

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

overrode the veto by wide majorities, but they worked it out. They worked it out.

1985, 1990, 1993, 1996, 1997, 2010, 2011, 2012. The debt limit is the appropriate place in this divided government to find some fiscal sanity, and that's what's happening here right now in this town.

Now, of course, like I said, I don't want to get into the blame game here. I'm really going to try to stay out of it. Whether we agree with ObamaCare or not is not the issue. It might be a great law. And there are other laws that some people think are great laws or are not great laws. The question really should be and really is: Can we afford it? Can we afford it?

We are running a trillion-dollar deficit every single year. We take in \$1 trillion less than we spend. So if you are a household that brings in \$100,000, you are spending \$25,000 more every single year as a ratio more than you bring in. I ask the American people, Mr. Speaker, how long can this be sustained?

So even if we agree that it's a good law—and many of us don't. That's fair. But even if we agree that it's a good law, how are we going to pay for it? That's the question.

Now Congress' job in this House and this Senate is to craft legislation and to determine our spending priorities and our spending levels. That's our job. The other gentleman said, We haven't read the Constitution or—it's in the Constitution. It's very simple. That is our job.

With all due respect to the President, I've got to tell you, it does not help. Again, we are going to have to work together. It's for the sake of our Nation. It does not help to be lectured to about what we must do here, according to the President, when it's exactly what he would not do and did not do when he served in this building. It does not help.

Now, our constituents elected us. The citizens of our districts elected us. They elected us to come here and do something, to do something. And we keep on hearing from the other side, Just pass a clean CR. Just pass it and everything will be fine.

I came here to do something. We are spending \$1 trillion more than we bring in every single year. We are \$17 trillion in debt. The bill that's being implemented, the law that's being implemented right now is going to cost us \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. We don't know. And the President, I understand—I'm not sure of the number—is going to ask in a week to raise the debt ceiling another \$900 billion. So that is \$100 billion short of \$1 trillion, which are still all numbers that are staggering to my mind.

So if we add that up, okay, so at the minimum, we're at \$20 trillion, and that doesn't include Social Security and all the other obligations that we have. And the clean CR that we're being beseeched to just vote on so ev-

everything will be fine says, That's okay, just keep going. Don't change a thing. Everything's fine. Nothing to see here.

Everything's not fine. The constituents that elected me had three concerns when I ran, and I hear about them every single day at the grocery store, at the gas station, on my telephones, in email, and in the letters they send to me. Do something about this debt. Do something about this deficit. Do something about this spending. Do something about ObamaCare. That's what they send to me. That's what they tell me.

Maybe the world doesn't understand where this is going to end, but a lot of us do. When our dollar isn't worth anything, when we have to take a wheelbarrow of dollars to the grocery store to buy just what we need to survive, that's where it will end. We don't have to go there. We are choosing to go there. And it doesn't have to be that way.

Another one of the gentlemen said, Well, we need to move on so we can make investments, investments in education, investments in infrastructure. And he's right. The world is leaving us behind. He's right. But we only have so much money. So we have to prioritize, Mr. Speaker. We must prioritize. And that's what this is about. We said, We've only got so much; and if you want to spend a bunch more on education and on infrastructure so we can compete, then you are not going to have as much money to spend on some other things.

□ 2115

But nobody wants to make that distinction. Nobody wants to choose in this place.

Some of us, reluctantly, because it's unpleasant, but reluctantly we know it is your duty and so we are forced to choose, and we are ready to choose. I say it's doing nothing because passing a clean CR will do nothing to fix our \$17 trillion debt and our \$1 trillion annual deficits. It will do nothing.

So I will go home to my constituents, to the people that elected me, and they'll say, What did you get accomplished? And I will say nothing?

I won't say nothing. No, I will say I tried. I might fail. I might fail, but I'm not going down on my knees, Mr. Speaker. I'm going down, if I go down, I'll go down fighting, because I can't do nothing.

I don't want to see a government shutdown. Nobody in this place wants to see it. It's not good for this side, it's not good for that side, it's not good for the American people. It is not good. We acknowledge that.

