United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2013 No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 27, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

Enable them, O God, to act on what they believe to be right and true and just, and to do so in ways that show respect for those with whom they disagree.

May their actions in these coming days prove to be of heroic importance and benefit to our Nation and its people.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMA WAR ON COAL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation benefits from great wealth, often we become disconnected from just what it takes to power a great Nation.

Standards of living that many are accustomed to in the developed world—including flipping a switch and having lights turn on, or with the turn of a dial having a machine do household laundry—these things aren't easily accessed by most of the planet.

We've become accustomed to these day-to-day activities; but to have lights and power, America needs both affordable and reliable electricity. The fact is, much of this electricity is generated by coal.

Despite some of the most abundant domestic energy resources, we are in denial. Mr. Speaker, we are in denial of the fact that we must produce energy to actually consume it. This disconnect from reality leaves the world's largest consumer of energy with no plan to power the largest economy in the world.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standard for coal-powered plants is a misguided pursuit that jeopardizes the economic security of our country. It is a direct threat to the American consumer, affordable electricity, and the economic security of Pennsylvanians and the Nation.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today on the brink of a threatened shutdown of the Federal Government—bad enough—and worse, a refusal to pay the bills of the United States of America. These are completely unnecessary, Republican-manufactured crises.

HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said:

A government shutdown is a political game in which everyone loses.

Karl Rove said:

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than in 1995. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.

In a moment of clarity, Senator MIKE LEE, one of the Senators holding up the bill in the Senate, said:

Shutdowns are bad; shutdowns are not worth it. This law, ObamaCare, is not worth causing a shutdown over.

This is former-Senator Judd Gregg:

A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would

Printed on recycled paper.

lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

Perhaps most important to my Republican colleagues, this is from The Wall Street Journal:

Some Republicans think they are sure to hold the House in 2014. The Kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of an all-Democratic rule.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TIMOTHY RAYMOND McGILL

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Timothy Raymond McGill, a member of the Rhode Island National Guard who was killed in combat last Saturday while serving as a member of the United States Army's elite Special Forces unit in Afghanistan.

A life-long resident of New Jersey, Sergeant McGill enlisted in the Marine Corps immediately after high school and was still training in boot camp when terrorists struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. After serving in Iraq, he joined the Rhode Island National Guard as an anti-armor specialist and just 2 years ago became a weapons sergeant with the Army Special Forces, the Green Berets.

Americans are blessed to live in a free and democratic society because of the heroic efforts and brave sacrifices of our men and women in uniform and owe an especially profound debt of gratitude to those like Timothy who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

We express our sincere condolences to Timothy's father, Raymond; his mother, Carol; and his two sisters, Megan and Lindsay. I pray that they find some small measure of comfort in knowing that an entire Nation is deeply grateful and shall keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATING SKILLSUSA MEDAL RECIPIENTS

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize students from my district who demonstrated excellence in technical, academic, and employability skills at the SkillsUSA National Leadership and Skills Conference held this past June in Kansas City, Missouri.

The SkillsUSA Conference brings together high school students, college students, and teachers with industry experts to participate in contests that demonstrate their abilities in technology, business, criminal justice, culinary arts, and many more fields.

Students from the Weber Institute in Stockton received gold medals for their project in human services, and students from Bear Creek High School in Stockton, California, received the bronze medal for their project in health services. These students have proven that they will not only be successful in their future careers, but that they will excel and be leaders in their fields.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these young adults on their academic achievements and to recognize the importance of the SkillsUSA Conference.

INSURANCE PREMIUM INCREASES

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an impending problem, which is the increase of insurance premiums in south Florida and throughout our country.

The Biggert-Waters Act of 2012 will burden many homeowners with flood insurance increases of up to 25 percent for years to come. Congress must act to reverse these increases and ensure they do not undermine our housing market.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem. This act was passed before I came to office, but affects my constituents and the Nation as a whole, and seriously threatens our economic recovery. There is already a bill that can delay these increases and gives us time to work on this problem. Let's act now.

Mr. Speaker, this is neither a Democratic problem nor a Republican problem. This is a national problem. Perhaps if we work on real problems as opposed to ideological problems, we can find the common ground that all Americans wish us to work on.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting our hardworking homeowners by creating a commonsense solution that addresses this crisis.

BUDGETING PRIORITIES

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the impact of the ongoing budget debates in Washington and how they are affecting the hardworking people that I'm honored to serve in Illinois.

Last November, the people of the 17th District of Illinois elected me because they were sick and tired of the partisan gridlock in Congress. I spent a short time here in Congress working across the aisle to find commonsense solutions to the problems facing our Nation. But too many in Washington have the wrong priorities—putting politics over people. Let me just offer one example.

During the last month, I have visited Head Start programs throughout my district. Head Start, as you may know, provides early childhood education and is an important downpayment on our region's economic well-being. In fact, for every dollar invested in Head Start, we get a $7 to $9 return. But due to shortsighted cuts, needy children and families are being turned away at the door.

In the region I serve, there are literally hundreds of children waiting to be enrolled in Head Start, while dedicated staff members continue to have to cut back. This is unacceptable.

I am willing to work with those who I disagree with and who disagree with me to find reasonable solutions that put people before politics. Let's find solutions that put Americans first.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES AFFECTING VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MONTHLY ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS WITH DISABILITY INVITED BY UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 322(d)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and $500,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013'' after ''2013''.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 322 of such title is amended by striking ''United States Paralympics, Inc.,'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States Olympic Committee''.

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 521A of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting ''and $2,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013'' after ''2013''; and

(B) in subsection (l), by striking ''The Secretary may only provide assistance under this section during fiscal years 2010 through 2013.''

and inserting ''The Secretary may not provide assistance under this section after December 31, 2013.''.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Such section is further amended—

(A) except in subsection (d)(4), by striking ''United States Paralympics, Inc.,'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States Olympic Committee'';

(B) in subsection (d)(4), by striking ''United States Paralympics, Inc.'' and inserting ''United States Olympic Committee''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTHS AND TERRITORIES OF UNITED STATES.—The provisions of this section and section 322 of this title shall apply with respect to the following in the same manner and to the same degree as the United States Olympic Committee:

''(1) The American Samoa National Olympic Committee.

''(2) Guam National Olympic Committee.

''(3) Comité Olímpico de Puerto Rico.

''(4) Such entities as the Secretary considers appropriate to represent the interests of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States Virgin Islands under this section and section 322 of this title.''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 521A and inserting the following new item:

''521A. Assistance for United States Olympic Committee.''.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.—Section 1710(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking ''September 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(d) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.—Section 1729(a)(2)(E) of such title is amended by striking ''October 1, 2013'' and inserting ''October 1, 2014''.

(e) EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.—

(1) HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(2) REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES: VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.—Section 2023(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting ''to enter into a contract'' before ''to provide''; and

(B) by striking ''September 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(f) EXTENSION OF PREVIOUSLY FULLY-FUNDED AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.—

(1) COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.—Section 2013 of such title is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(6) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

''(7) $150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.''.

(2) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.—Section 2044(e)(1)(E) of such title is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014''.

(3) GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''through 2013'' and inserting ''through 2014''.

(g) EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY WITH AMBULATING.—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary's'' and inserting ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary's'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking ''September 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) In fiscal year 2014, the Secretary may not approve more than 30 applications for assistance under paragraph (1) for disabled veterans described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).''.

(h) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CALCULATE NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY SECURING DEFAULTED LOAN FOR PURPOSES OF LIQUIDATION.—Section 3732(c)(11) of such title is amended by striking ''October 1, 2013'' and inserting ''October 1, 2014''.

(i) EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.—Section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking ''2-year'' and inserting ''3-year''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''and 2011'' and inserting ''and 2014''.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF USE OF NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR INCOME VERIFICATION PURPOSES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Section 453(j)(11) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(11)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following new subparagraph (G):

''(G) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under this paragraph shall be in effect as follows:

''(i) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

''(ii) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.''.

(b) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Section 5317A of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

''(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section shall be in effect as follows:

''(1) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

''(2) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RATIFICATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except that Section 2 (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2013.

(b) RATIFICATION.—If this Act is not enacted on or before September 30, 2013, any actions undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs under the authorities extended by this Act during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed ratified.

SEC. 5. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate amendments to H.R. 1412.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments we are discussing today to H.R. 1412 would extend a number of expiring authorities affecting the daily lives and long-term well-being of our servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

The important initiatives that would be extended through this legislation include those that provide adaptive sports programs and specially adapted housing grants for disabled veterans and supported services—such as housing and employment assistance—for homeless veterans.

The bill would also extend for 1 year the Department's authority to provide childcare assistance to certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

Further, it would extend VA's authority to collect copayments for hospital and nursing home care and to recover from third parties the cost of care and services that are furnished to veterans with health plan contracts for nonservice-connected conditions through September 30, 2014.

Needless to say, each of these programs is critical to ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of high-quality health care and benefits to veterans in communities across our country.

The committee will continue to be vigorous in our oversight of each of these programs to ensure the prompt delivery of needed benefits and services to veterans and the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort. I want to express my gratitude to the ranking member, Mr. MICHAUD, and to Ms. BROWN, who is here with us on the floor, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee—BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont and RICHARD BURR of North Carolina—for their hard work and their leadership in this effort.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412 and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1412, as amended, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expired Authorities Act of 2013.

□ 0915

VA would lose the authority to continue a number of critical programs

that, without action, would expire next week. These programs assist our most vulnerable veterans reintegrating back into society and into their communities.

With this legislation, wrap-around services for homeless veterans and their families would be authorized to continue. Services such as counseling, job training, job referrals, financial assistance, case management, housing, and the special needs for the frail, elderly, and seriously mentally ill veterans will continue.

We listened to veterans when they told us that they were busy with jobs, school, and families and, as a result, found it difficult to get the health care they needed without childcare assistance. This measure extended for 1 year VA's authority to provide childcare assistance for certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

This bill would extend the authority to provide a monthly assistance allowance to veterans with disabilities who are invited by the U.S. Olympic Committee to participate on the U.S. Paralympics team. More than 14,000 veterans with disabilities have benefited from these activities. The results for these veteran athletes have been astonishing both in terms of athletic accomplishment and personal accomplishment.

This bill extends eligibility for specially adapted housing for our most disabled veterans. It would allow them to live more independently in their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a moral obligation to ensure that we do what needs to be done to help those who have worn the uniform receive the benefits and services they have earned. These extensions of critical programs we are considering today will help us do all we can.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a gentleman who has worn the uniform of this country and served this country well.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for working with the members of the House and Senate Veterans Affairs Committees to pass this important legislation.

Specifically, I am happy to see the extension of the Veterans Paralympic program, which reflects my legislation, H.R. 1402, the Veterans Paralympic Act, which passed unanimously out of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee before being combined in an omnibus bill in the full committee. This program ensures that disabled veterans in local communities throughout the country continue to have opportunities for rehabilitation, stress relief, and higher achievement through adaptive sports.

U.S. Olympic Committee's Paralympics Chief Charlie Huebner testified at a hearing that ''participation in sports and other athletic activities can help speed the rehabilitation process for disabled veterans.'' As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I couldn't agree more with Mr. Huebner, and I personally understand the importance of rehabilitation opportunities for returning veterans.

Finally, although I fully support the passage of the extenders package, I am disappointed that the substance of H.R. 1412 was not included in this bill. H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act, seeks to build on an existing, yet little known and underutilized on-the-job training program that assists veterans by allowing them to use their educational benefits to learn a trade or skill by participation in an approved apprenticeship or on-the-job training program.

Employers in my district have expressed their desire to work with this program and hire more veterans because they know how valuable a veteran can be to their organization. Additionally, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America has endorsed the legislation by saying, ''IAVA stands ready to support and promote innovative ideas like this to end the veterans' unemployment crisis.''

It is my understanding that the original provisions of H.R. 1412 were dropped without prejudice and that they will be part of an upcoming negotiation between the House and the Senate. I look forward to seeing the substance of that legislation advance, and I will be working with Chairman MILLER to ensure that happens.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers at this time, so we are prepared to close.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1412, as amended. I want to thank Chairman MILLER for working in a very bipartisan way for veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, thank my colleague Ms. BROWN from Jacksonville for her hard work on behalf of veterans and her ability to work with us in the committee in a bipartisan fashion.

I once again encourage all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to express my support for the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013. This legislation includes the reauthorization of several fundamental programs that serve some of our most vulnerable veterans who are overrepresented in our nation's homeless population. These programs are the Homeless Veterans Reintegration program, the Grant and Per Diem Program for Homeless Veterans with Special Needs program, the Supportive Services for Veterans Families programs, and the Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program.

I believe that Congress and the VA must do what it necessary to end the homeless veterans problem, which is why I introduced H.R. 2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act. In addition to the programs that will be reauthorized in H.R. 1412, H.R. 2485 would reauthorize several other homeless veterans programs, such as the Therapeutic Transitional Housing component to the Compensated Work Therapy Program and the Acquired Property Sales for Homeless Veterans Program. This important legislation has been endorsed by numerous Veteran Service Organizations, including the American Legion, the Military Officers Association of America, the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, and the Center for American Homeless Veterans. Without Congressional action, we will neglect our nation's heroes by letting these programs expire at the end of this calendar year.

These veterans fought for our country and now it is our time to fight for them. I commend Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their leadership on this legislation to reauthorize these programs, and I appreciate their effort to end homelessness among veterans.

With so many men and women returning home and transitioning to civilian life, now is not the time to waiver on our resolve.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1412, and also join me in supporting H.R. 2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1412.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2251) to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

[SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

[The United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse''.

[SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

[Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse''.]

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse and Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building''.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the 'Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building'.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2251, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2251, as amended, would designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building.

Judge Devitt attended the University of North Dakota. Early in his career he served as judge on the Minnesota municipal court and as assistant attorney general for Minnesota. During World War II, he was a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve. Judge Devitt later became a United States Representative from Minnesota. In 1954, Judge Devitt was appointed to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and served as the chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

I think it is appropriate to honor the work of Judge Devitt by naming this courthouse and Federal building after him. I support passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2251, which names the Federal building and courthouse in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, after Federal Judge Edward Devitt.

Judge Devitt was a former Member of Congress, World War II veteran, and municipal judge. Judge Devitt received a bachelor of science and law degree from the University of North Dakota in 1932 and 1935, respectively. Upon graduation, Judge Devitt went into private practice as a lawyer and was later elected as a municipal judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota, becoming one of the youngest judges in the Nation at that time. He then went on to serve as an assistant attorney general for the State of Minnesota in 1939.

During World War II, Judge Devitt served as a lieutenant commander to the Seventh Fleet in U.S. Navy Intelligence. After his World War II service, Judge Devitt successfully won election to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 80th Congress. After serving one term in Congress, Judge Devitt returned to private practice for 1 year before serving as a probate judge in Ramsey County, Minnesota.

Judge Devitt became a U.S. District Judge in the District of Minnesota in 1955 after being nominated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. After joining the Federal bench, Judge Devitt went on to serve as chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

During his lengthy tenure on the U.S. District Court, he became one of the most respected district court judges in the Nation. His decisions were seldom reversed on appeal. He was known for spearheading efforts to balance the demands of free press access to courts with the needs of courtroom proceedings.

To honor his achievements, we are nominating him for his distinguished service and giving him the Justice Award, which is annually given to a Federal judge who has made significant contributions, Mr. Speaker, to the administration of justice, the advancement of the rule of law, and the improvement of society as a whole.

The designation of the United States courthouse as the Edward J. Devitt Courthouse and Federal Building is yet another fitting tribute, Mr. Speaker, to this judge's outstanding public service career.

I urge my colleagues to approve this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Minnesotan, the Honorable Edward James Devitt, and support my legislation, H.R. 2251.

The Federal court's presence in Fergus Falls continues to be an integral part of our Nation's unwavering principles: providing equal access to justice. The Federal court that resides in the Federal building in Fergus Falls serves the needs of the citizens of west central Minnesota and the surrounding region. It serves a population of over 610,000 people and covers over 25,000 square miles. It serves the cities of Fergus Falls, Moorhead, East Grand Forks, and Bemidji, as well as the Red Lake and White Earth Reservations.

Naming the building the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building will give a great honor to distinguished jurist Judge Devitt as a much-deserved recognition.

Before he was judge, he served one term in Congress, as was noted. He was elected in 1946. As a freshman in the 80th Congress, his classmates included John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. He was also defeated the end of that term by another famous Minnesotan, Eugene McCarthy.

No judge in the recent past is more closely linked to the history of the Fergus Falls courthouse than Judge Devitt. During his many years of service on the Federal bench, he presided over numerous cases in the Fergus Falls courthouse.

Judge Devitt was appointed by President Eisenhower to the U.S. District Court of Minnesota in 1955. Then, in 1959, he was named chief judge for the Minnesota district, where he held that position until 1981. He served on the Federal bench for 38 years.

I would like to submit the following statement for the RECORD, written by Mr. Thomas Boyd, who wrote this brief but detailed biography of the Honorable Edward J. Devitt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FERGUS FALLS, MN

(By Thomas H. Boyd)

The Honorable Edward James Devitt was a proud son of Minnesota, and a man of whom every Minnesotan can be proud. He served his Country during World War II, in the halls of Congress, and as a distinguished member of the United States Courts. He became one of Minnesota's most beloved citizens and one of the great judges in the history of this Country.

Judge Devitt was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, on May 5, 1911. He started off in the Dayton's Bluff neighborhood, where he attended Van Buren Elementary School with Warren Burger and Harry Blackmun. These three giants of the federal judiciary would be lifelong friend.

Judge Devitt came out to Western Minnesota when he was still a youth, attending St. John's College Preparatory School and St. John's University, in Collegeville. He eventually earned his law degree and bachelor's degree—in that order—from the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks.

Judge Devitt developed his life-long passion for people, politics, and the law in greater Minnesota. In 1935, these characteristics led him to run for Municipal Judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota—a post to which he was elected even before he had actually graduated from law school. Shortly after his election, he was featured by Ripley's Believe It or Not as the youngest judge in the Nation.

He left Minnesota during World War II to serve his Country for more than three years as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy. He saw action in the Pacific Theater with the Seventh Fleet, and he received the Purple Heart for injuries sustained on December 11, 1944 in a Kamikaze attack while on board the USS Caldwell during the Battle of the Philippines.

Following the War, he returned to Minnesota and reentered politics. In 1946, with the help of future Governor Elmer L. Anderson and others, he was elected to represent the Fourth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He went to Washington to serve in the 80th Congress, as part of a star-studded freshman class made up of other World War II veterans, including future presidents John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon—as well as his lifelong friend and fellow St. Paul native, George MacKinnon, who later served as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues in the House. While he was clearly a natural and would likely have enjoyed having a long career in Congress, that was not to be. As a Republican, he was fated to vote in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act. This was not a popular vote with the constituents in his largely Democratic and Labor dominated district. He was defeated by Eugene McCarthy in 1948 in what Judge MacKinnon referred to as the ''Dewey landslide.''

While this was the end of his Congressional career, it was not the end of his public life—far from it—this was just a detour that would soon lead back to the judiciary.

In 1950, Governor Luther Youngdahl appointed Judge Devitt to the Ramsey County Probate Court. He served well and was subsequently elected by Ramsey County's voters to remain as their probate judge.

Thereafter, in 1954, President Eisenhower appointed him to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. Judge Devitt would serve on the federal bench for the next 38 years. During that time, he came to personify the ideal for a federal district judge in this country.

Judge Devitt's reputation and renown as a federal trial judge would grow to legendary status. He handled many of the most notorious criminal cases and many of the most complicated civil cases in the District's history. He also was given more than his share of ''special assignments'' to handle challenging cases from other jurisdictions.

As part of his judicial duties, Judge Devitt ''rode the circuit,'' sitting in the federal courthouses located throughout the State. When he would come to Fergus Fall, he always stayed at the River Inn. He greatly enjoyed his associations with the local bar and always looked forward to seeing his many good friends in this part of Minnesota.

On one of those occasions when he sat in greater Minnesota, Judge Devitt arrived in town only to realize he had forgotten to bring his judicial robe. He was saved by the kindness of a local state court judge who gave Judge Devitt one of his—and this particular judge happened to favor blue robes. Judge Devitt loved the blue robe, and he wore proudly many times in the future.

His friend, Chief Justice Burger, said there wasn't ''any member of the federal judiciary that would rank higher [than Judge Devitt] in terms of pure professional qualifications and performance.''

In 1959, he succeeded the great Gunnar H. Nordbye to become the Chief Judge of this District. He served in that capacity for 22 years (1959 to 1981). Just as he could fairly be described as the ''judge from central casting'' in terms of his appearance, he was likewise the ideal chief judge. He was a leader in this District, and throughout the country, pioneering innovations and new methods to enhance the administration of justice in the federal courts.

His treatise on federal jury instructions became the indispensible standard for federal courts around the nation. He was also a leader in introducing the use of six person juries in civil cases, which has now become so common place today.

He served on and chaired numerous important committees for the United States Judicial Conference. The substantive breadth of these assignments reflect the breadth of his great contributions to all aspects of the workings of the federal judicial branch—spanning from court administration; standards for admission to practice; geographic organization of the courts; continuing education, research, and training programs; and balancing the interests to a fair trial with the freedom of the press.

To say that Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues on the bench would be a significant understatement. He was a great friend and role model to countless judges, particularly new judges. He regularly taught courses for new judges at the Federal Judicial Center, beginning almost from the time he himself was appointed to the federal bench. And, of course, he published his Ten Commandments for the New Judge which are still gospel today.

Judge Devitt took senior status in 1981, but he continued to serve and work hard. In addition to his caseload in this District, he also continued to receive special assignments to handle significant cases from elsewhere. This work included the assignment to preside in the trial of Walter Leroy Moody, Jr., who was accused of killing federal Judge Robert Vance of the Eleventh Circuit. The prosecutor in this case was future FBI Director, Louis Freeh. The two became close friends and, when Freeh was appointed to the federal bench, Judge Devitt swore him in and later presented Judge Freeh with a blue robe of his own.

While on senior status, he was also appointed to serve on the important United States Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

In 1982, West Publishing established the prestigious Devitt Award, which is presented annually to honor a federal judge whose decisions that reflect wisdom, humanity, and a commitment to the rule of law, and whose contributions have improved the administration of justice and enhanced the role of the federal courts in our society. The Devitt Award continues to be presented by the American Judicature Society, and is a most fitting tribute to its namesake whose life and career embodied this criteria so well.

Judge Devitt continued to sit on cases until just very shortly before he passed away on March 2, 1992. The loss of this great man was sincerely felt throughout the Minnesota and the Nation.

Today, Judge Devitt is still revered as the embodiment of the classic and ideal federal district judge. He is also still remembered fondly by so many people who were fortunate enough to have known him and to have been touched by his many kindnesses.

The naming of the United States Courthouse in Fergus Falls would be a most fitting tribute to this great man, and a well-deserved recognition for his extraordinary service and contributions to this State and this Nation.

(Thomas H. Boyd is a Shareholder at Winthrop & Weinstine. He is also a member of the Historical Society of the United States Courts in the Eighth Circuit and currently serves as the President of the Society's District of Minnesota Branch. The Judges of the District of Minnesota greatly appreciate Mr. Boyd preparing this tribute for Judge Devitt.)

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2251, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 0930

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center'' during the period in which the building is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

During the period in which the building referred to in section 1 is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3096 would designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center.''

Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick dedicated his 20 years of service with the FBI to protecting our Nation. He demonstrated his dedication to protecting us all from terrorism as he continued to work while fighting pancreatic cancer. Sadly, he passed away in 2011.

I think that it is more than fitting to name the FBI's Terrorist Screening

Center after him. I support the passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3096, which designates the building occupied by the FBI in Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center.''

As a former law enforcement officer, I have a special appreciation for Supervisory Special Agent Resnick's 20-year FBI career. His service was highlighted by his role as a senior advisor in the White House, where he had a prominent role in leading the Presidential review of watch-listing policies and procedures in the aftermath of the failed terrorist airplane bombing on December 25, 2009. Special Agent Resnick led the interagency review, which led to significant improvements in how the U.S. Government screens and integrates intelligence on terrorist suspects.

Agent Resnick was a well-respected public servant who passed away in 2011 as a result of pancreatic cancer. This designation is supported by the building owner, and it will stay with the building for as long as the FBI occupies this facility. The name designation of the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center is a very fitting tribute to Supervisory Special Agent Resnick and his exemplary career with the FBI. Agent Resnick will be remembered for his dedication to developing the architecture of a government-wide watch-listing of terrorism suspects, and for his tireless efforts to protect our fellow Americans from terrorism. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3096.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman and, of course, my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for their wonderful cooperation on this important bill.

By the way, I believe we are going to be joined by Mr. Resnick's widow and daughter very soon. Our colleague Mr. GRIMM is going to be accompanying them here to the House.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as already indicated, will rename the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center, located in the 11th District of Virginia, in honor of Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick, who was instrumental in the creation of this very critical component of our national security network.

I am pleased to sponsor this bill, along with my fellow Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JIM MORAN and with my colleague RICHARD HANNA of New York.

Like so many of the brave men and women throughout our law enforcement community, Mike Resnick was seized by the mission of public service and gave every ounce to ensure the safety of those he was sworn to protect. In his more than 20 years with the Bureau, Mike held numerous tactical and supervisory roles, but his greatest contributions came in the field of counterterrorism at precisely the time we needed it.

Following the attacks of 9/11, Mike Resnick was instrumental in laying the foundational policies and architecture for the screening and watch list system now administered by the interagency Terrorist Screening Center. He was later assigned to the National Security Council, where one of his last assignments was in promoting timely and effective information-sharing among Federal, State and local law enforcement partners. As a former local government leader myself, I can tell you how vital such collaboration is to the safety of our communities. Tragically, Mike Resnick was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer in May of 2010, but he continued to staff his post through the physical and emotional strain of his treatments.

CIA Director John Brennan, who at the time was the Assistant to the President For Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, said that Mike wanted to make sure everything was in order for those who will carry on with his work.

He died on February 2, 2011, at the age of 50.

Mike is survived by his wife, Sarah Chamberlain, and their daughter, Jordan. It was one of my former colleagues, Amo Houghton of New York, who introduced Mike and Sarah by setting them up on a blind date. They were married here in Washington, and they enjoyed tennis, golf and travel when they could find the time. Mike played as hard as he worked. In fact, I'm told he was known to give some of our Republican colleagues a run for their money on the tennis court.

He grew up in Bayside, Wisconsin, where his parents, Sheldon and Ruth, still reside. It will come as no surprise that Mike was an Eagle Scout growing up. He was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin—Madison and of the DePaul University College of Law. Prior to his service with the FBI, he spent a brief period as a prosecutor.

Former FBI Director Robert Mueller said that Mike was not motivated by recognition but by a desire to get the job done, help others and to see those around him succeed.

Though he shied away from the spotlight, renaming the building in which he invested so much of himself offers a fitting recognition and a lasting tribute to the memory of one of our Nation's most dedicated public servants, whom the President characterized as no less than an American hero. I hope we remember that as we debate the issue of a shutdown of the Federal Government. Our Federal Government is filled with such noble public servants who are serving this country.

Let me close by again thanking the chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and of its Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, and I urge the passage of this fitting tribute, this legislation, this morning.

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

Mr. BARLETTA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a former mayor for 11 years, I had the opportunity to work with some great people in law enforcement, not only in our city government but also those in the FBI, and I know all too well the difficult job that these men and women do to keep us safe, especially Mr. Resnick, who dedicated his life to fighting terrorism. I don't believe we need to look very far to see how vitally important it is as we try to keep Americans safe from terrorism right here at home.

Mr. Resnick not only loved his job, but he loved his country, so I think it is very fitting that we honor all of those unsung heroes who go to work each day, never expecting to see their names in the headlines or in a story. They are the men and women who go to work and make sure that we have the freedoms that we have here in America. Naming a courthouse is not a small thing, and naming a building is not a small thing, nor is just the dedication of a good American who did all he could. Even during illness, even during a time when most would quit and stop, he continued to work because of his love for his family and his country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3096.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0957

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412, by the yeas and nays, and passing H.R. 3096, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—29

Cárdenas
Clay
Conyers
Dingell
Duckworth
Ellmers
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Horsford
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Langevin
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Peters (MI)
Rice (SC)
Roskam
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schwartz
Stutzman
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1021

Ms. MENG changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 491, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

AYES—403

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook

Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—2

Massie
Sanford

NOT VOTING—26

Conyers
Dingell
Duckworth
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Horsford
Kaptur
Langevin
McCarthy (NY)
Messer
Peters (MI)
Rice (SC)
Roskam
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Smith (NJ)
Stutzman
Tierney
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1036

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call vote 491, to concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412, the Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act, and roll call 492, on H.R. 3096, which would designate the FBI Building in Vienna, Virginia, as the Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center. I was hosting a STEM Careers Fair in my congressional district, which was a longtime commitment to the students of Northern Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both roll call 491 and 492.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes 491 and 492, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both questions.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the coming day and weekend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Democratic whip, and refer him to the announcement that came out from my office that we intend for the Senate to act on the continuing resolution sometime today and to receive it here in the House either this afternoon or evening.

As per the announcement that we sent out, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour tomorrow on Saturday, at noon for legislative business, and Members are advised that we could vote at any point tomorrow or Sunday until the situation surrounding the CR is resolved.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Would it be safe to tell the Members there will be no votes before 1 o'clock tomorrow, do you think?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, yes, that would be correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Does the gentleman intend to meet on Sunday if we have acted on the CR tomorrow?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman about Sunday's schedule, pending action tomorrow, I am hesitant to commit that there would be no votes on Sunday. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that we're dealing with a day of worship for many people, and would work with that fact as well, if that's the purpose of his question.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN II

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing I know that hardworking taxpayers back home in my district need in these tough economic times, it's certainty. It's tough enough putting food on the table and putting gas in the car without worrying that an out-of-control Federal Government is going to make life harder for you and your family.

That's why last week my colleagues and I in the House passed legislation that provides some of that certainty. We don't want our fellow Americans to see their insurance premiums shoot up or lose their insurance altogether because of the President's unworkable health care law. And we want our government to stay open.

That's what the American people need, and that's what the House has acted to do. Now it's time for the Senate to act as well.

COME TOGETHER TO ACT RESPONSIBLY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there are 435 of us that have been asked by our fellow citizens to come to Washington, D.C., to have the extraordinary privilege of sitting on this floor and making—they hope—responsible decisions for their country.

I regret that the House is not full at this point in time.

I have a reputation for working across the aisle. I cherish that reputation because I believe that all of us have been given an honor, and each of us ought to respect that.

Mr. Speaker, we are days away from shutting down the government. We are a few more days from defaulting on the

credit of the United States of America. I believe there are a small number of this House who are holding us captive and rendering, apparently, this House unable to reach compromise. The American people surely will not reward any one of us.

There is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a working majority for responsibility in this House. I choose to believe that, I do believe it, and I pray that it is the case. And I ask my colleagues to come together on behalf of the American people and our great country to act responsibly.

□ 1045

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. Secretary of State John Kerry signed this treaty on behalf of the Obama administration this past Wednesday.

While I support keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of international terrorists and bad actors, I believe that this treaty represents a significant threat to our Second Amendment rights.

The State Department itself has acknowledged that this treaty is ''ambiguous'' and that any potential obligations imposed by the treaty are difficult to predict. In addition, once ratified, it will be possible to amend this treaty with the support of just 75 percent of the signing members, potentially locking the United States into more restrictions down the road.

Like many people from my district, I grew up around firearms, and I'm a life-long gun owner. The responsible use of guns for sport and hunting is a way of life in northern Michigan, and I do not want to see this way of life or our Second Amendment rights be threatened by a poorly thought out United Nations agreement.

I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose this treaty and join me in standing up for the millions of law-abiding gun owners in America.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus.

How much longer will the Republicans deny the science of climate change? Today, the world's leading climate change scientists say that it is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of climate change. In fact, just reading last night in the BBC, there's an article about a U.N. report that finds that, with 95 percent certainty, mankind has contributed mightily to climate change.

Last week, scientists from Stanford and Purdue Universities found that the eastern and central United States will likely see more severe weather by the middle of this century due to climate change. Despite this overwhelming evidence, Republicans proudly proclaim themselves as science deniers. When will my colleagues take their heads out of the sand and work with Democrats to preserve our climate and economy for the future?

WORLD TOURISM DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Tourism Day.

This year's theme is ''Tourism and Water: Protecting Our Common Future,'' and I join with the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority in celebrating this theme.

For southern Nevada, this combines two of our most prized resources, tourism and water. Last year, nearly 40 million visitors came to Las Vegas. We hosted over 21,000 conventions and meetings, which brought in some 5 million national and international visitors, most of whom spent time in District One.

To continue successfully attracting and serving tourists and residents in the middle of the desert, southern Nevada has learned to be especially conscientious about water usage. In Las Vegas, we've found efficient ways to maximize our water usage to enhance the experience of visitors while safeguarding this critical resource for the long term.

Every day, tens of thousands of tourists pass by to take in the majestic beauty of the fountains at the Bellagio, not realizing that they come from recycled water. There is also CityCenter, a resort destination located on the Strip which is the world's largest environmentally sustainable, mixed-use, new construction development to receive LEED certification. Every year, CityCenter saves nearly 50 million gallons of water and, as a tribute to its commitment to sustainability, proudly displays an art exhibit of the Colorado River.

Tourism and Water, it's a great theme. Come and experience it for yourself only in District One.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain committed to defunding, delaying, and dismantling the President's unworkable health care law; and our mission becomes more critical with each passing day.

We've already begun to see premiums go up for hardworking Americans all across the country. This is a bad law that will limit choices in health care and kill American jobs.

The House has passed legislation that would defund ObamaCare, rein in government spending, and prevent a government shutdown. That law is now in the hands of the Senate. The Senate must now give the American people what they deserve—an honest, transparent debate.

As this debate progresses, the American people will know who stands with them in opposition to this disastrous health care law. The House is leading the fight to control spending, stop ObamaCare, and protect hardworking Americans. It is time for the Senate to join us as well.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are well aware of how important the next few days are for this country and for the work to be done in this House. We in the House have done our job however. We have acted to control reckless spending, dismantle the President's unworkable health care law, and keep our government open. Now our House-passed bill is in the hands of the United States Senate, and we hope they will listen to the will of the people as we in the House have done.

The ObamaCare health care takeover is a bad law, it's harmful, and it must be stopped. The American people, having had a chance themselves to read it a little bit—unlike what happened in this House just a few short years ago—they do not want it.

We are already beginning to see how it's making insurance premiums go up all over the country—on the average, 99 percent for men, 62 percent for women, and the report just came out yesterday. It's unworkable. It's unaffordable.

We need to get rid of this law, and we need to keep our government open, as Republicans have work to do. It's time for the Senate to act and protect the needs of the American people.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, each year, from September 15 through October 15, we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, when we honor the contributions that Latinos have made throughout the communities in our Nation.

The Hispanic community embodies the idea that if you work hard, play by the rules and dream big, there is no limit to what you can achieve; after all, that is the American Dream. And achieve is exactly what we have done throughout our history. From serving in our military, to running 3.1 million Hispanic-owned businesses, the Hispanic community is an important part of moving our country forward.

We also know that to keep our country competitive, we must finally fix a broken immigration system. We believe that it is past time to offer hardworking Americans a pathway to citizenship. The future of our Nation depends largely on the future of all of our communities. Together, we keep fighting to give the next generation a meaningful shot at the American Dream. That dream is what we celebrate this month in Hispanic Heritage Month.

My mother used to say common sense tells us that we ought to always put our country before our politics.

THE PRESIDENT'S LAW DISCRIMINATES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is here to stay, saith the President. But his legacy landmark law discriminates.

The President has arbitrarily granted extensions to Big Business, to some small businesses, and some State exchanges, but ordinary Americans—no extensions for them. I guess special interest groups just have more clout with the President than normal people do. Too bad. Everyone should be treated alike. Postpone ObamaCare for everybody for 1 year. Don't discriminate.

The second place the President's wonder law discriminates is who is subject to this law of the land. The President touts his law as good for America. But why has he granted over 1,200 waivers for special groups—waivers to labor unions, for example? That's not fair—waivers for some, but not for others.

So delay ObamaCare for at least a year for all Americans and either grant waivers for all Americans or put those 1,200 groups back into this bill. It's unconstitutional for the constitutional law professor to wave his wand of exemptions and delay for some but not for others. That's just not fair.

And that's just the way it is.

WHY CAN'T HHS BE HONEST WITH U.S. CONGRESS?

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, while the President was again defending his health care law, the Department of Health and Human Services announced even more delays. This train wreck of a health care law is quickly derailing, but the President continues to provide delays and exemptions for everyone except ordinary Americans.

After the President and the administration promised time and time again that the exchanges would be ready and online October 1, several States have said consumers are actually just going to have to wait. Maybe you can send in a paper application if you're anxious.

Last week, on September 19, I asked the director of the agency charged with implementing the exchanges: Will the enrollment process be ready October 1 of this year? I actually posed that as a yes or no question. His answer: Consumers will be able to go online, they will be able to get a determination of what tax subsidies they are eligible for, they will be able to look at the plans that are available where they live, they will be able to see the premium net of subsidy that they would have to pay, and they will be able to choose a plan and get enrolled. Hardly a yes or no answer to a yes or no question. But nevertheless, yesterday's actions by HHS bespeak what really is the case. His answer should have been: No, they will not be ready.

GET IRS AWAY FROM HEALTH CARE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, a report released yesterday from the Treasury Inspector General shows that the IRS failed to track $67 million spent in the implementation of ObamaCare so far. This is before the health exchanges are even opened. My constituents, like myself, are concerned that this type of waste is what happens when Washington takes over health care.

The IRS has consistently demonstrated its inability to function as a responsible agency. Despite the scandals and blatant mismanagement by the IRS, the agency is also at the forefront of running our health care system.

The IRS has little credibility with the American taxpayers right now. The agency must significantly be reformed before we should let them anywhere near our health care system.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in repealing ObamaCare and getting the IRS completely away from our health care.

□ 1100

CELEBRATION OF THE CAREER OF DR. LEVI WATKINS, JR.

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Levi Watkins, a pioneer in the medical field and civil rights movement.

After four decades with Johns Hopkins Medicine, Dr. Watkins will retire on December 31, 2013. He is a man of many firsts. He was the first African American to attend and graduate from Vanderbilt Medical School.

His first scientific breakthrough was his research into the connection between the renin angiotensin system and congestive heart failure that led to the use of angiotensin blockers in the treatment of heart failure. He also performed the first implantation of the automatic implantable defibrillator in the human heart.

Dr. Watkins fought for African Americans' civil rights in the 1950s and fought for equal opportunities in education throughout his career, increasing minority enrollment at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine by 400 percent in 4 years.

I thank Dr. Watkins for all that he has done for our Nation and for the legacy he leaves to inspire generations yet unborn.

RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the sense of this House—and certainly the American people—is that the Constitution of the United States is worthy of protecting, and the rights that are afforded in that Constitution are worthy of protecting.

Unfortunately, the administration has unilaterally decided to try and obligate citizens of the United States to the UN's mandates when it comes to the small arms treaty affecting the Second Amendment rights of every American. I believe that we should not be held accountable, we should not be held in submission to the whims of an unelected organization on the world stage.

The value of our Constitution, the value of our rights must be protected. We must urge the United States Senate to reject the treaty that Secretary Kerry has just signed. Stand up for the rights of Americans, stand up for the rights of Americans to be able to keep and bear arms, and protect the Second Amendment of the United States.

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that the President's health care plan is completely unworkable. Not only is it unworkable, it is unfair to nearly everyone in the United States—businessperson and individual alike.

Hardworking Americans know it because their premiums are skyrocketing and, even worse, they are getting notices in the mail that they are being told that their health insurance is being pulled altogether.

Small businesses know it. They are having to respond by not hiring the people they want to hire—in some cases, even having to fire—or reducing the amount of hours to below 30 hours a week.

People in the President's own party know it. The gentleman that wrote this bill called the bill a nightmare. Even the labor unions that support the President know this. They have called this bill a nightmare, and they've said it is breaking the back on the American Dream, breaking the back on the 40-hour workweek and on health care benefits.

Even the President knows it. He has admitted, despite saying the law is working just as it is supposed to, the President just once again had to have yet one more delay in ObamaCare—in fact, over 19 times.

That is why we are asking, Mr. Speaker, for fairness in a workable health care law.

SPENDING BILL

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting listening to the parade of horribles recounted on the floor of the House today; but as a practical matter, in States like mine, in Oregon, people are going to get better coverage at lower costs—and California, New York, and Colorado, where people are actually working to implement the law rather than sabotage it.

But this is a smokescreen. Obscuring the fact that when my Republican friends talk, for example, about spending in debt, they are actually afraid to allow the House of Representatives to vote on their own spending bill because their own Members won't vote for it. That is why it has been 2 months and we have never finished deliberation on the Transportation bill. They pulled the Interior bill all together. They even refused to allow to have a conference committee formed to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate.

It is a sad chapter when the fractured Republicans stand around when Americans deserve better. There is no reason the Senate could not have its bill before us today and the House Republican leadership bring us back into session. Instead, we are going to stall and stumble all we can up to the brink.

