

States, who at least at one point in his career recognized the serious and the longstanding threat to this Nation that our rising debt is.

We have the opportunity to work together now to fix this problem; and if we can't fix it, at least we can take a meaningful step forward. I hope the President will work with us to address what he used to believe was a serious problem, but I believe it starts with one thing: sitting down together and talking in order to work it out.

The American citizens—all of us—deserve a President who is willing to lead. The American people deserve a President who is willing to talk. Yes, we live in a day in which there are policy and political differences, but that has always been the case. From the birth of our Nation, it has always been such. We are a Nation in which ideas and principles sometimes conflict, but the American people deserve a President who understands that negotiating is part of the process.

I pray that the President will sit down and talk with us now.

MR. SPEAKER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple message: let your people go.

The American people are very frustrated by what we are doing here. They want us to end this shutdown. In fact, some 70 percent of them do not like the way you or the Republican majority is handling this crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, if you will just let your people go and allow us to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor, we can end this. Despite your claims to the contrary, it is clear to everyone that we have at least 17 votes required from your side of the aisle to pass the continuing resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, why don't you just let your people go?

I have a simple question for you: If you think to the contrary that their votes are not there, then why not put your cards on the table and allow a vote?

The American people cannot afford more rounds of betting their economic futures on politicians' betting on a pair and thinking they have a full house. The American people think it's time to call your bluff. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

We can reopen the World War II Memorial and the VA today. We can ensure that all military families receive death benefits and can travel to Dover Air Force Base to receive their loved ones' remains. We can end what Senators on the other side of the aisle have declared "shameful and embarrassing."

We can end this today, Mr. Speaker, if you let your people go.

Holding back on a vote prevents the opening of lifesaving clinical trials at the NIH. It prevents the opening of na-

tional parks and museums for use by families everywhere. The shutdown is costing taxpayers \$12.5 million each and every hour you refuse to vote, and it is costing the American people already \$2.5 billion.

Don't listen to me. Listen to your own caucus Members: Enough is enough, said one Republican in the House. Let's get on with the business we were sent to do.

Another Republican agreed with him: The politics should be over, he said. It's time to legislate.

Another said: I'd vote for a clean CR because I don't think this strategy is working.

Many more echo these sentiments, Mr. Speaker: let your people go. Instead, you seem to be listening to a small faction in your caucus that says they want to "win at any cost." They say they won't be disrespected and that they need to get something out of this, but they don't know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will see what is clear to everyone around the world who is watching this spectacle: there are no winners. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

It's blackmail to shut down the government because you don't like the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, listen to those blunt assessments from your own caucus who call the followers of this strategy "lemmings with suicide vests."

Traditional allies of the GOP, like the Chamber of Commerce, have said this is "not in the best interest of the U.S. business community."

The Wall Street Journal has called it a kamikaze mission, and in fact, in their editorial headline, they said: Are the Republicans nuts?

Another Republican Senator said: This strategy isn't good for America.

This last comment really says it best, that this is not good for America. Mr. Speaker, let your people go, and bring a clean CR to a vote.

THE DEFINITION OF "FAIR"

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I was elected—and so were a lot of my classmates—in what we termed a very fair election. I think the issue that we all need to be concerned about right now is that it is truly unique in America that everybody is treated fairly. It doesn't matter what the color of your skin is; it doesn't matter how you worship; it doesn't matter if you even worship or don't worship—you are treated fairly. The President has said many times that this is a country in which everybody deserves a fair shot, in which everybody deserves a fair opportunity to rise to whatever level he can. Every single American deserves to be treated fairly. I hear that term. I hear it batted back and forth.

So what is the real definition of "fair"?

I went to Webster's Dictionary. It says "fair" is treating people in a way that does not favor some over others. It does not treat one person in a favorable way over somebody else.

That is truly, uniquely American because there are very few places in the world where everybody does get treated fairly.

When I look at the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, I ask myself: Is this really fair?

If you look at this definition, it goes farther down and gives the antonym, or the opposite meaning. I would say that, if you were to look at what is not fair, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, would be one of those things that would be the direct opposite of what fair is.

Is it fair to give 1,200 waivers to some and not to others? Is it fair to say to employers, do you know what, this is a very complicated law, and it has grown so complicated that you need another year to give you a fair chance to understand what's in it, so we're going to give you a year's delay. Now, if you're an individual, no, you're not given that.

So my question is: Is it fair? Is it fair to give one group something and the individual not?

I don't know. I don't know that that meets anybody's definition of what fair is.

Also, I heard Secretary of Health and Human Services Sebelius asked that very same question by a journalist:

So, Secretary Sebelius, is it fair to go ahead and give employers 1 year to figure it out because it's so hard to understand that it's not really fair to put that kind of pressure on them; yet, with the individuals, they have to do it today?

She says: No, no, no. They can opt out if they're not ready to do that. Now, you have to pay a fine if you want to opt out. You have to pay a fine if you don't want to participate at all.

You are held to a different set of standards than another group, so I don't know how that fits under the definition of fair.

We can talk about this and go back and forth all day long, but this is a gift. This Affordable Care Act—this ObamaCare—is a gift that keeps giving. It's a law that, while it's giving, it's also taking. It is driving our debt to an unbelievable level. The President says it's going to reduce our debt over the long run. The truth of the matter is in 10 years it adds \$1.8 trillion, and that's a pretty fairly heavy debt for the people to absorb.

Now, back home—and I don't know if this lady is a Republican or a Democrat—Melissa had written to me from Hermitage, Pennsylvania. I want you to understand how this is. This is an individual. She has two degrees, one in criminal justice and one in teaching, but she couldn't get a job, so she started her own business.