But why should anyone believe the concerns about debt and deficit will be discussed when they haven't been discussed in the 5 years?

And to be clear and to be honest, they haven't been discussed really ever. Republicans, Democrats, nobody wants to touch it.

I've got a mother on Social Security, Medicare. I don't want to see her out

on the street. I will take care of my mother. That's what we do in our family. We will not let that happen.

But some people don't have that option. I don't want to see it go bankrupt. But right now, Social Security Disability, that portion of Social Security, the last report I saw, will be bankrupt in a year and a half. In a year and a half.

Social Security, 10, 15 years behind it. Medicare, Medicaid, bankrupting our Nation. And we're doing nothing. We're doing nothing.

We can't do nothing. And so we must discuss it. We must get to the issue.

So we can't agree to this thing where the other side says, just pass it. Let us spend as much as we want to, and we promise you that we'll come to the negotiation table and talk to you about the things that are important to you.

With all due respect, they haven't been important enough in the last 5 years or the last 20 years; and so we have no reason to believe, I have no reason to believe that they will.

And those who say that one side is doing this for partisan reasons, for political gain, I ask, what political gain?

What is the upside?

What is the upside for me, any of us?

There is none. The Representatives in this body who disagree with passing a clean CR are putting themselves at peril for love of country and love of the future.

I've got two little girls, two little girls that I'm desperate to have the same opportunities that I had. When I grew up, our house didn't have electricity. We didn't have running water. My parents were often unemployed. Me and my brother ate some strange things just to eat because we didn't know any better. We did okay. And we made a life for ourselves, but we had an opportunity in America.

But that opportunity is going to slip away from us because of the way we are handling our fiscal house.

Look at what will happen if we continue without adjusting course. I would argue that the first people that would lose their jobs under this situation are government workers.

When we can no longer borrow from the Chinese, when we can no longer borrow from ourselves, Social Security, the Social Security trust fund, part of that \$900 billion that they're going to ask us to raise the debt ceiling so we continue to borrow is coming out of the Social Security trust fund. Who agrees with that?

I don't know one American that says that's okay. And somehow this is the only place in the world where it would be okay.

But government employees, just like in Greece, when they ran out of money, when they ran out finally, the first ones to go—not for a week, not for a couple of days, gone. The job is gone. You are no longer working. You have no job. There's nothing to come back to.

We don't have to do it. We don't have to. We can make a choice now. We're

saying turn the ship around on a dime. We're saying turn the wheel a little bit, just a little bit, and let's start heading to the course of correction.

But voting for a clean CR says just keep going, just keep going. Don't worry about the torpedos, don't worry about the iceberg, just keep going.

So just like in Cyprus, we'll come home to find out the banks under Federal control and Federal order will have removed the money from our savings account. They'll just do it. That's what they did in that country because they ended up where we're going.

Why would we do it?

Now, those who say they want a clean CR, they are patriots. I know that. They are hearing from their constituents. I've had constituents come in, crying, literally crying in my office, and we talked about the situation.

Those folks that want a vote on a clean CR, they are patriots too. They want to fix it; they just want to do it now.

But I would say that it is time to do the hard right because for too long the easy wrong has been done. I don't know when they want to do something, but I want to do it now because I don't think we can wait.

Now, we have offered our ideas and we have asked for their ideas. We have offered them. We understand and respect the other side disagrees with our solution.

We had four votes in this House before this government shut down, four bipartisan votes. People on both sides of the aisle voted four times for something.

But the Senate disagrees. The President disagrees. I respect they disagree. I respect that they don't like our solution. It is their prerogative, and maybe it's their duty.

All we're saying is okay, fine. You disagree. I get it.

What's your idea?

What's your solution?

The solution should not be nothing. The solution from them has been no. Now go about your business and come up with what we want.

It just seems like not negotiating—if I had a fight with my wife, if I had a dispute with my daughter, I never want to go to bed angry at my family, and I never want my family to go to bed angry with me. Before the day's done, we're going to sit down at the table, and we're going to talk about it.

We might go to bed a little sore with each other, but we love each other and we love this country, and so it's imperative that we stay with each other to work through it.