SENATE NEEDS TO DO THEIR JOB

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oregon is correct. It is important that the Congress get our work done on making sure that our military is fully funded and paid, that our veterans, the military construction, the bases around the world are taken care of, that Homeland Security is taken care of. But we have done that. It has already been done in the House.

The Senate has had our Homeland Security appropriations bills for over 3 months. The Senate has had possession of a military construction and veterans appropriations bill for over 3 months. The Senate has also had the Department of Defense appropriations bill for over 3 months. Yet they have irresponsibly chosen to just sit on them to set them up for this moment, because they know that House Republicans are devoted to delaying and defunding ObamaCare, one of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress that will destroy jobs and cripple this economy and socialize the greatest health care system the world has ever created.

We are committed as constitutional conservatives to doing everything in our power to make sure that we delay and defund ObamaCare. But at the same time, we have already done our job in making sure that our military—our men and women in uniform—have everything they need if the Senate will only do their job.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the false promises of ObamaCare are now coming to light. The President promised a $2,500 reduction in premiums. Well, the average now is $3,000.

I get countless calls every day and emails from my constituents about the increase in their premiums. One emailed me today that his increase was 200 percent. An $11,000 deductible cost him $1,100 a month. That is intolerable. Mr. Speaker, we have to address this today.

Another one called and said: ROBERT, it's gone up 250 percent on my premiums. This is wrong. We were promised jobs. Speaker PELOSI said: Well, we are going to have 4 million new jobs, 400,000 almost immediately.

Well, what's happened?

Seventy-one percent of all the new businesses, they're not hiring today. They're certainly not hiring full-time people. We lost 250,000 full-time jobs just in the month of June. It's killing jobs in this country.

It's a false promise on keeping your own health care plan. Seven million new people now cannot keep the health care plan that they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we address this today and relieve the American people from ObamaCare.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting back here when a Democratic leader came to that microphone and with indignation in his voice demanded the Republicans act responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you: Was it responsible for the Democratic Party, when they had Republicans willing to say, yeah, we will agree to a bill that let's 26-year-olds be on their insurance with their parents, we will agree to work something out so insurance companies can't abuse people with preexisting conditions—they didn't want our help. They said, We don't need your vote. They didn't get one because they didn't want it.

They took a massive—my copy was about 2,500 pages, rammed it down America's throats without even having them stick out their tongue and say, ''Ahh.'' This is irresponsible.

We are the ones that are acting responsibly and trying to mitigate the damage they've done to the American people—their health care they've lost they didn't get to keep, their doctors they've lost they didn't get to keep, and now the economy that's been devastated.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, your privacy is under attack. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is creating a data hub for every American's personal health information and financial information. It's basically a central location for all of America, for all of your private and sensitive information.

Can America really trust this system that has key information on your income, your Social Security numbers, your emails, your family size, your medical records, and the list goes on? The answer is ''no.''

With the ObamaCare data hub, an American's personal information will be shared from the Department of Justice, the Social Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security. The IRS will send information, the Treasury Department, Health and Human Services.

We have already witnessed many security breaches within numerous government agencies, and the potential for abuse here is staggering. We know a system like this will be attractive to identity thieves. It is clear that a system that has not been tested for security systems cannot adequately protect all of our security information and our

personal information. We have even witnessed privacy abuses by other government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS.

The Obama data hub will end privacy as we know it and will grant unprecedented power over citizens to the government.

NATIONAL PUBLIC LAND DAY

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 20th anniversary of National Public Land Day. Whoopee.

I am also reading a book about the members of my church trying to live in post-World War II East Germany where all building was restricted. If they wished to have a house in which to worship and it was on government land, the government always owned the building and could possess it at any time. If they actually wished to possess the building, they had to find private land to trade to the government because the official policy of East Germany was ''no net loss of federal land.''

I mention that because communist East Germany has the same policy standard as the Department of the Interior and Forest Service have today.

Mr. Speaker, either we are wrong or East Germany was right, and I sincerely doubt the latter is accurate.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare was first passed, we've known that it would cause premiums to rise and increase the cost of health insurance for millions of Americans.

One issue that has not been talked about enough is the serious threat to the access of quality care for patients, especially in the rural parts of the country that I represent. This is a very serious issue in my district, and one of the main reasons that I support defunding this bill.

As we get closer to the October 1 release date of the individual health insurance plans under ObamaCare, the threat of reduced access is quickly becoming the reality. Because of ObamaCare, one of the largest health insurers in Georgia is eliminating 40 percent of their contracts with hospitals and 30 percent of the contracts with doctors in the State and ending all voluntary out-of-State coverage.

For my constituents in rural Georgia, we already face a shortage of care. In small rural communities, working-class patients have a more difficult time accessing the hospital or doctor that they may need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and the American people to look at the facts and ask: What good is a health insurance card when a patient cannot find a doctor or hospital that takes it? That's one of the reasons that I stand before you in strong support of defunding this destructive law and putting in place commonsense, market-based reforms.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, as many of us do, to speak about the intrusion into a God-given American freedom called ObamaCare.

As I watched the debate go back and forth and listened to my junior Senator declare those of us who don't want to fund ObamaCare to be for anarchy, I would say instead it's this: that if ObamaCare is ever implemented and enforced, we will never recover from it. It is an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty.

What we are saying here in the House is we are not going to fund any implementation or enforcement of ObamaCare. If that means that the President would shut the government down in his throwing of a political tantrum, that's not on us; that's on him.

We have always recovered from government shutdowns. There were 57 days of government shutdowns under Jimmy Carter. We don't even remember that.

We will never recover from ObamaCare if it's implemented, and I'm going to stand in opposition to funding ObamaCare.

□ 1115

OBAMACARE: A BUDGET ISSUE

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Budget Committee. Yesterday, we had a hearing with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. That's the nonpartisan group that does the scoring and that talks about what the impact of the decisions we make here will have on Americans, on taxpayers, on future generations.

We all know that the largest costs we have in the Federal budget are driven by health care. That's why we are focused so much on bringing health care costs down. In the midst of that, we are developing an entirely new Federal health care benefit in this country, and the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker, said this: that of all the Federal health care costs that will be paid over the next 10 years, more than half will be brand new costs from ObamaCare.

This is already the biggest expense we have, and we are going to double it. That's why this is a budget issue. That's why we are talking about it in the time of funding the government and funding the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bankrupt us. We must take care of families in our districts. We must address preexisting conditions. We must cover children—but we must do it in a way that does not bankrupt America.

GET 'ER DONE

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to govern. Now is the time to govern. In a few short days, the government will shut down unless the House acts.

I oppose ObamaCare, and I oppose shutting down the government. We had a vote in the House. The Senate will soon have a vote. They will, in all likelihood, strip out the ''defund ObamaCare'' language and send us back a bill.

I believe it is time for us to stop playing political games. I believe it is time for us in a bipartisan manner to vote to fund the government and end this brinksmanship debacle that has been going on for the past few days. I feel very strongly about this. Moreover, the American people expect us to make sure that services are provided. I want to make sure the troops are paid and that the people who are in need of services actually receive them.

There will be more opportunities to debate these issues going forward, particularly as it relates to the debt ceiling, but for now, fund the government, and do it in a bipartisan way.

As they say in Texas, ''Get 'er done.''

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to stand in the greatest deliberative body in the world and in the well of the House of Representatives. It is especially poignant that we are here today as Members of this body, because we are looking at an historic shift in United States history.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, not one American will escape the new rules and regulatory burden of ObamaCare. We are going to face something that's unprecedented in the history of the country, and we already know what some of those results will be. We have a law that's absolutely unaffordable. Our

President told us that we had to hurry, hurry, hurry—not even take time to read the bill—because we were going to be saving $2,500 per American household if we passed this bill.

Mr. President, we are already told that the average increase is about $3,000 per household—well over a $5,000 difference from what you promised us. It's unaffordable, Mr. President. Now we also know it's completely unworkable. How do we know that? Because, Mr. President, we already know that you have granted 19 different waivers, blockages, repeals of ObamaCare. Even your administration—Mr. Speaker, we would say to the President—has admitted it's completely unworkable.

And it's unfair.

I think this is what galls the American people more than anything. How do we know it's unfair? Take a look at the leader of one of the largest unions in the United States, one of the advocates for the Unaffordable Care Act, as many have called it. James Hoffa, the head of the Teamsters Union, calls ObamaCare a nightmare, and he has begged and pleaded the President of the United States to back off of ObamaCare because he said, in his words, that it is taking away the American Dream—what unions have worked for, to build up a 40-hour workweek. We are now becoming a part-time Nation so that employers today are looking for employees who will work no more than 29-and-a-half hours a week. That's a 25 percent reduction in hours for the average American worker, let alone the multiple tens of thousands of employees who have already been thrown off of their health insurance. That's unfair.

Finally, it's unpopular.

Never has ObamaCare enjoyed any popularity, and the President of the United States promised his side of the aisle, Don't worry. Just pass it.

In other words, build it, and they will come.

The bill was passed, and today—just literally days before this bill goes into effect—it is more unpopular than ever. If we think it's unpopular now, wait until it's fully implemented. As they say, there is nothing more expensive than something that is supposed to be free, and we are going to find out just how expensive that is.

We are going to enjoy for the next hour comments from people within this body as to what they've heard from the folks back home, what real Americans are saying about how this horrific law is going to impact their lives.

I would like to first yield time to the esteemed colleague from the State of North Carolina, the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX, a leader within this body.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for helping to lead this effort today with our other colleague from Tennessee and all of our colleagues who are going to be here today.

I think it's really important that we shed a lot of light on a couple of issues that are going to be discussed. They were discussed in the 1 minutes this morning, and I want to compliment all of our colleagues who came down to talk about this problem that we are facing with the implementation of this unaffordable, unworkable, unfair, unpopular bill that was passed in an unprecedented way, as you said.

I also think that it's important that we throw light on the issue of what happens if our government is shut down. As our colleague, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, was saying, House Republicans want this government to stay open. We have acted to keep the government open. We don't want a government shutdown. We voted a week ago to pass a continuing resolution in advance of the new fiscal year, which lays out how the government will be funded, how the troops will be paid, how the parks will remain open, and how day-to-day government operations will continue. Yes, we oppose this bill, but we want to keep our government running.

The Democrats in the Senate have yet to pass this legislation to protect the American people from a shutdown or from the unfairness of ObamaCare. America is waiting for the Senate. Because the clock is running, the country is nearing the edge of the 18th government shutdown since 1976.

I want to thank our colleague, particularly MICHELE BACHMANN, for calling to our attention the article that ran in The Washington Post this week that pointed out the history of government shutdowns. We don't believe in government shutdowns on the Republican side, but contrary to what our colleagues are trying to say and what the President is saying, this is not an issue that has been brought on only by Republicans in the past. Government shutdowns have occurred with Democrats and Republicans in the White House. They have occurred with divided Congresses, with a Congress of one party and a White House of the other. They have even occurred when Democrats have controlled both the Congress and the White House.

We don't want to add another chapter to that history, so we have asked our colleagues in the Senate to do their part. We know that the threat of a shutdown breeds uncertainty and confusion for American families when too many are already concerned about how ObamaCare will be making unwelcome changes to their health care and making health care more expensive, as has been pointed out by several of our colleagues today. So we want the Senate to act, to follow the lead of the House and move the country away from shutdown and away from ObamaCare. By the way, let's point out again that our bill passed with bipartisan support.

The right step to take is to repeal ObamaCare—at the very least to delay ObamaCare—because of the problems that it presents and not shut down the government. That's the message Republicans are bringing. Unfortunately, it has not been the message that has been out there in the media. I am thankful, again, to my colleagues for being here today and leading this Special Order to make sure that, at least here, we can get that message out.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you to Congresswoman FOXX.

Thank you for your leadership in this area.

It's wonderful, I think, to hear from women, and one woman in particular is the gentlelady from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, who has let our Conference know absolutely clearly that 80 percent of all health care decisions in this country are made by women, so women, in particular, are impacted by this decision because they are at the front line of understanding how unaffordable the President's new health care plan is, how unfair it's going to be to themselves, to their families, to their parents that they often care for, how unworkable it is, and how they want to see a positive solution.

We are not here just to beat up. We are here to make sure that we have a positive solution for American families, and it is women whom we are very concerned about today.

So, with that, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee, Mrs. MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you so much, and I thank the gentlelady for her attention on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think each of us wants to thank the leadership for allowing us to have time on the House floor and talk directly to the American people in order to be certain that they know exactly what is in this unaffordable act. We have talked a lot about why we want to delay it and defund it and repeal it and replace it, and the importance of that.

As the gentlelady from Minnesota mentioned, one of the problems that we hear from women is—guess what?—the cost of insurance is going up. The President had said it's going to save you $2,500, and we are hearing now that it is going to be going up between $3,000 and $7,500 per family per year for the cost of insurance. When you look at the cost of these exchanges, they're not saving money; it's costing them more.

We are hearing reports of how out-of-pocket expenses are expected to escalate. It may be $5,000 or $6,000 per family. The costs are escalating in what families are going to be using to pay for health care, and because of that, they are looking at us and are saying you have to get the costs down.

There is the impact of ObamaCare on jobs, on the 40-hour workweek, which has been such a cornerstone of the American Dream, such a cornerstone for hardworking families to be able to support their families, to have their children dream big dreams, to educate those children, and to send them forward in the world to do their part in adding to the greatness of America. That is being attacked by this legislation.

It is, indeed, a law that the American people do not want because they can't afford it.

Go back, and remember where we started with this—and this is one thing I hear from women regularly. I had a constituent ask me recently, and it reminded me.

She said, What was the purpose of ObamaCare?

Supposedly, when all of this great debate started, it was to find a pathway for somewhere between 30 and 45 million Americans who did not have access to health insurance to have health insurance. What it has become is a Federalizing and a nationalizing of 17 percent of the U.S. economy. It is turning health care on its head.

In order to pay for it—Mr. WOODALL mentioned the hearing that we had in the Budget Committee yesterday—they have taken money out of Medicare, which is money that our seniors have earned. They've earned that money. They have put it into the Medicare trust fund. ObamaCare pulls it out and puts it over here in the ObamaCare pot—$600 billion worth. That money was to be there for seniors, for hardworking taxpayers. This administration picks it up, and they move it over.

They are implementing 20 new taxes. Insurance policies, home sales, equity—you name it—medical devices are all subject to a tax. Why? They've got to find a way to pay for this expensive program that no one can afford. All the while, we continue to stay near 8 percent in unemployment. We have millions of Americans—23 million Americans—who are either unemployed or underemployed, and the Federal Government is seeking to take more of their paychecks.

□ 1130

This is one of the reasons that about 130 of our colleagues, including the gentlelady from Minnesota, have joined me on H.R. 2809, which is the legislation that is the 1-year delay of all things ObamaCare—all the taxes, the fees, the penalties, the Medicaid expansion that our States don't want, the exchanges that are not ready to open. Indeed, on the front page of The Wall Street Journal, there was another article about another glitch in these exchanges. It's not ready for prime time. The smart thing to do is delay it so that we can defund, repeal it, and replace it.

At our Republican Study Committee, we have introduced great replacement language, the American Health Care Reform Act. I know that others who are waiting to speak are going to talk about this act and the ideas we have to give individuals and patients and moms and dads more control over their health care. That's what we want, individuals able to make their own decisions, not a bunch of bureaucrats sitting in a building down on Independence Avenue in Washington, D.C.

We do not trust those decisions to nameless, faceless, unknown, unaccountable bureaucrats. Those decisions should be made by patients and doctors. That is what we are fighting for. We are fighting for the future of this Nation. We are fighting to make certain that our children know the America that we have known: the America that is robust and accepting and is welcoming to those that want to dream big dreams, welcoming to our children's ideas and concepts to build companies, to innovate, to create jobs. That is what we come to the floor to fight for. We know an important component of that is to prevent the establishment of this program that is going to be difficult to get off the books.

Ronald Reagan told us regularly that ''there is nothing so close to eternal life on Earth as a Federal Government program.'' If we have to stand here day and night in order to stop this program, let's stop it.

We continue to invite the President with open hands. We invite him to come and meet with us and work with us. We're willing to work with you. Let's delay this. Let's do things right. Let's not force on the American people, force on top of them a program they have repeatedly said, We do not want it; we do not like it; we want it repealed; we want it replaced.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Tennessee for all her passion and vigor and also for the wonderful piece of legislation because I think it's a good compromise at this point on ObamaCare. And if the truth be told, I think a lot of Democrats secretly hope that the gentlelady's bill passes because they know this is unworkable.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I think we were all encouraged when we had bipartisan agreement and support for delaying both the employer and the individual mandate, a vote that we took a month earlier this year, and we were encouraged with that.

That's such an interesting thing. There has never been Republican support for this law or the 20,000 pages of regulation that is springing up out of this law because it is costing us jobs, it's costing us money, and it's causing our hospitals to close. And we do have bipartisan agreement that the law is not ready for prime time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentlelady.

That's exactly right. That's why I say that I think if the truth be told, a lot of Democrats are secretly hoping that we can get this 1-year delay. That's the minimum compromise that we're looking at, defunding and delaying for at least 1 year. We want to save the American people from the economic misery that's just around the corner.

I yield to the gentleman from the State of Florida, Florida's Third Congressional District, Mr. TED YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague, the gentlelady from Minnesota, my home State, for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a lot younger, I remember watching President Reagan in the debates with Jimmy Carter. President Reagan once said, Now, Jimmy, there you go again. Here we are today, another day, another delay by the administration, another example of why the Affordable Care Act, or as the President likes to talk about ObamaCare, is not ready for prime time.

Mr. Speaker, if fully implemented, this law was predicted to and is crippling our economy; businesses would cut hours, and they are; employees would lose benefits, and they are; and families would be forced into government-run health care exchanges. It was said by the President that if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan. Well, tell that to my constituents who are being told by their insurance companies that due to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, their current plans will not exist in 2014. Just yesterday, we had a Member of this Congress who said that his private plan, which he paid for by himself, was canceled within the last month. I don't believe he feels that he can keep his same insurance nowadays.

With all these delays, even supporters of ObamaCare know and now realize that this law should have been read before it was passed. If we go back to that infamous day, when the then-Speaker at the time said: We have to read it to see what's in it. We have to read it to see how it's going to work—well, that day is here and we see what's in it, and we see how it's not going to work.

Understand, America, that the people that our government has to sign people up on this, they're unskilled in the insurance industry, they're unlicensed, they don't have insurance to cover errors and omissions, they're unbonded; and we are going to give them our private information. I want you to think about that as this law changes and goes into effect.

With your help, we can change it. We changed the dynamics in this Congress on the intervention in Syria. The American people stood up and your Representatives listened to that. We can do it again if you're willing to do that same kind of commitment. We need to get rid of this law, and it's now time for our colleagues in the Senate to act. They need to act in the best interest of America and not for preserving a legacy.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT. He is another tireless stalwart that, during the time when we were trying to fight, said, This is what's going to happen, is exactly what we're about to see transpire before our face. Mr. SCOTT GARRETT from New Jersey's District Five

made it abundantly clear exactly what was going to happen, in terms of the unpopularity, the unfairness, how unaffordable it's going to be and how unworkable.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentlelady.

I guess I will be speaking for a minute or two on the issue of unworkability of what's before us right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have to remind all of us here that for years now Republicans have come to this floor with one main point when it comes to health care: that it is our goal, it is our desire, it is our effort to make sure that Americans can have affordable health care coverage and health care delivery in this country. To that end—I'm not going to go into all the details now—in this House, Republicans have offered numerous pieces of legislation that would help facilitate that, help Americans be able to get health insurance that they're able to afford, that would provide them and their families the type and quality of health insurance that they need.

We passed bills like that, and we sent those bills over to the Senate where, as I always say, the Senate is where all good bills go to die. Those bills never became law. What, of course, did become law is the Affordable Health Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

I'll speak in just a moment on the issue of its unworkability when it comes to the issue of the data hub. It's not really talked about much, but it is a crucial element if ObamaCare is going to go forward, and it is also one that affects every American's life and their privacy, whether you're in an exchange or not.

Why is that? Because ObamaCare is creating a data hub on every American. It will look at and collect and gather together in one place all of your personal information, all of your personal health information, all of your personal financial information. It will be a central location, if you will, for every American's private and sensitive information that will be right here in Washington, D.C., for the bureaucrats and whoever else may be able to get to it.

Can Americans really trust this system that has key information about your income, about your Social Security number, about your email addresses, about your family, about your family's size, about your medical records, about what you said, how you checked boxes off at the doctor's, your veteran status? The list goes on and on. The answer is an emphatic ''no.'' With the ObamaCare data hub, Americans' personal information will be shared with a myriad of distinct Federal agencies, whether it's over at the Department of Justice, over at Social Security with all of your Social Security information, the Department of Homeland Security, and also with your veteran information down the street at the IRS. We know how secure they are. It will be over at the Treasury Department with all their information; Health and Human Services with your medical information. It's all going to be sent, come October 1, right here to Washington, D.C., and collected through this central data hub.

As I said, we have already witnessed many security breaches over the years with numerous government agencies, and the potential now is even greater. It's magnified with abuse, and it's staggering. We know in addition, besides the abuses by the people themselves who are going to be operating it is a problem—just look at NSA—but we also know the system will attract outside identity thieves and hackers; and it is clear that the system really doesn't do an adequate job in that regard. The system has not been fully tested for a security system, so therefore, how can it protect Americans' personal records?

To that end, let me just bring up here a little bit of information. A little bit ago, Kay Daly—she is with the Health and Human Services Department—an assistant inspector general, told lawmakers at a House hearing that the system security plan and risk assessment filed way back on July 16 was not made available to the inspector general and to her office, which is for a system that is supposed to be opening up in just a few days.

Former Social Security Administration Commissioner Michael Astrue noted that the review was done back in July and the AG audit was due on August 2. He said:

> There must have been a draft at that point.

He also observed the hub's development, until he left office, and testified during that same hearing:

> I am just not used to the idea that an inspector general comes in and asks an agency for a thing, and they're told no.

Well, that is the situation here, and that is why many of us have real questions about the security and the testing of it.

Look, we have witnessed privacy abuses by a myriad of government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS. The list goes on. That same agency that targeted various groups—conservative groups, Christian groups, pro-Israel groups—they will now be the same ones greatly involved in administering this data hub. This ObamaCare data hub will end privacy in this country as we know it, and it will grant unprecedented power over all U.S. citizens by the government and bureaucrats right here in Washington.

The Obama administration has said that they are delaying the employers' responsibility provision of ObamaCare, which is the right and responsible thing to do. They should delay every part of ObamaCare because it is abundantly clear that the responsible thing to do is to stop and delay ObamaCare entirely and stop, most importantly, this unprecedented intrusion into every American's private life.

□ 1145

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT. He has given a brilliant case on why ObamaCare enjoys a 57 percent disapproval rate by the American people.

The privacy security breach is one that I think we can't underscore enough. People have been very nervous about disclosures that have come out about our government. They are worried about surveillance. What we would say is, Baby, you ain't seen nothing yet, because we are about to see the largest Federal data hub get underway.

Because what will this contain? Not only every single American's most sensitive, private health information about whether or not you've gone to see a psychiatrist or a counselor or what's happened between you and your doctor—we don't know yet if even chart notes will be a part of this Federal data hub that the doctor writes down about what you told them during the private doctor-patient visit.

We know that somehow this will have to be connected to data that is connected with your employment history—where you've worked, for how long, how much money you make, whether you are full-time, whether you are part-time. This will also somehow have to be connected to your tax returns, your most personal private information that no one is supposed to have access to.

All of that will have to come together, together with your family relationships. If you're married, if you're not married, who it is that's considered a dependent. We have never before seen, in the history of the United States, a conflagration and a centralizing of all of this personal data in one hub.

And how can we, the American people, have any level of assurance that this data will be secured? In my own home State of Minnesota, just in the last several weeks, we had a State Federal employee working in the new ObamaCare health care exchanges hit a button, and just like that, 1,600 Minnesotans' private information, including their Social Security numbers, was sent out in a terrible, flagrant security breach. Not only that, we've found out that the information, when it was sent from the government health insurance site, wasn't even encrypted. It was unsecured. It was on an old-fashioned Excel spreadsheet.

And in my home State of Minnesota, we were, early on, jumping on the bandwagon of supporting ObamaCare. So my State has been fully onboard, working to implement this as one of the earliest States, and this is the lack of security for privacy breaches that we see even in my home State.

That's why we are pleading with the President of the United States: Have mercy. Have feeling for people across America who don't want their security breached, because once it's done, it can't be undone. Once your Social Security number is out there, what do you do? Once people know what your income is, what some of your health

problems have been, what some of your family members' health issues have been, how do you reel that back in? As they say in courtrooms, how do you unring a bell? That's all we are trying to say today, those of us that are on the floor, Republicans. Before it's too late, please, look at these problems that have already happened, Mr. President.

You say you won't negotiate with us? You will negotiate with the President of Iran, who is flagrantly producing a nuclear bomb to use against our ally Israel and against us? You will negotiate with the former head of the KGB and the Soviet Union with the Communist Party, Putin, and you won't negotiate with us?

We are here. It's Friday. It ain't quitting time. We want to talk to you, Mr. President. We are here.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Montana, STEVE DAINES, who is a fabulous new Member of Congress, who has been working tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of Montana to render to them an affordable, popular, fair health insurance system.

With that, I yield to the gentleman who is the at-large Representative of Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

In fact, my family roots in Montana began in Minnesota. My great-great-grandmother was in Minnesota. She came from Norway and then pushed westward. I think she heard the skiing was a little better out in Montana and continued westward and homesteaded out there as a widow with seven children, just north of Great Falls, Montana.

Well, every day it seems we hear about yet another aspect of ObamaCare that is getting delayed or exempted or ignored. Two months ago, it was the employer mandate. A few weeks later, it was announced that the administration had delayed a significant consumer protection in the law that limits how much people may have to spend on their own health care.

A Washington Post headline from Monday read, ''One week away, ObamaCare's small business insurance exchanges not all ready for launch.'' And a recent POLITICO story summarizes perfectly what a disaster ObamaCare has become:

> The ObamaCare that consumers will finally be able to sign up for next week is a long way from the health plan President Barack Obama first pitched to the Nation.
>
> Millions of low-income Americans won't receive coverage. Many workers at small businesses won't get a choice of insurance plans right away. Large employers won't need to provide insurance for another year. Far more States than expected won't run their own insurance marketplaces. And a growing number of workers won't get to keep their employer-provided coverage.

With key parts of the President's health care overhaul set to start on October 1, one thing is certain to supporters and opponents alike: ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Rather than fulfilling the President's promise of, ''If you like your coverage, you can keep it,'' ObamaCare has become a tangled web of broken promises, backroom deals, with no relief for American families and hard-working taxpayers in sight.

This is no more apparent than with the Office of Personnel Management's decision to grant Members of Congress and their staff with a special exemption from a provision in ObamaCare. This decision demonstrates how deeply broken Washington is, and it unmistakably suggests that Congress is focused more on their self-interests than the interests of the American people.

That's why I've signed on to the No Special Deal for D.C. Insiders Act and the James Madison Congressional Accountability Act, both of which would reverse the OPM rule. It's absolutely unacceptable for Washington to impose new burdens and costs upon the American people and then carve out special loopholes for itself.

Until this failed law is fully repealed, Washington must live by the same rules that have been forced upon the American people. This train wreck of a law will raise health care costs, force businesses to close their doors, and hurt Montana's access to quality health care.

In fact, ObamaCare could increase underlying insurance rates by up to 158 percent for the average 27-year-old Montanan and 149 percent for 40-year-old Montanans, according to a recent analysis by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. And in August, the KULR–8 news station in Billings, Montana, reported that, according to a Montana health expert:

> It's entirely possible that there will be businesses that go out of business solely because of this law.

I was in Missoula, Montana, this summer, meeting with local business owners who are concerned about how ObamaCare will affect not only their businesses but their employees' benefits and access to affordable care. ''We don't know what to do,'' Opportunity Resources' Carrie Purdy told me. She shared how her employees are at risk of having their health benefits decrease and premiums increase next year, as Opportunities' own projections show an $800,000 increase in insurance costs for 2014 alone. Unsurprisingly, a recent poll shows that two-thirds of Montanans believe that the President's health care law should either be delayed or stopped altogether.

I was elected to represent the people, the people of Montana. Two-thirds of Montanans say the law should either be delayed or stopped altogether. And that is why I am on the floor here today, because this is the House of the people. We're the voice of the people, and we are standing up against the President's law.

As Montana's sole Member in the House of Representatives, it is my job to ensure the Montana voice is heard, and Montanans are speaking loud and clear. Mr. President, why don't we allow individuals to opt out for the first year? You cut a deal with businesses to push the mandate out for a year. Let the American people opt out, if they so choose, for their first year. If they like their health care coverage today, let them keep it, as you promised would be the case when you pushed for this law a few years ago.

ObamaCare is deeply flawed. It's a law that hurts Montana, and it must be stopped. And I will continue fighting to repeal it, delay it, take it apart piece by piece so that Montanans never have to face the full consequences of the President's failed health care overhaul.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

We also have ROGER WILLIAMS from Texas' 25th Congressional District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pressure is mounting on President Obama and HARRY REID to get rid of ObamaCare. Even Senate Democrats, like JOE MANCHIN, are starting to listen to the people who sent them to Congress. Americans don't want the law, Texans don't want the law, and my district doesn't want the law. And it's easy to see why.

This week, a report by the Manhattan Institute revealed that the President was lying when he said Americans will see a $2,500 decrease in their premiums. The average health care premium in 2013 for a 27-year-old male was $91. Under ObamaCare, it's $139, a 53 percent increase. That's really frightening. This study shows that at least 12 States will see an approximate 100 percent increase in their premiums, many of those far exceeding 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the worst pieces of legislation in my lifetime. It hurts families, it cripples businesses, and it does very little to insure those who are uninsured. We can do better.

The President's so-called signature piece of legislation is crumbling, and it's time for a permanent repeal, for today, tomorrow, and for all generations to follow. In God we trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas' 25th District, Mr. WILLIAMS.

We have, also, Mr. ROTHFUS from Pennsylvania's 12th. Mr. ROTHFUS, thank you for joining us today.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding and organizing this important discussion.

I have been hearing a lot from the folks back home. Robert from the North Hills of Pittsburgh wrote to us:

> When Congress debated the health care law under original objective of health care reform, we thought that meant control and reduction of health care costs. We were wrong.

Stephanie from the North Hills said:

> Add us to the statistics of those who can't keep our insurance plans or doctors. Our family is being kicked off our health care plan and is being forced into the exchanges.

Mark from Somerset County said:

> Defunding ObamaCare is a great first step. But the next step is total repeal, and I urge

you to work toward that goal at every opportunity.

His premiums are going up 43 percent.

Francis from Beaver County:

My hours were reduced to 29 per week. And now I've been informed by my employer that I can't participate in the corporate health insurance plan because ObamaCare prohibits it.

Paul from Cambria County works in an auto parts store. His annual costs are going up 16 percent.

These problems weren't supposed to happen. The President guaranteed that if you like your health care plan, you can keep it. You know, when you buy a product with a guarantee that doesn't work, you take it back to the store and you get a refund.

The good news is there's a new product that we can shop for. Last week, we introduced the American Health Care Reform Act. It's the new product. This proposal would lower health care costs by allowing Americans to purchase coverage across State lines and enabling small businesses to pool together to increase their buying power. It provides tax fairness for people who purchase their own insurance and provides the same tax benefit as those who get insurance through their employer. It provides tax credits for people who purchase their own insurance.

And, importantly, and if there's one thing that you have to remember, unlike ObamaCare, which penalizes you with taxes, it gives you a tax benefit. You are rewarded if you buy insurance, not penalized.

Also, importantly, the American Health Care Reform Act provides significant funding for State-based high-risk pools, a place where individuals with preexisting conditions can obtain health coverage when doing so would otherwise have been unaffordable. And it does so without increasing costs on those who currently have insurance.

It is time for a new beginning. It's time for bipartisan health care reform and for that discussion to begin. It's time to bring Republicans and Democrats together for real solutions.

As President Kennedy once said:

Let's not seek the Republican answer. Let's not seek the Democrat answer. But let's seek the right answer.

We know that ObamaCare is the wrong answer.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman.

We have with us the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from the great State of Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her leadership on claiming this time but also for all she's done to point out—and I think, Mr. Speaker, as every day goes by, more and more Americans are finding out just how devastating the President's health care law is to their families.

The President likes mocking Republicans who have said we want to stand up and find a better way. We don't think this law is workable. We've had 41 laws, the President has bragged and mocked, 41 laws to repeal or defund portions of the law.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, President Obama himself has actually signed seven of those bills into law. President Obama has recognized his bill is so unworkable that he issued 1,400 waivers to his friends who could find access to the White House.

Then he said, okay, the employer mandate's so bad, I'll give a break to big businesses because it's so unworkable.

Then, just a few weeks ago, President Obama himself, Mr. Speaker, said that he was going to actually go and give a big break to insurance companies. But you know who we haven't given a break to yet? American families.

Hardworking American families deserve the same relief from the President's health care law that he has granted, time and time again, to the privileged few who can get access to the White House. That's not how democracy is supposed to work. That's not how health policy is supposed to work.

This law is so unworkable that the heads of labor unions, including James Hoffa, of all people, have said that this bill, the President's health care law, will be a disaster to middle class working families and will destroy the 40-hour work week that's the foundation of our Nation's economy.

We want to give that same break to him. We want to give that same break to all American families, and that's what this fight all about. It's a fight to ensure that government continues to get funded, while also providing the same relief from the President's health care law that he already has said he wants to give, but just to the chosen few who can get access to the White House.

If it's so good for everybody, it should apply to everybody. But if it's so bad, it shouldn't be Swiss cheese holes that you carve out to exempt your friends; it should be an exemption for all American families. That's what we're fighting.

Again, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's a wonderful rendition, and I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana.

I now yield to Representative LAMALFA from California's First Congressional District.

Mr. LAMALFA. I greatly appreciate the gentlelady from Minnesota for her efforts here and for the great lady she is.

Mr. Speaker, again, here we are, discussing an issue where this has taken away choices from the American people.

Now, as promised, we saw the President himself say, if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away.

One of my colleagues on this floor yesterday, counter to that, said how he had had his plan canceled as of the end of this year. People all over this country are now starting to get cancellations on their health care insurance plan that they've chosen with their families, around their kitchen table, probably agonized over how they're deciding to afford it, what level of deductible, what kind of coverage they're going to have. And that's being swept away by what really feels, to a lot of people—a lot of my constituents are telling me it feels like a very oppressive plan that's being pushed upon them.

It's really unbelievable in the United States of America that you can be forced into being a part of this system. It blows my mind that the Supreme Court would agree and rule that people should be forced into purchasing something of this personal choice.

We talked a little bit earlier about how people's privacy is going to be so greatly affected by all this information being dumped into a pool, and government bureaucrats are going to be in charge of that. Look at the leaks we've already seen with other people's information being leaked out by the NSA, or things accidentally put on the Internet by who knows all the different agencies involved.

Yet, this is going to manage one-seventh of our economy, and a very important, very personal thing with people's health and their family's health care. I really, really shudder to think—if this measure cannot be slowed down or stopped by the efforts we're doing in the House and in the next few days around here, it's going to be devastating to people's personal choices, to the economy, to their jobs.

Look at the part-time jobs that are being made out of full-time jobs because people have to react. There are true costs to what the Obama health care takeover is going to do to the people of this country, their families, their livelihood.

So that's why we dig in so hard to do this. This isn't politics for us. No, it isn't. It's about doing the right thing for the American people. A document that really was not well-read or well-vetted, done here just about three or four short years ago here, now is coming home to roost, in its ineptness, in its incompleteness and the overall oppression it's causing for Americans who are feeling that they're out of choices.

In my own home area, for example, people had up to approximately 130 different choices of health care plans through 8 to 10 different providers. They will be limited to two in my part of northern California, with maybe 8 to 10 total plans that they can choose from.

And the way this is rolling out right now, you might get only one plan if you're in certain sectors for perhaps a full year. How is this improving anything?

How is this making health care more affordable, more options, more anything?

We've got to repeal this. But, in the meantime, at the very least, we ask our colleagues in the Senate to not strip out the provision we put in place that would allow for a 1-year delay, which is the least we would need, as a country, to see something made better than what it is right now.

Exemptions, one after the other, are being dropped on us. And why do people that work in the public sector want exemptions if this is such a great plan? Pretty soon there'll be nobody left in it except for the taxpayers themselves.

So I thank you for the time. I thank my colleague, Mrs. BACHMANN, for allowing this time here today. And let's do the right thing here the next few days in this Congress.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative LAMALFA, for all of your hard work on defunding and delaying ObamaCare.

We have next with us Mr. CULBERSON from Texas' Seventh Congressional District, who has been tireless, especially in the area of keeping government fully funded.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for the country to know that the House of Representatives has done its job in passing the most important appropriations bills to make sure that our military is fully funded, that our veterans are taken care of, that the essential functions of Homeland Security are taken care of.

In fact, we passed those bills. The Defense bill out of the House on July 24, the Homeland Security bill was passed on June 6, and the Military Construction and Veterans appropriations bill was passed on June 4. We've also passed out of the House the Energy and Water appropriations bill. And the Senate has been sitting on these bills for over 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, the President has very few responsibilities set out in the Constitution. One of those specific responsibilities is Commander-in-Chief. And it's been reported that the President recently said that the troops in the field might not be paid unless the CR was passed.

Well, the Senate has had these bills for over 90 days. And I think it does not—how does that reflect on the Office of the President, for the Commander-in-Chief to say that the troops are not going to be paid, when, in fact, we've already passed the legislation out of the House—and the Senate's been sitting on it for over 90 days—to make sure the troops are paid?

We, in the House of Representatives, the constitutional conservative majority in the House, are keeping our word to the Nation and to our constituents to do everything in our power to defund, repeal, delay, whatever it takes to stop the most destructive piece of legislation ever passed by this Congress.

And I don't think it should be called ObamaCare. It should be called ''DemocratCare'' because it was done with 100 percent Democrat support. Not a single Republican voted for it because we recognized the damage it would do to the economy and to our magnificent health care system.

The Democrats passed this bill on their own and, all of a sudden, they're discovering, as the asteroid enters the atmosphere, they've got a big problem because it is causing doctors to leave the profession. It's driving up the cost of health insurance premiums. It's raising deductibles. People are losing their health insurance and being dropped into these nonexistent exchanges.

One other problem that I just discovered and that no one is, I think, aware of yet, are nonprofit organizations who have been lifting people out of homelessness or addiction and giving them job skills and training them, and they find local employers that are willing to take these folks and give them a clean slate, a fresh start, and a new job, and it would wipe out any convictions they've had. They wipe out any history they've got of drug addiction.

These nonprofit organizations have suddenly discovered that the employers are pulling up the drawbridge because, all of a sudden, the employer could be faced with—he's got to decide, as an employer, do I have to provide health care coverage for this, essentially, volunteer, this worker who was previously homeless and had no job skills, and I could be fined for every employee in the company.

So the disasters continue to unfold. It's urgent the House of Representatives—we will all, I know—stand together working and doing everything we can to repeal, delay, defund ''DemocratCare,'' using every legislative tool at our disposal.

I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for the time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I am extremely grateful to Representative CULBERSON. I know his daughter, Caroline, is the most precious part of his life, as our daughter, Caroline, is as well. And as a gentleman from Texas, I know it's his daughter that he's most concerned about with the ill effects of this bill.

I yield now to another great Texan, RANDY WEBER, from the great State of Texas, from the 22nd District of Texas.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, four facts, one question.

Fact 1: ObamaCare passed the House by the House Democrats, 219 of them. Now, 34 Ds joined Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many join on funding the government with the upcoming CR.

Fact 2: Republicans are poised to fund everything in the government at the current levels, and are eager to do so.

Fact 3: Polls show that Americans overwhelmingly do not want ObamaCare.

Fact 4: This House of Representatives is the keeper of the purse, as designed in the Constitution, and it's well within our authority to defund the ill-conceived and very unpopular government takeover of health care.

Only one question, Mr. Speaker: Will those same Democrats that voted for ObamaCare vote with the American people this time, and will the Senate vote with the American people this time?

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank RANDY WEBER from Texas. Texans have stood up on this issue, and they've been fighting from the very beginning.

But there's also another Member, who's a new Member of Congress, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO. KERRY BENTIVOLIO, from Michigan's 11th District, has diligently worked not only to defund ObamaCare but to delay ObamaCare. He ran on that when he ran for office, and he has fulfilled that promise while he's been a Member of Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan's 11th District, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. That's to defund or delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President's health care law is unworkable. Hardworking Americans know it. They're going to see their insurance premiums skyrocket.

Small business owners know it. They're going to have to scale back hiring, and maybe even let people go.

People in the President's own party know it. Even Senator BAUCUS from Montana, a key author of the legislation, called it a train wreck not long ago.

The unions know it. Teamsters' James Hoffa calls it a nightmare because of the jobs and benefits lost. Why?

