

school, and I would like for it to be more accessible to people.

But burning the house down, the references are so misplaced because it's the Democratic President that says, Give me everything I want. Do not stand in my way when I legislate and rewrite the laws to suit me. We already saw that happen with the GM and Chrysler bailout. The government became socialists for a while here and decided to take up nationalist interests in things—did so with Wall Street.

With the car dealers, it should have scared most Americans. It should have scared Americans enough that they would never, ever have wanted the government to be in control of their health care, because what we saw is mainly Republican dealers were the ones that lost their dealerships. There was no due process. They violated bankruptcy law right and left. And the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold, but then let it lapse. The Supreme Court hung their heads, let illegal actions, unconstitutional actions, takings without due process all take place. And Republican dealers, many of them were punished, had their dealerships taken away even though they still owed money on them. That should have been enough to scare everybody, but we didn't learn a lesson.

Then we find out that after the Citizens United case that the President got upset, stood up here in this Chamber, misrepresented—I know he didn't do it knowingly, but he was not familiar with the law regarding the Citizens United case and misrepresented the law as borne out by the Supreme Court Justice Alito sitting there shaking his head saying "not true." And the President, I'm sure, is just taking advice that's given to him by those around him, not knowing that those who gave him advice were as ignorant as they are.

But when people keep clamoring, Give us a clean CR, when people hear the term "give us a clean CR," they need to understand that this is people demanding that Congress reject the responsibility it has under the Constitution and help crown a monarchy. Let's make it official. We don't want the Congress to do its job and to appropriate as article I requires. We want Congress just to say, Here's the massive sacks of money, Mr. President; go do what you want. Go find all the Solyndras you want. Go find all the cronies that you can help in a capitalist way so that they can overtake their competitors. Go do what you wish. Maybe you can even find some more dealerships to take away without due process.

We hear friends across the aisle say they love to debate elected officials when the fact is during the 4 years the Democrats had the House as a majority and had the Senate, it was the most partisan, closed Congress in the history of this country. There were more closed rules, bills where no amendments were allowed whatsoever. Even

on ObamaCare, we were not allowed input. There was some discussion, but it was made clear our input was not allowed, so nearly half of the country was not misrepresented when had it come to ObamaCare.

And it's really amazing to hear people say that the ObamaCare law was passed by Congress, by both Houses; the President signed it into law; and then of course they misrepresent—I know they don't do it intentionally—but saying the Supreme Court upheld it. Now, the Supreme Court rewrote it and then upheld what they wrote—or at least five out of the nine did. Then the President has completely rewritten anything he doesn't like, given waivers, exemptions. So it's not the law that got passed.

And it's amazing to hear people say, gee, once a law is passed and the President has signed it, you can't change it. It's the law; get over it. And almost in the same breath come back and say, now the debt ceiling—parenthetically, which was passed by both Houses, signed by President Obama and is upheld by the Supreme Court—we want to change that immediately, do that now; don't use it as a gun to our head. What do you mean a gun to your head? It's the law. You just told us if it's passed by Congress, signed by the President—the President himself said it bears my signature, we're not changing it. So why would that be a gun to the head when I thought the President said we weren't supposed to talk metaphorically like that. We weren't supposed to use violent metaphors. Why are we talking like that? Why are we calling people arsonists when we're just trying to follow the Constitution? But again, that's consistent with Homeland Security saying that those who believe in the Constitution are extremists, and they must be watched at all cost.

I think my friends are right when they say go to the American people. The trouble is the mainstream media has not done that. They have actually stood in the way of the truth getting to the American people. They're not asking questions as my friend had asked Andrea Mitchell today, Why are you not asking why the President is not under ObamaCare? She says, well, why aren't you under it? Well, we are on it.

There was an issue about subsidies. I'm not going to take them, not when other Americans don't get them the way they used to. But, gee, let's be honest about things. Well, The Wall Street Journal says that Maryland has 326 enrollees in their health exchange—got an article here talking about there. "ObamaCare's Winners and Losers in Bay Area," an article from Mercury News that talks about:

Cindy Vinson and Tom Waschura are big believers in the Affordable Care Act. They vote independent and are proud to say they helped elect and re-elect President Barack Obama. Yet, like many other Bay residents who pay for their own medical insurance, they were floored last week when they opened their bills: their policies were being

replaced with pricier plans that conform to all the requirements of the new health care law.

Vinson, of San Jose, will pay \$1,800 more a year for an individual policy, while Waschura, of Portola Valley, will cough up almost \$10,000 more for insurance for his family of four.

"Welcome to the club", said Robert Laszewski, a prominent health care consultant and president of Health Policy and Strategy Associates in Virginia.

For years, the Nation has been embroiled in the political rhetoric of "ObamaCare," but this past week the reality of the new law sank in as millions of Americans had their first good look at how the 3½-year-old legislation will affect their pocketbooks.

It's a disaster. So when my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, let's just let it fully take effect, we've already seen what happens, this President and HARRY REID are not going to let the full thing take effect.

We've seen the way the IRS, with instructions from somebody around the White House—if not in it, we're still trying to get to the bottom of it—was instructed to go after conservative groups. And they did. The IRS was weaponized.

We've seen what's happened with other groups. They're paying a price. And you want these people to control your health care? You want them to decide whether you get a knee replacement or a hip replacement?

"Beyond the glitches: Will young and healthy Americans pick up ObamaCare?" is an article, October 7, that talks about one of the most heated arguments among health care policy writers has revolved around the issue of rate shock, which is a term for the premium increases many Americans—especially younger, healthier ones—will experience once the law kicks in. It's just going to get worse.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they want a vote. They've been getting votes. They will continue to get votes. We just ask them to join us in demanding that HARRY REID bring these bills to the floor for a vote. And let's get them passed so these things will be taken care of.

And in answer to his question: Why would we do that? The answer is: To help America. It's that simple. Mr. REID needs to bring these bills to the floor in the Senate; and if you're not going to bring the bills to the floor, for heavens sakes appoint negotiators so we can get America moving before any more punitive shutdowns by this administration occur just to punish the American people because of the temper tantrum being thrown by those who want their way or nobody gets to play.

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

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 3, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3233. To extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported that on October 7, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3095. To ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9398-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3252. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Styrene, Copolymers with Acrylic Acid and/or Methacrylic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0381; FRL-9396-9] received September 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3253. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tuba City, AZ [Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0147; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3254. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TX, and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TSTC-Waco Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0136; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3255. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, Rickenbacker International Airport, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0270; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3256. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Grand Forks AFB, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0261; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3257. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Spata, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0165; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3258. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; San Marcos, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0273; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-9] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3259. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bedford, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0359; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-7] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3260. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Factoryville, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0345; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 373. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-243). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3273. A bill to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; to the Committees on Rules and Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

GALLEGUO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to make appropriations available to continue the payment of a death gratuity and certain other death-related compensation in the event of the death of members of the Armed Forces and certain other persons who pass away during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that the allowances of members of the Armed Forces covered by such Act include military tuition assistance programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3276. A bill to prohibit the operation of an exercise facility for Members of the House of Representatives during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BARR):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Environmental Protection Agency should hold