We understand and respect the other side. We understand that they don't want to do anything with ObamaCare, but ObamaCare adds \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to our national debt. So if you don't want to do anything about that, fine. What do you want to do?

That's all I'm asking. That's all we're asking. What do you want to do?

Some say, well, you need to raise taxes. ObamaCare raised taxes; I think

it was the largest tax increase in history.

Okay. So we did that. And that wasn't enough, so just last December, when I wasn't here, another \$650 billion in taxes on an economy that's struggling to get through, 1 to 2 percent growth.

We're choosing this, and I don't think we have to.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we're taking in more tax revenue right now, right now, than ever before in history?

There's more money coming in now than ever before, and we're \$1 trillion apart every year. I mean, how much more can we take?

Should we just take it all?

I mean, that's another form of government. It's been done. It doesn't work out real well.

Well, some will say, well, cut the military. Well, this place cut the military about \$1.2 trillion over the last year and a half. And for me, the Constitution says provide, it uses that word, provide for the common defense, Mr. Speaker.

The line below it is promote the general welfare. Words mean things. We have a duty to provide for it.

Certainly, there are inefficiencies. I've been in the military. I've served, and I know they're there. And it's right to take a look. Everything needs to be on the table.

But how much more, and how much do we enfeeble ourselves and disable our ability to do our constitutional requirement, which is to protect the citizenry?

It is our requirement.

Now, we passed a bunch of bills in the House here; and, to tell the you truth, I kind of like it. We're moving towards the CR one piece at a time, so I don't have to vote for things that I don't think we should spend money on for the sake of the things that we must spend money on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not optimal, but it's a way to get there. But, like, for cancer research for kids, we passed that out of the House, and the leader of the Senate says, when asked, well, why won't you pass it? He says, well, why would we want to do that?

My goodness, why wouldn't we want to do that?

That's where we have consensus. We have some consensus.

And another gentleman questioned why Congress has the right to pick and choose what gets funded. Isn't it astounding that someone in the Senate doesn't understand that not only is it the right of Congress to do that, but it's our duty. That's what we're here to do. That's what we're supposed to do.

We have offered numerous ideas. The Senate says no. They don't say no—but. They just say no.

Refusing to negotiate is, to my mind, irresponsible. I mean, I don't know if they're here for themselves or the greater good of Nation when I hear reports—I don't know if they're true—but

they're reported in the newspapers that the park rangers are told make it as difficult as possible.

And when I see the World War II Memorial, when I went out on the Mall this morning, the World War II Memorial barricaded up. It costs more money to close it than it does to leave it open.

I saw a cone out on one the streets with barricades all around the cone in the middle of the street. I mean, why are we renting barricades?

And on the Mall adjacent to the street that's closed because it's a Federal park area, there's an immigration rally that's being supported by the Park Police.

What's happening, Mr. Speaker?

The Grand Canyon, closed. I guess you can't walk up to the rim and look over. The State offered to pay the bill, and the Federal Government said, no, we don't want your money. We want to close it.

Is that reasonable?

I don't know. It's not reasonable to me.

It was The Washington Post that reported employees were to make it as inconvenient as possible.

Now, some are characterized around here as being extreme, an extreme faction. The four bills that we passed to avert the shutdown were passed by this side and that side together, four bipartisan bills.

And they say the House is being held hostage by a few Members. I don't know. Bipartisan votes on both sides seems less than extreme to me.

And I've got to ask, since when are Americans who want to see the government act within the constitutional bounds, that is, the House and the Senate, the Congress figuring out our spending level and our spending priority, when is that extreme?

Why is that extreme?

That's our job. That's the division of powers. That's the checks and balances. That's what we do. That's why we're here.

How is that extreme?

How is spending trillions of dollars more than you have now viewed as responsible?

How is talking about trying to save some money and be responsible with the taxpayers' money on our future, how is that seen as extreme?

Why is it okay to think that spending that money is okay and acceptable to most Americans?

Who gets away with that kind of behavior in their own households?

Well, you do, but not for very long, I guess.