Because, despite the President saying the law is working the way it's supposed to, we know it's not working at all. That's why House Republicans remain committed to protecting the American people from this unworkable, unfair law.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

I yield now to SCOTT TIPTON from Colorado's Third Congressional District, a fabulous Member of Congress.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act missed on its primary goal, addressing affordability and accessibility for the American people.

Probably no one said it better than the AFL–CIO just a few weeks ago, saying that the Affordable Care Act will lead to the destruction of the 40-hour work week, and will devastate the health and well-being of their members.

There was a time in America when we worked to be able to get a 40-hour work week. Now, Americans just want to have a 40-hour work week.

We know there is a problem with the health care law when we're seeing

fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer hospital beds, but yet we have the room to be able to create more IRS enforcers.

This is legislation that we're reaching out to the administration to be able to work on. To be able to create affordability and accessibility, we must defund and replace this broken piece of legislation on behalf of the American people.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative TIPTON.

From the Rocky Mountains all the way to the great State of New York, I yield to Mr. TOM REED, a fabulous Member of Congress from New York's 22nd Congressional District.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I came here today on the floor of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I just dropped the Fair CR. And what the Fair CR says is, let's listen to the American people. Let us delay ObamaCare for at least 1 year.

The President has already given business a pass for 1 year. Why is it fair that individuals and hardworking taxpayers have to be subject to this mandate?

Also, what's fair is, why are there special exemptions for Members of Congress and employees and staffers here in Washington, D.C.? You've got 300 million other Americans that have to be subject to this law.

It's just not right. It's just not fair. It's time to keep the government open but do what's right and listen to the American people and take care of this unfair policy that the administration knows needs to stop.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Representative TOM REED has gone to the heart of this problem, which is the lack of fairness in ObamaCare. And speaking to that is Representative TED POE of the great State of Texas. After myself, my mother's favorite Member of Congress is TED POE, our hero.

I yield to the representative from the great State of Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank your mother for being so kind. I appreciate the fact that you're bringing this to the attention of the American public and to Members of Congress again.

The Affordable Care Act, it's not affordable, and it has nothing to do with care. We cannot afford it, and it's the health care of the Nation now turned over to the government.

Are you kidding me?

That's why we are so persistent in trying to change a bad decision by Congress, the Affordable Care Act.

So this morning, I asked people that are on my Facebook to answer this question: How's ObamaCare affecting you and your business?

Share your story with me.

Well, I got a lot of them, and I can't give them all today.

□ 1215

Here's what Stan says:

I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no insurance, as a result of ObamaCare.

Carolyn says:

My husband's insurance increased 162 percent.

The gentlelady from Minnesota knows these are real people. These aren't statistics out there in the fruited plain. These aren't theories by the President. These are real people who are affected by the President's signature legacy nightmare law.

Ray says:

My family didn't get a congressional exemption. Can you get me one?

Ray, good point. Members of Congress ought to be under the same laws as everybody else in the country. Everybody ought to be under ObamaCare.

And he brings out a good point. I have here 729 exemptions of the over 1,200 that were granted by the President for waivers of ObamaCare. I would have had all 1,200 but the copy machine ran out of paper so I couldn't print them all.

But here are 729 special folks, special treatment, better deal, because they're not under ObamaCare. They get some kind of waiver for implementation of ObamaCare. And Ray is right: it's just not right. It discriminates against everybody else. This great law gets to apply to everybody except some special folks the President gives waivers to—at least 729.

After Ray's comment about a congressional exemption, I can't get you one, Ray. You need to call the President.

Michael says:

I have to postpone my graduation from the University of Houston because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance.

Tonya says:

My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I'll be able to keep it.

Tonya's tripled.

Pam says:

The huge chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits, all done in anticipation of this new law. Please help.

URGENT: I want to hear from you. How has #Obamacare affected your family or business? Share your story by commenting on this post & #MakeDClisten

Stan: I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no ins.

Carolyn: ''My husband's insurance increased 162%.''

Ray: ''My family didn't get a congressional exemption, can you get me one?''

Michael: ''I am having to postpone my graduation from UH because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance.''

Tonya: ''My families insurance premiums have tripled since Obamacare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep my insurance.''

Pam: ''The HUGE chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits. All done in anticipation of the implementation of the health care act the Pres and Dems are forcing on us! He works hard, I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: The University of Texas. More coming out of our pockets for health ins, means less available for college! Please help''

Kristy: ''Family business has had a 47% increase in cost to company since Obamacare was passed. Want to provide the same benefits to employees, but the increase amounts to the annual salary of employee. Will have to cut somewhere.''

David: ''I am a US/Texas citizen, living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a US policy are pay a penalty.''

Huckleberry: ''I expect my health insurance to double. The provider has extended my renewal date till dec 1st as they are waiting to see what congress is going to do.''

Teddy: ''My fiancée went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hrs because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from obamacare. My sister has been told that her test and some of medicines for her MS will not be covered because obamacare mandates say she is no longer going to be a 'viable' person at the age of 50.''

Linda: ''I'm feeling the pain of Obamacare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that my insurance company will no longer cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay $1,080 out of pocket. Asked if this was a result of Obamacare, she replied in the positive.''

24 Hour Fitness, Allied Building Inspectors IUOE Local 211 Welfare Fund, Alpha Omega Home Health, LLC, Andersen Corporation, Bowman Sheet Metal Heating & Air-conditioning, Bricklayers Insurance & Welfare Fund, Bridge, Structural, Ornamental & Reinforcing Ironworkers Local Union No. 60*, Carey Johnson Oil Co, Inc, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany*, Cement Masons' Local No. 502 Welfare Fund, City of Bloomington VEBA Health Savings Plan*, City of Burnsville*, City of Olathe*, Clausen Miller PC.

Crystal Run Village, Inc*, Delta Apparel, Discovery Benefits*, Dr. Trailer Repair, Inc., Employer-Teamsters Local Nos. 175 & 505 Health and Welfare Fund, Entrust, Fabri-Quilt, GC Harvesting, Inc., Glen Curtis, Inc. #2143, Heritage Christian Services, IBEW Local 3 NYC Electrical Division Health & Welfare Fund, Indiana Area UFCW Union Locals and Retail Food Employers' Health and Welfare Plan.

Ingham County, Innovative Driver Services Company, Integrity Data*, Inter-County Hospitalization Plan, Inc., Jakov P. Dulcich & Sons, Jefferson Rehabilitation Center, JLG Harvesting, Inc., Johnson Machine Works, Kent County, Laborers' District Council of Virginia Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Laborers National Health and Welfare Fund, Local 1245 Health Fund, Local 237 Teamsters Suffolk Regional Off-Track Betting Corp. Health and Welfare Trust Fund.

Local 295 Welfare Fund, Local 381 Group Insurance Fund, Local 805 Welfare Fund, Marble Industry Trust Fund, McGregor Schools ISD #4*, MJ Soffe, MO-Kan Teamsters and Welfare Fund, Mounds View Public Schools*, MVP, North State Bank, North States Industries Inc*, Pathways Inc., Pavers and Road Builders District Council Welfare Fund, Phoenix Children's Academy, Roofers Local 8 Insurance & Trust Fund.

San Bernardino IHSS Public Authority, SCC Healthcare Group, LLP, Schenectady ARC*, Schoharie County ARC*, Sieben Polk Law Firm, Sitel, Inc., Southern Graphic Communication Health Fund, Springbrook Standalone HRA*, St. Lawrence NYSARC*, Sunview Vineyards of California, Inc., Tandem Eastern Inc. / Consolidated Transport

Systems, Inc., Taylor Farms, Teamsters Union Local # 35, The Day Care Council/ Council of Supervisors and Administrators Welfare Fund.

The Public Authority of San Luis Obispo County, The University Financing Foundation, Inc., The Village of Newark Non-Union Employee Plan*, Theatrical Stage Employees Local One, Tuff Shed, Inc., U.A. Local 13 & Employers Group Insurance Plan*, UFCW & Participating Food Industry Employers Tri-State Health & Welfare Fund, UFCW Local 1500 Welfare Fund, UFCW Local One Health Care Fund, Ulster Greene ARC*, Westminster-Canterbury of Lynchburg, Wine and Liquor Salesmen of NJ, A–1 Transport, AIDS Council of Northeastern New York, Avon Central School District,

Azeros Health Plans, Inc.*, Benton County*, Bessey Tools, Inc., Canandaigua City Schools*, City of Eagan*, City of Shakopee Post-Employment Health Care Savings Account Plan *, Community Work and Independence Inc., Continuing Developmental Services, Crystal Cabinet Works, Inc., CU*Answers, Inc., Euromarket Designs, Inc., d/b/a Crate and Barrel, First National Bank of Dietrerich, Franziska Racker Centers*, Fridley Public Schools Health Savings Plan*, FSA/SUNYAB-Campus Dining and Shops, Genesee County ARC*.

Genesee County Economic Development Corp Health Reimbursement Account*, Grand Island Central School District*, Hammondsport Central School District, Imperial Wholesale, Inc., Learning Disabilities Association of Western New York, Minnesota State Retirement System Post-Employment,

Health Care Savings Plan—City of Roseville*, Naples Central School District, Naples Central School District Support Staff, Newark Central School District, Niagara-Wheatfield CSD Self Funded, Panama Central School District, People 1st Health Strategies, Inc., Pipe Fitters' Welfare Fund, Local 597*, Ron Clark Construction Health reimbursement Arrangement*.

Sherman Central School District, Silver Creek Central School District*, Sodus Central School District, Telco Construction, Town of Albion, Town of Chenango, Town of Lockport, Twin City Die Casting*, Western Area Volunteer Emergency Services*, Westfield Academy*, Williamson Central School District, American Radio Association Plan, Carpenters Health and Security Trust of Western Washington, Communicare Health Benefits Trust, District Council 1707 Local 389 Home Care Employees Health & Welfare Fund.

Health and Welfare Plan of the Laundry, Dry Cleaning Workers & Allied Industry Health Fund, Workers United, Northern Illinois and Iowa Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, Prell Services, United Food and Commercial Workers Retail Employees and Employers Health and Welfare Plan, A–1 Realty*, AABR*, ABCO Diecasters*, Alfred P. Sloan*, Alizio & Galfunt*, All American Heating and AC*, Allied Pilots Association, Amherst Central School District*, AristaCare at Meadow Springs*, Arthur Sanderson & Sons*, Associated General Contractors of ND Employees*, Autistic Service, Inc.*

Bartech Group, Basf Fuel Cell, Inc.*, Battery Park City Authority*, Battery Park City Conservancy*, Benefit Analysis Inc.*, Blaze SSI*, Blue Beacon, Board of Trustees for the Operating Engineers Local 101, Health and Welfare Fund, Business Wire*, Cargo Ventures*, Carnegie Corporation of NY*, Carpenters Local No. 491 Health & Welfare Plan, Central Laborers' Welfare Fund, Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Health and Welfare Fund, City of Cottage Grove*, City of Inver Grove Heights*, City Of Roseville MN*.

Clinton Management*, Cloquet Area Fire Department*, Cohen Partners*, Community Bank of Bergen County*, Community Mainstreaming*, Contract Cleaners Service Employees Benefit Trust, Cornerstone Search Group*, D & D Ag Supply and Construction, Inc.*, Dial Senior Management, Inc, Douglaston Development*, Dr. Margaret Andrin, MD FACOG LLC*, Dynasil Corporation*, Echo Molding*, Eighth District Electrical Benefit Fund, Electrical Workers Health and Welfare Fund, Enterprise Concrete Products, LLC Texas.

Epilepsy Foundation*, Epilepsy Foundation Northeastern New York*, Evans Chemetics*, Excellus Health Plan, Fairport Central School District*, Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, Gregory Packaging*, Gulf Coast Health Care, Handcraft Manufacturing Corporation*, Haver Analytics Health Waiver*, Health Care Employees Dental and Medical Trust, Hiawatha Medical, Inc.*, Highfield Gardens Care Center*, Hirsch International*, Hotel, Restaurant & Bar Employees Health and Welfare Fund.

Hypex Inc.*, IBEW Local Union No. 126 Health and Welfare Fund, International Union of Operating Engineers, Supplemental Benefit Fund Local 409*, Interstate Connecting Components*, Jacobson Family Investments*, J-B Wholesale Pet Supplies*, JKL International*, Jump, Scutellaro, and Co., LLP*, KC International dba Ekman Recycling*, Kerwin Communications*, Kingstown Capital Management*, Koellman Gear Corporation*, Kramer Electronics*, Lakeview Subacute Care Center*, Langan Engineering and Financial Services, Inc.*, LBDD*, League of Minnesota Cities*, Leisure Properties LLC d/b/a/ Crownline Boats*.

Liberty House Nursing Home*, Lifetime Assistance, Inc*, Lincoln Hall*, Local 888 UFCW, Maharishi University of Management, Mamiya America Corporation*, Mandt Reiss & Associates PLLC, Margaret P. Muscarelle Child Dev. Center*, Merrill Farms LLC, Micelli Motors, Inc.*, Midwest Asphalt Corporation*, Midwest Teamsters, Monroe County*, Nassau County Chapter, NYSARC, Inc*, NCHC, Inc.*, New York State Assn. for Retarded Children Erie Co.

Chapter dba/Heritage Centers*, NJ Society of CPAs*, North Greece Fire District*, Northern Minnesota-Wisconsin Area Retail Food Health & Welfare Fund, Ogontz Avenue Revitalization Corporation*, Parkview Care and Rehab*, PCB Machining Solutions*, PCB Piezotronics*, Philadelphia Macaroni Company*, Phoenix Partners Group, LP*, Privilege Underwriters, Inc.*, Progressive AE*, Quadrant Capital Advisors, Inc.*, Regency Management Group, LLC*, Rhoads Industries*, Roofers Local #96 Health & Welfare Fund.

Rowe and Company, Inc.*, Rush-Henrietta Central School District HRA*, Security Benefit Fund of the Uniformed Firefighters Association of New York City, SEIU Health and Welfare Fund, 2000 Seneca Cayuga ARC*, Service Employees 32BJ North Health Benefit Fund*, Sierra Video Systems*, SMEG*, Strategic Industries*, Superior Officers Council Health and Welfare Fund, Teamsters Local Union 966 Health Fund, Techno Source USA*, The Alternative Living Group, Inc.*, The Arc of Otsego (Otsego County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.)*, The Arc of Rensselaer County*, The City of Cloquet*, The Henry Luce Foundation*, The Maritime Aquarium of Norwalk, Inc.*

The Pew Charitable Trusts*, The Rehabilitation Center*, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation*, Topco*, Totino Grace High School*, Urstadt Biddle Properties*, W.H. Reaves & Co., Inc.*, Walder, Hayden & Brogan, PA*, Walters-Morgan Construction, Inc., Wellspring Advisors*, West Bergen Mental Healthcare*, Westchester ARC*, Westchester JCS*, Western Beef*, Hollow Metal Trust Fund. Theatrical Teamsters Local 817 IBT Welfare Fund.

Vestal Manufacturing Enterprises, Inc., AccessAbility, Inc., Ackerman Oil Employee Benefit Trust, Albany County Chapter, NYSARC Inc., DBA New Visions of Albany*, American Eagle Outfitters, Basin Disposal, Bengard Ranch, Inc., Bestway Rental, Inc, Big Lots, Inc., Byrd Harvest, Inc., Cardinal Hayes Home for Children HRA Plan*, CDS Administrative Services, LLC, Center for Energy and Environment*, City of Brooklyn Park*, D'Arrigo Bros. Co. of California, Defender Services, Inc., DineEquity, Inc.

Green Leaf Distributors, Inc., IBEW Local Union No. 728 Family Healthcare Plan, Joseph Gallo Farms, Life Benefit Plan, Luther Automotive Group HRA*, Metrics Inc., Nueces County Appraisal District, Ocean Properties Ltd, P-R Farms, Inc., SEIU Health & Welfare Fund, Sports Arena Employees' Local 137 Welfare Fund, Staywell Saipan Basic Plan, Truck Drivers and Helpers Local 355 Health and Welfare Fund, Communications Workers of America, Local 1180 Security Benefits Fund, Health and Welfare Fund of the Detectives' Endowment Association, Inc. Police Department City of New York.

Man-U Service Contract Health and Welfare Fund, Paschall Truck Lines, Inc., SEIU Local 300, Civil Service Forum Employees Welfare Fund, Electrical Welfare Trust Fund, Highmark West Virginia Inc. d/b/a Mountain State Blue Cross Blue Shield, Advocacy and Resource Center*, Amalgamated, Industrial and Toy & Novelty Workers of America, Local 223 Sick Benefit Fund, Atlanta Plumbers & Steamfitters Fringe Benefit Funds.

Aurora Consulting Group, Inc.*, Brock Enterprises, Inc., Central Texas Health and Benefit Trust Fund Locals 520, 60 & 72, Electricians Health, Welfare & Pension Plans I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 995, Essex County Chapter NYSARC, Inc. dba Mountain Lake Services*, Executive Management Services, Inc.

Florida Laborers Health Fund, Fulton County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.*, General Parts, LLC*, Greystone Program, Inc*, Hacienda Harvesting, Inc., IBEW Local No. 640 and Arizona Chapter NECA Health & Welfare Trust Fund, Lone Star Park at Grand Prairie, Louisiana Electrical Health Fund, Maverick, Inc. Employee Health Care Benefits Plan, Memphis Construction Benefit Fund, Mid-South Carpenters Regional Council Health and Welfare Fund, Mountain Lake Services, NECA-IBEW Local 480 Health and Welfare Plan, Plumbers and Pipefitters Welfare Fund of Local Union No. 719.

Retiree Plan of the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Health and Welfare Fund, Richmond Community Services*, Sheet Metal Workers Local No. 177 Health and Welfare, Pension and Vacation Funds, Sheet Metal Workers' National Health Fund, South Central Laborers' Health & Welfare Fund, Southeastern Pipetrades Health & Welfare Fund, Telamon Corporation Health Reimbursement Arrangement*, The ARC of Delaware County*, UFCW Local 1262 and Employers Health & Welfare Fund, United Cerebral Palsy of Ulster County, Inc*, Vincent B Zaninovich & Sons, Inc., Wayne ARC Standalone HRA Section 105 Plan*, Wildwood Program*, Allied Welfare Fund.

Becker County Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan*, Becker County VEBA*, FIDUCIA*, Triple-S Salud, Inc., B. R. Company, Britz Companies, ET AL, Century Health and Wellness Benefit Plan and Trust, EBSA Foundation Encore Enterprises, Faurecia USA Holdings, Goodwill Industries of Kentucky, Inc., Minnesota Cement Masons Health and Welfare Fund, Plumbers Local

Union No. 690 of Philadelphia and Vicinity Health Plan, Robert Heath Trucking Inc., Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., Sunwest Fruit Company, Inc., The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Midwest Health Benefits Fund, WD Young & Sons, Inc., Atlantis Casino Resort Spa, United Food and Commercial Workers and Employers Arizona, Act Trust Mini-Med Plan, Allen's Family Food, Anderson Media Corporation, Blasters, Drillers & Miners Union Local No. 29 Welfare Fund, Care Initiatives, Inc., Cement and Concrete Workers District Council Welfare Fund Plan, COARC*, Construction Workers Local 147 Welfare Fund, Crystal Run Healthcare, Diamondback Management Services, LTD, Freeman Metal Products, Hardwick Clothes, Inc., Hronis, Inc.

International Union of Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers, Isaacson Isaacson Seridan & Fountain, LLP, Katy Industries, Inc., Landscape, Irrigation and Lawn Sprinkler Industry Health and Welfare Plan and Trust, Local 298 Health Benefit Fund Plan, Local 803 Health and Welfare Fund, Louisiana Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, M.A. Mortenson, Maple Knoll Communities, Marshall Durbin Food Corporation, Minnesota Teamsters Construction Division, Name Brand, Inc., Oklahoma Goodwill Industries, PepsiCo, Inc., Plumbers & Pipefitters Local Union 823 Health & Welfare Fund, Plumbers & Steamfitters Local No. 6 Health and Welfare Fund, Regent Care Center, Rice Food Markets, Inc., Rice Food Markets, Inc.

Ricker Oil Company, Skilled Health Care, Southwestern Teamsters Security Fund, Teamsters Local 445 Welfare Plan, Teamsters Local 210 Affiliated Health and Insurance Fund, Teamsters Welfare Fund of Northern New Jersey Local 1723, The Durango Herald, The Talbots, Inc., Town of Frisco Medical Plan, Tudor Ranch,

UNITE HERE Local 74 Welfare and Dental Trust, United Employees Health Plans, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000 and Kroger Dallas Health and Welfare Plan, United Service Employees Union, Local 377, RWDSU, UFCW, WageWorks, Inc.

IBEW Local 613 and Contributing Employers Family Health Plan (Union), Advantage Benefits Company, LLC, Aerospace Contractors' Trust**, AJFC Community Action Plan**, Altisource Portfolio Solutions, American Heritage Life Insurance Company, Americare Properties, Inc., AMN Healthcare, Andrews Transport L.P.**, Anoka Hennepin Credit Union***, APWU Health Plan Conversion Plan, Aspen Snowmass**, ATCO Rubber Products, Inc, Baylor County Hospital District, Belk Farms**, Bricklayers Local 1 of MD, VA and DC, Cardon & Associates, Inc**, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Ogdensburg.

Central Mills**, Civil Service Bar Association Security Benefit Fund**, Cotton Belt Inc.**, CPC Logistics Health & Welfare Plan**, Delmarva United Food and Commercial Workers**, Dole Food Company**, EchoStar**, First Acceptance Corporation, Fontanese Folts Aubrecht Ernst Architects, PC**, Forest Products Inc. Group Health Plan**, Fruhauf Uniform Direct Labor, Golden State Bulb Growers, Inc.**, Greater Kansas City Laborers Welfare Fund**, Grower's Transport LLC, Heartland Automotive**, Helfman Enterprises, Inc.**, Hoosier Stamping and Manufacturing Corp., Horizon Bay Realty LLC**, I.B.E.W. Local 1249 Insurance Fund**, Ingomar Packing Company, LLC.

Integra Healthcare, Inc. (Integrity Home Care)**, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers**, International Brotherhood of Trade Unions Health and Welfare Fund—Local 713, International Union of Operating Engineers Local 295–295C Welfare Trust Fund**, International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union Number 137**, Iron Workers Local Union #28 Health and Welfare Fund**, Lamanuzzi & Pantaleo**, Living Resources**, Local 1102 Amalgamated Welfare Fund, Local 1102 Health & Benefit Fund, Local 1102 Welfare Fund—Lerner Employees, Local 272 Welfare Fund**, Local 338 Affiliated Benefit Funds, Madelia Community Hospital**, Max Homes, Loc**, Medical Development Corporation**, Mesa Air Group**, Mesa Packing** Michigan Conference of Teamsters Welfare Fund**, Minnesota and North Dakota Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers**.

Mission Linen Supply, NFI Industries, Operating Engineers Local 835 Health and Welfare Fund, Opportunity Resources, Inc. Health and Welfare Plan, Orange County AHRC***, Orscheln Industries, Pacific Risk Management**, Pearson Candy Company, Pinnacle PRM**, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 430 Health and Welfare Fund**, Progressive Logistics Services**, Pure Air Filter Sales & Service**, Rancho Maria PRM**, Reiter Affiliated Companies**, Retail, Wholesale & Dept. Store Union Local 1034 Welfare Fund.

Rio Farms PRM**, Sensient Technologies Corp., Service Employees International Union Local 1 Cleveland Welfare Fund, SFN Group, Sheet Metal Workers Funds of Local Union 38**, SMWIA 28**, Southeast OBGYN, PC***, Southern CA Pipe Trades Trust Fund, Southern Operators Health Fund**, Stonebridge Hospitality Associates**, Sun Healthcare Group, Inc., Teamsters Local 522 Welfare Fund Roofers Division, Teamsters Local Union 72 Welfare Fund**, Telesis Management Corporation, Texas Carpenters and Millwrights Health and Welfare Fund, The Mentor Network, The Wada Farms, Inc.

The Wilks Group, Inc. dba Ashley Furniture Homestore, The Wright Travel Agency**, Town of Grand Island***, Trans-System, Inc., True Leaf Farms**, UFCW Local 371 Amalgamated Welfare Fund**, United Crafts Benefits Fund**, United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Local No. 348 Health & Welfare Fund**,

United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1445 New Hampshire, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1459 and Contributing Employers Health and Welfare Fund**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 464a**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 911**, Varsity Contractors, Inc., Waffle House, Weckworth Manufacturing**, Western Express, Inc., Western Harvesting PRM Health Plan**, WG Yates and Sons Construction Company**, World Class Automotive**, Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation**, Alaska Pipe Trade U.A. Local 367 Health and Security Trust**, Amalgamated National Health Fund.

American Farms, PRM Health Plan**, American Growers Cooling, PRM Health Plan**, AUTO, LP, dba AutoInc. Health Benefit Plan**, Better Way Partners, LLC**, Big Valley Labor, PRM Health Plan**, CB Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, City of Rockwall**, Cocopah Nurseries, Inc., Express Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, Fallen Oak Packing, PRM Health Plan**, FirstCarolinaCare Insurance Company on behalf of Longworth Industries, Foot Locker, Inc.**, Fresh Express, G&H Farms, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Ranch, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Transport, PRM Health Plan**, Gills Onions, PRM Health Plan**, Green Valley Farm Supply, PRM Health Plan**, Greencroft Communities, Growers Express, PRM Health Plan**, Hall Management Group, Inc.**, IH Services**, Independent Group Home Living Program, Inc.

King City Nursery, PRM Health Plan**, Meijer Health Benefits Plan/Primary Care Option, Mission Ranches, PRM Health Plan**, Moore's Retread & Tire of the Ark-La-Tex, Inc., NOITU Insurance Trust Fund**, Payroll Solutions, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local No. 630 Welfare Fund, Seco Packing, Transcorr, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000, United Wire, Metal & Machine Health & Welfare Fund**, Western Growers Assurance Trust, Wisconsin United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Health Plan**, 1199SEIU Greater New York Benefit Fund, A. Duda & Sons, Inc., Adecco Group, Inc., Biomedic Corporation, Buffets, Inc.

Carington Health System, Cleveland Bakers Teamsters, Club Chef LLC, Columbia Sussex Mgmt, LLC, CRST International Inc., Darr Equipment, Co., DC Cement Masons Welfare Fund, Deaconess Long Term Care, Diamond Comic Distributors, Inc., ECOM Atlantic, Inc., FW Walton, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, GC Services, L.P. & First Community Bancshares, Inc., Guardsmark, LLC, Indiana Teamsters Health Benefits Fund, Knox County Association for Retarded Citizens, Laundry and Dry Cleaning Workers Local No. 52, Mars Super Markets, Inc., MPS Group, Inc.

Nexion Health, Noodles & Company, Pharmaca Integrative Pharmacy, Quality Integrated Services, Inc., RE Rabalais Constructors, LTD, RREMC LLC, Security Forces Inc., Shirkey Nursing.

Social Service Employees Union Local 371, Spindle, Cooling, & Warehouse, Strauss Discount Auto, Sunburst Hospitality, Susser Holding Corp, Telescope Casual Furniture, Teletech Holdings, Inc., The Brinkman Corporation, The LDF Companies, United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Mount Laurel, NJ), United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1459 Universal Orlando, Valley Services, Inc.

United Food and Commercial Workers and Participating Employers Interstate Health and Welfare Fund, Protocol Marketing Group, Sasnak, Star Tek, Adventist Care Centers, B.E.S.T of NY, Boskovich Farms, Inc, Café Enterprises, Inc., Capital District Physicians, FleetPride, Inc., Gallegos Corp, Hensley Industries, Inc., Jeffords Steel and Engineering, Laborers' International Union of North America Local Union No. 616 Health and Welfare Plan, O.K. Industries, Service Employees Benefit Fund, Sun Pacific Farming Coop, SunWorld International, LLC.

UFCW Allied Trade Health & Welfare Trust, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1995, HCR Manor Care, IBEW No. 915, Integra BMS for Culp, Inc., New England Health Care Employees Welfare Fund†, Wiliamson-Dickie Manufacturing Company, Aegis Security Insurance Company†, Alliance One Tobacco, Asbestos Workers Local 53 Welfare Fund, Assurant Health (2nd Application), Captain Elliot's Party Boats, Carlson Restaurants, CH Guenther & Son, CKM Industries dba Miller Environmental, Caribbean Workers' Voluntary Employees' Beneficiary Health and Welfare Plan†, Darden Restaurants, Duarte Nursery.

Employees Security Fund, Florida Trowel Trades, Ingles Markets, Meijer, O'Reilly Auto Parts, Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 123 Welfare Fund, Sun Belt, UFCW Local 227, Uncle Julio's, United Group, US Imaging, Vino Farms, AdvantaStaff, Inc.†, Agricare, Alaska Seafood, American Fidelity, Convergys, Darensberries, Gowan Company, Greystar, Macayo Restaurants, Periodical Services, UniFirst, Universal Forest Products, UFCW Maximus Local 455, American Habilitation Services, Inc.†, GuideStone Financial Resources, Local 25 SEIU, MAUSER Corp., Preferred Care, Inc.

Ruby Tuesday, The Dixie Group, Inc., UFCW Local 1262, Whelan Security Company, AMF Bowling Worldwide, Assisted Living Concepts, Case & Associates, GPM Investments, Grace Living Centers, Mountaire

Corporation†, Swift Spinning, Belmont Village, Caliber Services, Cracker Barrel, DISH Network, Groendyke Transport, Inc., Pocono Medical Center, Regis Corporation, The Pictsweet Co.

Diversified Interiors, Local 802 Musicians Health Fund, MCS Life Insurance Company†, The Buccaneer, CIGNA, Greater Metropolitan Hotel, Local 17 Hospitality Benefit Fund, GSC–ILA, The Allied Industries Health Fund, Harden Healthcare, Vernon Sheltered Workshop, Inc. Health and Welfare Plan #501, I.U.P.A.T., Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc.

Transport Workers, United Federation of Teachers Welfare Fund, Aegis, Aetna, Allflex, Baptist Retirement, BCS Insurance, Cryogenic, Fowler Packing Co., Guy C. Lee Mfg., HealthPort, Jack in the Box, Maritime Association, Maverick County, Metropolitan D.C. Paving Industry Employees Health and Welfare Fund, PMPS–ILA, PS–ILA, QK/DRD (Denny's), Reliance Standard, Tri-Pak, United Agricultural Benefit Trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Judge TED POE, because what we are fighting is to make ObamaCare equal for all Americans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the President.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, we just heard a remarkable hour of problems that were so overblown as to be really not worthy of much discussion. But I think the American public really needs to understand what this last hour was all about. In fact, the Affordable Health Care Act is working. And it's actually working very, very well for millions upon millions of Americans.

I just want to read some facts and then move on to what is really going on here, which is an effort to try to leverage the necessity of funding the Federal Government, which is something we must do every year to provide the money to continue all of the work of the Federal Government. They're trying to use that as a lever to gain something that they've been unable to do in a Presidential election year.

The last Presidential election year, the issue of the Affordable Health Care Act was front and center, and the American people heard more than a year of debate about the Affordable Health Care Act, whether it was good or not so good, all the benefits and all of the problems that it might be. At the end, in November of last year, the American public decisively said that the Affordable Health Care Act and President Obama should continue. That was the decision by Americans.

In the House of Representatives we gained seats on the Democrat side, and I think about 2 million more voted Democratic than they voted Republican. Although, because of the redistricting and the gerrymandering, the House remained in Republican hands.

Just understand what's going on here. What could not be achieved in the democratic process of an election is attempted to be achieved in two absolutely critical moments in the annual processing of the Federal Government.

The first moment, which comes up on October 1, is the necessity to provide money to carry on all of the tasks of the Federal Government—the Social Security Administration, the National Parks, and on and on. Nearly every aspect of the Federal Government has to be funded every year. That is a moment that is now being used as a lever to try to achieve what could not be achieved in an election. After all, America is a democracy. We make our decisions through the electoral process, not by trying to lever, using a critical moment, basically, the funding of the American Government.

Now two or 3 weeks beyond October 1 there will be yet another moment of critical importance, and that is the ability of the American Government to continue to pay its bills. It's called the debt limit. Until 2011, this was a routine process in which the Congress would continue to say, Okay, we will increase the debt limit so that we can pay our bills.

It was done during Democrat and Republican administrations routinely. There was always some discussion about the debt and the deficit, as it should be. In fact, the President, Mr. Obama, when he was in the Senate, railed against this issue of deficit. Now he's on the other side of that. That often happens.

But the fact of the matter is that in this process, these two moments of time are now being used as a lever to achieve in the legislative process what could not be achieved in the electoral process. So much for democracy.

Just a few facts about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, as it's become to be known.

Nearly 13 million Americans have benefited from over $1.1 billion in rebates from insurance companies. I was the insurance commissioner in California in 8 years. And I knew then, as I know now, that the insurance companies were overcharging the public for their health insurance policies. However, I did not have any authority under California law to order rebates.

The Affordable Health Care Act sets up a system that requires the insurance companies to pay at least 80 percent of the premium dollar for medical services. If they don't, they have to do a rebate. It's the law that they want to repeal. That's $1.1 billion.

Also, 105 million Americans, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors in Medicare, have received access to free preventative services. Do you want to hold down the cost of medical services? Do prevention.

The Affordable Health Care Act requires that every insurance policy, including Medicare, provide a free medical checkup every year. Guess what has happened? The cost curve has bent downward. Why? Because serious illnesses are either treated or delayed. Diabetes, strokes, and heart conditions are analyzed early and treated, reducing the cost of health care and, far more important, keeping people alive and healthy.

Moving on. Thirty million women are receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventative services, including a well-woman visit and diabetes screening. They want to repeal that: 30 million American women receiving free diagnostic care. They want to repeal it.

Seventeen million children with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage. I was the insurance commissioner. I cannot tell you the numbers of times that I begged for a law that would require insurance companies to continue or to provide insurance for a newborn child that had a serious illness, time after time, in California. Insurance companies would insure the mother for the delivery. And the moment that child was delivered, the child had no coverage. Bankruptcies and lack of medical care ensued. Seventeen million children will be denied health care coverage if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act. That's 17 million children.

Also, 6.6 million young adults to the age of 26 have taken advantage of the ObamaCare law, the Affordable Health Care Act, to stay on their parents' health insurance plan. Do you have a kid in college or a kid that's graduated from college that's 21 or 22? They can stay on your plan. Before the Affordable Care Act, before ObamaCare, they had very little opportunity to get insurance. They would have to go out and buy their own policy. They were able to stay on their parents' policy. That's 6.6 million young adults that will not be insured if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act.

Also, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion. Previously, most health insurance policies in the United States set a limit on the amount of coverage that a person could have during their lifetime or in a given year. Now, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion, and 100 million Americans are able to get comprehensive coverage for the duration of their illness. They want to affect the well-being of 100 million Americans.

You've heard about the senior doughnut hole, the drug coverage. Written into the law in 2003, providing drug coverage for seniors—Medicare part D—was a doughnut hole. You got the first couple of thousand dollars covered. After that, 100 percent of the cost had to be paid by the seniors.

The Affordable Health Care Act is shrinking the doughnut hole every

year. And in another 2 or 3 years, that doughnut hole will be closed, providing an extraordinarily important benefit to seniors. I know this problem in my communities. Before the Affordable Health Care Act, before ObamaCare, seniors would reach that doughnut hole threshold and they could not afford to continue to buy their pharmaceutical products. So what did they do? Their blood pressure went up, their diabetes was not treated, and they became seriously ill.

They want to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, and the doughnut hole will not be closed if they are successful.

Shall we continue on?

□ 1230

In California, on October 1, 4 million Californians for the first time will have access to an insurance exchange, a marketplace, a free marketplace—which we talk about all the time. But one does not exist in California until October 1, where the uninsured in California, including this Member of Congress, will be able to go to a rational marketplace that lists numerous health care policies, five different levels of coverage, all of them uniform, all of them priced, where I and 4 million other Californians can select the policy of our choice—not a government policy, but a private insurance company policy; a marketplace, a free market solution to the 40 million Americans that are not insured and the 4 million in California that are not insured today.

We rail back and forth, Democrats and Republicans alike, about the necessity of a free market. For the first time ever in this Nation, a free market, rational market system is established, not only in California, but in every State in this Union. And thirty-three State Governors have refused to set up a free market rational system called an exchange—called an exchange in which insurance companies will lay out their policies, lay out their price, lay out their coverages, exclusions and the rest; and the public will be able to have price information, quality information, and make a choice. That's what's called a free market. And they want to repeal it. So what are those people to do?

You know, 435 of us represent the people of America. I spent an hour listening to some 20 people who may, in their own mind, believe that they're representing their people. But I know, from my experience as insurance commissioner in California, that for the first time across this Nation, we have the opportunity to have a market system, a health insurance market system that is rational, that is sensible, in which prices are available, in which quality and multiple products are available—not a government-run health system, but rather a market system established by this government so that the people of this Nation can pick and choose which private policy they want.

If you're over 65, you can get your Medicare; and you will continue to get it with the additional benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act. If you're not yet 65 and you happen to have been unemployed at the age of 50, prior to the Affordable Care Act you were in the deepest of trouble. You were virtually uninsurable. Why? Because you were 50 years of age. You were entering that period when you were expensive; you were likely to get health issues. Insurance companies routinely discriminated against you. If you happen to be a woman, you were in even deeper trouble. Those days are gone—unless the Republican Party succeeds in repealing, delaying, and defunding the Affordable Care Act.

The American people have an opportunity today to get insurance—or they will on October 1. Exchanges will operate across the country, some run by States such as California and New York, where the Governor said this makes sense to the people in my State and we're going to do it. Others, like Texas and Montana, the Governor said, oh, we don't care about our people; therefore, the Federal Government is stepping in to set up exchanges.

Whatever you may have heard over this last hour about a government-run health care system, it is not true, except if you happen to be on Medicare. Medicare is a government-run health insurance program in which the delivery is not provided by the government, but provided by a multiplicity of health care providers. Individual doctors, groups of doctors, hospitals, big health care medical centers such as the University of California-San Francisco. Yes, Medicare is a government health insurance system; it is not a delivery system. There is one, however; it's called the U.S. military. Military hospitals and veterans hospitals, those are government delivery systems.

So whatever you may have heard about the government takeover of health care, not true unless you happen to be in the military, a veteran, or on Medicare. Even the Medicaid program is State run, not run by the Federal Government.

Oh, there are so many falsehoods. You could fill this entire room with the falsehoods that we've heard over the last months. But the reality is that the Affordable Health Care Act is good for America. It is reducing the inflation rate in health care. We've already seen the lowest inflation rate in the last 3 years, since the enactment of the Affordable Health Care Act, over the last 25 years.

So are we going to shut down government so that the opponents who failed in an election, who failed in Congress in 2010 to stop the Affordable Care Act, failed in the Presidential election, in Senate elections, are we going to shut down government so that they can leverage something that they could not achieve in an electoral process? I don't think so. I don't think the American Government will stand for it. I don't think the American people will stand for it.

I wanted to talk about jobs. I wanted to talk about my district. I wanted to talk about the necessity of a farm bill so that there will be food on the table for the poor, so that there will be a program that the farmers in my district will know what they will face as they begin to plant their winter crops. That bill languishes because of this process that we're seeing.

I wanted to talk about a transportation bill that we must write and fund so that we can build the infrastructure, so that we can put people back to work. But, no, we're caught up here in this process.

There are things that we need to do in America, and here we are. Here we are. This is not good for America. The Affordable Health Care Act is good for Americans. And when we provide health insurance for every American, we will be a much more just society, and we will have a stronger economy. This road is out ahead of us.

I'm going to be joined by my colleagues. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you for sharing this hour with me, Representative GARAMENDI from California, my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, who could be against making every American eligible for health care insurance? I can't even imagine. So I'm here today to help set the record straight about ObamaCare. I'm here to explain what ObamaCare means to the people in my community and the people around this Nation. And I'm here to explain the truth—the real truth—behind the health care reforms that are moving ahead on Tuesday, October 1, simply because Obama cares.

Mr. Speaker, this health reform is about making it easier and cheaper to get insurance if you don't have it. It's that simple.

Our President, Barack Obama, cares and is making health care easier to obtain. He cares and is making health care more affordable. President Barack Obama cares and is making health care more accessible.

Now, listen up: if you have Medicare, this does not apply to you. This has absolutely nothing to do with you. It will not affect your coverage. If you have Medicaid, this does not apply to you. If you have a job with health care coverage, this does not apply to you.

ObamaCare only applies if you do not currently have insurance. You will finally have the opportunity to gain protection for your body. You will finally find peace of mind. You no longer have to live in fear of being bankrupted by a health emergency. You no longer will have to let your health suffer by avoiding the doctor. You no longer will have to fear for your family going without care.

Mr. Speaker, there are very simple steps for getting started if you're insured. Because Obama cares, you can

get started with these simple directions. If you have access to the Internet, you can get started right away.

Beginning Tuesday, October 1, Healthcare.gov will give you all the information you need to sign up for this program. Once you're there, go to the tab that says ''get insurance.''

Mr. Speaker, this will take you to a page that will explain all the insurance marketplaces available to you. You will be able to compare all the plans available to you in your area.

