reagan was President.

Over the MX missile, they shut it down, but they figured out a way to get past it because they negotiated.

And for 3 days in 1983, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats, with Tip O'Neill Speaker. And they resolved it, again, over about a \$100 million discrepancy.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. Over a Supreme Court ruling, they shut it down, but they resolved it after all sides came together and negotiated.

This is from not a right-wing paper in town here. These are not my facts.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. And they shut it down again, but they opened it back up.

The 13th one happened in 1986 under President Reagan. Republicans controlled the Senate, Bob Dole. Democrats in the House by Tip O'Neill. And they resolved it by getting together—each side gave up some of their demands—and they expanded welfare in return for the appropriations necessary to reopen the government.

Ronald Reagan, in 1987, was the President. Democrats were in control of both Houses. And again, they found a way to get together on the fairness doctrine.

In 1990, George H.W. Bush was the President. Democrats controlled both Houses. They figured it out and signed a continuing resolution and reduced the deficit.

And then the 16th time, Clinton was the President and Gingrich was the Speaker of the House. The Senate was controlled by Republicans and so was the House. But even then, they worked it out. Even then, they worked it out. When both Houses of Congress were against the President, Mr. Speaker, they found a way to work it out.

And then for 21 days in 1995, with Clinton as the President and the House was controlled by Republicans and the Senate was controlled by Republicans, again, what resolved it? They worked it out. They got together, and they worked it out.

So let's go to the debt limit, because we've also heard this is a historic time, it's unprecedented, it's never happened before, Mr. Speaker.

So 1970 is where we found out the practice of attaching nongermane provisions to the debt limit began in earnest. In 1971, Social Security changes; 1972, the spending cap and impoundment of powers on the proposal to increase the debt limit.

And I'm just skipping because there's a pile of them here.

In 1980, Congress repealed an oil import fee. President Carter vetoed the bill. Both Houses of Congress were Democrat and President Carter was a Democrat. But he vetoed it, and they