With that I'd like to yield some time, if I could, to the fine gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania.

You were mentioning some of the things that the prior speakers, the Democrats, were saying. And one of the things that was said was, give us a vote, when, as my friend from Pennsylvania pointed out, there have been plenty of votes.

They also were saying that, talking about budget conferees. We're past the end of the fiscal year. The way it's supposed to work, we're supposed to have a budget very early in the year, and then after that, do the appropriations bills.

Well, the Senate has not been doing budgets in the past. This is the first time in years. They haven't done what the law required. They seem to ignore the law anytime they wish.

They have not been passing any appropriations bills. And that's a political game that allows Majority Leader HARRY REID to avoid following the law so that any potential vulnerable Democratic Senators will not have to take tough votes like people do in the House constantly, because we've appropriations bills and we continue to do that.

And so we know, since we passed the military pay bill that required that the military get paid, we treat military pay somewhat like we do Social Security pay, so that if the government were shut down, the military still gets paid. People in harm's way don't have to worry about family members getting their check.

So since my friend across the aisle was so upset about not having a vote, and I realize we get busy here and some people forget the things we've been voting on the last 10 days.

So I'd just like to remind my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that actually, we voted, after we passed a bill to pay our military; and as my friend, Mr. PERRY knows, the Democrats voted for it. The Senate voted for it. The President signed it.

And in the bill, as we spelled out, civilians were supposed to continue employment that were assisting the military. Contractors were supposed to continue working that were supporting the military; and yet this administration had chosen to try to make as many people suffer as possible, even though the law didn't require it.

So the Secretary of Defense sat on his hands for about a week, had civilian personnel not working that could have been working all this time; decides, after a week, to follow the advice, he says, of his people that had been looking at the bill.

And we made clear from the very beginning, before the shutdown even started, you don't have to send all these people home, but he did it anyway.

□ 2130

It was consistent with what has been mentioned that one of the park rangers said, though it was disgusting to the ranger, We were told make things as difficult for people as we can.

And people keep saying we were demanding the total repeal of ObamaCare. Well, we know that would be best for America because a lot of people are already suffering. We've already seen ObamaCare is not being followed as law because the President has had hundreds of exemptions that he

has waved his hand, waved his magic wand and said, You don't have to follow this law; you don't have to follow this law. You don't have to follow what's here in this provision; you don't have to follow what's in this provision. And by the way, the business mandate in the law makes no exceptions. Business folks, my party still wants to get your contributions, so I will wave my wand and you don't follow the law.

So when my friends across the aisle say, Just let ObamaCare go, I would say the same thing. You let ObamaCare go, if the President will, if HARRY REID will. If you just let it be enforced exactly the way it is, it won't last a month.

But he has had to do so many waivers, and it will continue. So it's not going into law. In fact, the Supreme Court had to rewrite it just to uphold it. Because they already said that the basis for the law that was given, the interstate commerce clause, was not a basis to take over health care in America. So they struck it down under the law as written; and the law, as written, said there was a penalty.

Well, the Supreme Court said at page 15 that it's a penalty, and therefore the anti-injunction act does not apply. Therefore, we do have jurisdiction, and so now that we have jurisdiction, we'll go ahead and decide it's not constitutional the way it's written as a penalty, but we will rewrite it, the five of us in the majority, and call it a tax. And then we'll uphold it as a tax, even though clearly that's not the way it was written.

It's not what the President promised the American people. So much for the Democrats wanting ObamaCare to be followed as it was written. We're way beyond that with all the waivers and exemptions.

But then we had a vote that said, Okay, let's just suspend it for a year because everybody knows ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Clearly. That's why the President had to give business a 1-year exemption, where we just won't follow the law as it's applied to business.

But then, after the Senate refused to even take that up, we did the most reasonable thing that some said they could imagine and that is, Okay, you just waved off the mandatory requirements for business. So if you're going to magically wave off part of the law that's mandatory, then let's agree to do that for everyone, like the person that's making \$15,000, or 133 percent of the poverty level. A year or so ago, we were told that was \$14,000 something. Now it's \$15,000. But even with subsidies, you're probably going to end up paying a few thousand dollar. Somebody making \$15,000 is going to have a few thousands over their subsidies? And if you don't do that, you're going to pay the \$95, or 1 percent of your income, as an extra tax?