Mr. Speaker, the Internet is the best way to sign up; but if you're not comfortable using a computer, ask a friend, or ask a young relative to help you survey the choices. Young people know all about computers. If you need additional help, you can also call 1–800–318–2596. People are available around the clock to offer assistance in more than 150 languages—and in Miami, that is very important. They can help you enroll by mail if you prefer.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares so much that there will also be expert advisers called ''navigators'' in your community. You can find them at community health centers, at the mall, in drugstores, and in many places of worship. In some States, traditional insurance agents and brokers will be able to help. But remember this: if someone tries to charge you money for advice on how to sign up, say ''no'' because it is a scam. No one should be charged for assistance in signing up.

Mr. Speaker, Americans should take their time in completing the important task of choosing the right health insurance plan. I know sometimes it can take 2 hours to choose the right pair of shoes at the mall or 2 hours at the kitchen table to choose the right cable TV plan.

□ 1245

Be patient. Take your time in choosing the right plan to protect your body and your life. You won't regret it.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares because health reform is not only about making insurance simple, but also making it affordable. Let me just give you a couple of examples:

A self-employed person with a spouse and two children and a household income of $33,000 would more than likely not be able to afford insurance at all today, but starting Tuesday, October 1, this person would be able to get insurance for his entire family for an average of $94 per month because of a government subsidy;

A single mother with three children and a household income of $40,000 will now be able to insure herself and her children for an average of $163 per month through ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it's affordable and it's essential to be covered. Young people under 26 will be able to stay on their parents' plans. For those young people without the opportunity to join their parents' plans, it's especially important for you to get insurance.

If you're young, you're statistically more likely to end up in a car crash or a motorcycle crash or to experiment with drugs or other risky behavior that lands you into trouble. You need insurance as much or more than anyone else. You have to pay to insure that car, you have to pay to insure that motorcycle, so make sure that you pay a very small portion of that first paycheck you earn to insure your precious body.

Mr. Speaker, no one said this would be easy. There will be challenges as the Federal Government implements the new insurance markets in 36 States in the weeks ahead. But progress is never easy. Nothing this important and ambitious is easy. There will be needed tweaking and needed corrections. But that was also the case in 1935 when we rolled out Social Security and in 1965 when we rolled out Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we know that Obama cares because insurance companies can no longer deny 17 million children with preexisting conditions their health coverage. We know that Obama cares because 105 million Americans with life-threatening diseases like cancer no longer have to live in fear of maxing out on their lifetime dollar limits on their insurance coverage. We know that Obama cares because more than 3 million young people up to the age of 26 now have coverage because insurance companies can no longer remove them from their parents' plans.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are well on our way to a healthier, more financially secure Nation. We refuse, we utterly refuse, to allow anyone to damage, repeal, or turn back ObamaCare. It is the law of the land and it is here to stay. We will stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves. We will speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. We will do all this and more because President Barack Hussein Obama cares. He cares for the people of this Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. WILSON. Thank you for laying out the way in which the Affordable Care Act will benefit and how people can use that act, how they can access the exchanges and the benefits that are found in it.

I would like now to call on one of my colleagues from the Midwest, Mr. RYAN, if you would care to join us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman; I thank the lady.

This is, obviously, a very important issue for all of us around the country—in Ohio, especially. We have a very unique situation going on in Ohio. As I heard in the previous Special Order, I heard many members of the Tea Party Caucus come up here and talk about how bad the Affordable Care Act is, how it is going to end democracy as we know it, how the sky is going to fall, and it is troubling, I think, when you actually see what the benefits are.

Let me be the first to say as, I think, even those of us who voted for the health care reform, there's a long way to go. We've got a lot of work to do. These things aren't easy. This is a very complicated situation, a very complicated program to try to cover all 313 million Americans, try to drive down health care costs, try to move towards more prevention and wellness—very big goals in the United States, goals that we can only really achieve if we work together.

So to have one side trying to destroy what is now law in the United States, confirmed by the Supreme Court, passed by the House, the Senate, and signed by the President, approved by the Supreme Court, now as we try to stand it up, we have people trying to inject into the process not a helpful hand, not trying to make it work better, but trying to destroy it, trying to add more uncertainty here in the United States Congress, even to the brink of wanting to shut down the government or default on the credit, the full faith and credit of the United States.

All the polls are saying 60 to 70 percent, maybe in the high 50s, most Americans say we do not want you to use shutting down the government or defaulting on our debt as a way to try to push back on ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act.

So what I'm saying is we have millions and millions of people—here's what really gets me. People walk up on the other side of the aisle, God bless them, and they act like prior to 2008–2009 we had a health care system that took care of everybody. Everybody was fine with the current. No businesses were calling our offices saying: Man, this health care is destroying my business; I can't plan ahead. It's a 30 percent increase this year; it's 70 next year. We get one person sick in a small business of 20 or 30 people, we've got to go bankrupt.

People forget. Millions of Americans. Prior to this health care law, 1,700 families in my congressional district went bankrupt because of health care. So we are not even going to talk about that? Are we going to sweep that right under the rug, the kind of suffering that goes on in some of our communities? Are we going to drive around the problem and close our eyes?

Everyone says this is a giveaway. This is not a giveaway. This is about giving people who go to work every day, sometimes two or three jobs, have a sick kid, we are just going to ignore them because we've got this bumper sticker on the back of our truck that has four little slogans on it and, boy, we can't deviate from that because we will get primaried by a Tea Party candidate because we can't check every box along the way.

But, fine, let those 1,700 families go bankrupt. Let that kid with cancer and his parents who are at Akron Children's Hospital or some other children's hospital around the United States have to deal with the fact that they hit their lifetime cap because their child has cancer.

Now, give me a break. Because you've got to stick with that bumper

sticker, you can't deviate from the bumper sticker that says ''less government,'' we want to go back to that great health care system that left 40 million people without any health care, that kept driving up prices for small businesses, small manufacturers in Ohio.

We can maintain what is great about the American health care system. I represent a district not far from the Cleveland Clinic. We understand in northeast Ohio how powerful it is, some aspects of our health care system, but there are failures in our health care system, and we are here as Members of the United States Congress to try to fix those holes in the system and try to help our fellow citizens that may be sick, maybe can't afford it, but go to work every day just as hard as everyone else.

I will say, before I kick it to my friend from New York, that I find it very interesting that we have some Governors in some of our States, Republican Governors in some of our States, conservative Republican Governors in some of our States, Tea Party Governors in some of our States, one in Ohio was the chair of the Budget Committee during the Gingrich revolution, Governor Casey, he makes the exact same arguments for expanding Medicaid in Ohio, which he is fighting for, along with Governor Brewer out in Arizona and some others. He makes the exact same arguments that it is immoral for us to have this level of sickness in our society with people not having access to health care, that it doesn't make any sense for us to wait for somebody to get so sick and then they dump themselves into an emergency room after weeks and weeks of sickness ending up there much sicker than they should be. He, as well as others, are making the argument that prevention is the way to go, wellness is the way to go. I commend these Governors, because it makes sense.

So sit down and work with us to help stand this up to create more competition, to make sure that these young children and their families don't have to go to bed every night—and this is the last one, now trying to take any help we are giving to congressional staffers, which is floating around here. I know it's a political hot button. But my goodness gracious, we get young people that want to come to Capitol Hill, live in one of the most expensive cities in the world, make peanuts because they are ambitious and want to get ahead, and we are going to say, You are on your own with your health care, too. What are we doing? What are we doing? This doesn't make any sense.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry you don't like President Obama. I'm sorry. I don't know what to say. But to come after health care reform where so many millions of people are going to benefit. In Ohio, we are saying 6 out of 10 of the people who are uninsured in Ohio can get health care for less than 100 bucks a month. What's wrong with that? What's wrong with that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN. Thank you for expressing the tone of harshness that has prevailed in this Chamber.

I don't know if I can remember when a law, a standing law in this country, was used as a reason to avoid paying our bills or keeping government running. I find it regrettable that we go after the law of the land, in this case the Affordable Care Act. They'll reference it as ObamaCare, and we will see how long that label stands when the program proves successful. It might be removed immediately.

But, nonetheless, the harshness here is driven after a season, season's worth of activity on the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1300

We have voted for it in both Houses of the Congress and with bipartisan support in the Senate. The President stood for reelection, and was reelected amidst immense arguments and debates about repeal and replace by the opposition, by the candidate for President of the other major party. So the people have spoken. Then, when they elected Members to the House of Representatives, the cumulative total of votes for the Members of this House was, in the majority, calling for Democrats. The people have stated they support this. As Senator MCCAIN indicated on the floor just this week, there are consequences to elections.

It's not sinking in—or perhaps it has, but they refuse to allow their behavior to end. It's putting themselves first as political forces rather than the people, rather than what's in the best interest of the people. I'm convinced that this is driven by the fear that this ObamaCare, as they call it, will be successful and that this is their last effort possible to end the opportunity to provide affordable, accessible, quality health care for all. We know it. We see it in our States. We see it in Ohio. We see it in California. We see it in Florida. We are joined by our friend from Texas, who just visited my district this week in Albany, New York, Representative CASTRO from Texas. We see it in our home States. People have a need out there.

In my case, I can cite some of the stats: 36,000 young people with preexisting conditions will not be biased against in having insurance. Take it away, why don't you. Take it away, and then put us at risk of defaulting with our credit rating. Take it away. Be harsh. We look at the 12,000-plus seniors who are receiving discounts for their pharmaceutical needs. Take it away, why don't you.

It's unfair. It's un-American—immoral—to take it away, but we are going to use it as a pawn in a device here called ''negotiating'' on whether or not the government will continue to run or on whether we will keep the doors open and the lights or on whether or not we are going to pay our bills. Come on. Working families in this country understand it. They roll up their sleeves. They play by the rules. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their government to do likewise.

They don't expect us to put a roadblock in the way that says the law of the land—constitutionally tested in the highest Court of the land, in the Supreme Court, and that has been given the green light—we're going to put that in as a roadblock to stop progress because we know the October 1 starting date is quickly arriving. This is grossly unfair to the people of this country.

When I look at the 124,000 seniors who are receiving free preventative services, I'm not ready to give that up. Repeal is not an answer—improving is an answer, and I will work with you—but we don't use this vehicle as a reason to stop government from running or as a vehicle from stopping us from paying America's bills. It goes on and on. There are 6,200 young people who now qualify to stay on their parents' policies for their health care coverage. This is a vast improvement. This is allowing the tens of millions of people who have been uninsured—and the many who are underinsured—to finally have access, connection, to a system.

Aren't we in this business to respond to the needs of people? Are we in the business to take the facts, twist them, present them in a way that offers confusion, and only serve for political, partisan purposes?

I think we can do better than that in this Chamber. We are going to work, and we are going to get to that finish line. I am convinced, Representative GARAMENDI, that we are going to stand for justice, for what is fairness in our society. Health care is a right. We should see it as an American right—the moral compass points in that direction—and we ought not use it as a pawn in a political theater that allows for us to not have government funded or that allows for us not to pay our bills. Let's get on with business.

What's happening in this Chamber? Are we so insensitive to the needs of people? What could be more important than responding to the health care needs of the people of this great country? Let's stop the brinksmanship. Let's get it done. Let's get business done here.

I thank you for leading us in this discussion and for having served with our all of colleagues here.

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

In previous weeks, you and I and Mr. RYAN and Mr. CASTRO have had the pleasure of talking on this floor about putting people to work, about jobs, about creating the infrastructure, the education, the training that's necessary to move Americans, but this week, we find ourselves caught up in this leveraging of the necessity of funding government and of paying our bills—the debt limit—and using that as

a lever to destroy a very important law that provides real benefits to every American.

Mr. CASTRO, we thank you for joining us. We know that Texas was much discussed in the previous hour. I am sure that you have some thoughts about all of this, so please join us. Thank you very much.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, and thank you, Congressman TONKO and Congressman RYAN, for your very eloquent words in describing the situation that we face today.

I, like millions of Americans, hope that there will not be a government shutdown. I hope that we can get past the hostage politics that have prevailed over this place over the last few years. This is no way to run a government. Our Nation is the strongest nation on Earth, and we are the most exceptional nation on Earth. These wounds are self-inflicted ones.

I have said many times and have heard from my constituents that all of these fiscal fights, these self-inflicted wounds by Congress—when we get up to the limit where we are supposed to pass a budget or we are supposed to raise the debt ceiling limit—are causing the Nation high blood pressure. They are affecting the market in negative ways. The stock market is taking a hit. Our employment rates are taking a hit. In every way, this has been bad for the country.

I would also remind our Members of Congress and the American people about what happened the last time brinksmanship was tried. The last time this happened, the sequester resulted—a bad way to do business. I think people on both sides of the aisle would agree that the sequester did not turn out well for our Nation, but that's the same road we are headed down again. The Republicans are taking us down the same road that gave us the sequester—the Budget Control Act. Then the cuts that really were across the board were not targeted and have hurt the military, have hurt education, have hurt health care, and we are headed down the same road.

Congressman, the last time you and I spoke—I guess about a month ago here on the floor—I mentioned that, in politics, you are often asked whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. What is it that you stand for? I think, as Democrats, what we believe in are a few things that have made this Nation great.

The first is freedom, because we are a free people. That freedom has been hard fought. I come from San Antonio, Texas—Military City USA. The people of San Antonio and the people of Texas know the high price of freedom.

The second is democracy. We are a democratic Nation. Because we are free, we get to elect our leaders, and we get to kick them out of office when we no longer believe that they are representing our views and our values.

But much of the politics of today is really fought over the third principle and value, which is opportunity. You see, what is special about this country and the reason that, for years and years, people from all over the world have wanted to come to America is that, as Americans, we have come together to build out what I call an ''infrastructure of opportunity'' that enables each of us to pursue our American dreams. I want to remind you of what I mean by that.

Just as there is an infrastructure of transportation—a system of streets and roads and highways that help all of us get to where we want to go on the road—in American society, we have built up together an infrastructure of opportunity that enables or at least helps each of us get to where we want to go in life, and that has to include certain things that are at risk when we get into hostage politics—great public schools and universities; a strong health care system so that, if you get sick, you don't become debilitated or die; and then an economy that's built around well-paying jobs so that people can support themselves and their family members. It's that second part that I mentioned—health care—that has been at issue in this debate.

I just want to close by saying this, that the junior Senator from Texas, a few days ago, talked about how he was speaking for 26 million Texans when he was threatening to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act, which he derisively calls ''ObamaCare.'' He does not speak for 26 million Texans. The fact is that Texas has the highest percentage of people who have no health care coverage at all. There are a lot of families who are having to take their kids to the emergency rooms, who are getting letters from their insurance companies because they have hit their lifetime caps. They are getting letters of their being denied coverage because they have preexisting conditions. The Affordable Care Act is going to change that. It's going to be a good thing for our State.

So I would just note that there are a lot of people in Texas who are excited about the Affordable Care Act and about the fact that they are going to have a chance to afford to have insurance, some of them for the first time in their lives. Even of those who have insurance, many of them will no longer have to worry about being denied because of preexisting conditions, worry about hitting a lifetime cap or about going bankrupt because of health care.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CASTRO, and thank you for pointing out that one junior Senator doesn't represent all of Texas. I know you represent the heart of Texas—that is, the people of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Very good.

We are joined here now by our distinguished senior Member from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from California and all of my colleagues who came to the floor in the aftermath of that hour from the GOP side of basically criticizing, on the Republican side, the health care reform—the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

Sometimes, when I listen to what the Republicans say about ObamaCare, I am shocked because I don't think they understand how many people are out there who have already benefited from it and who are really looking forward to October 1 because they can sign up for the first time for health insurance. Let me tell you that, in my own district, I have had so many inquiries from people who are uninsured or underinsured or who can't afford the health insurance they have now.

I just want to say that I agree with the gentleman from California in that this was basically resolved last November. It couldn't have been clearer that the President, for whom ObamaCare is now known, was out there in the Presidential election, saying that the Affordable Care Act was a great accomplishment on his part and that he was going to continue with it. Then you had Mitt Romney on the other side, saying that, if he were elected, he was going to repeal it. So my colleague from California is right—that was resolved in the election.

So why is it that our colleagues on the Republican side are trying to hold the health care reform hostage by saying that, if we don't repeal it or delay it or defund it or whatever—we've had so many votes on this, over 40 now—that they're going to shut the government down? One has nothing to do with the other.

I just want to talk about those three groups of people who will be the most positively impacted by ObamaCare beginning October 1.

First of all, we know we have about 40 million Americans who are uninsured. Many of them are from New Jersey. They don't have health insurance options right now. This is going to be the first time, on October 1, that they will actually have a rational, legitimate option to get health insurance, and they are waiting for October 1 to come around.

Secondly, we have just as many people—maybe 80 million people—who may have health insurance, but it's very skeletal. It doesn't provide much in the way of benefits, and they have to pay a lot of money out-of-pocket if they get sick or if they have to go to the hospital or whatever. Those people will also benefit because every health insurance policy that's offered under the health exchange, as the gentleman from California talked about, will be a good benefit package, at least as good as what we know as, say, Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Then you have the third group of people who may have health insurance, but they're spending so much money in order to make sure that they have

health insurance that they can't pay for their rent or they can't pay for their mortgage or they can't put food on the table.

All of these people are going to benefit come October 1, when they can sign up for a good package and an affordable package. One of the main reasons it's affordable is that the Federal Government is helping pay the premium—is helping subsidize the premium—with tax credits but not with tax credits that you have to pay up front and then get a refund for when you file next April 15, but a tax credit like a subsidy that goes directly to pay for the premium.

We are already hearing—and I've said this to my colleagues in New Jersey—that the average health insurance policy is going to be about $350 a month. Some people say, ''Oh, $350 a month,'' but that is incredibly affordable for a lot of people in New Jersey who are paying a lot more right now, and that's without the subsidy. With the subsidy, that can go down to $100 a month depending upon your income.

So I can't stress enough how important this is, and for the Republicans to try to hold this hostage, no one on our side of the aisle is going to give up on the Affordable Care Act, because we know people need it. We are going to move forward, and, hopefully, they come to their senses and don't keep trying to shut this government down.

I want to commend the gentleman again. Thank you.

□ 1315

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for your comments about New Jersey.

Mr. RYAN, I think we have maybe 2½ minutes left if you'd like to close, and I'll take the last 30 seconds and then we'll thank the public for their attention.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the last couple of points I would like to make is that we have very conservative Republican Tea Party Governors saying, We want to expand Medicaid, and they make all of the same arguments that we made during the health care debate. Coming into an emergency room and getting your primary care does not make any sense; you get sicker and it costs more money. There is also a moral aspect that we've got millions and millions of people going bankrupt, children not getting treatment, hitting the ceiling when they have cancer or some other issue. Those problems have been fixed.

Folks here in the House of Representatives, they need to recognize just how extreme their position is. When Karl Rove and JOHN MCCAIN and some of these other folks are saying, You folks are really out on a limb here, you're not making a lot of sense, that's not TIM RYAN and Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. PALLONE and others who they would call liberals. That's Karl Rove, Bush's brain, who is telling you you're way out on a limb on this one, and it doesn't make any sense. I think that's important. You have Republican Tea Party Governors making the same argument about expanding Medicaid. Critical, critical, critical points.

Lastly, as we see the top 1 percent and the top one-tenth of 1 percent garnering almost a third of the wealth created from 2009 to 2012, we've got a problem in this country. If we can't step in and say at the very least we can give some of these folks some basic health care, then we have to ask ourselves what kind of country we really want to live in.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN and Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for joining us on this discussion about the Affordable Care Act and the way in which the Republican Party here in the House is using its repeal as a lever to really shut down government. It's not a good situation.

We normally spend our time here on the floor talking about jobs, infrastructure, how we can move this committee and this Nation forward. We hope to get back to that next week. We've got a critical vote coming in the next couple of days, or tomorrow or the next day, about the health care of America and more importantly about the way in which this government should operate.

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

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I heard our President in a speech that I heard this morning say that in essence people who watch Fox News think ObamaCare is terrible, there are all kinds of problems. I sure hope that our President will start watching something besides CNN or MSNBC so he can find out that everything he's done is not made of gold, that people are hurting across America.

They heard him when the President promised that if you like your insurance, you'll get to keep it. He said it over and over and over and over: if you like your insurance, you can keep it. He made that speech across the Nation over and over and over.

He said that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It turns out that wasn't true. If you like your insurance, you're probably going to lose it or it's going to cost a whole lot more. That's what people are finding across the country.

So I appreciate my colleagues talking about and actually saying some of the same things about ObamaCare that they said 3½ years ago. The trouble is now that ObamaCare is upon us and people are being hurt. They've lost their insurance, and they've lost their doctor. They can't afford the extra thousands of dollars it is costing. I think it was PolitiFact that took a shot at me for accurately saying it would cost people thousands of dollars if they were at 133 percent of the poverty level, that they'd have to buy the insurance or pay the extra income tax.

When you get down to it, even their article that criticized me pointed out at the end that still, with all of the government subsidies, it was still going to cost a few thousand dollars. That was the estimate. It's costing people money they don't have. They're getting less care, not more. And I don't have to just give opinion on that. We've got case after case, email after email from real Americans that have seen the harm it's done.

A young friend that I have tremendous respect for across the aisle pointed out, from his limited experience, that Congress has worked in a very partisan way the last few years. What he doesn't realize is that in the 4 years the Democrats controlled the House, they presided over the Congress that had more closed bills—that meant they didn't allow a single amendment. They ostracized nearly half of the country from being represented because they did not allow a single amendment to more bills than any other Congress in the history of our country. It was the most ruthless, partisan, overreaching Congress in the history of the country. It was unbelievable.

So it gets a little difficult to hear leaders who were in charge during the four most oppressive partisan years when it comes to having input from the other side tell us about responsibility and bipartisanship when they showed what they think when they were in charge. It was really quite mean.

We were told by our colleague earlier that Republicans gave us sequester. I encourage my friends across the aisle to go back and look at accurate history. It was the President who proposed sequester. I didn't think it was a good idea at all. That's no way to really legislate. We should have made the difficult choices and made the cuts. Then to hear comments that the Democrats believe freedom has made us great, I absolutely do, too. But freedom has a price. Freedom requires responsibility from Americans. It requires that everybody be involved, that everybody pay attention to what the government is doing.

So for those who have said for so long, I don't care what the government does as long as they stay out of my business, if that's your approach, the government does not and will not stay out of your business. It gets to where we are right now with ObamaCare. Every American's most private secrets about their own personal and private health will be kept by the Federal bureaucracy headquartered in Washington. The records may be kept elsewhere. I think the administration made a deal with GE. So GE and the Federal Government will have everyone's most personal secrets. It's a good thing they can keep a secret in the Federal Government so that nobody's

personal records will be leaked out once they get into the possession of GE or the Federal Government.

But for my friends across the aisle to talk about hostage politics, all I know is that people that I talk to across my district—I think the lowest denominator probably ended up at 500 to four that gave examples or talked about how bad ObamaCare was. You'd have a few people that said, Well, actually, we got our 26-year-old on our health insurance, so it's not so bad. Gee, the Republicans were ready to agree to that. We were ready to do bipartisan bills, but the most closed-minded and closed Congress in our history would not allow input. They didn't want our input. They were going to do it all themselves. As a result of that kind of mean-spiritedness, Americans are suffering today.

I have my friend from Texas, also a former State district judge. As I understand, he has heard from his constituents, as well. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman yielding some time.

Earlier this morning, I was reading some emails and Facebook posts on my Facebook from people with the question that I asked: How does ObamaCare affect you? We ran out of time earlier this morning. Unlike the Senate, we can't talk until we're through talking, as you know.

I'm going to read a few more of those in the next few minutes from some of these folks that I received comments from in my district and people on Facebook this morning.

Tonya told me:

> My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep it.

Pam says:

> The huge chemical plant my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, co-pays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits—all done in the anticipation and implementation of the health care act. He works hard, I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: the University of Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT and I may have a disagreement on that. Anyway, they want to send their daughter to the University of Texas, and she continues:

> More coming out of our pockets for health insurance means less available for college. Please help.

Shannon says that because of ObamaCare:

> Premium doubled, all co-pays went up. So I had to change employers because of the law.

Brandy:

> I am the finance manager for a non-profit company with 16 employees. We may not be able to offer health insurance next year.

Linda, who I went to high school with said:

> I'm feeling the pain of ObamaCare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that my insurance company will no longer, they have in the past, cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay $1,080 out of pocket.

Asked if this was a result of ObamaCare, she replied in the positive.

> Also, TRICARE won't cover it and my doctor dropped Medicare coverage. Expensive.

Matthew says, I'm an outlaw now. I'm a subcontractor, and I just can't afford ObamaCare.

Kristin:

> If I could afford insurance, I would already have it. This forces me to buy something I can't afford.

Jenn says this:

> Deductible went up, co-pay went up, I have thyroid problems and have to have it tested one to two times a year. Insurance always covered the test. No longer covers it. I'm still trying to figure out the ''affordable'' part of the health care when my costs keep getting higher.

Here's what Kristy says about her family business:

> Family business has had a 47 percent increase in cost to company since ObamaCare was passed. Will have to cut somewhere.

David:

> I am a U.S./Texas citizen living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a U.S. policy or pay a penalty.

And Teddy, the last one, presents a rough situation for people he cares about:

> My fiance went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hours because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from ObamaCare. My sister has been told that her test and some of the medicines for her MS will not be covered because ObamaCare mandates say she is no longer going to be a ''viable'' person at the age of 50.

These are real people who have contacted me today about the effects of ObamaCare. Contrary to what the folks on the other side have said for the last hour, it's not all great for a lot of Americans. It's a tough piece of legislation. It affects people's health. It affects them financially. This law turns over America's health to the Federal Government. There's got to be a better way.

I appreciate the gentleman from Tyler yielding me some time.

□ 1330

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, real people being hurt in real ways is what ObamaCare is doing. And for those who think it is a good thing, those were people that would have been helped by either side of the aisle.

But it should be noted that insurance companies, under ObamaCare, are paying an additional tax to the Federal Government. Everybody is having to pay more for everything, and yet they're getting less health care.

I get questions: Why, under ObamaCare, are we now going to see everything—we've already gotten notice, it's so much more expensive, and yet we're getting less coverage, less health care, higher deductibles, those kinds of things.

Part of that answer is, well, we've got to pay for the 18,000 or so IRS agents who are going to be hired to help you with your health insurance so they can monitor more closely what you make and what you spend it on and whether you are spending enough on health care and how you are spending it. But we've got to pay for all the IRS agents. Now, that's not going to help anybody's health.

But then you also look at all the navigators that are being hired, and that's a problem. I saw over $1 billion was about to be spent on advertising to tell Americans how good they were going to feel under ObamaCare. All of those things end up coming out of the coverage and the health care that people would otherwise get.

I see my friend from Pennsylvania has arrived, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, for yielding to me.

I would just like to talk about what many Americans hear talked about in Congress but maybe can't put a face or a name to, and that is access to care. What does that mean, ''access to care''? And our claim is that ObamaCare reduces access to care. ''Access to care'' is your ability to have a doctor take care of you or some kind of practitioner take care of whatever your health care need is. I think it's important that we show examples of that.

So, as of right now, on January 1, thousands of Americans are at risk of losing their lifesaving dialysis treatments which they need to survive. We're not talking about, I need to have my bunions reconfigured. We're not talking about, I've got a skin tag or I have an upset stomach. We're talking about dialysis. People who are on dialysis must have it on a regular basis to live.

I visited a dialysis clinic with 25 machines that operate 6 days a week in the Fourth Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, 6 days a week, 25 machines, all day long people come in, and it serves primarily the underprivileged population of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, which is the capital. That's its primary clientele. And the gal there that was running the place told me that on January 1, if ObamaCare continues to go through, they will cut their operating hours from 6 days to 3, 3 days a week from 6. So those 25 machines will be idle half the time that they're currently being used. That's 50 percent.

Now, Medicare payments already fall very short of covering the entire cost of this, but this clinic makes up the difference by the other paying customers. And I would ask the folks that support ObamaCare, do they really think that the rich in this Nation are going to go without access to care? We've heard about concierge medicine. The rich are going to continue to receive care one way or another. But it's the poor, it's really the abject poor that are going to suffer under this.

I just want to put some names to this. I met a Vietnam veteran named Johnny. You know, people think, Oh, if you have dialysis, you've got diabetes. You didn't take care of yourself. This man is fit, doesn't smoke, and does take care of himself, but he just happens to have diabetes. And he comes into this clinic, and he needs to come in more than once a week. So when you go from 6 days to 3 days, Johnny is going to have to look for some other way to get his dialysis.

And then there's Amy. Amy comes in a couple times a week and hooks herself up. She comes and knows it so well that the people there that are actually administering the service and the care don't have to do that work for her. She comes in and takes care of that herself so she can literally stay alive.

And then there's Chris, 34. People think, Oh, if you need dialysis, you didn't take care of yourself. You are an old person who didn't take care of yourself. Chris is 34 years old. When you go to dialysis, it's 4, 5 hours, sometimes, and more in the chair. That's a day away from work, away from family. And it's hard to sustain employment when you are gone 4 or 5 hours a day, two or three times a week to stay alive. But that's what these people must do. Chris supports himself. He is a chef in a local restaurant. He has got type 1. He's had kidney failure. So he's going to have to find another place to get his dialysis, because this place will no longer be there.

So that's what ''access to care'' means, and that's putting a face and a name to it; and that's what ObamaCare is going to do in the community that I represent, literally taking this lifesaving care away from people.

I would urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to really take a look at the upcoming votes both in the Senate and in the House regarding this bill, regarding this law. It is not ready to roll out. There are significant failures of it and shortcomings. We understand it was laudable trying to find a way for every American to receive care. That is a laudable goal, and we support that.

We have a plan here in the House of Representatives. We would like the plan to be aired, but none of that is going to happen. None of that is going to happen if ObamaCare is fully implemented as is planned for in the upcoming days. None of that is going to happen. And these people that are receiving their dialysis on the west shore in the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are going to have to find some other way, literally day by day, to stay alive thanks to ObamaCare.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. But it's not just Pennsylvania, and it's not just Texas. It's everywhere. People are hurting.

My friends across the aisle in the last hour had commented about Republicans wanting a shutdown. We don't want a shutdown. We don't. TED CRUZ does not want a shutdown. I visited with him quite a bit yesterday. He doesn't want a shutdown. But we know the damage ObamaCare is doing not just to the economy—that's bad enough—but to people's health.

Here is an email. We've gotten so many of them. Just in the short time I have, I'm trying to decide which ones to present. This one from Kaytee says:

> Just got notice my health care coverage options and costs will be changed. They will send out the info next month. I am one of the 26,000 part-time Home Depot employees whose hours were cut back to never exceed 29 per week. We used to do the 6-week thing. They would schedule us for 35 to 39 hours per week for 5 weeks, then cut us back in the 6th week to 25 or so and then back up again. Now it's always going to be less than 29 hours per week. I'm scared to death to see what the rate changes will be. Probably way more than I make.
>
> My doctor of 9 years is retiring this month. She is only 46 and an amazingly exceptional family medicine practitioner. Says she'll grow a garden and herd goats, but she won't be a contributing member of the insanity. She is an Indian Hindu born and raised in Canada. She came to Texas because of the messed up state-run medical care in Canada.

Insurance not the same, losing the doctor.

Here is one from Sandric:

> My wife has a bone disease and is always in severe pain. We see a specialist in Longview, Texas. This specialist travels from Dallas, 110 miles away, and practices here a couple of days a week. But since ObamaCare, he has said that he can no longer afford to have two practices so far apart and will have to close his Longview practice and that he may just retire early. Now there will soon be no doctor in this area for my wife to see, and she is too debilitated to make the drive to Dallas every month. We are not sure what to do now.

These are real Americans agonizing over the damage that ObamaCare is doing. And I can't bring myself to call it the Affordable Care Act, because it isn't.

Here is one from a widow that lives in east Texas, Joy. She says:

> I am losing my insurance, which I have had for over 30 years.

So much for, ''If you like your insurance, you can keep it.'' There's no telling how many millions of times that promise will be broken in the subsequent months if we can't put off the damage ObamaCare is doing.

Back to her letter. Talking about the insurance, it says:

> It was in my husband's name, and he has recently died. So here I am, a widow and losing my insurance. I am frustrated and a little scared. I've never had to do anything like research for insurance and don't even know where to begin. I am from Tyler, Texas, and saw your post on Facebook. Enclosed is the letter my insurance company sent me. They do not directly say it is due to ObamaCare, but it's pretty easy to read between the lines.

And actually, you don't even have to do much reading between the lines. She enclosed a copy of the letter from New York Life Insurance. At the end of the first paragraph, it says that their insurance, their Group Health and Life Insurance Trust will terminate at midnight on December 31, 2013.

> The decision to exit this market was not an easy one. The determination was made based on the evolving market conditions and regulatory requirements stemming from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I think that's pretty clear. She lost her insurance because of ObamaCare.

I know that there's nobody on the Democratic side that really wants to do this, put this kind of fear and suffering into a dear widow, but it's being done. I know that nobody voted on this side of the aisle for ObamaCare intending to hurt widows and children like is happening, but it's happening. And now that it's happening, it is absolutely incorrigible if my friends do not help us help those that are being hurt by at least postponing this disastrous, hurtful ObamaCare.

Here's another from Jay:

> On Tuesday of last week, my 89-year-old mother-in-law fell and broke her hip. Her doctor gave her only a 50 percent chance of survival, but survive she did. He stated after the operation that she was lucky that it happened this week. He said, ''In 2 weeks, I could not have performed the same procedure because it is not an approved procedure under the new rules. It's too expensive.'' We all wondered what her chances of survival would have been under Dr. Obama.

She will have insurance, but we're already hearing from people that they've been told they'd better get the procedure now because, if they wait, it's not going to be covered because the ObamaCare board apparently thinks if you are of a certain age then maybe you don't need or deserve a pacemaker or back surgery.

Here's another:

> I work for a commercial electrical contractor who has been in business in east Texas for over 30 years. At the beginning of this year, we employed over 100 workers. The company provides group health insurance and pays 75 percent of the cost for the employees. At this time, we have 66 employees. We will intentionally have less than 50 employees by the end of the year, and the owner is planning to drop the health plan at the first of the coming year.

So much for, ''If you like your insurance, you can keep it.'' Not only are you not going to keep your insurance, you are not keeping your employment.

Here is another from Bobbye: With the health mandate looming, the college where he teaches ''determined that adjunct professors could no longer teach four classes per semester because the time for prep/teaching would require they provide me health insurance.'' So he has been dropped from the class maximum to three. He said: I didn't expect health insurance from the college, but the mandate has now dictated my workload.

It dictated less work. So how does he make it?

Here's one:

> I am a 56-year-old single woman with no children, and I have been stuck as part-time toll collector for Harris County, Texas, since the passage of ObamaCare. For 4 years, I only work 72 hours every 2 weeks, with no benefits whatsoever. Last year, the County

Commissioner stated they will no longer hire full-time employees. I have $39 left for groceries once mortgage payment and bills are paid. ObamaCare will destroy me.

□ 1345

Here's another, from Charles:

I recently applied for a job in Tyler at a new restaurant. At my interview, I asked how many hours I could expect. The owner said, verbatim: I'm sorry but because of ObamaCare I cannot afford to hire anyone for more than 30 hours per week.

Here's another, from Timothy:

I am the only one that works in my house. I support a family of five and would be considered lower middle class. I just received notice from my employer that I now have to pay an additional $6 per person per month as a surcharge on the new health care law. Also, my premium is going up $60 per month. It's a total of $100 per month, or increase of about $1,200 per year. I am basically looking at a 34 percent increase for nothing. I don't know how I'm going to be able to afford this as my budget is pretty tight already. Repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, please, because for me, it's anything but affordable.

Here's another, from Rose:

I'm 54 years old and have always had health insurance, which I pay for myself. I too received a letter telling me that, due to this so-called affordable health care, they will not be providing me with continued insurance. I will need to make decisions about what insurance I want, but they have no idea what choices I will have and of course, no idea what I will be charged, but were quick to say it will likely be more than I pay now. Thanks a lot, ObamaCare.

We have no extra income to pay for this. Please stop this from happening to our family and families throughout our country who are having their rights taken away from us.

Here's one from Andrea. She sells insurance for State Farm. They partner with Assurant Health for our individual medical plans:

Ever since we were forced this monstrosity in the most partisan vote ever, we have seen major changes come from the health insurance policies we were able to offer. Not only is there a noticeable increase in the price, we no longer offer maternity coverage, we no longer offer prescription copay, we no longer offer an office copay, we no longer offer the low deductibles we once did.

We have lost many of the networks that allowed people in our area the best choice as their doctor being in network. Now, the premium increases at the renewal are much higher than pre-reforms.

Here's another, from Melissa:

I am self-employed, and I'm already paying for my own health insurance. I received a letter from my insurance provider 3 weeks ago that stated there would be changes in my policy and they would be sending me additional information in the coming months. Based on the estimates I've seen, my monthly insurance costs will go up roughly 136 percent.

ObamaCare is damaging real Americans. We owe it to them to do everything we can to stop it, and stop the waivers and exemptions.

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

HOW WE GOT HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, especially at this time, as the House and the Senate hurtle towards some type of perhaps collision and sometimes perhaps a conclusion to the drama that's taking place over the funding of our government. And it seems as though the focus of all this comes down on ObamaCare.

But I'd like to first, Mr. Speaker, paint the picture on how we got here. And it's this: the House has consistently passed a budget, and then, the House-passed legislation, essentially, required the Senate to finally, after over 1,000 days, pass a budget over there themselves.

Of course it was a token and, of course it was pushed off to the side and, of course it wasn't something that could be reconciled with a responsible, legitimate budget here in the House of Representatives. But it met the criterion narrowly.

So the functionality of this Congress, which has been in the past, 12 or so appropriations bills passing here, starting here, being messaged over to the Senate where, when things worked right, the Senate picked up those appropriations bills and, through their appropriations process, their hearings, their deliberation, their subcommittee and their committee process, worked their will with the House bill that had been messaged to them.

And one at a time, 12 or 13 appropriation bills would work their way so that they had passed the House in one form and, generally, the Senate in a different form, in which case, a conference committee would be appointed, and House Republicans and Democrats would sit down with Senate Republicans and Democrats, hammer out the differences in one of 12 or 13 appropriation bills, and come to an agreement, send the conference report to the House or the Senate, for passage, in which case it would pass both, be messaged to the President. That appropriation, then, would be concluded and fulfilled.

A responsible government starts with hearing from our constituents, in November, December and January, as we look forward to the end of the fiscal year, which happens next Monday night at midnight—we're working towards getting all of our government funded appropriately.

And in those months of January, it starts up, and then in February and March, the intensity of hearing from constituents and their budgetary concerns, the appropriations hearings in the Appropriations Committee, and then here on the floor under an open rule, bill after bill after bill, a dozen appropriation bills are debated, and the open rule that allows amendments to be brought forward on that to adjust the appropriations up or down, or perhaps transfer some of those appropriations, and the House work its will, the Senate work its will.

We come together and agree on a conference report. We send it to the President. The President signs it, and those departments of government that are funded by that appropriation bill then are given their budgetary responsibility and their spending authority for the upcoming fiscal year.

That's how it has worked in the past. It does not work that way under this dysfunctional setup that exists today.

What happens now in this Congress that we have, Mr. Speaker, is this: the House debates the appropriations bills, 12 of them or so. We have passed several of them at this point in the House. We've sent them over to the Senate.

They go, messaged to the Senate, where they arrive at the Majority Leader HARRY REID's desk. And figuratively speaking, HARRY REID then puts that appropriation bill in his desk drawer and closes the drawer, not to be discussed or heard from again for the balance of the fiscal year. And another appropriation bill goes and another and another and another.

And what you see happen is, we've seen this happen in the past, where we have passed, I remember, under Chairman Jerry Lewis, the Appropriations chair at the time, all of our appropriation bills by July. Messaged them all over to the Senate, where they all would go in HARRY REID's desk drawer.

At the end of the fiscal year, some time about now, or maybe a week ahead of this time, HARRY REID would look around and think, oh, we're facing a government shutdown if I don't get those bills out of my desk drawer.

And so he pulls out a dozen appropriations bills. Each one of them is a collective judgment of the majority of the United States House of Representatives, constitutionally messaged to the Senate, stacks them up and takes his little marker through there, and he draws a line through the appropriations that he doesn't like, and he writes in all of the line items and puts on all the Christmas tree spending that he does like, and he puts in the wish list of the Senators that he wants to help out, so to speak, and some are Republicans and many are Democrats.

He creates this omnibus spending bill. Sometimes we call it omnibus if it doesn't show up at the end of the year. Otherwise, if it's at the expiration of our spending of our appropriations, as it is now, we call it a continuing resolution.

We've been operating on continuing resolutions for too long. And it isn't because of ObamaCare, necessarily, that we're at this point today. The leverage has been created because HARRY REID didn't deal with our appropriations bills.