She says:

No government loans, no bank loans, no investors, and I have grown the business over the past handful of years. I received a letter from my insurance provider, Aetna, and according to my letter, no longer am I going to be covered after November 25. I operate a small business, a successful business in this economy.

Now she talks about her daughter, Riley:

Riley is a young girl who is working her way through school as a part-time cashier at a local grocery store. She makes minimum wage, and she is paying for her own health care benefits. She got a letter, saying, Do you know what, your policy that you have now is going to go from \$70 a month, and it's going to triple. It is going to put a heavy weight on her in order for her to stay covered.

So we talk about fair, and we talk about what's fair to everybody—not just to a few but to everybody. My friends get up, and they rail about what we are not doing, about how we are not treating the law fairly. The law is not treating us fairly. Sadly, we are in a time when Americans don't expect an awful lot out of Washington. In fact, it's fair to say they don't expect hardly anything out of Washington, but they do expect to be treated fairly.

So I would say to everybody: Please, let's treat everybody the same. This is America. That's what makes us unique, and that's what makes us special.

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY'S 100TH-YEAR ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Concordia University of Chicago is an American private Lutheran liberal arts university, located in the village of River Forest, Illinois, 10 miles west of downtown Chicago.

In 1855, Lutheran ministers Friedrich Johann, Carl Lochner, and Philipp Fleischmann established a private teachers seminary in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to train day school teachers for Lutheran schools. In 1857, the responsibility for the operation of the school was taken over by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The synod moved the school to Fort Wayne, Indiana, uniting it with a theological seminary which had been founded there by followers of Johann Konrad and Wilhelm Lohe. In 1861, the theological seminary was moved to St. Louis, Missouri, later to Springfield, Illinois, and then back to Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1864. The teachers seminary was moved to Addison, Illinois. Concordia University makes its foundation with the 1864 move to Addison, Illinois.

Originally called Concordia Teachers Seminary, then Concordia Teachers College, the institution is the oldest in the Concordia University system. The original building is gone, but a monument still stands on the site of the seminary in Addison, Illinois.

In 1913, the college moved to its present campus in River Forest, Illinois. In 1979, the institution expanded its education-centered program to become a full liberal arts institution, and it changed its name to Concordia College. In 1990, having experienced a tremendous growth in its graduate offerings, the school recognized and changed its name to Concordia University. The university was officially known as Concordia University, River Forest until 2006, when the current name was adopted.

In 2006, CURF was the only university in the 10-school system to achieve the rank of top tier on U.S. News & World Report's "best college" list. They were also awarded this ranking in 2010.

Concordia University Chicago has a prominent and a prestigious music department among schools of a similar size. However, education is still Concordia's largest academic program. Other programs include business, communications, theology, and many other undergraduate degree programs. Concordia University's enrollment for the 2012-2013 academic year is 5,454 students, and many of these students plan to become church workers.

I am inspired when I read the university's mission statement, which is:

As a distinct, comprehensive university of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, centered in the gospel of Jesus Christ and based in the liberal arts, Concordia University equips men and women to serve and lead with integrity, creativity and compassion in a diverse, interconnected and increasingly urbanized church and world.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and salute Concordia University on its 100 years of teaching and service in the Chicagoland community.

DEATH BENEFITS

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen soldier from my district, and I urge the passage of a bill later today to ensure that death benefits still flow to the families of our military heroes despite the government shutdown.

Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was killed this past Sunday by an IED.

Sergeant Hawkins was on his fourth tour in Afghanistan and was serving as a rifleman, a gun team leader, and a Ranger team leader when he was killed. Fittingly, he was tending to another wounded Ranger when he was killed. Sergeant Hawkins was clearly following part of the Army Ranger creed, which says:

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

Mr. Speaker, we should take that advice as well here in this body and not leave behind Sergeant Hawkins' wife, Brittanie, of Lansing, Kansas, or his parents, Roy and Sheila Hawkins, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Here in the House, we thought we had taken care of this problem by passing our Pay Our Military Act soon after the shutdown occurred; but, apparently, the Pentagon wants to have more explicit guidance on their ability to provide the death benefits to military families. So let it be said loudly and clearly here in the House of Representatives: we will never leave a fallen comrade.

I urge my colleagues to pass the bill to make sure that the \$100,000 gratuity is paid to cover final costs for Sergeant Hawkins and for all of our other brave men and women in service and that loved ones left behind receive what they are entitled to. I hope that the Senate follows suit and that the President signs it into law so that there is no further delay.

May God bless Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins and all others like him who defend our freedoms every day.

OBAMA REFUSES TO PAY MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely disappointed at the lengths the White House has gone in order to manipulate American lives as they seek to coerce America's elected House of Representatives into spending money America does not have on a dysfunctional, socialized medicine program that does not work, that threatens American lives, and that a majority of Americans do not want.

Congress and the White House agree on, roughly, 99 percent of Federal Government spending. We should fund that 99 percent, reopen the Federal Government, and debate our disagreements on the remaining 1 percent, but the White House and Senate refuse to do that. Instead, President Obama, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and their Democrat allies force a Federal Government shutdown. They hold 99 percent of the Federal Government hostage to support their all-or-nothing demands.

The lengths the Democrats and the White House will go in order to manipulate American lives and public opinion is most disheartening.

The Obama administration ordered the closings of all Washington, D.C., monuments, thereby denying World War II veterans access to their memorial. Never mind that, in the history of all Federal Government shutdowns, no President has ever ordered and spent taxpayer money to barricade and close Washington's open-air memorials.

The Obama administration disregarded the Pay Our Military Act and illegally ordered furloughs of, roughly, 400,000 Department of Defense civilian personnel for a week, thereby disrupting their lives and, more importantly, jeopardizing America's national security. The Obama administration followed that up with illegally ordering furloughs for who-knows-how-many