People do not have that extra money. People have been sent from full time to part time. When the union members

figured out what the union leaders had done to them, causing many of them to lose full time and going to part-time employment, many of them losing their great health insurance and now they'll have to go under the ObamaCare exchanges, like Members of Congress, they got upset. All of a sudden, the leaders of the unions said, Gee, look at all the unintended consequences.

We knew there were intended consequences. We talked about them at the time.

So that was something that was passed. Just waive the individual mandate for a year. That was not taken up by the Senate. So then we passed what, to me, seemed like a capitulation. We appointed negotiators and said, Okay, you don't like any of those proposals, Mr. Majority Leader HARRY REID, then this is what adults do: we appoint negotiators, and we can probably have a deal done by morning before anybody realizes there's even been a shutdown at midnight.

But Majority Leader REID, following the lead of our President, made clear that they were going to follow the conventional wisdom of the last few years that if there's a shutdown, the mainstream media will clearly blame Republicans, and maybe that will help us politically. So he even refused to negotiate.

So once we saw that HARRY REID had completely refused to even negotiate, pretty reasonable folks that were appointed by Speaker BOEHNER, the majority leader says, We're not going to do that.

It's possible they could have slept through it. Maybe I was given a speech and my Democratic friends dozed off and didn't know we had all these votes. So if they happened to be sleeping while we had these votes, I would like to remind people that then we had a bill that we voted on to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. We know the District of Columbia has a lot of money of its own that comes in.

Frankly, I was shocked that our friends across the aisle—most of them—voted against allowing the District of Columbia to just move forward with its own money so that it could run the operations of the city. Apparently, they wanted to inflict as much harm as possible so that people would continue to blame the Republicans.

We know the mainstream media has long since quit being objective. Twenty-one stories from the mainstream media at first all unanimously blamed Republicans failing to report that HARRY REID would not even appoint negotiators to work something out quickly.

And then we passed the Open Our National Parks and Museums Act. It would have made sure that all of these places that have been shut down by this administration in the most hurtful, harmful, punitive way possible, trying to get everybody in America

they can to hurt some way so that they can blame Republicans, when it's simply the decision of the President.

We answered by saying, Okay, Democrats across the aisle, you want a vote? Let's vote. There's no need to do this, and the response across the aisle was to have most of the Democrats vote to leave them shut. They weren't going to vote with us to fund our national parks.

And then we had a vote on Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, H.J. Res. 73, to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for lifesaving medical innovation and cancer research. Most, except for about 20 or so Democrats, all voted not to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Our friends across the aisle say, Give us a vote. They got a vote. You want to fund the NIH, then vote to do it. We'll send it down. But even though we passed it and sent it down the Hall, HARRY REID was not going to do it because, as my friend pointed out, when he was asked if you could save one child with cancer, why wouldn't you do that, he said, Why would we do that? And then he chastised the reporter for asking a question which in his mind he thought was a silly question. I thought it was an excellent question.

And then many of us believed there was enough latitude to pay some of our Reservists on Active Duty. But the Defense Department took a narrow interpretation so they could punish more people and blame the Republicans.

So to counter that, we passed a Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act on October 3 that ensured during the shutdown that it would not affect the pay for our National Guard and Reserves. Again, 160 Democrats voted against that. They asked for a vote, we give them a vote. Most of them voted against it. Then our friend, HARRY REID, down the hall said, No way, we're not funding them.

Again, maybe our friends were asleep. Sometimes when I talk, I put people to sleep. It happens. I'm a very restless speaker.

We passed the National Emergency Disaster Recovery Act. That provided immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that, and HARRY REID refuses to bring it up.

We actually brought up a bill to pay our veterans and make sure our wounded warriors were taken care of. The way the rules of the House have been—and are—you can bypass the committee of jurisdiction and go straight to the floor without the committee bringing the bill to the floor, without it being voted out of committee, under what is called a suspension. But to bypass the committee of jurisdiction, it requires a two-thirds vote in the House.