And furthermore, he's not going to deal with our appropriation bills. He is going to create this crisis so that it increases the leverage that he has in defeating the will of the people, which is

to shut off all of the funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, to put an end to its implementation, to not let ObamaCare become implemented, because—

First of all, I don't agree with the decision made by the Supreme Court. I think it's completely inconsistent to declare a bill to be a tax as it arrives at the United States Supreme Court—excuse me—to declare it not to be a tax as it arrives at the Supreme Court for the purposes of considering the issue of the litigation on ObamaCare, but then to declare it to be a tax as a decision of the Supreme Court.

It can be one or the other. Either ObamaCare is a tax or it's not a tax, but it can't be conveniently not a tax for the purposes of whether the Supreme Court would grant cert, and then conveniently, a tax for the purposes of declaring that it is constitutional. But that's the decisions that were made by the United States Supreme Court.

All of us take an oath to uphold the Constitution, everyone in the House and the Senate and, of course, the Supreme Court as well. And we can't be taking an oath to uphold a decision that no one that I know of in America predicted.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that of all the constitutional scholars we have that had been writing and reading and thinking and analyzing ObamaCare, that had watched as, by legislative shenanigans, hook and crook, that patchwork of ObamaCare had been jammed through the House and the Senate in a fashion that would not have mirrored any process we had ever seen before, they'd seen the time that the Senate had a filibuster-proof majority.

And I remember going into Christmas Eve, the vote that was taking place over there on the 24th of December, on Christmas Eve, and I remember when the Senate had the ability to delay that vote from 9 in the morning on Christmas Eve morning, December 24, till 9 that night, which truly would have been Christmas Eve.

And I sent the message over there to my Senator and I said, please delay that vote as long as you can. Keep that thing delayed until the last possible minute. If they want to jam this country and give us a Christmas present of ObamaCare so badly that they will sit there on Christmas Eve, keep them there then, and let them miss Christmas with their families because the flights will be gone out of Dulles by then. That's what I asked to happen.

There was a negotiation that took place, allowed an agreement from Republicans that there'd be a couple of votes in January that they wanted on some taxes or something of that nature. So they had a vote at 9:00 in the morning, December 24, that allowed for ObamaCare to move ahead one more time.

And then I wrote back to my Senator, and I said, what do we do now?

And his answer was pray, and pray for a Republican victory in the United States Senate race in Massachusetts, the special election because of the passing of Senator Teddy Kennedy.

None of us thought on December 24, that year, that the following January 18 or 19th—that's very close to the election date—that Scott Brown would be elected as a United States Senator out of Massachusetts.

That is what happened. That was the people in Massachusetts rising up and saying, we don't want ObamaCare. We reject ObamaCare. We'll even go so far as that entirely blue State of Massachusetts, that had a delegation of eight Members of Congress, every single one of them a Democrat, and none of them known as conservative Democrats by the measure that I know.

That's Massachusetts, and they sent us Scott Brown. And they're the ones that had the most example with something that looked like a preview, perhaps, of ObamaCare.

So who knew more than the Bay Staters about this?

Who had the most loaded politics that should have been electing a Democrat in that election?

No, they said, we don't want to see anything that looks like ObamaCare, and we're going to send you a young, fresh Republican whose job it is to help kill ObamaCare. And he came here and began to engage in that effort, and was significant in his role. My hat's off to former Senator Scott Brown.

But, in the end, legislative shenanigans defeated even the voters in Massachusetts' will, and they put legislation through back over from the Senate under that process they call reconciliation. They carved out some, put it into the reconciliation process to avoid the filibuster because they no longer had a filibuster-proof majority. The people had spoken. And then the legislative shenanigans began.

While that was going on, there was a drama here in the House. Now that takes us to March of that year. And the drama in the House was that there were the ''Stupak Dozen'' who said, I'm not going to vote for an ObamaCare piece of legislation that will fund abortion.

So the President made an offer—this is what's reported in the news at least, Mr. Speaker—that he would write an Executive order that would nullify the Stupak amendment, or nullify the ban on funding abortion. And that promise was made by the President before ObamaCare was passed in order to get the votes to get ObamaCare to pass here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 1400

The President of the United States, a former adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, made a promise to a Democrat Congressman from Michigan, who, presumably, controlled 12 votes of the unnamed ''Stupak dozen,'' who were anonymous, oddly. It's hard to think you're going to control votes if nobody knows who they are.

In any case, the President made a promise that he would sign an Executive order that would nullify some of the language that's in the law. Congressman Stupak took that promise and the former adjunct law professor, President Obama, made a promise that said that the President thought that he could amend law after he signed it into law. Now what constitutional professor would take a position like that?

I dig this up for a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because I want people to understand this piece of ObamaCare legislation is not the will of the people. It never was the will of the people. It's the product of hook and crook and legislative shenanigans. It's done against the will of the people.

And furthermore, Thomas Jefferson, whom both parties revere, once said:

Large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities.

Large initiatives need to be bipartisan initiatives, not completely 100 percent partisan initiatives, which ObamaCare is. And the slender majority that Thomas Jefferson was talking about was a slender majority that he presumed to be a bipartisan majority. If Jefferson had been talking about a partisan majority, it would have been very clear, in my opinion, what he would have said. He would have said that large initiatives should never be advanced on partisan majorities. That's what happened with ObamaCare.

The largest initiative that has been jammed down the throats of the American people in its entire history is ObamaCare, advanced on a purely partisan majority by utilization of legislative shenanigans and hook and crook. That's what got us to this point.

People wonder, Why don't you just throw up your hands, why don't you accept reality? ObamaCare is the law of the land. Let it be. Fund it. Because the people have spoken.

Well, the people had spoken. They spoke when they elected Scott Brown. And in the aftermath of the passage of ObamaCare about March 20 or 21, 2010, the people spoke again that following November. And I remember when ObamaCare passed in the night. I had been battling this thing for days, and I went home about 1:30 or 2 o'clock in the morning, maybe a little later than that, but it was when the business wound down here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I went home and I thought, I'm going to lay down and I'm going to sleep the sleep of the exhausted. And I'm going to get completely rested up, and I'm going to wake up in the morning and then I'm going to put a plan together on what we do now. Because I knew that the bill was messaged to the White House, and I knew the President was salivating to sign it. Well, he did that within about 48 hours.

I woke up, though, in about 2½ hours because the wheels were turning and I

couldn't take it any longer. And I drafted the language to repeal ObamaCare. I had that formal request to get that bill handed back to me by the draft people we have here when the door opened at 9 o'clock that morning.

We've been doing battle with ObamaCare ever since. Not only me, but the gentlelady from Minnesota that was down here and led an hour Special Order earlier today has been standing in there. And she ran for President on the issue, MICHELE BACHMANN. No one wondered what she would do if she were elected President. She would have repealed ObamaCare. LOUIE GOHMERT has been putting in hour after hour here on the floor and around this country, doing battle with ObamaCare.

The list of people that deserve credit for stepping up to this fight is long. And it isn't exclusive here in the House, Mr. Speaker. It includes a group of stalwarts in the Senate, led in this latest episode by Senator TED CRUZ of Texas, who stood on the floor for more than 21 hours and delivered a whole series of arguments against ObamaCare.

But I'll say here's the argument that is at the center of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: ObamaCare is, by my opinion, an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty. It takes away our right to manage our health. The most sovereign thing that we have as an American people is our soul. And the eternal nature of our soul is controlled by God and our will. This Federal Government hasn't figured out how to nationalize our soul.

But the second most sovereign thing we have is our bodies, our health, our skin, and everything inside it. It's the second most sovereign thing that we have. And the Federal Government, under ObamaCare, has figured out how to nationalize our skin and everything inside it.

It's a Federal Government takeover of the management of our health where, under ObamaCare, if you walk into a clinic, if you walk into an emergency room, if you apply for government-approved insurance under whatever means that might emerge, when no one really can tell us at this point, the government decides whether you get the insurance, the government decides whether you get a subsidy for the premium, the government decides what kind of research gets done, what kind of treatment one gets.

The government decides if you are worth the hip replacement or the knee replacement or whether you get just painkillers for as long as you can live with a broken hip. The government decides that, not us any longer. We understand that, those of us that have a little bit of gray hair, or maybe have lost some. We understand that. But do the children in our grade schools and in nurseries today understand that?

Mr. Speaker, we know that answer is no. They don't understand that. When these children grow up and they get out of school and they step into adulthood and they have already been brought up under a system of ObamaCare that makes these decisions for them, what happens to their dreams, what happens to their aspirations, what happens to their ability to think big? What happens to their ability to manage their life?

The institutional memory will disappear of the culture and civilization that remembers the glorious time when we could choose our doctor, when the market demand created the insurance policies that suit us, the consumers, when we could shop from doctor to doctor, from clinic to clinic, when we could say, But you know, I want this care for my mother this badly that I think even though she is 85, she needs a hip replacement. Because I don't want to see her die in a wheelchair. That's a different world than we have today.

Mr. Speaker, we've just gotten messaged to us on the CR—the continuing resolution—from the United States Senate, that the vote had concluded over on the other side, down on the other end, through the Rotunda. The Senate has now acted to peel out the ban on funding for ObamaCare and send us back what they would call a clean CR with their changes and provisions, which would include a continuing resolution up until November 15. So it is a shorter-term CR than we offered to them.

But what it says is, We as Senators are not going to let you prohibit the funding of ObamaCare. So, again, we're back to the center and the crux of this. Another dramatic event has taken place here in the United States Capitol. And the drama of this now is in the lap of the House of Representatives, where our Speaker has just received the message of H.J. Res. 59, the CR.

Now we have a decision to make. My message, Mr. Speaker, is this: if 218 House Members hold our ground, if we say we will not fund ObamaCare and we will not fund an appropriation that fails to cut off the funding to ObamaCare, if we hold our ground, we will win.

This contest now that's going on in is a contest of wills. There's a relatively narrow majority in the Senate. There's a little bit broader majority in the House, I believe. And the strength of will is being measured. This is like holding a gun on each other now, standing in a burning building, and deciding who's going to blink. But we can't just let down the hammer and stand there because the building is burning. Somebody's got to walk away from this confrontation and say, I'm going to give you your way.

Well, my message to this, Mr. Speaker, is that we've heard this message over and over again: if there is a government shutdown, House Republicans will always lose in a confrontation with the President. I don't know that that's true. And I don't know if it was even true in 1995 and 1996, when there was a government shutdown that lasted for 21 days.

What I do know is this House sent the funding to keep our government open over to the Senate. With it was language that said there would be no funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare. It happens that's language I wrote and presented here in this Congress in February of 2011.

We have said we want this government to stay open. We want to avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown. If we repeat that enough times, it might be sending a message to the Senators that we really don't mean it when we say that we're not going to fund ObamaCare.

I want to send the message, Mr. Speaker, that we do mean it. And I want to send the message that we're going to hold our ground. And I'd like to remind, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a whole series of shutdowns throughout history. And I have a list of them printed here. There were at least five government shutdowns when Jimmy Carter was President. Five of them. Five incidents. One of them was over a nuclear ship of some kind. The longest shutdown he had was 18 days. Does anybody remember those shutdowns from the eighties? Kind of. It didn't change my life, that I remember.

But that was Democrats in majority in the House and the Senate and a Democrat President. Their infighting caused government shutdowns for a total of 57 days—57 days between 1977 and 1981. And sometimes Jimmy Carter won, sometimes the Democrats in the House and Senate prevailed over the President of the United States. All the same party.

So if we don't remember the price paid for a government shutdown, if the inconvenience of it doesn't linger in anybody's memory, I take you to the era of Ronald Reagan, when there were a number of shutdowns under Ronald Reagan—fewer and for a shorter period of time. One of them was over a billion dollars in social spending. Of that billion dollars, the government was shut down for about 3 days. In that period of time, by the way, there was a Republican majority in the United States Senate and we had a principled Republican President, Democrats in the majority here in the House. The Democrats refused to agree with the President and the Senate. It resulted in a government shutdown.

In that shutdown that lasted—in the end, the $1 billion in spending that Democrats here wanted was negotiated down to $900 million dollars. They gave up 10 percent of what they asked for and the government was opened back up again.

So a determined majority in the House of Representatives prevailed to the level of 90 percent of their ask against a Republican majority in the Senate that opposed them and a President who has clearly held his ground in case after case.

It isn't clear who prevails in an issue like this, but I'll say this: the American people will judge our resolve and

our determination. And the determination on who wins and who loses, if that actually matters, will be written by history.

But I say this, Mr. Speaker. If we hold our ground, I believe there will not be a political price for House Republicans to pay. When House Republicans held their ground and eventually caved in 1995 and 1996, some say House Republicans lost that. They lost eight seats in the following election. They did not lose the majority. Six of those eight seats were marginal seats they were likely to lose anyway. So perhaps they lost two congressional seats.

If we don't want to put at risk two congressional seats out of the House Republican majority to stand on the principle that cuts off all funding to implement and enforce ObamaCare, is our fear for our political jobs greater than our love of principle and the people we represent?

I would argue instead that there will not be political consequences for standing on principle and refusing to fund ObamaCare. If there are political consequences, they will be recovered from over time.

□ 1415

But we, Mr. Speaker, can never recover from ObamaCare if it's implemented and enforced. That is the bottom line.

No political consequences will be delivered to the people who stand up for the American people. That's the House Republican stance. That's the Senate conservative stance—that came a little short over here a few minutes ago down the other side of the Capitol. But if we stand together as House Republicans, as Senate Republicans, as principled people who look back at that time and saw that Scott Brown came to the United States Senate because the blue State Massachusetts rejected ObamaCare.

There was a wave election in 2010 that elected 87 new House Republicans—every one of them ran on repeal of ObamaCare. Every Republican in the House and Senate has voted multiple times to undue, repeal, unfund and defund ObamaCare. All of us stand together—it was bipartisan the last time. We had two Democrats that also agreed with us on this CR.

We must stand on principle. If there's a political price to be paid for standing on principle, I say it's worth it. We can recover from any political price, even though I don't believe there will be anything but a political reward; but we can never recover if we allow ObamaCare to be implemented or enforced.

That's my stand, Mr. Speaker. That's the stand that I ask my colleagues to take today, tomorrow, the next day, and every day. If we hold together and we hold strong, in the end the beneficiaries will be the American people and God-given liberty.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. (Ms.), one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Education and the workforce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1412. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, September 28, 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:

3118. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program Integrity Issues [Docket ID: ED-2010-OPE-0004] (RIN: 1840-AD02) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2,5-Furandione, Polymer with Ethenylbenzene, Hydrolyzed, 3-(Dimethylamino)propyl Imide, Imide with Polyethylene-Polypropylene Glycol 2-Aminopropyl Me Ether,2,2'—(1,2-Diazenediyl)bis[2-Methyl utanenitrile]-Initiated; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0383; FRL-9398-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0025; A-1-FRL-9732-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0868; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0463; FRL-9900-92, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Steubenville-Weirton Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0337 and EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0462; FRL-9900-79, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Aspen [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0475; FRL-9901-06, Region 8] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Wisconsin [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0465; FRL-9827-9] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0140; FRL-9901-10, Region 4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Conformity of General Federal Actions to State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0511; FRL-9901-01, Region 7] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulatory Updates [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0174; FRL-9901-03, Region 10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0635; FRL-9395-1] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3129. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modernizing the

FCC Form 477 Data Program [WC Docket No.: 11-10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Documenting Contractor Performance [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2012-009; Item III; Docket 2012-0009, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM09) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3131. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation and Hawker Beechcraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1180; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-17539; AD 2013-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3132. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0639; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-020-AD; Amendment 39-17518; AD 2013-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3133. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1114; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-17511; AD 2013-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3134. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Approval and Communication Requirements for the Safe Transportation of Air Bag Inflators, Air Bag Modules, and Seat-Belt Pretensioners (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0201 (HM-254)] (RIN: 2137-AE62) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0297; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17550; AD 2013-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3136. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0353; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-17545; AD 2013-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3137. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0367; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-17546; AD 2013-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 185. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 113–232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 579. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 113–233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2251. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse''; with an amendment (Rept. 113–234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3096. A bill to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center'' (Rept. 113–235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2189. A bill to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 113–236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200. A bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran from 1979 through 1981, and to members of their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the National Coal Heritage Area Act of 1996 to reauthorize the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 3202. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203. A bill to provide the people of the United States with an opportunity to make gifts to the United States Government to be used for the purpose of providing public tours of the White House; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LATTA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3204. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3205. A bill to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3206. A bill to promote the sexual and reproductive health of individuals and couples in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3208. A bill to clarify that certain natural gas facilities are not subject to the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3209. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to Boko Haram or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H. Res. 362. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 26, 2014, as ''National Pediatric Bone Cancer Awareness Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CHU, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H. Res. 363. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 364. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''World Alzheimer's Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives commending efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . .''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

''To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, but Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-yards and other needful Buildings;''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 3206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the Global Sexual and Reproductive Health Act, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 3207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 66.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 207: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 419: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 447: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 541: Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 647: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 732: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 765: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 792: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 901: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 920: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 940: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 961: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 962: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 975: Mr. GRAYSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 980: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1015: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1024: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1149: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1150: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1209: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1250: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1423: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1461: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1466: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1518: Mr. VELA and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1553: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1588: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1652: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1690: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1731: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1750: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 1755: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1814: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1851: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1869: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1920: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2083: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2238: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2247: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 2309: Mr. UPTON, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2310: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2328: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2366: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2478: Mr. COTTON and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2500: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2502: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2577: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2664: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2735: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2785: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2788: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2797: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2809: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 2823: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2839: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2894: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2901: Mr. COTTON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2988: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 3043: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3103: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3108: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3118: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3121: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3134: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3143: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3166: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 3168: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3170: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3183: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YODER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. VALADAO.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 30: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 153: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 301: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 327: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 356: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. LOEBSACK.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2013 No. 130

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God, You created us for freedom, so keep us from shackling ourselves with the chains of dysfunction. Use our Senators today to serve Your purposes for this generation, making them ever mindful of their accountability to You. Lord, deliver us from governing by crisis, empowering us to be responsible stewards of Your bounty, using judicious compromise for the mutual progress of all.

Provide this land we love with Your gracious protection, and may we never cease to be grateful for the numberless blessings we receive each day from Your hands.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, which is the continuing resolution. The time until 12:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 59. The time from 12:10 p.m. until 12:30 p.m. is reserved for me and Senator MCCONNELL. I will control the last 10 minutes; he will control the first 10 minutes of that block of time.

The filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 59 is 10:30 a.m. today.

At 12:30 p.m. there will be up to four rollcall votes in relation to the following, in the following order: cloture on H.J. Res. 59, motion to waive budget points of order, the Reid-Mikulski amendment—we will vote on that—and passage of the resolution, as amended, if amended.

Mr. President, as I indicated, I am not going to give any remarks this morning. I want to leave as much time as possible to those who have not had an opportunity to speak or wish to speak again. I am told the Republican leader will not be here either. So I will return at approximately 12:20 p.m.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 59, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid/Mikulski amendment No. 1974, to perfect the joint resolution.

Reid amendment No. 1975 (to amendment No. 1974), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1976, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1977 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1976), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1978 (to amendment No. 1977), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:10 p.m. will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion to invoke cloture.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Well, here we are Mr. President. I guess this is like the movie

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

''High Noon.'' The two sides are walking down the street. I just hope, like in the movie ''High Noon,'' the good guys win. In other words, I hope reason and judiciousness and a sense of responsibility to the people of this country prevails, and not some knee-jerk reaction to what a few people in the House of Representatives want to do to our government.

There seems to be a sense among some Members across the aisle here, and certainly among a block of Republicans in the House, that shutting down the Federal Government is no big deal. Well, I suppose if you are of an anarchist mind—which I think some of them may be—then you do not want government, you want to create chaos, you want to create confusion.

Someone might ask: Why would someone want to create chaos and confusion? I think if you read your history, you will find that most authoritarian governments and most authoritarian movements that are based upon a minority view or a minority support gain their power through confusion and chaos, by disrupting—disrupting—the public body. I do not care whether it is authoritarian movements of the left or the right, that is what they do. They know they cannot gain power through the normal channels, especially in a democratic government, so, therefore, they do everything they can to skew the way government operates.

First, you manipulate the district lines for how you elect Members of the House of Representatives so that you have a lot of safe districts for one party. I have to hand it to the Republicans, they were very keen on this for the last 10 years or so, and they focused on redrawing the district boundaries so they would have what we might call sinecures, a safe seat.

But if you look at the election results of the last election, more Americans voted for Democratic Members of the House than they voted for Republican Members of the House, but the Republicans are in charge of the House. That is because of the way the district lines were drawn after the last census was taken.

So that is one way you do it, you skew it that way. And then what happens is you bring in a minority block of tea party-type people to the House of Representatives, and they want to sow more confusion and more chaos because they know that is the only way their views are ever going to prevail. They will never prevail in the open marketplace of ideas and debate and discourse among the American people.

On what do I base that statement? Look at the last election. A lot of what the tea party is proposing and what they are now doing in terms of focusing on shutting down the government, much of that was proposed by their candidate for President—not all of it but a lot—and I think the American people soundly rejected that. So the tea party, being frustrated because they cannot get their way electorally or in the open marketplace of ideas and discourse and public debates, now sees their only way to do it is to create confusion and chaos.

One might say if they are doing that, certainly the public will turn against them. Well, I think to a certain degree that is happening. But for the vast majority of Americans out there—who go to work every day and work hard, who are raising their families, thinking about where the next paycheck is coming from or whether they are even going to have a job; young people getting out of school with mountains of debt, trying to get a job, to start a family, perhaps—they are not focusing on the everyday activities of what we do around here in Washington. They read the headlines and may see the news or see something on their laptops or on their iPads or whatever, and what they see is a Congress that is muddled and mixed up and cannot get anything done.

You read the polls, and the people blame all of us for this. I think the people in the tea party have seen that, and I think they believe that if they can create more confusion and chaos and disruption of government, both sides will be blamed, and out of that they believe somehow they can rise to the top of the heap and infuse the government with their minority views.

That is what is happening. It is a small group of willful men and women, who have a certain ideology about how our country should run and what we should do, who cannot get their way in the normal, as I say, discourse and debate and votes either here in the Congress or in the body politic at large. And since they cannot get their way, they are going to create this confusion and discourse and hope the public will be so mixed up on who is to blame for this that they will blame both sides, and perhaps they feel their minority—which is so imbued with this passion of theirs, this ideology, this rigidness of ideology of theirs—that they are the ones who will come out en masse and vote in the next election, other people will be so discouraged they will say: Oh, a pox on both your houses, I won't vote, and, therefore, that is the path they see to taking over government.

It is dangerous. It is very dangerous. I believe we are at one of the most dangerous points in our history right now—every bit as dangerous as the breakup of the Union before the Civil War. We are at a point where: Will this Congress allow a small group dedicated—I give them credit for working hard—but a small group of dedicated, ideologically driven individuals to dictate to the Senate and the House what our course of action is going to be? We cannot give in to that.

So I call upon my friends in the Republican Party who are moderates—and there a lot of them in my own State, around the country. They are conservative, but they are responsible conservatives. They may look at Democrats and say: You want to go too fast one way. We might want to go a little bit slower that way or maybe we want to go in a slightly different direction, so let's get together and work it out and see which way we go. That is being a responsible conservative or a responsible liberal too, I would say. I call upon them to disabuse themselves of this idea that somehow they have to march in lockstep with this small band of tea party—call them what you will—rightwing ideologs—you can use whatever adjectives you want—but they must disabuse themselves of the idea that they have to somehow march in lockstep with them.

I keep reading the papers that somehow the Speaker of the House is trying to find a way out of this. Well, I do not know JOHN BOEHNER real personally, but he was on the Education and Labor Committee all the time I was on the committee here. We always went to conference. We worked things out in a reasonable manner.

There is a way forward—there is a way forward—and that is for the Speaker basically to take what we do here. What we are about to pass today is a stripped-down version of a continuing resolution that will keep the government running until November 15. But it knocks out all that other junk the House put in about defunding ObamaCare and all this other stuff they put in there. It is just a straightforward: Let's keep the government running until November 15.

The compromise we made on our part was to give up on our budget line. We had a certain level that we wanted to fund the government. The Republicans had a lower level. So we accepted the lower level. We accepted that lower level. In turn, we asked, rather than going until December 15, go to November 15 on this continuing resolution funding the government.

So we accepted the lower level—hard for some of us to swallow. I didn't believe in that lower level. I thought it should be higher so we could adequately fund things such as education, health care, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, all of the things—transportation infrastructure. But it was a compromise. We took the lower level.

We said: Do it until November 15 so we can bring our appropriations bills out on the floor, hopefully between now and then, and we can work on an overall spending package for next year, one that is not just a continuing resolution that just keeps things going, but maybe we want to make some changes—and we do. I know in my committee we want to change some things, hopefully make them work better. So by doing that by November 15, then that gives us a month from November 15 until Christmas to get it all worked out and hopefully have this package passed by Christmas. If we go to December 15, we will not have time to do that. So that is what is before us today.

Here is the Speaker's avenue to act responsibly and to let the American people know there are responsible Republicans. All he has to do is take the bill we pass here and bring it up in the House and encourage some of his more moderate Republicans to support it and get the Democrats to support it and pass it in a bipartisan fashion. However, if the Speaker wants to just cater to this small band of ideologs, well then he will take what we pass here, change it around, add this, add that—I hear they have a laundry list—and then send it back to us. That is totally irresponsible.

There is a path forward. It is the path of responsibility, of being responsible, being judicious, not giving in to a small band of ideologs who want to seed confusion and discord, a small band of ideologs who want to use the power of the minority to do what they can to disrupt government in order to get their way.

When we were kids, there was always some kid who was playing marbles with you—or whatever it was, playing games—who did not get his way. So they picked up and went home, threw a temper tantrum. Well, for kids who were out playing, as we did, in the fields in small communities, temper tantrums were something they lived with. They did not really do much harm. But that is not true here in the Congress. We cannot afford the temper tantrums of a few ideologs.

There is more I could say about what they want to do and how they want to nullify laws by doing this. We have the Affordable Care Act that we passed here. It is being implemented. There has been a lot written about the exchanges starting next week. It is the law of the land and has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Yet a small band, a small group, a few on this side—not everyone on the Republican side—and some in the House want to nullify that law not through votes, they want to nullify it by shutting down the government or by not paying our bills when the debt ceiling comes and defaulting on our debt. Nullification of a law through that type of action—that is sort of like picking up your marbles and going home. But when you are a kid, no one really gets hurt. But who gets hurt from this? The American people.

I think there are a lot of people who say that shutting down the government is no big deal. It is a big deal. OMB recently estimated that in 1996 when the government shut down, it cost in today's dollars $2.1 billion just because of a few days of a shutdown of government. So those who say they are fiscal conservatives have to think about that, what the cost would be to the American people of shutting it down.

I happen to be privileged to chair the appropriations committee that funds Head Start Programs, early childhood development programs, elementary education, Pell grants, student loans, and medical research. I can tell you that if the government shuts down, a lot of people are going to get hurt.

Twenty-two Head Start providers will be delayed. About 18,000 kids will be denied Head Start Programs. The National Institutes of Health will not be able to fund new biomedical research projects. Social Security offices will close. Every day in this country, 445,000 people will call their Social Security office. They have a missing check. They have something wrong. They need some help. With the government shut down, no one will be able to call the Social Security office and get that kind of help.

I could go on and on. This is not a game. This is not a game. Hopefully we are not children. Hopefully we are responsible adults. I believe what we are doing today is responsible, in passing a stripped-down continuing resolution to keep the government going until November 15. I understand we will have the votes to do that. I just hope the House of Representatives will be responsible and forget about kid's games like picking up your marbles and going home or throwing a temper tantrum or shutting down the government because you cannot get your way. This is a dangerous time. I just hope the Members of this body, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, in which I was privileged to serve for 10 years, will rise to the occasion and let the American people know we are going to act responsibly.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of proponent time to Senator CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I understand there has been time allocated to proponents and opponents, but there is no breakdown for individual speakers in terms of how much time is allocated?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, ObamaCare is more unpopular today than when it was passed in 2010. I know the proponents of ObamaCare—my Democratic friends who voted for it in a party-line vote—had hoped it would meet their expectations and the promises the President and other people made about how it would be implemented and what its impact would be on our health care system.

I am amazed, though, that our colleagues say: You know, it is the law of the land. We cannot change it.

Well, that is completely contrary to our constitutional system where the very legitimacy of our laws depends on the consent of the governed. Of course it is within the power of Congress to change the law. That is what we do when it turns out the law does not work as those who hoped it would or it, unfortunately, meets the expectations of those skeptics who thought it would never work. So it is within our power to change this law.

We will be voting today on a very important provision that will give us an opportunity to start over and to address the failures of ObamaCare that even some of its most ardent advocates had hoped it would meet. So today we will vote on a number of matters, including a cloture vote on the underlying bill. I will be voting yes on cloture because I do not understand how I can otherwise vote on a matter I want to see passed. In other words, we will vote to proceed to a bill that defunds ObamaCare. I believe we should defund ObamaCare. Indeed, just as we did on the motion to proceed—we had 100 Senators vote for cloture on the motion to proceed—I do not know why we would not vote to proceed on the cloture vote on the underlying bill—especially those of us who believe we ought to go ahead and defund ObamaCare today in light of experience between 2010 and 2013 which shows it has not lived up to expectations and promises.

There are some people across America who are so upset with ObamaCare—and I understand their frustration—that they say we ought to shut down the Federal Government. Our colleague Senator COBURN asked the Congressional Research Service to look at what would happen to ObamaCare if the government shut down for some reason. Their conclusion is that ObamaCare would continue to be funded even though the government was shut down because there are alternate sources of revenue that could be used to keep it going.

So I say to my friends who say we ought to shut the government down to get rid of ObamaCare that it will not work. Even if they hoped it would work, it will not work. Of course, we can imagine the disruptions to our seniors, military, and to our economy, which is bouncing along the bottom with slow growth and high unemployment, and what that disruption might mean there.

So I think the real vote today is going to be on the vote the majority leader will offer to strip out the defunding language. I hope we have five Democrats—perhaps those who hoped in 2010 that ObamaCare would actually work but will, in light of subsequent experience, reconsider and say: Maybe we ought to start over again because ObamaCare has not worked. Maybe it is not the best way to make health care policy, to have a bill that was passed strictly on a party-line vote.

No one is invested in trying to actually make sure it will work, such as when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan fixed Social Security and secured it for subsequent generations. Unfortunately, we have seen the President of the United States govern by waiver, exception, and exemption when it comes to implementing ObamaCare. We have learned that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time even though the exchanges are supposed to go into effect next Tuesday.

Why are the American people so upset with ObamaCare? Why are there

some people who are so upset that they are willing to see the government shut down in order to get rid of it and change it? Well, it is simple. When the President was promoting his health care overhaul in 2009 and 2010, he repeatedly assured the American people: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you do not have to worry, nothing will change.

He made that promise time and time again. He was always 100 percent unequivocal. Here is a direct quote from the President's speech in January of 2009 before the American Medical Association. He said:

> If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health-care plan, you will be able to keep your health-care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what.

That is the President of the United States. When the President made those remarks 4 years ago, many Americans believed him or at least gave him the benefit of the doubt. Unfortunately, we now know ObamaCare was sold to the American people under false pretenses. The Congressional Budget Office has projected that ObamaCare will cause millions of Americans to lose their existing health care coverage.

Employers large and small have already announced that because of ObamaCare they are ending their employer-provided coverage for their employees and some of their retirees. In a front-page story, even the New York Times admits that because of ObamaCare, ''many insurers are significantly limiting the number of doctors and hospitals available to consumers.'' So if you like your doctor, if you like your hospital, you will not necessarily be able to keep them. For that matter, earlier this year one of my constituents sent me a letter she got from her insurance company informing her that because of ObamaCare the coverage she had would be terminated by the end of 2013.

That letter said:

> Never have we experienced the uncertainty and immense challenges that confront the insurance industry during this time of health-care reform.

It is now painfully clear that many people who do wish to keep their existing coverage and wish to keep their current doctors will not be able to do so if this law is implemented.

This is why we are seeing some leading Democrats who are saying maybe we ought to reconsider in the light of experience since the time we voted to pass ObamaCare in 2009 and 2010.

It is also clear that ObamaCare is destroying our economy. Recently, a group of labor leaders went to the White House to ask for a special carve-out because they said ObamaCare, as implemented, was killing the 40-hour work week. These are some of the folks who were the biggest cheerleaders for ObamaCare at the time it passed, but they have realized, based on subsequent experience, that it is turning full-time work into part-time work so employers can avoid some of the penalties and costs.

We know it is having a particular impact on some specific types of employment such as restaurants, retailers, hotels, the people who develop medical devices which save lives and increase lifespan, and it is having a negative impact on hospitals as well.

For example, the Franciscan Alliance health system recently announced that because of ObamaCare it was eliminating about 125 jobs at two hospitals in President Obama's hometown of Chicago.

Meanwhile, in a letter to a DC city councilman, the owner of a popular area restaurant chain described ObamaCare as: ''the biggest mandated cost ever inflicted on restaurateurs . . . in the HISTORY OF RESTAURANTS.'' The restaurant owner added: ''We still haven't figured out how we are going to pay for that.''

Also, as I mentioned a moment ago, because of the tax on medical devices to pay for medical care, medical device manufacturers are leaving the United States or they are not hiring new people. Some constituents from Texas came in to see me and said they had an operation in Costa Rica. Instead of hiring more people in Texas, they are going to be moving that operation to Costa Rica for one reason and one reason only; that is, to avoid the medical device tax in ObamaCare.

We know that because of ObamaCare's impact on the economy, many college graduates—who advocates celebrate are now able to stay on their parents' health insurance until 26—those same young men and women are unable to find jobs because of ObamaCare. We know that its impact on the medical profession is having a dramatic outcome on people's access to health care.

It is very important to make a distinction between coverage and access. Just because the government provides Medicare coverage doesn't mean you are going to find a doctor to see you. Increasingly, in my State and around the country, doctors are saying: We can't afford to see new Medicare and Medicaid patients because of how much the government compensates for that service.

As a matter of fact in Texas, only about one out of every three doctors who currently see Medicaid patients will accept a new Medicaid patient because of the low reimbursement rate. Medicaid is already failing to meet the important needs of the most vulnerable people in our country. Because of ObamaCare, States are preparing for a massive spike in individual health care premiums and because of ObamaCare insurance carriers are already limiting consumer choice.

As many of us warned years ago, ObamaCare affects everyone. It affects working families who are happy with their employer-provided coverage. It affects Medicare recipients living on a fixed income. It affects Medicaid patients who are already having trouble finding doctors and dentists who will take their insurance. It affects young people who are struggling to pay off their student loan debt, and, yes, as I said, it affects small business owners who wish to expand their workforce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

It affects medical device companies that produce technology that has helped millions of Americans with disabilities. The false promises of ObamaCare have been shattered by the harsh realities of ObamaCare. A law that was supposed to solve some of our biggest health care problems in the country has, instead, made those problems even worse.

Now we have a second chance. Congress has a second chance as the elected representatives of the American people under our constitutional system of learning from the experience we have had since 2010 when Congress passed ObamaCare on a party-line vote, we have a second chance today to do the right thing, a chance to stop ObamaCare in its tracks, a chance to reverse the mistakes of 2009 and to allow Congress, instead, to pass real health care reforms that will lower costs, improve access, expand quality insurance coverage to more people.

Republicans have said we have an alternative to ObamaCare. Some of our colleagues who support ObamaCare said: The only way you can cover people with preexisting conditions is with ObamaCare, a $2.7 trillion expenditure. That is baloney. We all know many States have health risk pools. If we provided additional funding to those State health risk pools, people with preexisting conditions could get coverage without having to embrace the whole behemoth of ObamaCare at a much more affordable cost.

We are eager to adopt reforms such as equalizing the tax treatment of health insurance and making health care price and quality information more transparent and accessible so people can actually shop based on quality and price—what a concept—also, by letting people buy insurance coverage across State lines, allowing both individuals and businesses to form risk pools for individual markets, by curbing frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits, using State-based health insurance pools to cover people with preexisting conditions, and to give States more flexibility to improve Medicaid and to bring more competition to Medicare.

Republicans have spent years advocating these policies. Now that we know ObamaCare has failed in its intended purpose, it is time to look to these alternatives. We are prepared to defund ObamaCare and to move ahead with real reform as I described.

The only question is how many Democrats are going to learn from the evidence since 2010. How many of them

are going to listen to their constituents and say we can do better than this failed attempt from the Federal Government to take over our health care system and deny people access to the doctors of their choice and to keep the insurance coverage they have.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of proponent time to Senator SANDERS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me begin by saying I think a debate over ObamaCare, a debate over health care, is good for the Nation. As I think many Americans understand, the United States is the only country in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care as a right to all of our people.

Today, before the initiation of ObamaCare, we have 48 million people who have no health insurance. I would tell my good friend from Texas that the State of Texas, I think, ranked first in the country in the percentage of their people under 65 who have no health insurance, one out of four.

George W. Bush was President for 8 years. Where were the ideas about how we provide health care to all of our people. It is not only 48 million people today who have no health insurance; there are many more who have huge deductibles which prevent them from going to the doctor. They have high copayments. At the end of the day, in this dysfunctional health care system we have, we are spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as do the people of any other nation, many of which have better health care outcomes than we do in terms of life expectancy, infant mortality, and the treatment of a number of diseases.

In my view, ObamaCare is a step forward, but we have to make significant improvements. That is a good discussion and debate to have.

One thing that is absolutely certain is you do not hold the American people hostage by threatening to shut down the government or, for the first time in the history of our country, not pay our bills, bringing this country and perhaps the entire world into a major financial crisis. That is what you don't do.

ObamaCare was passed with 60 votes in the Senate, it was passed in the House, and it was signed by the President. ObamaCare was challenged in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled it constitutional.

There was an election 1 year ago on this very issue, one of the major issues in the campaign. The Republican candidate said: Let's defund ObamaCare. He lost the election. Republicans lost seats in the Senate. They lost seats in the House.

This is what democracy is all about. What democracy is not about is a handful of the Members of the House of Representatives, extreme rightwing Republicans, saying if we do not get our way, we are prepared to punish tens of millions of Americans. Yes, we lost the election; yes, we lost seats in the House and the Senate, but we are prepared to bring this government down; we are prepared to cause, perhaps, a major global financial crisis unless we get our way.

That is not what the American system is about. That is not what democracy is about. If we want to debate about how we improve ObamaCare, that is a good debate. Let's have it. Let's not tell men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, who today are putting their lives on the line to defend us, that they are not going to get paid. Let us not tell police officers here in Washington and elsewhere they may not get paid. Let's not tell working families who take their little kids to Head Start so they can then go out to work that program may be killed. Let's not tell senior citizens, who are on the Meals on Wheels Program who can't leave their homes and depend upon a meal, let's not punish them because we have a small number of extreme rightwingers who want to get their way at the expense of millions and millions of people.

Let's have a debate, continue the debate. ObamaCare will provide health insurance to 20 million more Americans, a good step forward, but 28 million more remain uninsured.

Many of the trade unions are concerned about some provisions, and I share those views. Let's change that, let's improve it. Let us not shut down the U.S. Government and make us look like fools throughout the entire world because a handful of rightwing extremists are so determined to try to destroy this President.

Senator CRUZ was on the floor the other day. I appreciate anyone—I was on the floor a couple of years ago for 8½ hours, and he was on the floor for 21 hours. That is tough. I respect anyone who can do that. I disagreed with most of what he did say, but he did say one thing which I think was right; that is, we need a serious debate about fundamental issues.

What I believe very strongly is that this debate about ObamaCare is kind of small change, nickel and dime, compared to where many of our rightwing Republicans wish to go. It is important we have that debate because I think the American people are not understanding the role of multibillionaires, such as the Koch brothers, worth some $70 billion, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the tea party. This is what this debate is about; it is not about ObamaCare. I will give some of the issues we should be debating. Senator CRUZ was right.

The Texas Republican Party platform calls for an immediate and orderly transition away from Social Security; in other words, they want to kill Social Security. That is a good debate. Let's have it.

How many of the American people think we should end Social Security and go back to the days of the 1920s, when the elderly people were the poorest people in America. That is what rightwing Republicans want to do. Let us have that debate.

The Republicans in Texas—again, their view represents a whole lot of folks here in the Senate and in the House—want to privatize veterans' health care. I am the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I will tell you very strongly the veterans of America want to improve and expand the VA health care system, not privatize it. But let us have that debate.

Quoting from the Texas platform, the Republican Party in Texas believes—and, again, reflecting the views, I believe, of a strong majority of Republicans here in Washington—''We believe the minimum wage should be repealed.''

The minimum wage today is $7.25 an hour. We have millions and millions of workers who are trying to get by on $8 an hour, $9 an hour. I think the minimum wage should be significantly expanded—raised. Many Republicans say let's abolish the minimum wage. Do you know what that means? It means in Maine, in high unemployment areas; in Detroit, in high unemployment areas; and in Vermont, in high unemployment areas, what the employer will say is: Look, there ain't no jobs around here. You want to work, here is 3 bucks an hour. But we have the government out of your lives. There is no longer a minimum wage.

They consider that freedom. I consider that wage slavery. Let us have the debate about whether we should abolish the minimum wage, abolish Social Security.

The Ryan Republican budget in the House a couple of years ago wanted to end Medicare as we know it and create a voucher system. Here is a check, 8,000 bucks. You got cancer, good luck. Here is your $8,000 check. Go to the doctor, to the hospital, you will get good care—for about 2 days—and then we don't know what happens to you.

We are going to end Medicare as we know it. We are going to make devastating cuts in Medicaid. We are going to give tax breaks to the rich at a time when the rich are doing phenomenally and the middle class is collapsing. Let us have that debate. That is a good debate to have.

It is very interesting; there was a CBS/New York Times poll that came out the other day absolutely consistent with every other poll I have seen. What these polls do is they say to the American people: What do you think are the most important issues facing America? What should Congress be focusing on? You know what. They are not talking about health care. They are not talking about ObamaCare. They are not talking about taxes. What the American people are saying is: We need jobs.

Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. Youth unemployment is higher. We need to create millions of

jobs. Where is the debate? We bring forward ideas about rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, creating jobs, moving to a more energy efficient society, and creating jobs. Where are their ideas on jobs? They do not have any. All they can say is: Let's give more tax breaks to billionaires. One out of four corporations doesn't pay any taxes. Let's give more tax breaks to the rich and to the corporations. Trickle-down economics has not worked.

What the American people also understand is that most of the new jobs that are being created are low-wage jobs. Often they are part-time jobs—a trend, by the way, that has been going on for many, many years, well before ObamaCare. Major employers didn't need to think too hard to figure out if you hire people for 25 or 28 hours a week you don't have to provide them with benefits. Let us discuss about how we create decent wages in this country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's yielded time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. The last point I will make.

Maybe the most important discussion we should have is ending and overturning this disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision which gives the billionaires in this country the ability to control what goes on here in the Congress, forcing Members of the House and Senate to raise unbelievable sums of money.

So there is a lot to be debated. But one thing we should not be debating is shutting down the United States Government in order to achieve a narrow political goal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to use 15 minutes of the appointed time and be notified after 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Look, what we are here today about is the Democratic majority in the Senate has built a fortress around ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act. They have refused steadfastly any serious reevaluation of the law. They have blocked every attempt to do that. The House, Senator CRUZ, Republicans, and others are trying to force this Congress to confront the obvious flaws in that law, and they have refused to do so.

That is why it has all come down to a debate at the end of the year over what we are going to do. Do we just give up? Do we allow the majority in the Senate to not even allow votes in the weeks to come? They are not. They will not do it unless they are forced to do so. They made a strategic decision to reject and fight off any attempt to bring up a vote on the floor of the Senate.

People in America, I am sure, cannot believe if a Member of the Senate desires to try and fix and improve the Affordable Care Act that they cannot go to the floor and get a vote on it. That is exactly what has been happening ever since it passed. Polling data show the American people want substantial changes to it. Members, even Democrats, have said they want some change. But nothing gets voted on that will actually make a real change in the law.

It is the plan of President Obama and Senator REID to accept no change. Indeed, Senator REID has made clear his plan is to move to a single-payer system. He said openly and publicly just a few weeks ago he wants a single payer system for all health care in America—the United States Government. And that can only be described as socialized medicine.

That is what the goal is, and we have got to confront this. So I wanted to say that first of all. But as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I want to share a few thoughts about where we are financially and what is going to happen with this legislation. First and foremost we have to know that the Affordable Care Act is deeply unsound financially. The President's promise—repeatedly made—was that it would not add one dime to the debt. He said it would not add one dime to the deficit ''now or ever, period.''

Is that true? No, sir, it is not true. This is a hugely unsound new entitlement program that will endanger the financial future of America at a time when we need to quit digging ourselves deeper in debt and begin to work ourselves out of debt.

The Acting President pro tempore is on the Budget Committee. We both know these numbers.

We are dealing with Social Security, desperately trying to figure out a way to make Social Security sound so our seniors can go to bed at night and not have any worries about the future of Social Security. Medicare is even more stressed. Now we are adding this law—ObamaCare.

What does it do? The Government Accountability Office, headed by an independent person, actually appointed by President Obama, has issued a report stating that under the likely financial scenario over the next 75 years—that is how they figure Social Security and Medicare's liabilities—this bill will add $6.2 trillion to the Federal deficit. Social Security's unfunded liabilities are only $7.7. We are talking about adding almost as much debt to the future of the United States and to our children and grandchildren as Social Security has in liabilities. We need to be fixing Social Security, not creating a new entitlement. We need to be fixing Medicare, not adding another one. We need to be fixing some of our pension plans that are unsound, not adding more debt. We were promised it wouldn't happen.

We are going to have a budget point of order later, and we will hear arguments that ObamaCare is good for the budget. But this is how a country goes broke. This is how a country goes broke. We are going to have a score from the Congressional Budget Office that says over 10 years this law will bring in more money than goes out.

In one sense that is correct. But where did they get the money? The money—$500 billion or so—is coming out of Medicare. But it is Medicare's money. They are cutting doctors and hospitals—providers—$500 billion, and they are saying, therefore, the U.S. Treasury—the conventions of unified budget accounting, as CBO says—will show it as increased money. Therefore, it can be spent by an entirely new program. But it is not money for a new program or the U.S. Treasury. It is not Congress' money. This is Medicare's money, and it will be loaned by the Medicare trustees to the U.S. Treasury so it can be spent on this program.

The ObamaCare money that comes out of the Medicare savings is borrowed money. It is not free money. It is not new money. It is borrowed—borrowed from the trustees of Medicare—and it is headed in a downward spiral, and they will call those loans in very soon. There is just no money there, and that is how it all comes out.

The Government Accountability Office says under a realistic set of assumptions this law will add $6 trillion—$6.2 trillion—to this country's deficit. Mr. Holtz-Eakin said in the first 10 years there will be $500 billion added to the debt of America.

Supporters of the new law will contend otherwise, but it is indisputable that this is so. We are adding to the debt and it is going to threaten the future of America.

I would also point out, as we work our way through the entire effort to focus on our debt and what we will do for America, we need to understand how this accounting works. The Congressional Budget Office, on December 23, the night before the bill passed in 2009, in response to my request, sent a letter saying you cannot simultaneously use the money for Medicare and to fund a new program, though the conventions of accounting might indicate that. You cannot use it for both purposes. They used the phrase it was ''double counting.''

That is our own Congressional Budget Office. The night before this bill was rammed through the Senate, they told us that. Yet we still have the President—we still have Members of this body insisting this law is fully paid for and will not add to the deficit ever, period. Nothing could be more false. Nothing could be more false.

I know there are good people who feel like we have to keep this process moving, we have to send something to the House, and they will want to move this bill to the House. I understand that. But I just want everybody to know that we all need to fully understand that this health care law is unsound financially. This health care law will never work.

Second, I am disappointed that our colleagues in the House have sent a bill

over that spends at a rate that would add $20 billion more to our debt than the Budget Control Act would allow.

Colleagues, we have got to be so careful about this. I know they have an excuse for it. I know they say that by the end of the year the sequester will cut those spending levels down and it will not add to the debt at the end of the year. Don't worry about it, they say. But right now we couldn't agree, so we just spent more money on the discretionary side than we should have otherwise. We are going to spend $988 billion instead of $968 billion, $20 billion more at that rate.

But they say after 3 months or 2 months, when this CR ends, it will all be fixed. I am worried about that. It is going to be harder, I think. I think the pressure is going to be more intense 2 months from now to keep spending at that level.

I don't think they should have sent a bill to this floor, even though they can correctly argue that if sequester laws stay in effect, it will be reduced. I recognize that they can continue to argue that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

But fundamentally it is going to be harder for us to confront this problem as we go forward in the future because we will have more cuts over 9 or 10 months than would otherwise have been the case if we don't make any of them in the first 2 months in this Congress.

I would say to our colleagues who are thinking, ''We may need to waive the budget points of order. Let's just go forward, and somehow we will work all this out in the future. We are going to be watching''—I can't support it. But those who feel they have to do so to keep the ball moving when the House sends another bill back over here, it ought to be on the budget level, not above it. I hope they will do that. That will relieve one more problem.

But the truly big issue is how to understand the cost of this health care law. My colleagues, using a score from the Congressional Budget Office, are going to contend that if you eliminate ObamaCare, it will cost the Treasury money. That is what they are going to tell you, and that is the score CBO would issue. But the CBO Director told us it is double-counting the money. You can't score this money twice.

But according to the conventions of accounting and the 10-year window over which this occurs, by reducing the cost of Medicare, you can therefore spend more money to fund a new program. You can do that, and it will appear not to add to the debt. But you can't count the amount of money coming in because it is Medicare's money. It is simply borrowing money from Medicare. It is going to add to the debt.

Our own independent Government Accountability Office has said, according to the likely analysis of events over the next 75 years, as they do for Social Security and Medicare, this plan is going to add $6.2 trillion to the Federal deficit. In other words, what they are saying is that you would have to deposit $6 trillion into an account today to have enough money to honor the commitments that are being made with the Affordable Care Act. So that much money, in addition to the other revenues and taxes that are in the legislation and the payments that are made by Americans, is not going to be enough, and we need that much more money. But we are committing this benefit to American citizens. It becomes an entitlement. We are committing these benefits to them, and we don't have the money to honor the commitment. That cannot continue. We cannot as a nation continue down this path.

Wall Street and others are telling us we have to get our house in order. We cannot continue to add to our debt in this fashion.

I understand the difficulties Members will be facing when they cast a vote as they come up here today. I am not going to criticize any Member on their vote—although I am not going to vote to waive the budget. I think we ought to stay within our budget, and I think we cannot get by with this idea that the Affordable Care Act is going to improve the financial condition of America when it absolutely is not.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would be delighted. The Senator is such a fine leader of the Appropriations Committee and one of the most knowledgeable people here, a person I respect greatly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. And I feel the same way.

I understand the Senator from Alabama is the ranking member of the Budget Committee. Could the Senator tell me why six Senators have objected on his side of the aisle to having the conference on the budget? The Senate passed a budget bill 5 months ago, and we could have been in negotiations to resolve that. Could the Senator tell me why those six Senators object? And because of that objection, we do not have a budget. Senator MURRAY passed a budget working here in a marathon. The Senator will remember that.

Mr. SESSIONS. I certainly do. And I think I may have had a little role in the fact that a budget was passed since I had been complaining that the Democratic majority went 4 years without passing a budget and several years without even bringing it to the floor. While the House was passing a budget every year, the Senate failed and refused a fundamental legal requirement to even produce one.

But this year our new chairman, Senator MURRAY, did bring a budget forward and did move it through the body. There was a concern—I didn't raise it, but a number of colleagues on this side of the aisle said: We are glad to have the budget move forward, but we want you to commit not to raise the debt ceiling on a budget reconciliation because you could raise the debt ceiling with 51 votes instead of 60 votes.

I know the Senator may not like that, but that is exactly what was said. And Senator DURBIN on this floor said he did not think it could be done under the rules of the Senate and that we could raise the debt ceiling on the budget. But then why wouldn't the Senator agree to that?

So the request from the people who objected to sending a budget forward to conference was based solely—and they expressed it repeatedly—on the concerns that budget reconciliation would be used to raise the debt and therefore not be subject to a 60-vote majority.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator for his answer. I dispute the logic and the reasoning, but I thank the Senator, and I thank him for working with Senator MURRAY to move the budget. I will comment on that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield the floor. If I have not used all my time, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes of the proponents' time to Senator MURRAY, the chairperson of the Budget Committee, who actually did pass a budget 5 months ago but has been precluded because of sheer, rigid, ideological posturing from being able to go to a conference, sit in a room with PAUL RYAN, and work out what the budget of the United States of America should be. This is why we have gone from the greatest deliberative body to the greatest delay body.

So I yield 3 minutes and any other time she wishes to consume to Senator MURRAY, who has done an outstanding job, and I wish people would follow her lead and let her go to the conference so we could have a budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her tremendous leadership. She is absolutely correct—we are here in a manufactured crisis. This Senate and the House passed a budget last spring. For 6 months we have been trying to get those two budgets together to conference a deal to set our budget priorities for the next several years. We have been precluded from doing that by the same Republicans who now want to kill a continuing resolution that will simply keep our government open for a few short weeks so we can do the work we should have been doing for the last 6 months.

The answer to this is easy. Let's pass a clean resolution, keep the government open for a few short weeks, do the responsible thing, say to the Nation and to the world that we will pay our bills and raise the debt ceiling, and then do what we need to do, what every

one of us knows we need to do, which is to work out the differences between the House and the Senate budgets.

But we are here in a manufactured crisis because the same Republicans who are now leading us to a shutdown are saying they don't want us to talk. I agree with the Senator from Maryland. Keep the clean resolution, send it to the House, keep government open, and do what we should do as leaders and adults and come to a budget agreement.

I also wish to speak today on and urge my colleagues to support the majority leader's motion that he will bring to us to waive the budget point of order against the continuing resolution we will vote on in a few hours.

My Republican colleagues who announced their intent to raise this point of order are concerned that the funding levels in both the House and Senate continuing resolutions violate the Budget Control Act. But, as we all remember, sequestration was never supposed to be in there. It was supposed to be so unthinkable that it would force a compromise, which is what we are going to have to do anyway. But since those automatic cuts took effect, we have now heard from families and communities across the country that sequestration is costing us jobs, it is slowing our growth, and it is harming our national security. That is exactly why the Senate and House budgets both require changes to the Budget Control Act.

It is true that we took very different approaches to altering the automatic cuts. The Senate budget on our side fully replaced the sequestration. We did it with an equal mix of spending cuts and new revenues that we raised by closing loopholes skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. The House budget on the other side replaced sequestration fully also, but they did it by fully funding defense programs and paying for that with very deep cuts to investments in families and jobs, all the while protecting the wealthiest Americans from participating in this at all and helping to pay for it.

We do have a lot of work to bridge that divide, but that alone shows how important it is that we pass a clean, temporary continuing resolution to keep the government operating while we have that space to negotiate a longer term budget agreement that works for our families and economy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 3 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. To do that, we have to be able to finish this bill, send it back to the House, and get our country back on the right course again.

So voting to sustain this point of order isn't voting against a funding level or a policy vote. Voting to sustain this point of order is voting for a government shutdown because if this bill that is in front of us today dies, it is very likely the government will not be open for business on Tuesday, and then our American families will have to deal with the disruption and all the uncertainty that will cause.

There is no reason to let the gridlock and dysfunction in Washington, DC, cause more harm to our families and businesses. A vote for this point of order is a vote to kill this bill and shut down the government, and we do not want that to happen. So I oppose it. I urge my colleagues to join me in waiving the point of order when we have that vote later today. Let's pass a clean continuing resolution, have the House pass a clean continuing resolution, and then do the job we were sent to do. Every one of us knows what needs to be done, which is to bridge the divide between the House and Senate budgets and get our country back on track again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington State for her comments because, as usual, they were clear, cogent, and compelling.

We need to get a job done today. Our job today—am I correct—is passing a continuing resolution, which means we keep the funding at fiscal 2013 in place until we resolve other budgetary issues with the House. Is that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. I would say to the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, that is absolutely correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we will be voting at 12:30 on four questions. Those four votes are cloture on the continuing resolution, waiver of a Budget Act on the point of order, the amendment that I offered on the continuing resolution, and final passage. But essentially it is all pretty much the same thing—it is four separate votes that get there.

Our goal today is to send to the House of Representatives a continuing resolution, stripped of ideological riders, that keeps the government funded until November 15 while we work out other budgetary issues. The continuing resolution historically was always meant to be short-term to get us over problems, to keep the government functioning while we solve problems we have been working on, and it has always been historically not to have ideological riders attached to them.

We the Democrats, hopefully with others who will join with us to find the sensible center—America always governs best when it finds the center, a sensible center—we want to find that and send it to the House where, No. 1, our continuing resolution will be until November 15. This gives us a couple of weeks to work these issues out.

No. 2, to take out the ideological riders. The first rider is to defund President Obama's Affordable Care Act. We want to strip that out because it is now the law of the land. There is no need to keep fighting the same battle.

Next, there is an ideological rider on how we structure paying our debt. That rider is a rigged game, that we pay China first before we pay other obligations to people here, debtors in our own country. We want to strip that out and then send them the continuing resolution, which is not new money. It keeps the Government operating until November 15 at fiscal 2013 levels. That is where we are. I want to explain, if we do not do this we could head to a government shutdown that is harmful to our country, it is harmful to our economy, and it is harmful to our standing in the world.

In plain English, after debating the continuing resolution last Thursday, we now have these four votes. A vote to waive a point of order against the continuing resolution where we could end up with more sand in the gears. Where we are now is that the vote on the Senate amendment to the House CR, as I said, strips out partisan ideology, shortens the date and moves on so the House can look at it.

A government shutdown is a serious matter. If we do not come together across the aisle, across the dome, across town, we will be facing a damaging government shutdown. Here are a few things that will happen. If we cannot enact a clean continuing resolution by October 1, our troops, including troops deployed overseas, will not be paid on time; 800,000 civil servants who serve the American people will be sent home and told they are nonessential. Shutting down the government will have an immediate and harmful effect on our economy. Small Business Administration approval of loans will be put on hold; important rural development housing and farm loan grants will be stopped.

Our economy is struggling to pick up steam. The uncertainty that we will create in the marketplace, in our own country and in the world, will put on the brakes to our economy. It is irresponsible and unacceptable for this to happen.

Every day, thousands of Federal workers keep Americans safe. We don't hear about them every day but they do make a difference. Every time a defective product is removed from the market, every time an inspector recommends a change to keep people safe in terms of approving the safety of our food supply or drug supply, every time a scammer or a schemer is arrested for fraud, the Federal Government and the people who work for them play an important role.

In my own State, I represent the National Institutes of Health. Last spring, Director Dr. Francis Collins announced we had reduced cancer rates in this country by 15 percent. Instead of pinning a medal on the men and women who did the basic research that could then lead to the private sector inventing new pharmaceutical and biological

products that would put that into clinical practice—instead of that, they had to announce a furlough. How would you like to be working at NIH right this minute and be told you are nonessential? You are working on a cure for cancer, you are trying to find out the causes of autism, you are trying to come up with a cure or at least cognitive stretchout for Alzheimer's—just talking about the A words—then you are told you are nonessential. They did not know that. The American people do not believe it.

We have to avoid a government shutdown and a government showdown. What we need to be able to do today is to be sure we work on our amendments and make sure we have cloture on the continuing resolution. We have had substantial debate. It is now time to bring that together, waive the Budget Act and the point of order, pass my amendment to change the time to November 15, and then have final passage.

The time to act is now. You hear in my voice great frustration. I am frustrated, not because of solutions I do not like—that is give and take in a legislative process. What I am frustrated about is the continual process of delay, where we not only throw sand in the gears of our ability to function, we are now throwing cement into those gears.

I hope we can move. There are cool heads on both sides of the aisle. There are people on both sides of the aisle who have worked together and can come together. Let's pass this continuing resolution, have the House act so we can avoid a shutdown so that our focus is on solving the important issues facing our country. Yes, there are those who call for reducing the public debt. I support that. We can do that through a balanced approach: additional strategic cuts, a review of mandatory spending, and a look at closing tax loopholes.

But there are other debts we have. We have the issue of chronic unemployment, of growing education unattainment, where our standing in the world is slipping. I worry that we will not fund the necessary research and development so, working with the private sector, we will come up with those new ideas that lead to new products, that lead to new jobs.

DARPA, a government agency, helped create the Internet. Then the genius of our private sector unleashed a power that the world has never seen. This is what America is known for—discovery, entrepreneurship, moving our own country ahead. This is what I hope we will get back to.

Let's get through this process. Let's get through this quagmire and let's keep America being what America can be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do have time right now that is scheduled. However, my friend from Alabama had one other point to make. I would like to yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, as I explained the unfunded liabilities of the Affordable Care Act, I now want to make something clear. It is a lot more than that. It is unlike Social Security and Medicare, where there is a dedicated tax that supports those programs that are on our payroll withholding every week, that FICA withholding, dedicated to Social Security and Medicare. There is no dedicated tax support for ObamaCare.

If you assume all the new taxes they raise are actually used to fund ObamaCare, then there would be a $6.2 trillion shortfall, a liability. But if you do it like it should be accounted and assume that none of this money raised in taxes is actually dedicated to the Affordable Care Act, then it runs about $17 trillion according to estimates by my Budget Committee staff.

Congress is well-known for this. Unless your tax money is absolutely legally dedicated to something, it gets spent on other things. So we have no confidence we will come in with just $6.2 trillion. It is likely to be far higher than that, the way we know this body operates.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree with my good friend from Alabama. He has done a great job on this subject.

I would like to say, one of the things I enjoyed about the presentation that was made by my good friend from Texas Senator CRUZ was that we were in a position that is very rare in this body, where we could talk as long as we wanted to. In fact, we actually tried to talk longer. We were looking for different things to fill in. We may have forgotten some.

That is not where we are today. We are confined. But I have to share with my good friend in the chair that something I am going to say now is going to be very offensive to a lot of people, but I really don't care. At my age and being here, I think I know what this country is all about and I think I know that we have the obligation to express our true feelings.

I have written a speech and have put it off. I am not going to give it today. But I was rereading it this morning. I had no intention of coming down and talking because I talked long enough during the course of the Cruz talk. But I went back and reread the speech I was going to give. What it is is to answer the question one of my sons asked me, and everyone has been saying this over a period of time in Oklahoma. I don't think Oklahoma is that different from other States. But they ask me over and over again, they say: What happened? Why is it that we have an administration—people in government, not just the Obama administration but others—who are praising Islam and trashing Christianity, trashing the Judeo-Christian values and other things that are happening today?

We all know it is true. How do you answer that? It is a tough answer. So I am preparing and later on I will give you a little warning, I am going to make a little talk.

There is a guy named Paul Johnson who wrote a history of the American people. He talks about how we got to where we are today. This is going to tie into ObamaCare. He says that the Puritans were devoted and single-minded to their ambition of creating a colony that was built on the foundation and teachings of Jesus Christ. The Mayflower compact is evidence of that. Paul Johnson, the guy who wrote the book I told you about, is right to observe the document was not just a ''contract . . . between a servant and a master, or a people and a king, but between a group of like-minded individuals, with God as a witness and symbolic co-signatory.''

Why is this important? It is important because William Bradford and the other Puritans understood that while forming a civil government was fully within their rights, there were limitations to what they could and could not do. Not talking about government here. Those limitations were established by God and enumerated in the Bible.

I go on. When I make my talk on this, I quote the Apostle Paul in Romans, but there is not time for that. I go on to say it is within the foundation of Biblical authority that the Puritans crafted the Mayflower compact and their system of government at Plymouth Colony. Paul Johnson rightly observes that this line and model of thinking was critical to laying the foundation for a successful United States of America. Ultimately, it is a morality derived from God that had its strongest enduring influence over the Nation, and this is what has crafted our history as a strong nation.

I say all this as a predicate to the answer to the question people ask me: Why is it that we are trashing our Judeo-Christian values in favor of something that was not American to start with? Sadly, our Nation does not have the same belief today that we had during that time in our history. We have become arrogant, inward-focused individuals. Rather than submit to God's authority and definitions of truth, justice, and goodness, as we conduct our government's business, we have replaced them with our own ideals defined on what feels right at the time. As Americans, we now look inward to ourselves to define with fluidity the foundation of truth. We have allowed ourselves to become ultimate arbiters of what is right and wrong instead of the higher moral authority of God.

Lastly, what was going to be in this talk, this time getting back to the subject at hand, today, instead of having leaders who are protecting the church from government, we have leaders who

believe it is government's job to impose on churches what should be universally upheld as truth. Instead of leaders who are protecting an American's freedom to practice his or her religion of their choice—here I am not talking about the choice you may be thinking about—they may instead be using government institutions and law to force them to do or buy things that are in very violation to their religious beliefs and conscience. That is the issue we are talking about now.

Government has become so strong and influential in our lives that we are losing our powers, and these are our ordained powers that we know are a part of this country. There is not a person in here who didn't study the Pilgrims coming over on the Mayflower and having that meeting in the captain's chamber and making these decisions and now we are where we are today.

I have an example. I have a friend in Oklahoma whose name is David Green. David Green started a company called Hobby Lobby. David Green and his wife started this company by making picture frames in their garage. They were able to open their first store, which was 300 square feet, with the profits they made in their little garage operation making picture frames.

Over the years their business has grown to 550 stores. It has an annual revenue of $2.5 billion, and David Green has had success despite running his business in a very countercultural way. For instance, all of the retail stores close at 8 p.m. each night and all day on Sunday so employees can spend time with their families. This is appreciated by the company's 16,000 employees—remember, it all started in a garage—who are paid at a minimum $12 an hour, even though they could be paying a much lower legal rate.

At one point, the company was challenged by a competitor who said they would bury Hobby Lobby with their money, so their firm opened their doors on Sunday, ultimately earning the company $150 million in revenue each week. Eventually, David Green said he was challenged by God to trust in him with his business, to go back to his policy of closing on Sundays and he did and his business has prospered. It is one of the largest businesses in America today.

David's Christian faith runs deeper than his desire to have a profitable, successful company. When he was faced with a decision to make more money or obey God, he chose to obey God, whatever the consequences.

Keep all of that in mind and listen to this. This is what I am getting at. Recently, he was faced with a new test. It didn't come from a competitor. It came from the U.S. Government. Part of the ObamaCare law requires employers not only to provide health care insurance to their employees but also to provide free access to the pills that terminate pregnancies.

David, as I do, and many others believe—and some don't believe that we believe—that life begins at conception, and offering an option to end that life would be in violation, in his case, of his moral compass as defined by his faith in Jesus Christ.

As a result, he said he would rather pay the $1.3 million a day in daily fines from the Obama administration than comply with the law. Here is a guy who feels so strongly in his beliefs—that I think are consistent with the beliefs that made this country great, but that is just my belief—that he would pay $1.3 million a day in fines from the Obama administration rather than comply with this law.

Today the Obama administration is vigorously opposing Hobby Lobby's legal challenge to the mandate, claiming that this privately owned business is waging a war on women for not agreeing to provide these treatments for its employees free of charge. That is just one example of what is happening. By the way, I don't think my State of Oklahoma is that different from most other States.

Last week, four universities in my great State of Oklahoma filed a lawsuit against the Federal Government over the ObamaCare mandate to provide certain types of contraception to their employees. These are four universities which are joining with this one great American named David Green. So we have the faith of an individual and what he is willing to do for his faith. He is willing to stand up to this abusive government that we have today and to this ObamaCare law and is willing to pay $1.3 million a day. My feelings are just as strong as his on this issue, but that is a subject for another day.

My wife and I have 20 kids and grandkids. Back in the old days, when we were having our kids, there was kind of a rule where you couldn't go into the hospital, I say to my good friend who is occupying the chair. Back then we couldn't see this and we had to wait outside and we didn't have notice of what the baby was going to be and all that.

But in the case of my first grandchild, my daughter called me up and said: All right, Daddy. Come on over. It is time. I went over to the hospital delivery room. What a great experience that was. I never dreamed that would ever happen. We are talking about a number of years ago—17 years ago. So I watched this take place, and I honestly—a tear did come out from my eye.

At that time we were talking about partial birth abortions and the fact that they could have taken little baby Jase and jammed scissors into his skull and sucked his brains out. That could have happened, but it didn't happen.

I feel just as strongly as David Green does. I can make all the arguments I want about this, and I made arguments on the floor during the Cruz debate.

I remember Hillary health care, which was about 19 years ago and it was the same thing. It was government taking over the health care system, and I had my friends in Parliament and Great Britain who would call and say: What is wrong with you guys over there? Don't you realize we are just getting away from this thing that hasn't worked? Don't kid yourself and think this is not a road to socialized medicine if we end up not doing something about ObamaCare. It is.

I have a great deal of respect for the leader of the Senate, HARRY REID. Senator REID himself said: Yes, I believe this is leading to—and I endorse it—the single-payer system. So we are talking about socialized medicine.

They called and said: What is wrong with you guys? It hasn't worked in Great Britain, it hasn't worked in Denmark, and it hasn't worked in Canada. Yet you think it is somehow going to work there.

That is the big issue. We have an abusive government, and this is probably the greatest single step we have witnessed in the last 4½ years as to the abuse that has taken place. We need to look at the big picture and do something about this. They say it can't be done now. It is too late. They are probably right, but they said the same thing about Hillary health care 19 years ago, and I will never forget it because I was on a plane going back to my State of Oklahoma and had a stop in Chicago.

I thought we finally drove the final nail in the coffin and killed Hillary health care. Yet I picked up the Wall Street Journal, and there was a full-page ad by the AMA endorsing Hillary health care. They had given up, and that was the day before they gave them that story.

Anyway, it is never too late. This is something that needs to be stopped. I have faith in the American people that somehow we are going to win this thing.

I thank the Chair. I know my time has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor, the members of the Appropriations Committee and others who have been down to speak in support of passing this continuing resolution.

I am a new member of the Appropriations Committee, and I have been very impressed with the work our chair, Senator MIKULSKI, and Ranking Member SHELBY have done. They have crafted the appropriations bills that would address the budget for the coming year. Those appropriations bills would replace the harmful cuts from sequestration. Those are cuts that people on both sides of the aisle have said they oppose. Unfortunately, because of the obstructionism we have seen so clearly

this week, those bills have not yet come to the floor and so we need a short-term CR to keep the government open.

We all know that the continuing resolution before us is not ideal. It is short term and it doesn't replace sequestration. So it doesn't either deal with the cuts or give businesses and our economy the certainty they need. But this suggestion that we should refuse to keep the government open is irresponsible. There is too much at stake for our economy, for our small businesses, and for our families across this country. Unfortunately, what we have seen this week is that there are some who are pushing this country to the brink of another manufactured crisis as a tactic to prevent health care reform from going into effect.

I am not going to review what Senator MCCAIN said so well about how the democratic process works in this country and the fact that once a law goes into effect, it is important to implement it. I think democracy works, but it doesn't always work the way I want it to either. When a law is passed, we have a responsibility to go ahead and make it work. We have a seen a small minority of this body and of the House who are willing to shut down government to defund the new health care law.

The people I talk to in New Hampshire don't think that shutting down government is a good approach because they understand the serious consequences it would have for them, for their businesses, and for the country. It would especially hurt small businesses, which are the foundation of the economy in New Hampshire and the Presiding Officer's home State of Maine and Rhode Island, Senator REED's home State. Those small businesses create two out of every three new jobs. Many of those small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country rely on Federal contracts as they figure out how they are going to grow and create new jobs.

We talked to one CEO of an innovative small company in New Hampshire who told me if its contracts were shut down:

> Our income would drop to essentially zero and we would burn our very thin cash reserves . . . when that money is burned it is not able to be replaced so our basic financial viability can be irrevocably damaged even after the crisis passes. There will be no way to recover those dollars.

We had a chance to hear from the former Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Rubin, this week. He said: Unlike 1995, when there was a short-term consequence to shutting down the government, if we do that this time, it will be felt not just for years but for decades to come.

A shutdown would close the Small Business Administration's lending programs, and those SBA lending programs are critical to small business in New Hampshire and across this country. On average, SBA supports loans to over 1,000 small businesses per week.

Then there is the housing market. In New Hampshire and across this country, the housing market has been one of the slowest sectors to recover, but in the last year we have begun to see some signs of improvement. The Federal Housing Administration has been a big part of that recovery because they have helped families afford homes and kept our housing economy afloat.

Under the shutdown, it is estimated that assistance to 34,000 homeowners would be delayed. With all of the problems that have been caused by the housing crisis, we should not be stalling one of the most effective programs we have for assisting homeowners, and that is what we would do with a government shutdown.

Then, of course, this would be terrible timing for the tourist industry in New Hampshire and across New England because fall foliage is one of our biggest seasons and tourists come from all over the world. They spend money in our local restaurants and hotels. Many small businesses rely on this time of year to increase their revenues. But if the government shuts down, we will be turning away those customers. Applications for visas will come to a halt. According to the Congressional Research Service, during the 1995–1996 shutdowns, approximately 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for visas to come and visit in America went unprocessed. That will not just affect the tourism industries in New Hampshire, it will affect airlines and people across the country.

Then, of course, there are Federal workers. In New Hampshire there are 7,400 of them. It is one of the State's largest employers, the Federal Government, and their salaries are not just important to them and their families but to the grocery stores and gas stations and all of the other businesses they support.

The Presiding Officer certainly knows, as I do, about the impact on the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard of a potential government shutdown.

These are just some of the effects on the economy. Considering the many industries that would be affected, it is no surprise that economists have forecast that failure to pass a continuing resolution, as Bob Rubin said, would do significant damage to our economy. Even a 3- or 4-day shutdown would slow growth by 0.2 percent, according to economist Mark Zandi.

It doesn't have to be this way. I was a Governor for three terms. The Presiding Officer was a Governor for two terms. We understand what it is like to work across the aisle. We always passed a budget because we had to put in place a budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the Chair.

There were a lot of differences on both sides of the aisle, but we understood the importance of compromising, because it would have been impossible to get something through the New Hampshire legislature and get a budget to my desk if people hadn't been willing to compromise, if they had been continuing to play the kinds of political games we are seeing here in Washington.

It is unacceptable. Congress can do better. We need to work together to pass this continuing resolution, and then to raise the debt ceiling later this year so we avoid the negative effect to families, to businesses, and to our economy.

Thank you very much.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes of proponent time to Senator COATS, as well as, by agreement of the other side, 3 minutes of opponent time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of confusion over what has been happening in the Senate this week. I know Hoosiers want a clear explanation, so I wish to take a moment to explain exactly where I stand on the issue before us.

Let me start by laying out a few facts. This is the reality we face. No. 1: Every single Republican opposes ObamaCare and wants to see it repealed and defunded. That is unassailable. We are all together on that.

No. 2: The House has sent us a bill that would defund ObamaCare while keeping the rest of the government running. I support that bill, and I think all Republicans support that bill.

No. 3: Senate Democrats are united in their opposition to repealing ObamaCare and, unfortunately, the fact is they control the Senate and they control the White House, and we don't have the votes to prevail.

So the confusion sets in because, let's face it, we have a lot of confusing procedures here in the U.S. Senate, but I have always been guided by the principle that to the extent possible, a yes should be yes and a no should be no.

We have all of these procedural motions and Members like to attach caveats, such as: This is what it means if you vote to go forward or this is what it means if you don't vote to go forward. It is so easy to run home and say: Oh, well, that was an issue politically. That was procedural, so don't pay any attention to that.

Sometimes we have no other option because the majority leader won't allow any votes on the issue itself. In this case, the majority leader has allowed that vote. That is not the case here. We don't need a procedural vote to determine whether one is for or against ObamaCare. We will be able to have a vote if we invoke cloture and move forward and keep this alive to continue debate not just this week but next year and however long it takes to deal with this issue. We need to move forward or everything else comes to a standstill.

That is why I will be voting to move forward. I will be voting to keep the

process alive. Otherwise, everything stops. The House of Representatives, controlled by our party, is waiting for us to send this bill back. If we deny cloture, it doesn't go back to the House. They don't have an opportunity to go to the next step.

There is bipartisan support for a bill I have introduced in the Senate, and TODD YOUNG, a Congressman from southern Indiana, has not only introduced but passed in the House of Representatives a measure to delay this process for a year so we can continue to address and hopefully repeal ObamaCare. The President has delayed implementation for business, and again today for small business. He can delay it for individuals, and that will give us time to continue this effort.

Voting for cloture today so we can send something back to the House is not a vote for ObamaCare. It is exactly the opposite. It is a vote against ObamaCare. It keeps the process alive. Saying otherwise is misleading. Also, if that were the case, then the procedural vote we had on Wednesday would not have been 100 to zero. So those who try to define this as a procedural vote are essentially stopping the process from going forward and stopping the government from running. It affects military families, it affects veterans, and it affects thousands and thousands of people in critical jobs. It affects people all across my State.

The problem with this approach is that it doesn't achieve the goal. We all know a major portion of ObamaCare is funded through mandatory spending, and that is not what we are addressing here. It can only affect the appropriations, the discretionary funding, which is less than 50 percent.

If it achieves the goal, then it may be worth considering. But since it doesn't achieve the goal, let's keep this process alive and let's all be on the record with a yes or a no. Let's get this bill back to the House so we can continue the fight and let's be straight up on where we stand on this issue, not through a procedural vote but through a clear yes or no. The American people deserve no less.

I commend the passion of my colleagues talking on the floor, trying to get rid of ObamaCare. We have a difference of opinion as to how tactically we can achieve this objective. I have come to the judgment and the conclusion that I think many are coming to, which is that instead of just stopping everything—which means being at a total impasse and shutting down the government—and even if we were successful, it wouldn't address the full shutdown and defunding of ObamaCare, the best course of action is to move forward. Our House Republican Members are waiting for us to send them legislation so we can keep this process going and come to, hopefully, a much better resolution than just simply using a procedural gimmick to define where we stand on this issue.

I take a back seat to no one on where I stand on ObamaCare, and I will not give up the fight until we achieve the goal of replacing the law with real health care solutions.

Mr. President, I yield any time I may have remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of proponent time to the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, where is America now? We have an economy in recovery. The Dow was at 7,900 when George W. Bush left office. It is over 15,000 right now. Our deficit is heading downward. Unemployment is still high, but jobs are coming back. But, as we make this progress, people continue to struggle, and they expect us to put together a business plan for America, here on the Senate floor, and work with the President—work together as Democrats and Republicans—to put that plan together for every American family.

What is the tea party Republican response? It is to shut down the government, to stamp out signs of our fragile economic recovery, to send the signal that America can't perform the most basic job of government—and that is to pass a budget.

What is driving these tea party Republicans? I know all about these tea party extremists. I served in the House of Representatives with them. I served over there for years. They live by the Republican tea party paradox: They hate the government but, paradoxically, they have to run for office in order to make sure the government doesn't work, and that is where they are today.

They sent us a bill from the House and they know it won't pass. This is a bill to nowhere, and nowhere is where the tea party Republicans want the government to go.

The tea party Republicans want to repeal ObamaCare. I say to those who want to repeal ObamaCare, to those who do not like ObamaCare, and to those who like ObamaCare: We have had that debate. We debated here in Congress. The bill passed. It was signed by the President. It was held up by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is the law. It is time to stop playing games and to let the law work. But that is exactly what the tea party Republicans are afraid of—that the law will actually work.

Shutting down the government for ObamaCare is like canceling the World Series because your team didn't make it. ObamaCare is the law. We can't cancel the government. We can't cancel the World Series. We have to accept the reality that it is the law. We had an election. But what we have here are the mad hatters of the Republican tea party in Congress who have decided that their approach to government—to the old, to the sick, to the needy, to every single principle of the United States of America that we stand for—it is off with their heads for all of those people who depend upon these programs in our country. We are living in an absurd ''Alice in Wonderland'' Republican tea party world here.

This government has to work for the American people. Instead, what they are about to do, over this weekend, is send another Maalox-moment-for-the-marketplace signal to the credit markets of the world that the United States cannot be depended upon to operate a government, to pay its bills, to respond to the needs of the families within our own country, to meet its obligations not only here but around the world.

And those families who are dependent upon a paycheck from the Defense Department? They are wondering, along with the families who are dependent upon a Federal helping hand, whether or not they are going to get that help over the next week, over the next two weeks, over the next month.

I will just give my colleagues one final example. The National Institutes of Health budget—well, it is really the national institutes of hope. That is what we give to families who have somebody with Alzheimer's, with Parkinson's, with cancer, with heart disease—is being cut and cut and cut and cut. It is being cut at the same time that last year we spent $132 billion worth of taxpayers' money on Alzheimer's patients in our country. We can't cut the money for the cure and simultaneously say we want to cut the money for taking care of those who have the disease. We can't have it both ways. That is what this nihilistic tea party approach is bringing to our people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I hope the tea party Republicans come to their senses.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are going to have the opportunity to vote today to reverse course. I think most people agree that ObamaCare is not working out as it is intended. In fact, we had a Democrat recently say that when it comes to the implementation of ObamaCare, it is a train wreck. Whether one believes it is a train wreck, which is what I happen to believe, or whether it is a slow motion derailment, it is time for us to reverse course.

We have an opportunity to go in a different direction with the vote we are going to have here in about an hour on whether or not to defund ObamaCare. I think the overwhelming opinion across this country—an overwhelming number of Americans—believe that this is not working. It is hurting middle class families. It is costing us jobs. It is driving up health insurance premiums for people across this country, and we need to do something to reverse course.

For example, when we look at how this impacts average people in my

State of South Dakota, we have young people today who, when they look at what they are paying in terms of health insurance premiums this year and what they are going to pay under the exchanges when the exchanges kick in, are seeing that a healthy 30-year-old woman in South Dakota is going to be faced with a 223-percent premium increase as a result of ObamaCare. A healthy 30-year-old man living in South Dakota is facing a 393-percent premium increase, when we compare the data being put out by the Department of Health and Human Services of what people in my State of South Dakota are paying today for similar coverage. I am using the bronze plan under the exchanges as a case in point.

For a young person in South Dakota, we are talking about $1,500 more a year to pay for health insurance for a young woman, and $2,000 more for a young man. This money is money that could be used to pay off student loans, save for a home, maybe start a family.