I, like Speaker BOEHNER, thought that surely you could bring the veterans bill to the floor under a suspension because surely they would vote to fund our wounded warriors. Most of us were totally shocked that the vast ma-

jority of Democrats voted against funding our veterans, our wounded warriors.

So we had to go back, have the committee of jurisdiction pass it, bring it to the floor under a rule so a simple majority would pass it. And that's what we did with H.J. Res. 72; and when 157 of our friends across the aisle who wanted a vote, they got a vote. And they voted against funding our wounded warriors.

We also took up the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act that provided immediate funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for women, infants, and children. It serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children and provides vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Then 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that bill, but it passed the House nonetheless. We sent it down to HARRY REID. They have been wanting a vote. We gave them a vote.

On October 5, we voted for the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. It provided for compensation for Federal employees furloughed due to the Senate Democrats' government shutdown. It's similar to the bipartisan legislation enacted during previous shutdowns. We did pass that, but HARRY REID thus far has refused to take that up.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTING TO END THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania, bringing this whole issue forward.

There are a number of more votes that we did take. We took up the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, providing official education funding to support Head Start programs across the country, and 168 of the Democrats across the aisle voted against that. HARRY REID is refusing to take that up.

My friends across the aisle wanted a vote. So we voted for the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act. It seemed like if HARRY REID would not appoint negotiators before the shutdown really had a chance to take hold, I wasn't sure this was really necessary, but there's a Chinese proverb having to do with allowing your opponent a graceful way out.

□ 2145

So this bill was proposed as a graceful way out so that HARRY REID could come back and say, Okay, well, now we will, under this new bill, we'll go ahead and appoint negotiators and act like it was some new bill when the truth is

it's just us trying to have a bicameral discussion. Yet we had 197 Democrats vote against—well, there were 197 that voted against the bill, basically Democrats, saying we don't want to sit down and work this out with negotiators.

I thought about voting against it because it seemed pretty needless since we already voted to appoint negotiators, conferees. HARRY REID wouldn't do that. But I was persuaded, look, this is a way for HARRY REID to get out gracefully, go ahead and appoint negotiators. Now maybe we can get something worked out.

We also passed the Federal Workers Pay Fairness Act, which ensured all Federal employees who are still on the job during the shutdown will be paid on time. Again, we have not seen that the Democrats in the House have any interest in bringing that to the floor to get a vote.

So my friends across the aisle here in the House who kept screaming, Give us a vote, I hope that will be directed toward their friend, HARRY REID, down the hall, Give a vote to the Senate on these bills. I just can't imagine a majority of the Senate not being willing to fund the things that we have passed.

So, let's see, the term that was used in the prior discussion was "burning the house down," "rigging negotiation." Rigging negotiation? We appointed negotiators. It's not rigged.

Now, it is interesting that the President wishes to have the authority—takes the authority even though he doesn't have it—to just rewrite the entire ObamaCare law. Any part that he decides to wave his hand and dismiss, he's done that. But there are consequences for doing that.

We've also seen in this shutdown something that's just not normally been seen in America. We've seen Franklin Roosevelt say, We have nothing to fear but fear itself. But it's a rare thing—an extremely rare thing—to say that the market needs to be afraid and needs to start getting concerned, trying to gin up a panic to drive down the market. And the market, after a week's time of Republicans having negotiators sitting out there for over a week, waiting to sit down and negotiate with Senators, and the Senators thinking they're winning a political battle, so being unwilling to send negotiators to sit down and work out a deal. Today, between the concerns expressed by the President that the market needs to be concerned, basically saying it needs to start dropping so Republicans will get scared and they will give me everything I want.

So it's interesting they talk across the aisle about holding a gun to the head, burning the house down. The thing is, this is not our House. It's not the Democrats' House; it's the people's House. That's why I try to take people through tours at least once a week when we're in session. This is the people's House, and it breaks my heart that it's so hard to get in here nowadays. It wasn't when I was in high