It is not just young adults who are going to be faced with making tough budget decisions between having health care and paying for other items. We know also that families are seeing health care premiums skyrocket, since the President took office, by about $3,000, or by about $2,500 since ObamaCare became law. That is happening at a time when average household income is going down. If we look at the average household income since the President took office, it is down by about $3,600. So families are seeing health insurance premiums go up by $3,000 while average household income is going down by $3,600. As we can see, middle class families in this country are being squeezed from both ends.

We have an opportunity to correct that. The vote today is a vote to defund ObamaCare. I have been a big advocate for delaying, defunding, replacing, repealing. When it comes to this issue, count me as one of the ''all of the above''—anything we can do to get rid of this bad law and the harmful impacts it is having on the American people.

The vote today is going to be on defunding. I would daresay that every Republican in this Chamber—all 46 Republicans—will be casting a vote to defund ObamaCare. There is not a single Republican in the Chamber today or when this law was passed back in 2009 who voted for it. Since that time, we have had numerous votes—I think 29 or 30 votes—here in the Senate on repealing all or parts of ObamaCare.

So everybody on our side is going to be on the record today in favor of defunding this bad law. All it will take is 5 Democrats—5 Democrats—to get us to the 51 votes necessary to change the direction, change the course, turn this train around, and head it in a different direction. Republicans are going to be united on that point. There is sometimes a difference of opinion on tactics, about the best way to reach the goal, but one thing that unites all Republicans is the goal, and that is doing away with this bad law and its harmful impact on the American people, on middle-class families, on jobs, and on our economy. The question before the House is, Are there going to be Democrats, a handful of Democrats—five is all it takes—to stand with Republicans today and help us defund this law?

Nearly 60 percent of Americans say they oppose ObamaCare. We can stop it. We can start over and do this the right way. We have talked about, many times, the things we would do differently if we had the opportunity to write a law that actually would address the health care challenges people face in this country, that would create greater competition in the marketplace by allowing people to buy insurance across State lines, by allowing small businesses to join larger groups in pools so they get the benefit of group purchasing power, by reducing the cost of defensive medicine, by ending a lot of the junk lawsuits that clog the system today, by allowing people to have a refundable tax credit where they can buy their own health insurance and they have more choice, more competition.

These are all approaches we think make sense and would provide a positive alternative to the American people that would not cost us the jobs, that would not be driving up health insurance premiums by 393 percent for a 30-year-old man in the State of South Dakota or 223 percent for a 30-year-old woman, and that would give American families an opportunity to save more for their future, to provide for their families, and hopefully to invest in what is a better and a more prosperous future for their children and grandchildren.

That is the vote before us today. Again, I do not have to belabor the point when it comes to the harmful impacts this has had if you look at what it is doing to jobs, if you look at what it is doing to employers. We talk to people all the time. I doubt there is a Member here in the Senate who, when they go home to their State on weekends, does not have conversations with small businesses, with employers who are talking about what this is doing to their ability to create jobs, to put people to work, to raise salaries, to make sure the people they employ have a better future for their families.

But, clearly, as long as this bad law stays in place, it is going to be more expensive and more difficult for businesses in this country to create jobs; it is going to be more difficult, more expensive for middle-class families to make ends meet; it is going to create a much bigger, more expansive government that is going to cost the American taxpayer way more than I think was originally promised; and certainly it is going to add significantly to the massive amount of debt we are passing on to future generations.

We have an opportunity to get a do-over today. There has been talk during the implementation of this that it has glitches and bumps and inaccuracies and malfunctions. This is not ready for prime time. I think we can all acknowledge that. At a minimum, we ought to figure out a way to delay this and change course, change direction, and go in a better direction for America's future.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, let me start by getting something out of the way: I am opposed to funding Obamacare, plain and simple, and my votes this week reflect that. The allegedly Affordable Care Act is raising premiums, forcing millions of Americans into part-time work, and raising taxes on hard-working American families.

However, I want to bring up another problem we are facing this week, which has so far been mostly drowned out in this latest budget crisis. Short-term, month-to-month budgeting is no way to run a government. Even if we manage to avoid a government shutdown this time, we will be debating this same question in just 6 weeks. We should not continue to place bandaids on Washington's failure to pass a responsible, long-term budget.

When I ran a small business, I had a plan to meet payroll and keep the lights on and doors open with the revenue I brought in. Even small businesses need long range planning, fiscal discipline, and foresight. When families sit down to plan their budgets, they are forced to make tough choices—like how to save for college, or simply how to get food on the dinner table that week. But the Federal Government has repeatedly failed to play by these same rules, and as a result, we move from crisis to crisis with no solution on the horizon for our growing fiscal mess. Congress has not completed all 12 regular spending bills on time since 1997. This year, Congress has not yet passed any of these bills. As a result, our debt continues to rise, our government grows ever bigger, and our economic future remains uncertain. This hurts our economy and hurts our families.

A big part of the solution here is not rocket science: Pass a budget. Pass all 12 appropriations bills. Show some fiscal foresight. While Obamacare is certainly more than enough reason to oppose the current continuing resolution, I will not support this stopgap spending measure and further grind our budgeting process to a halt.

● Mr. President, I want to take a moment to reflect on the current Senate debate over the funding of our government and the future of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

At the outset, I want to make one thing perfectly clear: I oppose Obamacare and have from the beginning.

I was among the most outspoken critics of Obamacare when it was being debated in the Senate. In fact, I was the first Member of Congress to suggest that the individual mandate was unconstitutional, an argument that eventually went all the way to the Supreme Court.

Since the law's passage, I have been one of the foremost voices in Congress in favor of repeal.

I have introduced legislation to repeal some of Obamacare's most egregious provisions, including the individual mandate, the employer mandate, the health insurance tax, and the medical device tax.

I have come to the floor countless times over the years to call for either a full repeal or permanent delay of the implementation of Obamacare.

In short, Mr. President, no one can accuse me of acquiescing when it comes to opposing Obamacare. I have and will continue to do all I can to protect the American people from this monstrosity of a law.

That said, I wish to express my admiration for my colleagues who are currently fighting to defund Obamacare as part of the continuing resolution to fund the government. I admire their commitment to their principles and share their desire to see Obamacare disappear once and for all.

While I may not agree with their chosen strategy, our overall goals are the same.

It is that strategy that I want to comment on today.

Once again, no one is more committed to repealing Obamacare than I am. However, if we are going to be successful in this endeavor, we need to look at the bigger picture.

Quite simply, the strategy of forcing a government shutdown in order to defund Obamacare has no chance of success. And, in the long run, I believe it will do more harm than good.

Unlike a number of my colleagues, I was around for the government shutdown of 1995. And, while purists may have patted themselves on the back for their resolve, the shutdown did nothing to advance conservative principles and, in the end, harmed the Republican Party.

I can't help but think that the same would happen now if we end up shutting down the government over a fight about Obamacare.

In fact, given the number of setbacks he has faced recently, I have little doubt that President Obama is hoping for a government shutdown so that he can blame it on Republicans.

That is what the Wall Street Journal editorial page argued recently, saying:

> With his own popularity fading, Mr. Obama may want a shutdown so he can change the subject to his caricature of GOP zealots who want no government. He'll blame any turmoil or economic fallout on House Republicans, figuring that he can split the tea party from the GOP and that this is the one event that could reinstall Nancy Pelosi as Speaker. Mr. Obama could spend his final two years going out in a blaze of liberal glory.

Does anyone seriously believe that the mainstream media would portray a government shutdown over Obamacare in a light that was favorable to congressional Republicans?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the Wall Street Journal editorial.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a recent op-ed piece authored by Karl Rove.

In that opinion piece, Mr. Rove rightly argues that:

''The desire to strike at Obamacare is praiseworthy. But, any strategy to repeal, delay, or replace the law must have a credible chance of succeeding or affecting broad public opinion positively. The defunding strategy doesn't. Going down that road would strengthen the president while alienating independents. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.''

Karl Rove isn't the only conservative making these arguments.

Writing in the Washington Post, Charles Krauthammer said of the shutdown strategy: ''[T]here's no principle at stake here. This is about tactics. If I thought this would work, I would support it. But I don't fancy suicide.''

Mr. Krauthammer continued, saying: ''Nothing could better revive the fortunes of a failing, flailing, fading Democratic administration than a government shutdown where the president is portrayed as standing up to the GOP on honoring our debts and paying our soldiers in the field.''

Rich Lowry, editor of the National Review wrote that this strategy is ''a grass roots-pleasing slogan in search of a path to legislative fruition,'' and that it ''seems tantamount to believing that if Republican politicians clicked their wing tips together and wished it so, President Barack Obama would collapse in a heap and surrender on his party's most cherished accomplishment.''

Mr. President, these aren't critiques aimed at the Senators pursuing this strategy. Instead, these are stalwart conservative commentators recognizing the reality of our situation.

If the strategy that some of my colleagues are apparently pursuing had even a minor chance at success, I would be the first in line to support their efforts. Once again, no one wants to see Obamacare defeated more than I do.

But, facts are facts.

For this strategy to be successful, it would require at least 15 Senate Democrats to change their minds and support defunding Obamacare. That is unlikely.

It would also require President Obama to sign into law a resolution defunding what he believes is his signature domestic achievement. That is even more unlikely.

That being the case, I cannot support this strategy. I cannot support a filibuster of the continuing resolution now before the Senate.

The CR does what Republicans want it to do—it defunds Obamacare. I urge all my colleagues to vote for cloture on the continuing resolution.

At the same time, I oppose any effort to strip the language defunding Obamacare from the resolution and to raise the overall spending levels above those established under the Budget Control Act.

Indeed, if, after the Senate invokes cloture on the CR, the Majority Leader's amendment is agreed to, I urge my colleagues to vote no on final passage.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 16, 2013]

THE POWER OF 218

IF HOUSE REPUBLICANS CAN'T HOLD TOGETHER, THEY HAVE NO LEVERAGE AT ALL

Perhaps the only war strategizing more inept than President Obama's on Syria are GOP plans for the budget hostilities this autumn. Republicans are fracturing over tactics, and even over the nature of political reality, which may let Mr. Obama outwit them like a domestic Vladimir Putin.

In our view the GOP would be less confused if more House Members appreciated the power of 218. That's the number of votes that makes a majority and it is the only true ''leverage'' Republicans have while Democrats hold the Senate and a Presidential veto.

The latest GOP internal dispute is over a continuing resolution to fund the government at sequester-spending levels. The current CR runs out at the end of the month, and about 40 to 50 House Republicans (out of 233) want to attach a rider that either delays or defunds the Affordable Care Act for a year and leaves everything else running.

Speaker John Boehner floated a CR with an arcane procedure that would force the Senate to take an up-or-down vote on the anti-ObamaCare component. But pressure groups like Heritage Action and the Club for Growth rebelled and the vote had to be postponed, like so many other unforced retreats this Congress. Here we go again.

These critics portrayed the Boehner plan as a sellout because of a campaign that captured the imagination of some conservatives this summer: Republicans must threaten to crash their Zeros into the aircraft carrier of ObamaCare. Their demand is that the House pair the ''must pass'' CR or the debt limit with defunding the health-care bill. Kamikaze missions rarely turn out well, least of all for the pilots.

The problem is that Mr. Obama is never, ever going to unwind his signature legacy project of national health care. Ideology aside, it would end his Presidency politically. And if Republicans insist that any spending bill must defund ObamaCare, then a showdown is inevitable that shuts down much of the government. Republicans will claim that Democrats are the ones shutting it down to preserve ObamaCare. Voters may see it differently given the media's liberal sympathies and because the repeal-or-bust crowd provoked the confrontation.

With his own popularity fading, Mr. Obama may want a shutdown so he can change the subject to his caricature of GOP zealots who want no government. He'll blame any turmoil or economic fallout on House Republicans, figuring that he can split the tea party from the GOP and that this is the one event that could reinstall Nancy Pelosi as Speaker. Mr. Obama could spend his final two years going out in a blaze of liberal glory.

The defunders sketch out an alternative scenario in which Mr. Obama is blamed, and they say we can't know unless Republicans try. But even they admit privately that they really won't succeed in defunding ObamaCare. The best case seems to be that if

all Republicans show resolve they'll win over the public in a shutdown, and Democrats will eventually surrender, well, something.

If this works it would be the first time. The evidence going back to the Newt Gingrich Congress is that no party can govern from the House, and the Republican Party can't abide the outcry when flights are delayed, national parks close and direct deposits for military spouses stop. Sooner or later the GOP breaks.

This all-or-nothing posture also usually results in worse policy. The most recent example was the failure of Mr. Boehner's fiscal cliff ''Plan B'' in December 2012, which was the best the GOP could do because Mr. Obama had the whip hand of automatic tax increases. The fallback deal that was sealed in the Senate raised taxes by more and is now complicating the prospects for tax reform.

The backbenchers are heading into another box canyon now. Mr. Boehner is undermined because the other side knows he lacks 218 GOP votes, which empowers House and Senate Democrats. They want to reverse the modest spending discipline of the sequester, and if the House GOP can't hold together on the CR they will succeed. The only chance of any entitlement reform worth the name is if Mr. Boehner can hold his majority and negotiate from strength.

We've often supported backbenchers who want to push GOP leaders in a better policy direction, most recently on the farm bill. But it's something else entirely to sabotage any plan with a chance of succeeding and pretend to have ''leverage'' that exists only in the world of townhall applause lines and fundraising letters.

The best option now is for the GOP to unite behind a budget strategy that can hold 218 votes, keeping the sequester pressure of discretionary spending cuts on Democrats to come to the table on entitlements. The sequester is a rare policy victory the GOP has extracted from Mr. Obama, and it is squeezing liberal constituencies that depend on federal cash.

The backbenchers might even look at the polls showing that the public is now tilting toward Republicans on issues including the economy, ensuring a strong national defense and even health care. Some Republicans think they are sure to hold the House in 2014 no matter what happens because of gerrymandering, but even those levees won't hold if there's a wave of revulsion against the GOP. Marginal seats still matter for controlling Congress. The kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of all-Democratic rule.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 18, 2013]

KARL ROVE: GOP'S SELF-DEFEATING 'DEFUNDING' STRATEGY

(By Karl Rove)

In 2010, Republicans took the House of Representatives by gaining 63 seats. They also picked up six U.S. senators and 675 state legislators, giving them control of more legislative chambers than any time since 1928. The GOP also won 25 of 40 gubernatorial races in 2009 and 2010.

These epic gains happened primarily because independents voted Republican. In 2010, 56% of independents voted for GOP congressional candidates, up from 43% in 2008 and 39% in 2006.

Today, independents look more like Republicans than Democrats, especially when it comes to health care. In a new Crossroads GPS health-care policy survey conducted in 10 states likely to have competitive Senate races and in House districts that lean Republican or are swing seats, 60% of independents oppose President Obama's Affordable Care Act. If this holds through 2014, then Republicans should receive another big boost in the midterms.

There is, however, one issue on which independents disagree with Republicans: using the threat of a government shutdown to defund ObamaCare. By 58% to 30% in the GPS poll, they oppose defunding ObamaCare if that risks even a temporary shutdown.

This may be because it is (understandably) hard to see the endgame of the defund strategy. House Republicans could pass a bill that funds the government while killing all ObamaCare spending. But the Democratic Senate could just amend the measure to restore funding and send it back to the House. What then? Even the defund strategy's authors say they don't want a government shutdown. But their approach means we'll get one.

After all, avoiding a shutdown would require, first, at least five Senate Democrats voting to defund ObamaCare. But not a single Senate Democrat says he'll do that, and there is no prospect of winning one over.

Second, assuming enough Senate Democrats materialize to defund ObamaCare, the measure faces a presidential veto. Republicans would need 54 House Democrats and 21 Senate Democrats to vote to override the president's veto. No sentient being believes that will happen.

So what would the public reaction be to a shutdown? Some observers point to the 1995 shutdown, saying the GOP didn't suffer much in the 1996 election. They are partially correct: Republicans did pick up two Senate seats in 1996. But the GOP also lost three House seats, seven of the 11 gubernatorial races that year, a net of 53 state legislative seats and the White House.

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than the one in 1995. Back then, seven of the government's 13 appropriations bills had been signed into law, including the two that funded the military. So most of the government was untouched by the shutdown. Many of the unfunded agencies kept operating at a reduced level for the shutdown's three weeks by using funds from past fiscal years.

But this time, no appropriations bills have been signed into law, so no discretionary spending is in place for any part of the federal government. Washington won't be able to pay military families or any other federal employee. While conscientious FBI and Border Patrol agents, prison guards, air-traffic controllers and other federal employees may keep showing up for work, they won't get paychecks, just IOUs.

The only agencies allowed to operate with unsalaried employees will be those that meet one or more of the following legal tests: They must be responding to ''imminent'' emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, be funded by mandatory spending (such as Social Security), have funds from prior fiscal years that have already been obligated, or rely on the constitutional power of the president. Figuring out which agencies meet these tests will be tough, but much of the federal government will lack legal authority to function.

But won't voters be swayed by the arguments for defunding? The GPS poll tested the key arguments put forward by advocates of defunding and Mr. Obama's response. Independents went with Mr. Obama's counterpunch 57% to 35%. Voters in Senate battleground states sided with him 59% to 33%. In lean-Republican congressional districts and in swing congressional districts, Mr. Obama won by 56% to 39% and 58% to 33%, respectively. On the other hand, independents support by 51% to 42% delaying ObamaCare's mandate that individuals buy coverage or pay a fine.

The desire to strike at ObamaCare is praiseworthy. But any strategy to repeal, delay or replace the law must have a credible chance of succeeding or affecting broad public opinion positively.

The defunding strategy doesn't. Going down that road would strengthen the president while alienating independents. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.●

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have opposed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act since it was forced through a Democratic-controlled Congress without the support of a single Republican in the House or Senate. I have voted to dismantle, defund, delay and reverse this law every chance I have been given. I will continue to take every possible action that might be effective in achieving its repeal.

As the negative impacts of this law become more apparent, people in my State of Mississippi have expressed a great deal of concern about how the law is affecting their families and businesses. They have articulated a pronounced unease about the costs of the law, and the extent to which the Federal Government will be involved in their personal healthcare decisions. I share their concerns.

My constituents recognize that the law is not working as promised. The administration has delayed implementation of several of the law's key provisions. These special exceptions and exemptions are clear indications that the law is overly complex and ill-conceived.

As their representatives in Washington, we should respect the fact that the majority of Americans do not support this law, otherwise known as ''Obamacare.''

I dislike Obamacare as much as any of my colleagues. I strongly support the provisions in this appropriations bill that would bring implementation of Obamacare to a halt. However, to now vote to stop that very bill in its tracks makes little sense to me.

Shutting down the government to show how much we dislike the law would not stop Obamacare. The mandates in Obamacare do not go away if we do not fund the rest of the government. Most of the funding to implement Obamacare does not depend on us passing this appropriations bill; that funding is mandatory spending that has already been provided in law.

To stop Obamacare we have to enact a law that does just that. That requires a sufficient number of votes in the House and in the Senate, and it requires either the President's signature or a veto-proof majority in both houses. I suspect that we do not currently have the votes in the Senate to pass such legislation. But more importantly, I do not think voting to stall the very language that we opponents of Obamacare wish to see enacted—and risking a government shutdown as a result—will get us closer to the goal of stopping Obamacare.

I think a government shutdown might have the opposite effect. It will

shift public and media focus away from the costly and damaging aspects of the health care law just as it is being fully implemented, and it will detract from the ability of the American people to clearly express their discontent about the law. It is only such expressions of discontent that will either change the minds of a sufficient number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or send new representation to Washington to aid in the fight against Obamacare.

It is shortsighted for those of us who oppose the Obamacare law to take actions that would not reverse the law's potentially devastating impacts, and will likely damage our prospects of achieving that goal in the future. The stakes are too high.

I will continue to fight for our shared end goal—to fully repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, since 2001 I have served as chairman on three different appropriations subcommittees.

I chaired subcommittees on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, the Interior Department, and today the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Over the years I made a lot of tough choices on which programs to fund and which programs not to fund. But never have things been as bad as they are today. The cuts that we are making to our appropriations bills under sequestration are strangling programs that must be funded. Programs that are vital to our economy, vital to public safety, and programs that promise to deliver the next breakthroughs in energy research.

To compound the problem, we are now just a few days away from a government shutdown that has the potential to devastate our economic recovery and shake the confidence in our government to get anything done.

I would like to speak today about the negative effects a shutdown and continued sequester would have on my subcommittee.

The agency within my subcommittee that may have the most direct impact on the public is the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Corps safeguards our dams, our levees and our drinking water, it keeps our harbors open for cargo ships, and it maintain more than 4,000 recreation sites. Simply put, a government shutdown would mean the termination of a wide range of vital Corps activities.

Work would stop on virtually all construction projects, studies and activities related to flood control and navigation across the country. These important projects protect tens of millions of Americans.

A shutdown would mean the Corps stops work on improving dam safety projects including the dam at California's Isabella Lake, the dam most at-risk of failure in the State. Halting these projects would endanger citizens and ultimately increase the cost to complete this vital work. What's more, these projects actually reduce overall costs to the federal government. Damage prevented by Corps projects exceeds $25 billion per year. Other Corps projects interrupted by a shutdown include strengthening levees and floodwalls to reduce the risk of loss of life and economic loss from flooding and coastal storms. Work would stop on improvements to flood protection levees along the Mississippi River, levees that experienced record flood levels in 2011. Projects in Boston, Kansas City, and Seattle would be suspended. Even worse, these construction delays would come at a time when severe storms are causing damage with greater frequency.

Even dam safety projects would be affected by a shutdown. One example is California's Folsom Dam, where the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation are working to increase dam safety. A shutdown would likely cause the Corps and Reclamation to suspend contract activities, delaying this vital project. The Folsom Dam is a major component of the Central Valley Project, which provides clean water to more than 20 million Californians, and should not be put at risk by a government shutdown.

A shutdown will also have dramatic impacts on water-borne commerce. More than 2.3 billion tons of cargo moves through our marine transportation system. Improvements to channels, harbors and waterways ensure that this vital traffic flows without pause.

Projects at Oakland Harbor in California, Savannah Harbor in Georgia, and Charleston Harbor in South Carolina would be impacted by a shutdown, meaning higher construction and transportation costs.

The country's vast system of inland waterways would also suffer from a shutdown. More than 600 million tons of cargo move through our inland waterways on commercial ships. A shutdown would mean this cargo would be dramatically slowed, and the use of locks would likely not be available at all to recreational boaters. While facilities on lakes that combine flood control and hydropower would continue to operate because of safety issues, hydropower operations would likely be curtailed. This means 353 hydropower units operated by the Corps—which provide roughly one-quarter of the country's hydropower—would operate at reduced capacity. This would cut into the $1.5 billion in payments the units generate each year.

There are also major permitting and operational impacts that would be immediately noticeable. Processing of regulatory permits under the Clean Water Act, which the Corps handles, would be immediately suspended. In a typical year, the Corps processes more than 80,000 permit actions. This means anyone from an individual building a dock to a community planning a major development would not be able to move forward because they won't be able to secure a permit. The Corps would also be unable to provide enforcement actions on existing permitted activities, which could harm sensitive environmental or aquatic resources.

Another visible effect would be the shuttering of recreation areas. The Corps of Engineers is the largest provider of outdoor recreation among all Federal agencies. They maintain more than 4,200 recreation sites at 422 projects in 43 states, with more than 370 million visits each year. Those visitors spend more than $18 billion annually and support 350,000 full-time or part-time jobs. All would be suspended by a government shutdown.

The Department of Energy would also face severe limitations under a shutdown. Research grants to national labs and universities would be suspended. These grants fund important clean energy challenges related to biofuels, supercomputing, and materials research. The output of world-class science facilities on cutting edge research and product development may be significantly reduced. With U.S. leadership in science threatened by China, Japan and Europe, now is not the time to suspend major scientific research.

Regarding the national security missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, a government shutdown may delay important nuclear modernization activities. A government shutdown may disrupt and delay efforts to replace aging components in every single nuclear weapon in the stockpile. For example, delays in replacing aging components in the W76 submarine-launched warhead—which makes up more than 50 percent of the Nation's nuclear deterrent—would have serious impacts to the Navy's nuclear deterrence mission. Upgrades to aging infrastructure related to uranium, plutonium and high explosives capabilities would also be delayed. Delays of just days can add millions of dollars to a project's bottom line.

A government shutdown may also delay the design of a new nuclear reactor for the Ohio-class submarine. A shutdown may also delay refueling one of only three training nuclear reactors for sailors, which is critical for supplying sufficient numbers of sailors to man the U.S. submarine fleet.

Finally, a government shutdown will delay and increase costs to clean up and remediate nuclear contamination at former nuclear weapons and nuclear energy research sites. These activities should be completed as quickly as possible to protect human health.

I have laid out only a taste of the effects of a government shutdown. What I cannot begin to convey is the harm to millions of families who would be out of work or whose work would be curtailed because of canceled projects across the country.

This is only one of 12 subcommittees. A government shutdown would be folly, and we must prevent it from happening.

Before I close, I would like to touch on another threat to the agencies funded through my subcommittee, and that is the dangerous and ongoing cuts forced on us by the sequester.

With Congress focused on this immediate threat, we risk losing sight of the even more dangerous and long-term consequences of sequestration. Once again, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill provides a fine example of the choices—and dangers—that we face. The Senate bill funds the Corps of Engineers at $5.3 billion.

The House bill, based on sequester levels of funding, would slash that by $596 million. This would take money from vital flood control, ecosystem restoration and navigation projects. The House also would not approve a single new study or project, further delaying vital flood protection and navigation needs. The sequester would also jeopardize such vital projects as harbor maintenance and dredging, putting a crimp on billions of dollars in cargo that moves through our coasts. The House sequester level also slashes $136 million from the Bureau of Reclamation's budget, 12 percent lower than the Senate level.

One example of what the sequester would cut: The Senate bill directs funds to the WaterSmart Program and the Recycled Water Program, both of which increase the efficiency of water use in the West. With record-breaking droughts, farmers are desperately in need of more water, but the sequester would dry up these programs.

The Senate would also restore funding arbitrarily cut by the House from restoration programs such as the San Joaquin River Restoration in California. This joint Federal-State-local program was the result of a settlement that ended 17 years of litigation. Defunding the program could force the project back into the courtroom.

The House funding level also further weakens U.S. scientific leadership and efforts to improve the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers through the Department of Energy. The House would cut funds for the Office of Sciences by $500 million, the cutting edge work of ARPA-E by $329 million, and efficiency and renewable energy programs by $1.4 billion.

While Europe and Asia invest heavily in renewable energy and basic research, the House funding under sequester would cut in half our investments in renewable energy development and by 10% investments in basic research.

The government shutdown is a manufactured crisis and it is dangerous. The continuation of the sequester—while less immediate—is arguably even more dangerous.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the House, will join with Democrats to keep our government operating at responsible levels. We need to make those tough choices, we need to keep the government open and we must repeal sequester.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, everyone knows that the vote we are about to take—cloture on the House-passed continuing resolution—is essentially a vote to allow the Democrats to gut the House bill. That is why the Senate majority leader, the Senator from Nevada Mr. REID and every other Senate Democrat are supporting it.

Twenty-one House Members know this is a vote to gut the bill that they passed, that they worked so hard to pass out of the House of Representatives. That is why they signed a letter yesterday asking the Senate Republicans to stand united and vote against cloture on this bill.

You see, what happened was the House of Representatives, acting boldly and nobly and in response to a growing cry from the American people—a cry for help—acted to keep the government funded, to fund government while defunding ObamaCare, protecting the American people from a law they are becoming increasingly aware of; a law that was passed 3½ years ago without Members of Congress having read it and all of its 2,700 pages; a law that has since led to the promulgation of 20,000 pages of implementing regulatory text; a law that has since been rewritten not just once but twice by the Supreme Court of the United States, which, having concluded that the law as written was constitutionally deficient in two respects, became convinced that it was its duty, its prerogative, and within its power to rewrite the law in order to shoehorn it within the provisions of the U.S. Constitution; a law that has since then been rewritten three or four times by the President of the United States without any statutory or constitutional authorization to do so—a President who has acknowledged that the legislation, this law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, is not ready to be implemented.

If the President of the United States is convinced this law is not ready to be implemented, if the President of the United States, who pushed this law through Congress 3½ years ago and counts this as his signature legislative accomplishment—if this same President is unwilling to follow the law and is convinced it is not ready to be implemented, Congress should not fund it, and Congress should keep the government funded while protecting the people from ObamaCare.

Millions of Americans are concerned about what this law will do for them. We have seen millions of Americans worried about keeping their jobs, noticing that jobs are becoming harder and harder to find. Many are losing their jobs. Others are seeing their wages cut. Others still are seeing their hours cut. Many, including those 20,000 Americans who work for Home Depot who were informed last week—like many other Americans, they will be losing their health coverage.

This is why the House of Representatives acted. This is why what the House of Representatives did by passing this continuing resolution is such a good thing. It keeps the government funded, and it protects the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

Now we get over to the Senate. When it came to the Senate, we saw that the Senate really had a couple of options—a couple of very legitimate options—upon receiving this legislation from the House.

The Senate could take up this legislation and subject the legislation to an open amendment process, allowing Democrats and Republicans to submit amendments as they deemed fit, to debate those amendments, discuss their relative merits, their pros and their cons, and ultimately vote on them, making compromises and adjustments along the way, in the forum that has long been honored and revered in this institution, which heralds itself as the world's greatest deliberative body. Another option, of course, would be to bring it up for a vote as is, an up-or-down vote based on what the House passed. You can vote on it as it was passed by the House or you can subject it to an open amendment process.

Either one of those would be fine. If that is what we were looking at, I would be voting yes on this cloture vote on this resolution. That, however, is not the option majority leader HARRY REID selected. Instead, what he chose was a different procedure whereby he would select a single amendment—one that guts the House-passed bill of its most important provisions—without allowing anyone else the opportunity even to present an amendment and have that considered for a vote.

The American people are tired of the games that hide the true meaning of this kind of tactic, of this kind of vote. So it is incumbent upon us to try to explain them as best we can. The people who elect us do expect us to do what we say we are going to do—not sometimes, not just when it is convenient. In fact, they expect us to do what we say we are going to do especially when it is inconvenient. That is really what this first vote is about. Cloture on this resolution is about showing the American people that we will do what we say we are going to do even when—especially when—it is inconvenient.

We have the ability to prevent the majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, from unfairly gutting the House continuing resolution. If we all vote no, that is what we will achieve. It is what many of us have told—have promised—the American people we will do.

I, along with several of my colleagues, including Senators TED CRUZ, MARCO RUBIO, RAND PAUL, and several others, have promised to do everything in my power to bring the message that we have received—received overwhelmingly and repeatedly—from the American people, to bring that message inside this Chamber, inside these halls. That is what this effort has been all about. We promised to do everything we can to improve the procedure and improve the outcome for the American people, taking their message to Washington, incorporating their message into our legislative strategy.

Across this great country, Americans stayed up with us this week. They stayed up with us even overnight, choosing to forgo sleep, just to show they were supportive in this effort, and we greatly appreciate that.

I want you all who have participated in this effort in one way or another to reflect on how you feel at this very moment. It has been said that opportunity looks a lot like hard work, how change is hard work, especially here in Washington. This is what it feels like to take on Washington. This is what it feels like to take on the immense and intimidating inertia of big government. This is what it feels like to do what the American people ask and expect and demand. Those of you who have been involved in this effort should be proud, should feel energized and motivated to take on the next big challenge. The American people, of course, expect more and deserve better than what they frequently get from Washington.

I wish I could say that the fight that has ensued over the last few days was just about ObamaCare and nothing more. Sadly, ObamaCare is just one symptom of a much larger problem. It all stems from the syndrome of self-importance that the political ruling class in Washington tends to feel. The bigger problem in Washington is that the bigger the problem the American people face, the more people in Washington tend to think Washington has all the answers. ObamaCare, like the fiscal cliff, like our $17 trillion debt, like our almost $1 trillion annual deficit, like our $2 trillion annual regulatory compliance costs in this country, all are the natural, inevitable results of a Federal Government that is simply too big and too expensive, that delves far too deeply into the lives of the American people, delves far too deeply into everything from our communications to our health care decisions, into everything from what kind of light bulbs we use, to how much water our toilets flush.

These are deep and personal decisions that are getting deeper and more personal every single day. The American people understand that they are the sovereigns in this country. They are not subjects. We the people are citizens. The government works for us, even though it has started to feel as though it is the other way around.

All these things show what happens when the political elite, not we the people, pretend to be in control. This is not about any one person or even any one policy or even one political party. This is about this town and it is about the American people, what they deserve, what they demand, what they expect, and what they have a right to, which is the right to live free of undue interference from their national government.

This vote is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. This is simply the end of the beginning. Washington may appear to have the upper hand at this moment, but it is essential that we remember that the American people will always have the final word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, 3½ years ago, perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether ObamaCare would work. Perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether it would cripple the economy. Perhaps reasonable minds could have differed over whether it would be devastating to millions of Americans. Today, that is no longer the case.

Today, we have seen the impact of ObamaCare. We have seen what it is doing. ObamaCare is a train wreck. It is a nightmare, to use the word used by the lead Democratic author in the Senate, and a union leader who previously supported ObamaCare. ObamaCare is the single largest job killer in the country. ObamaCare is forcing Americans all over our Nation into part-time work, to working 29 hours a week or less.

ObamaCare is causing health insurance premiums to skyrocket all over this country. ObamaCare is jeopardizing the health care for millions of Americans, threatening that they will lose their health insurance altogether. It, quite simply, is not working.

Perhaps saddest of all, the Senate is not listening. The Senate Democrats are not listening to the millions of Americans who are being hurt by ObamaCare. If you are a young person right now coming out of school, and finding door after door closed to you because small businesses are not growing, because jobs are not there, because we have the lower labor force participation in decades, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are a single mom right now, perhaps waiting tables at a diner, and you are seeing your hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week—29 hours a week is not enough to feed your kids. But that is what ObamaCare is doing to you. Senate Democrats are not listening to you. If you are a recent immigrant trying to raise a young family, working hard and seeing your health insurance premiums skyrocket, and you are wondering how on Earth you are going to be able to pay these rising premiums while still meeting the needs and expense of your young family, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are retired, if you are a person with disabilities, getting notice from your insurance carrier that the policy is going to be dropped because of ObamaCare or if you are concerned that you will be getting notices—so many others across this country have been—Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are married and on your spouse's health insurance, and you have received a notice like 15,000 employees at UPS recently received a notice, telling them that their spousal coverage was being dropped, that their husbands and wives were losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

If you are a union worker working hard to provide for your family to seek the American dream, and you are discovering that the health insurance that you liked, that you have worked for, that you have paid for, is going to be taken away from you because of ObamaCare, Senate Democrats are not listening to you.

Perhaps some might say, how could it be that this is happening? Surely Senate Democrats would listen to the American people if that sort of suffering were happening. Well, if you do not take my word for it, let me urge you to take the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters. I would like to read a portion of a letter Mr. Hoffa wrote recently to Senate majority leader HARRY REID and House minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

> Dear Leader REID and Leader PELOSI: When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, ObamaCare will shatter not only our hard-earned benefits but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the backbone of the American middle class.

That is not me speaking, that is James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters.

> Like millions of other Americans, our members are front-line workers in the American economy. We have been strong supporters of the notion that all Americans should have access to quality, affordable health care. We have also been strong supporters of you.

I would note this is addressed to Senate majority leader HARRY REID and House minority leader NANCY PELOSI.

> In campaign after campaign we have put boots on the ground, gone door-to-door to get out the vote, run phone banks and raised money to secure this vision.

The vision of a Democratic majority in the Senate. So how is that Democratic majority in the Senate working out for union workers across the country? Well, the next sentence in this letter is:

> Now this vision has come back to haunt us.

I would note this is the exact same sentiment I expressed a moment ago. Senate Democrats are not listening to you. The letter continues:

Time is running out. Congress wrote this law; we voted for you. We have a problem. You need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios:

Note that word ''nightmare'' which I started my remarks by quoting. That is not my word, that is the Teamsters describing ObamaCare. Indeed, the letter concludes by saying:

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of the elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hardworking Americans.

Let me note, No. 1, Mr. Hoffa says millions of working men and women. Not hundreds; not thousands; millions. What does Mr. Hoffa say is happening to those millions of working men and women? That their health care is being destroyed. Destroyed is the word he used. What answer do we get today from the Democrats in the Senate? Nothing.

President Obama has granted exemptions from this failed law to big business and to Members of Congress. So the friends of the administration do not have to bear the burden of the law's collapse, but hard-working Americans, those without lobbyists, without friends in the corridors of power, are getting no exemptions from Senate Democrats. That is wrong.

In roughly an hour, if Senators vote as they have announced publicly they intend to vote, this body will vote to put back, to restore the funding for ObamaCare and to gut the House continuing resolution. But the good news is, the process is not over. It is going to go back to the House of Representatives. I salute the House for having the courage to stand and fight and defund ObamaCare. I remain confident, hopeful, and optimistic that the House will stand their ground, will continue the fight, which means this issue is coming back to the Senate.

That is good news. That is good news, No. 1, for Republicans. It is unfortunate that there has been Republican division on this issue. When it comes back to the Senate after the House stands their ground yet again, we will have an opportunity for Republicans to come home, for Republicans to stand together. I very much hope the next time this issue is before this body in a few days, all 46 Republicans are united against ObamaCare and standing with the American people, that we listened to the American people the way Senate Democrats are not.

Let me tell you I hope also that it is not just 46 Republicans. Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle go home to their States, they listen to their constituents. They are hearing the suffering from the men and women who elected them. It is not easy to disagree with your political party. But at the end of the day, what we are doing here is bigger than partisan politics. What we are doing here is fitting for 300 million Americans across this great country.

So I hope when this issue comes back, when the House stands their ground and sends it back to us, instead of just exercising brute political power, as this body is getting ready to do, I hope the Senate Democrats begin listening, that they begin listening to young people, that they begin listening to single moms, that they begin listening to immigrants, that they begin listening to people who are retired, people with disabilities, that they begin listening to married people, that they begin listening to union workers, all of whom are suffering under ObamaCare.

This is an opportunity for the Senate to return to the finest traditions of this body, where we listen to and fight for the American people. That has not happened in a long time. But I am very hopeful that we are in the process of seeing it begin to happen now.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY.) The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am not sure if you have a fax machine at home. Many Americans don't anymore and neither do a lot of small businesses. It seems a bit odd to tell small businesses they need to fax in—fax in—enrollment forms for ObamaCare, but this is what the Obama administration is now doing.

If I might paraphrase the President: The 1980s called, and they want their health policy back.

To be fair, snail mail is also an option and it looks as though the President's people will try to have the issue fixed soon, despite passing a law more than 3 years ago. Again this is the same President who told us that ObamaCare is ''working the way it's supposed to,'' and that those who already have health care won't see many changes under this law. This is the same guy who promised us his health care ideas would make American premiums lower and that they would be able to keep the plans they like.

Forgive me for being a little bit skeptical, given how these other rosy scenarios have played out. I am not the only skeptic out there. Just ask the folks who have already been laid off or seen their hours cut. Ask the graduate who can't find anything but part-time work. Ask the twenty-something who is going to lose her employer health plan and pay more over in the exchanges.

The reality simply does not match up with the rhetoric. That includes the President's remarks yesterday in Maryland. He said there is no ''widespread evidence'' that ObamaCare is hurting jobs. That is actually what he said, no ''widespread evidence.''

We all know the President was hanging around with Bill Clinton the other day. What we didn't know was he was getting pointers on syntax. It makes you wonder what would constitute widespread evidence of job loss in this President's mind. I mean, only yesterday his press secretary dismissed reports of a company dropping health insurance for 55,000 employees as only an ''anecdote.''

Maybe that is how things look from the south lawn. It looks a lot different if you just lost the health care plan you liked and wanted to keep. As Senator Moynihan used to tell us: Data is the plural of anecdote. There are just too many stories about the impact of ObamaCare, far too many to be dismissed with the wave of a hand.

Ironically, the same day the President was painting more rosy scenarios in Maryland, the administration announced yet another delay in this law's implementation. That is about the time we found out about the fax machines and all that follows the revelation of yet more exchange problems, this time with an exchange in the District of Columbia. You might be able to take away any one of these ObamaCare problems in isolation and explain it away, say it doesn't matter and call it an anecdote, but what we are getting here is a constant drip, drip, paired with the effect of seeing what is happening to our jobs, our health care, and the economy.

It all adds up to just one thing: a law in trouble, a law that needs to be repealed. This is the goal of every Republican Member here in the Republican Conference in the Senate. We are united on the need to repeal ObamaCare. We want to replace it with sensible, bipartisan forms that actually will work, and in a few minutes each and every one of us will vote against funding ObamaCare.

The American people want this repealed. Republicans want it repealed. I wouldn't be surprised if a number of our Democratic colleagues secretly want it repealed as well. The problem is we can't get this done unless my friends on the other side are prepared to step up with us and work on the issue, because there are 54 of them and 46 of us. This doesn't mean we will give up the fight if they don't. We won't. There are a lot of other things we can do in the meantime.

For instance, we can follow the administration's lead in offering ObamaCare a delay for the American people. After all, the administration seems to think businesses deserve a break from ObamaCare. Doesn't the middle class deserve the same treatment, the very same treatment? Republicans think so. I think we might be able to convince enough Democrats to join us on that to help us provide fairness—fairness to the middle class.

Yesterday, one Democratic Senator already signaled his willingness to delay some of the worst aspects of the law as well. He called a delay for the

American people ''very reasonable and sensible.'' He posed a question: ''Don't you think it'd be fair?''

The answer is: Yes, that would be fair. That is a question for my Democratic colleagues to respond to. Many of them know how badly this law is hurting their constituents. Isn't that the fair thing to do? Of course it is.

I am calling on Democratic Senators to put the middle class ahead of the President's pride, calling for them to pass a delay for everyone. We have already filed legislation that would do just that. A bipartisan majority of the House already supports it. Let's work together to actually do it. Once we get that done, let's keep working to get rid of this law and replace it with real reforms, not with ideas from the 1980s, but with commonsense, step-by-step reforms that will actually lower the cost for the American people and spare them from this terrible law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 is reserved for the two leaders, with the final 10 minutes reserved for the majority leader.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. During my time in Washington I have had the opportunity to work with many reasonable, thoughtful Republicans, including those serving in this body today. Those reasonable Republicans value this institution, the Senate, and they respect the government of which it is a part.

Today, the Republican Party has been infected by a small but destructive faction that would rather tear down the House our Founders built than govern from it. These extremists are more interested in putting on a show, as one Republican colleague put it, than in legislating. That is why they prevented the Senate from taking action to avert a government shutdown last night to put on a show today.

Despite pleas from the House of Representatives for a quick Senate action, that same vocal minority was determined to waste the dwindling hours before a government shutdown—1 day, basically, they wasted. Although every minute that passes puts this country 1 minute closer to a shutdown, a shutdown that would shatter our economy, they continue to obstruct and to delay.

A bad day for government is a good day for the anarchists among us, those who believe in no—I repeat, no—government. That is their belief. Modern-day anarchists known as the tea party believe in no government. They are backed by a very wealthy group of people who finance this effort to destroy our government.

It is important to note these tea party obstructionists don't represent mainstream Republicans either in this body or mainstream Republicans in our country. But unfortunately their grip on the rudder of the Republican Party is very firm.

For the last few years these radicals in the House and Senate have driven America from crisis to crisis—we lurch from crisis to crisis—leaving a trail of economic destruction behind them. Now they have taken the U.S. Government hostage and demanded an impossible ransom—that Democrats repeal the law of this land known as ObamaCare.

The Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land for 4 years. The U.S. Supreme Court has declared it constitutional and soon it will help 25 to 35 million people in America who are currently living without health insurance. It will allow them to get access to the lifesaving care they need and deserve.

I don't know if people truly know what it means not to have health insurance, not to have the ability to go to the doctor or hospital when they are sick or hurting. Some of us do. Some of us understand how tens of millions of people in America can't go to the hospital when they are sick or when they are hurt.

When I was a boy—I don't know how old I was, 10 or 11 years old—I was so sick. I can still remember how sick I was. I had been sick for quite a long time in the house we lived in. But, you see, we didn't have doctors in Searchlight. There wasn't a doctor for 50 miles and we had no car. I was very sick. We didn't go to doctors. But it was obvious I was very ill and so one of my older brothers came to visit and he was with a friend. That friend of my brother Don agreed to take me to the hospital. So I went to the hospital. I still have the scar. I had a growth on my large intestine. I would have died had I not gone to the hospital. So I know what it is like not to be able to go to the hospital or doctor when you are sick.

My wonderful mother took in wash. Searchlight had nothing much there, but once, I remember, a TB wagon came through. That was a truck where they would do x-rays of somebody's chest to find out if they had tuberculosis because it was still around. People in Searchlight—I remember Conn Hudgens and others—had tuberculosis. My dad wouldn't go, but my mother went and had her chest x-rayed. The results came back on a little card in the mail, and she had tuberculosis. She was positive for tuberculosis.

What did we do? What did she do? Nothing. Nothing. As a boy, caring about my mother, I worried so much about that. I can't imagine even to this day how she must have felt. In hindsight, it looks like it was a false positive, but that didn't take away the concern I had for a long time. So I can't imagine, I repeat, how my mother must have felt.

So I have had some view of what it is like not to be able to go to the doctor or hospital when you are sick or hurt.

Again, I don't know how old I was, but my little brother, 22 months younger than I am, was coming up on a bicycle and he slid and he was hurt. He was crying. I guess he was 10 years old or something like that, and no one was home. So I helped him get up to the house and lie down. I went and found my mother. My brother never, ever went to the doctor, and he had a broken leg. He still has a bent leg to show today. He laid on that bed. He couldn't touch the bed it hurt so much. He laid there until he could get up and walk a week or 10 days later.

So these people who just nonchalantly don't focus on the fact that millions of Americans have no health insurance—we can't just walk away from this. The health care law we have is important.

Republicans fought long and hard in opposition to ObamaCare, and they lost. It was a fair fight. They made their case against Obama directly to the American people in November last year, and they lost again. Obama won not by a small margin. He won by 5 million votes. What was the main issue in that campaign? It was health care. The American people overwhelmingly reelected the President, and one reason they did is because of health care.

Yesterday, on this floor, from over there, a colleague of ours, the senior Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, spoke with great eloquence about this law, a law he opposes. This is what he said:

> The people spoke. They spoke, much to my dismay, but they spoke and reelected the President of the United States. That doesn't mean we give up our efforts to try to replace and repair ObamaCare. But elections have consequences. The majority of the American people supported the President of the United States and renewed his stewardship of this country. I don't like it. But I think all of us should respect the outcome of elections, which reflect the will of the people.

Who said this again? Who said this? Who is this JOHN MCCAIN? He is a proven fighter, in war and in public service. This is a man who held the mantle of the Republican Party's nomination to be President of the United States. He is not some gadfly but an American patriot, and history books will talk about that in generations to come. The Republicans heard his message, for which the Senate and the country should be grateful.

So there is challenge this fall, closing in on the end of the fiscal year, for those of us who respect the system of government devised by America's Founders, those of us who believe in the rule of law and that elections reflect the will of the American people will face a test. Can we prevent an economically disastrous government shutdown, and can we protect the full faith and credit of the United States?

From one newspaper—not lots of newspapers, one newspaper—look at the headlines ''GOP hard-liners block strategy to avoid shutdown''; ''Government shutdown would entail cost''; ''Shutdown could carry pay risk even for employees kept on the job.''

One newspaper.

''Agencies prepare to furlough workers in the face of partial government shutdown.''

''Shutdown grows more likely as House digs in.''

This is from Governor Christy: ''Shutdown would be a failure.'' He says it would be irresponsible.

''As government shutdown looms, Americans brace for possible disruption, disappointment.''

Another headline: ''Surrounding jurisdictions develop shutdown game plans.''

''Threat of shutdown delays some Colorado flood relief.''

Is it any wonder the stock market is going down? Is it any wonder that people are concerned? Is it any wonder that someone such as the woman who works for the Park Service, who came to see me yesterday, said to me: I have been through this before. I am not going to get paid for my work.

So the question is, Can we overcome modern-day anarchists? In just a few minutes the Senate will take the first step toward wresting control from these extremists. Democrats will vote to avert a government shutdown, and I am confident many of my Republican colleagues will vote with us to allow the government to perform its basic duties. Together, we will send a message to radical Republicans that we will not allow the law of the land to be used as a hostage, a law that has been in place for 4 years.

I am pleased so many of my Senate Republican colleagues seem to understand the stakes of this debate—the economic health of a still struggling Nation and the economic well-being of still struggling families. I urge sensible Republicans in the House of Representatives to follow our lead, to follow the lead of Republicans in the Senate, and let the House Democrats vote. Don't just make it a majority-minority; let the 435 Members who serve in the House of Representatives vote and pass a clean bill to avert a shutdown. Defy the anarchists. Respect the rule of the law and help the Senate govern.

I ask unanimous consent that the time remaining for Senator MCCONNELL and myself be yielded back and that we begin the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the following cloture motion which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 195, H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Carl Levin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted ''yea'' and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Durbin	Menendez
Ayotte	Feinstein	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Tester
Chambliss	Kirk	Thune
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Coats	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Coburn	Leahy	Warner
Cochran	Levin	Warren
Collins	Manchin	Whitehouse
Coons	Markey	Wicker
Corker	McCain	Wyden
Cornyn	McCaskill	
Donnelly	McConnell	

NAYS—19

Crapo	Lee	Scott
Cruz	Moran	Sessions
Enzi	Paul	Shelby
Fischer	Portman	Toomey
Grassley	Risch	Vitter
Heller	Roberts	
Inhofe	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any other Senator wishing to vote?

If not, a reminder that expressions of approval or disapproval are not permitted in the Senate.

On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 19. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked, all time is yielded back. Amendment No. 1975 is withdrawn.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of the Act and any other applicable budget points of order for purposes of the pending joint resolution and the amendments.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time on the motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Portman
Blunt	Hirono	Pryor
Boxer	Isakson	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Kirk	Schatz
Casey	Klobuchar	Schumer
Chambliss	Landrieu	Shaheen
Chiesa	Leahy	Stabenow
Cochran	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	

NAYS—30

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 30. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

For the information of the Senate, upon the invoking of cloture, the motion to commit falls.

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Reid-Mikulski amendment to the continuing resolution. Our amendment makes two important changes in the House CR. First the amendment clears out the toxic political item in the House CR—defunding the Affordable Care Act. It also removes the debt-limit provision that threatens the full faith and credit of the United States. It changes the date of the CR from December 15 to November 15 to see if we can't get to vote on an omnibus bill and end the sequester.

We are out of time. The fiscal year ends in 3 days. Let's pass the Reid-Mikulski amendment, let's pass the CR, and let's keep America's government working as hard as its taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this is the moment of truth. We need to be absolutely clear about what we are voting on here. A ''yes'' vote will be a vote to fund ObamaCare because it will take out of the underlying continuing resolution the House position that Republicans have universally supported to defund ObamaCare.

I ask my colleagues, before they vote yes on this important amendment, Do you really want to be responsible for killing more jobs? Do you really want to be responsible for more people losing their health insurance and their own doctors? Do you really want to be responsible for making full-time work part-time work? If not, then vote no.

This is a second chance, and in life we don't get many second chances. I hope our colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1974.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Once again, a reminder that expressions of approval or disapproval are not allowed in the Senate.

Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted ''nay''.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Casey	Heitkamp
Baucus	Coons	Hirono
Begich	Donnelly	Johnson (SD)
Bennet	Durbin	Kaine
Blumenthal	Feinstein	King
Boxer	Franken	Klobuchar
Brown	Gillibrand	Landrieu
Cantwell	Hagan	Leahy
Cardin	Harkin	Levin
Carper	Heinrich	Manchin
Markey	Pryor	Stabenow
McCaskill	Reed	Tester
Menendez	Reid	Udall (CO)
Merkley	Rockefeller	Udall (NM)
Mikulski	Sanders	Warner
Murphy	Schatz	Warren
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Nelson	Shaheen	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Cruz	Moran
Ayotte	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Chiesa	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Collins	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch

The amendment (No. 1974) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is now time to vote on final passage. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this. It will prevent a government shutdown. It will lay the groundwork for us to get to a solution on the long-term fiscal needs of our country, including to replace sequester and to come up with an approach to fund essential government services where we make investments that America desperately needs.

If the Senate keeps this government open, it means continuing our critical services, it avoids a shutdown, and it lays the groundwork for solving our problems.

I urge the adoption and passage of this bill.

We yield back our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Cruz	Moran
Ayotte	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Chiesa	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Collins	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Hatch

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59), as amended, was passed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent during Friday's cloture vote on H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution, as well as the motion to waive the budget act points of order with respect to H.J. Res. 59, the amendment offered by Senator REID to strike language defunding Obamacare, and final passage of the resolution, due to my son's wedding in Arizona. Had I been here, I would have voted against all four measures.

I would not have supported a bill that would weaken the meaningful spending reductions required by current law. The rate of spending under this continuing resolution exceeds the budget cap set by the Budget Control Act. Additionally, I took issue with the restrictive process under which this bill was considered on the floor: There was no indication that Senators would have had the opportunity to vote on an amendment that respects the overall budget cap and funds the government at the required $967 billion level for next year.•

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10

minutes each, and the majority leader be recognized at 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO FLOODING

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak once again about the floods that were of biblical proportions that afflicted our State just a couple of weeks ago and the necessity of passing a piece of legislation, as we have done in the past on the heels of such natural disasters, that will allow my State to access existing emergency transportation funds more efficiently.

This is legislation my colleague and my friend and fellow Coloradan Senator BENNET and I have introduced.

It is critically important because it will allow us in Colorado to begin rebuilding our battered roads and bridges and highways without having to wait years for relief. In Colorado, hundreds of miles of roads and approximately 50 major bridges have been damaged. I want to display one photograph to give you a sense of what happened in Colorado.

I know Senator BENNET is here. I think he and I would agree that this is moderate damage represented in this photograph. There are many, many other scenes in our State where the roads are completely gone. You would not even know there was a road in the canyon like this one here. But this gives you a sense of what we have to do to repair all of this infrastructure.

Many towns, as I am implying, have seen the roads which provide access in and out of their communities severely limited. In fact, there a couple of communities that have been cut off. But the good news is that there are emergency relief dollars for transportation projects that have already been appropriated. They are available right now.

Why do I come to the floor, then, if that is the situation? There is an arbitrary statutory cap of $100 million per disaster that applies to those funds. This could limit the flood relief that we receive and then unnecessarily delay repairs, not necessarily this year or next year, but for decades. But historically, this is the good news, this opportunity we all have, as Members of the House and the Senate, to lift this cap. It has routinely been recognized by Congress as an unwise impediment to helping States recover, particularly when they are hit by the size of this disaster.

We have made exceptions to this cap for nearly every natural disaster in recent years. We waived it for Hurricanes Gustav, Ike, and Sandy, as well as for the Missouri River Basin flooding in 2011. In other words, when States are devastated, as we have been by natural disasters, we as a Congress have said that putting arbitrary impediments in the way of relief efforts just does not make sense, especially—and this is really important to understand—when no new funds need to be appropriated.

The good news is, as I have alluded to, we are not asking Congress to appropriate any new money for transportation projects, nor does our bill increase budget authority or increase spending by the Federal Government. We are simply making sure that Colorado has fair access to the program that was created for the very purpose of helping States such as Colorado rebuild after a natural disaster.

In fact, if we do not raise the cap, then we may be in the situation—not just Senator BENNET and I—but the Congress may be in a position where we have to pursue something more serious that does require money—in other words, additional appropriations.

This is critically important. We have to do this. We need to. We must provide Colorado with certainty and relief as soon as possible. I want to again underline what happened in Colorado and what we are facing. Beginning on September 11, historic rains poured down. We had had a heat wave. We had been in the 90s, a very warm spell of weather. Literally overnight, beginning on September 11, historic rains poured down on our State without cessation.

Rivers overtopped their banks from Rocky Mountain National Park, which is our crown jewel in the National Park System in Colorado, all the way out onto the eastern plains. It washed away highways, it drowned family homes, and it transformed entire farms into lakes. Creeks such as South Boulder Creek, which runs right behind my home, swelled. My neighbors were evacuated. I could not get home for 24 hours.

Culverts such as those near Commerce City quickly filled with rushing water. Rivers such as the Big Thompson near Estes Park turned into walls of water that devastated entire communities.

Let me give you another set of metrics. The affected area covers nearly 200 square miles and over 80 percent of our State's population. If we counted—Senator BENNET and I would agree—5 million Coloradans that we represent or 80 percent of our State's population has been affected.

For a sense of scope—I did not know Senator MURPHY would be presiding—the floodwaters cover an area the size of Connecticut. Nine counties are considered major disasters. At least 9 Coloradans have died. Thank God it was not more. We had a lot of missing people, but we think we have identified where all of those people are. We lost 9 Coloradans. Nearly 20,000 homes are damaged or destroyed.

Nearly 2,500 people were evacuated by the Colorado National Guard, the most since Hurricane Katrina. Some bit of good news: The muddy waters have begun to recede. That has given us a better look at the vast extent of the damage: 200 miles of State highways and 50 bridges are damaged or destroyed. Preliminary estimates are that the infrastructure repairs could cost up to $475 million.

I come with a heavy heart when I think about all of that. Then I have to also confess that this is a natural disaster that is beyond our capacity and Colorado's ability to address alone. We need help. We need support from our Federal partner.

I have always supported disaster aid whether I was serving in the House, as the presiding officer has, and when I have been in the Senate, for Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina and for all of the natural disasters that have hit our country since I began serving in the House in 1999.

I have to say that Coloradans now need our Federal partner to support our rebuilding and recovery efforts. I want also to say, though, in the face of this historic disaster, that I have been so heartened to see our Federal partners in the administration, led by FEMA, team up with our State leaders, who have been tireless, with the mayors, the council members, the county commissioners, our Governor, local communities, nonprofit organizations, and with countless friends and neighbors who have begun the hard work of recovery.

Our strong sense of community will allow us to recover and to rebuild stronger and more resolute than before. But we want to get going. We want to access these dollars right now. Those dollars are sitting in this account, waiting to help States such as Colorado rebuild and repair in the wake of a disaster. In fact, the U.S. Department of Transportation—I see our chairman of the EPW Committee, Senator BOXER, who is such a leader on infrastructure and knows infrastructure policy backwards and forwards—the U.S. Department of Transportation projects that Colorado, New York, and New Jersey, plus the 11 other States that have projects in the queue, could receive every single dollar they need and there would still be $221 million in remaining funds in this account available for future emergencies across our country.

That is right. Everyone who has disaster-related infrastructure needs can receive relief, and we will still have significant funds to help other areas that may find themselves in need such as Colorado, New York, and New Jersey.

I want my colleagues to know that we have a real opportunity here. Coloradans need these dollars. These are legitimate uses of these dollars. Senator BENNET and I are going to be working every minute today, this weekend, next week, to make sure that Colorado can recover as quickly as possible. Perhaps in light of the challenges that we face in Congress, moving the government forward and doing what is right for the American people, maybe this is an example of how we can work together and do the right thing not just for Colorado but for the United States.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I would.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to say to both of my friends, coming from a State that has experienced too many moments like the one you are going through, I have never seen anything quite like this in terms of flooding. But we have the most devastating fires, droughts, floods, mudslides, and earthquakes and the rest.

I wanted to be supportive of what you are doing. We all need to come together and help each other here. So I will do whatever I can to make sure that happens.

I ask unanimous consent that when my friend Senator BENNET completes his time I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. My question to my friend is: Is it not critical that we avert a government shutdown? Because if we go into a shutdown phase, people who want to apply for help—businesses and all the rest—are going to be experiencing far more pain. This is just a terrible time to even consider a government shutdown. We have so much we have to do. I wonder if my friend had thought about that when he voted to keep the government open?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I certainly did. I so appreciate the point the Senator from California is making. We have been assured that a shutdown would not affect Colorado. But as we all know there are unintended consequences. Just in the last 24 hours, Senator BENNET and I came to understand that the Utah National Guard, which was sending over a unit that has engineers and experts in flood recovery, probably cannot come to Colorado because their funds are going to be limited by the government shutdown.

For all of the assurance that this is emergency aid and emergency support—there are always situations where the full weight, if you will, and the focus of all of those good people who serve us, it is local, county, State, and Federal Government—they will be affected by this shutdown.

It is all the more important. We feel it in Colorado. The other thing I would add, and I wish to cede the floor to my good friend Senator BENNET, but what has been remarkable in Colorado is the partnership between the local, county, State and Federal governments. It has been seamless, for the most part. Then you mix in the NGOs, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and citizens who would hear the call and come to work to muck out basements, cut up debris. The spirit of community in Colorado has never been stronger. We ought to reflect that here. We were sent here to reflect that approach. That is America at its best.

I thank the Senator. I very much look to hearing the remarks of my friend and colleague Senator BENNET.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I wish to first say thanks to the great Senator from California at this time for her words. We need to pull together for other places, Sandy and other things. Now it is time for the country to embrace Colorado, as my senior Senator so eloquently said. I know he may have to leave the floor, but I wish to say how much I have appreciated his leadership in all of this. It has made a huge difference.

The work that is really being done is the work on the ground, as Senator UDALL was saying. That is the most important work—the first responders, neighbors helping neighbors. But it also has been a time when our political leadership has come together in a way at least for once not to get in the way and actually try to support the people who are just trying to serve their friends and neighbors. I wish to say thank you to Senator UDALL, my senior Senator and my friend, for his leadership.

As he mentioned, our State is a long way from recovering from the floods that have inflicted so much damage over this month. The damage has been historic. Based on the latest estimates, over 16,000 homes have been seriously damaged. Thousands have been destroyed. The floodwaters consumed more than 2,000 square miles across Colorado's Front Range—an area about twice the size of Rhode Island. To give some sense of scale, it would be as if Rhode Island were completely underwater twice or, as Senator MARK UDALL said, as if it covered a State the size of Connecticut. The floods have tragically killed at least nine Coloradans. We hope that number won't go up, but we don't know if it will.

Over the weekend I went to Jamestown, which is a small community about 14 miles northwest of Boulder, CO. Tara Schoedinger, the mayor of the town, showed me around. The damage to this one town was simply unbelievable. It was as if a bomb had gone off in the middle of this community. The flooding destroyed over a fifth of Jamestown's homes, half of its roads, both of its bridges, a central fire hall, and much more.

The storm killed Joe Howlett, age 72, a beloved pillar of the Jamestown community. The mayor's house is right next to Joe's house. The mayor's house is fine. Joe Howlett's house was destroyed by a mudslide that came down from the very top of the hillside, the very top of the mountain behind his house, killing somebody who had been the glue of that community.

I have a couple of photos from the visit that I wish to share to give a sense of scale of this damage.

This used to be Main Street in Jamestown. We can see it passing between these two utility poles on either side of what is now a raging river. Main Street is gone. It is not the asphalt that is gone; the whole street, the roadbed is gone. All that remains is a torrential river that ran in a completely different place than it does today.

This photo shows the end of Main Street in Jamestown. My deputy chief of staff took that picture. This is what Main Street used to look like. This is what Main Street in Jamestown, CO, looks like as we stand on the floor of the Senate today.

I will say, as the senior Senator is still here, it was amazing, the resilience of the people of this community, the sense of humor people had, and the sense of community they had. There were probably 30 people or so left out of a town of 300. They had come back to see their belongings and to secure what was left of their homes. What they were talking about was how they were going to rebuild this community together. There were tears from time to time, as you naturally would expect there to be, but what really came through, as it always does at the back end of these disasters, was the human spirit we see in each one of our States. We are particularly proud of the Coloradans who are struggling together to get through this incredibly difficult time.

In my mind, these are the most heartbreaking pictures, people who have dedicated their lives to being able to secure homes for their families.

They, by the way, had no expectation there and in other parts of the State that they would ever be affected by a flood and see everything lost.

One woman came up to me while I was there and said, ''this was our house.''

It was in reasonably decent shape compared to some of the others I had seen. She also had a rental property down the road in which she had invested her life savings. She had no flood insurance.

She said: I just don't know how we are not going to go broke as a result of this piece of bad luck.

I also saw in Evans, CO—a rural community near Greeley in the northeastern part of the State—two trailer parks that had been entirely destroyed by floodwaters from 1 mile or 1¼ miles away. In the middle of these trailer parks, there was a cement pipe that was about this tall sitting underneath a carport. The thing must have weighed tons. It was a huge culvert pipe that had come from 1½ miles away through these raging waters to position itself in this trailer park.

The people who live there work in agriculture in our State, clean hotels in our community, and work in our oilfields in northeastern Colorado. When I went to the trailer park, the people were assessing the damage. They have lost everything. Because they couldn't qualify for financing for those trailer homes, they bought them with cash.

One person there said: Senator, it is awfully lucky this happened during the day and not at night because our kids were at school during the day. If they had been there at night, we don't know how many of them would have been killed by these floodwaters.

In addition to the human dimension of all of this, which is the most important dimension, the flooding also inflicted enormously costly damage to

Colorado's infrastructure. Over 200 miles of roads in Colorado have been affected by this flooding. The mountainous terrain in the State is going to make repair work exponentially more expensive and exponentially more difficult. I salute our Governor and everybody who is working to make sure that at least temporary roads are built to these communities in the next 90 days, which would otherwise be completely cut off.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Colorado Department of Transportation that estimates the total damage just to Colorado's federally maintained roads and highways. These are not our State and local roads; federally maintained roads and highways will exceed $400 million.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Denver, CO, September 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you know, this week Colorado begins the process of rebuilding. Over a dozen Colorado counties were devastated due to record-setting rains and heavy flooding. Today, thousands of our neighbors are without homes, power, or drinking water. For us to begin the rebuilding process, we must repair our roads, bridges, and culverts that were swept away by the floodwaters. We need the help of Congress to begin this process.

Multiple counties received over a foot of rain, which turned to floodwater. Those floodwaters destroyed many critical transportation connectors throughout our state. This week, the waters are receding and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has begun to assess the damage. At this time, we have identified a number of bridges in need of significant repairs or replacement, and approximately 200 state highway lane miles that washed away. In the interim, CDOT is working with the National Guard to restore access to communities severed from the rest of the state. This includes installing temporary crossing structures and gravel roads.

Although cost estimates will certainly change as we continue to inspect our infrastructure, CDOT's early estimate indicates that approximately $475 million is needed to rebuild our highway system. This estimate includes materials, maintenance, reconstruction, and contracting costs. Last week, the Colorado Transportation Commission directed over $100 million—CDOT's entire contingency funding line—to begin reconnecting critical roadways and communities. The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) also acted swiftly to release $35 million in emergency funds. While these contributions provide critical initial repair funds, CDOT has already secured 19 contractors and have dedicated the advanced funding from the FHWA. It is clear that existing resources are inadequate to fix highway damage of this magnitude. Furthermore, CDOT's $475 million estimate does not include costs to rebuild destroyed city and county roads that are also eligible for FHWA emergency funds.

Approximately $1 billion is available from the FHWA Emergency Relief Program. States rely on this program in times of crisis and disaster to provide needed funding to repair federal aid highways. Unfortunately, although adequate funds are available, under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Colorado may receive no more than $100 million in program relief. This is a significant hurdle for Colorado as we anticipate damages to exceed this limit by four times or more. In recent years, Congress raised the $100 million cap for the most severe disasters. For example, the cap was raised by Congress to $500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy. And, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, the cap was waived entirely for affected states. This flood was of a magnitude that Colorado will likely never see again and the total devastation will easily surpass several billion dollars. For this reason, we urgently need help from Congress.

I join Governor John Hickenlooper and the Colorado congressional delegation in asking for your leadership in raising the program limit to $500 million for Colorado. Before Coloradans can begin rebuilding their homes and lives, we must rebuild the roads to their communities. Increasing this cap swiftly is of the utmost importance so that we may restore Colorado's transportation network. Please contact Kurt Morrison at (303) 757–9703 or me should you have questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HUNT,
Executive Director.

Mr. BENNET. Earlier this year Congress passed funding for Federal Highway Administration emergency relief. States such as Colorado that have been hit with significant natural disasters are eligible for funding. Our State will be in desperate need of these funds, as New Jersey and New York were in desperate need. The scale of the damage far exceeds what our States and local governments can cover.

As my senior Senator said, there is a catch. There is a cap of $100 million per incident, per State, on this Federal highway assistance.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Hickenlooper urging Congress to raise the current cap on emergency funding and explaining why this is something Colorado desperately needs to have done.

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, September 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER REID, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you may know, this month massive rains and heavy flooding left over a dozen Colorado counties in devastation. With the rains, highways, bridges, and culverts were washed away. As a result, even now many communities still are cut off and isolated from the rest of the state. Colorado is in dire need of help.

Communities across Colorado's Front Range and Eastern Plains are starting to deal with aftermath of the flooding and destruction. The affected counties include Boulder, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, and Washington—an area so expansive, that it surpasses that of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode Island combined. Early analyses show that the flooding was so severe that it may not occur again for 500 to 1,000 years.

Thousands of Colorado families are without homes, potable water, or power. Before the state can fully restore essential services to impacted towns and cities, and allow residents to permanently return home, we must repair our devastated highway system. Early estimates are that at least 50 bridges will need significant repair—30 of which must be fully replaced. Approximately 200 highway lane miles must be reconstructed. Temporary crossing structures are needed in the interim. And, today, numerous state highways and local roads remain closed, cutting off primary, and in some cases the only, access to Colorado cities and towns. Assessing the damage to Colorado's highway system is underway. But early assessments are that the damage will be several hundred million dollars.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, Public Law 113–2, the U.S. Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) Emergency Relief Program (ERP), received over $2.02 billion to help states rebuild and repair damages to their highways and bridges. In this bill, states impacted by Hurricane Sandy could receive up to $500 million per disaster in ERP funds; however, all remaining states—including Colorado—were capped at $100 million per disaster.

Given the widespread devastation to our state highway system, we are respectfully asking that Congress raise this $100 million cap for Colorado as well. As the Colorado congressional delegation stated in a letter to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, there are precedents for waiving or raising this cap. For example, the $100 million was waived in response to damage caused by Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, and Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. Recently, the cap was raised to $500 million for those states devastated by Hurricane Sandy.

Based on Colorado's anticipated highway needs and the precedents mentioned above, we ask that you raise this cap for Colorado. Time and again, Congress has answered the call to help communities during times of disaster and loss. The September 2013 floods may prove to be the worst natural disaster in the history of our state, and is likely the worst we shall ever see in our lifetimes. Before we rebuild our homes and businesses, we must rebuild our roads to reopen our communities. On behalf of all Coloradans, please raise this cap to $500 million, so that we may begin this process.

Sincerely,

JOHN HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

Mr. BENNET. Senator UDALL and I have a simple bill that would raise the $100 million cap for Colorado for emergency funding for our highways, matching what Congress has done, as Senator UDALL has said, many times previously—in fact, as far as I know,

every time an issue like this has arisen.

We have already talked to the Congressional Budget Office about this. They have looked at the bill. They have told us that it will not cost the Federal Government one dime because the money is already there. It has already been appropriated. It just needs to be used for the purpose Congress laid out—to help States with major disasters that inflicted cost damage on that State's highway system.

Colorado needs this Congress to act, and act now, to get this done so that Colorado can access the highway aid we will clearly need to recover in the coming months.

This $100 million cap on emergency funding from the Federal Highway Administration, as I mentioned earlier, has been lifted many times before. It has been done routinely and swiftly by this Congress following other major disasters when it was obvious—as it is in our case—that federally maintained highway costs would exceed $100 million. We lifted it for the Sandy States, as I have pointed out, earlier this year when we passed the Sandy supplemental on January 29, 2013. We lifted it on November 18 for Hurricane Irene and the Missouri River basin flooding. We lifted it on September 30, 2008, for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike. We lifted it on May 25, 2007, for storms in the State of California. We lifted it on December 20, 2005, for Hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. All told, Congress has waived this $100 million cap 14 times in the past 25 years. It is routine, and it is normal when there is a major disaster that causes major highway damage in excess of $100 million.

Senator UDALL and I have been working with our colleagues in the Senate. Nearly all of them have indicated a readiness to work with us to pass this bill. I am very grateful for that.

I also wish to thank my colleagues for working with us to get this done quickly for Colorado in recognition of how badly we need this cap lifted and this Federal funding made available.

I urge my colleagues to pull together to work with us to quickly clear this bill in the coming days so we can get Coloradans the help they need.

If you will indulge me a few more minutes—and if the Senator from California would as well—I wish to take a quick moment to tell you why this is so important.

A picture tells a thousand words—especially when I am the one who is speaking. I want to show the damage to Colorado highways as a result of this historic flooding.

This photograph was taken during a helicopter tour by Vice President BIDEN, Governor Hickenlooper, and FEMA officials of flood damage in Greeley, CO, earlier this week. We can see that a huge portion of the road has washed away and water has breached a dam.

I would like to say that FEMA has been doing a tremendous job with our local and State officials.

This is a section of Highway 72 that collapsed and washed away after a flash flood tore through Coal Creek near Golden, CO, which is outside of Denver—maybe in Golden they would say Denver is outside of Golden. This is what the road looks like there.

A bridge on the south side of Lyons is gone. Huge portions have broken off. This is a photo of the bridge that is missing. Here is another shot of large portions of U.S. 34 washed away.

This is a very clear example of the way these mountain roads work. In this case, when the prospectors first came to Colorado, what they would do is pan for gold in the bottom of the rivers, near the plains. They would see whether there was gold leaf there. That would lead them to walk up these valleys—very steep valleys—to see where the gold was coming from. They founded towns in these places. That is the way the river came, then the road followed the river, and that allowed them to get to their town. You can see in this case this road has been completely washed out by the river.

This is just another instance of mountain roads where we can see the dropoff below is what used to be road but no longer is.

Here is a roadway that, when this photo was taken, is completely submerged and with extensive damage. And then this, what used to be a ribbon of pavement, is now in fragments in the remaining water.

In times of disaster in this country, we have stood together time and time again. Working on behalf of the people of Colorado, along with Senator UDALL, that is what we are asking for again. We have pulled together with all of our colleagues and we are going to need all of you to pull together with us.

The Founding Fathers had a lot of work to do and they are often quoted around this place, but they were engaged in founding a country, not dismantling one. This is a reminder of why this vision was so important and why people, frankly, are counting on us to carry this on for this generation of Americans and for the generations that will follow us.

With that, I thank the Chair for his indulgence, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from California.

GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING

Mrs. BOXER. Let me say to my friend from Colorado he is right about a picture being so powerful. Having shown my share of those types of photos, I think the Senator underscores why it is important to have a national government. He and his colleague from Colorado makes the point, as did the Senators from New Jersey, New York, and California—regardless of party—that many times these natural disasters are just too much for any one State, and that is why we need a national government that works well, not one that teeters on the brink of shutdown because political parties get into these partisan disputes and seem to lose their way.

As one who feels we have a very clear path ahead, there is no reason for us to add to the uncertainty the people in Colorado face right now because we don't have that particular funding laid out clearly at this point. We don't need to add a layer of fear that this government is not going to function. So I wish to thank my friend.

But I will say that we did vote 54 to 44 in the Senate to keep the government open and to make sure we don't get involved in clashes about other matters and add it to the resolution that keeps this government going.

Listen, there is no shortage of arguments we could have. Even within our own parties there are different views on many issues: how best to bring this economy back, how best to reform education, how best to have a very strong, lean military—we have arguments about all these things—how to deliver health care. All these things are worthy of debate, but they should remain separate and apart from our basic functions, one of which is to keep the government running and doing the things government does, and the second is to pay our bills, which requires us to make sure the debt limit is raised. When we see games being played in these areas, we know we are in deep trouble.

I see our leader Senator REID is on the floor. With his leadership we passed a bill to keep the government open. All JOHN BOEHNER has to do, as Speaker of the House—and I know the House well. I served there for 10 years—is to put our bill on the floor and let the Members vote. That is democracy. We don't have to have every Republican support it. We don't have to have every Democrat support it. Just put the bill on the floor.

When I served in the House I served with many different Speakers. I have to say, in my time, Tip O'Neill was the greatest. Why was Tip O'Neill great and why can JOHN BOEHNER learn from Tip O'Neill? Because Tip O'Neill knew what his function was. It was to keep this country going. It was to give a sense of certainty and calm to the people that even though we could debate all kinds of things, including whether to go to war or how to deal with many problems, we would keep the government going. We would pay our debts.

When Tip O'Neill was Speaker, Republican Ronald Reagan asked Tip O'Neill to increase the debt ceiling many times. Over the period Reagan was President, he asked to raise the debt ceiling 18 times. Did all of us agree the debt ceiling should be lifted? No. A few voted no, and that was fine. No one played games. Ronald Reagan was very clear on the debt ceiling. He said even any talk about not raising it was a problem for this economy, and he

said it way more eloquently than I, being the great communicator. He said even the thought of a default was dangerous for our economy. Yet here we have Republicans, in the House in particular, marching down that path and also marching down the path right now to shut down this government. We are just a few short days away.

I don't know about the Chair, but I know I did have a meeting with my staff to explain what could happen. People act as if a government shutdown doesn't mean pain. It is a dangerous game and it has devastating consequences for our families and not only for the people who rely on their work for their country—whether they are serving on the military or civilian side of the Defense establishment or in the Social Security Administration or the Medicare administration or the FBI or the food inspectors or the highway inspectors.

I have to say, Republicans keep saying: We don't want to shut down the government. Believe me, we don't want to shut down the government. We just want to stop the Affordable Care Act. You tried 42 times. You had an election over it. Give it up. This is a democracy. Run candidates who want to repeal it. That is fine. That is fine. We had that in the last election and President Obama won. I know people aren't happy about it. I understand that. I wasn't happy when Republicans beat my Democratic candidates for President. I wasn't happy, but I didn't shut down the government. I didn't demand their signature accomplishments be repealed. I lived with it, and I am not the only one. We all did. We all accepted it.

That is democracy. You have an election. There are winners and losers. Suck it up. Stop complaining. Go register your friends. Tell them to vote against BARBARA BOXER. Go tell them to vote against the Democrats. Go do it. That is fine. That is what elections are for. But once the election is over—and in this last case it was a central issue—work with us to make it better.

Senator CARDIN and I were on the floor the other day pointing out we voted against the prescription drug benefit for Medicare for basically two reasons; one, we thought it was going to cost too much money for the government because in there it said Medicare could not negotiate for lower drug prices. So it was a giveaway to the drug companies. They couldn't negotiate for lower drug prices. Also, there was a great big doughnut hole so after you got a certain amount of drugs, you got no benefit at all, and seniors were risking their lives to get through that period of time.

We didn't try to repeal the prescription drug benefit; we tried to fix it. Here is the great news. In the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, we fixed the doughnut hole. We are closing it. Now senior citizens are not going to have to cut their pills in little pieces while they wait for that doughnut hole period of time to pass.

So there are a lot of pathways forward for the Republicans in the House. Follow history and tradition, which says we have two basic things we must do: keep this government open and pay the bills that we incur. Simple. It is not complicated. If anyone tells you it is complicated, laugh, because it isn't.

If you are a family and you incur bills, you pay them or you are a deadbeat. In the old days, people used to go to jail. We stopped that. Now we have bankruptcy filings. Pay your bills, Republicans. Pay your bills. Keep the government going—a very simple path. Take the bill we just passed. It is neutral. It has no policy in it. It keeps the spending going. We haven't added any of our wonderful things we would like to see and do. We kept it clean. Put that bill on the floor—it passed 54 to 44 here—and vote on it. People who want to shut down the government will vote no. That is their right. People who want to keep the government open will vote yes. There will be Republicans on either side. There will be Democrats on either side.

What we hear happening is they are going to bring it back and they are going to put more of their favorite things in it. Who knows what they will pick. They have a lot. They want to shut down the Environmental Protection Agency. They want to stop us from cleaning up the air and the water. They want to stop us from addressing the issue of coal ash piling up all over the country. That is what they want to do, from what I read in the paper. Then they want to delay this health care bill, just as it is about ready to kick in.

We have been down this road before. We know what happens when the government shuts down. I asked my staff to go back, to go to the press and look at the stories. I am not speaking make believe. I am speaking history. When Newt Gingrich and the Republicans shut down the government in the 1990s, we all know what happened. It hurt our country. It hurt our economy. It hurt our seniors, our veterans, our businesses. It hurt anyone who even had 100 shares of stock in the stock market. It hurt the American people.

Mark Zandi, an economist who advised Republican Members of the Senate, predicts a shutdown lasting just a few days would reduce our gross domestic product by two-tenths of a point.

How does that help us when our economic growth is curtailed by a shutdown? How does it help our economy when more than 169,000 Federal employees in my State and many more nationwide are furloughed without pay? It will be more than 1 million Federal employees and 169,000 in California. These are real people, with real families, with real bills to pay who get up and go to work for their Nation. How does that help our economy?

We know the last shutdown cost the Federal Government $1.4 billion. If we factor in inflation, that is $2 billion, and that was for 2 weeks. A 2-week shutdown cost $2 billion. Great, just what we need to do—throw money out the window. Because we can afford it, right? No.

Agencies are making their shutdown plans. Federal employees are preparing to be furloughed. You know what happens when you get scared you will not get a paycheck? You pull in. You don't go out to the movies and you don't go out for dinner because you are worried. That has a trickle-down effect on small businesses.

How does it help our seniors when the Social Security Administration, during a shutdown, cannot process benefits for retirees? What happens if someone is widowed and she needs the help from Social Security to get those burial benefits she is entitled to? Is that making the Republicans excited over there, to hurt our seniors with Medicare, with Social Security?

Medicare can't take any new patients because they won't be able to. In the last shutdown, 10,000 people a day were turned away. People who were waiting to turn 65 so they could get their Medicare card called up Medicare, and no one is there. Sorry. Oh, that is a lovely thing to do to your mothers and dads, I say to my colleagues over there. Lovely.

How does it help our veterans and their families when a new disability claim or GI bill claim cannot be processed? I can tell you, it hurts them. There is already a huge backlog. This is just what we don't need, a shutdown, where the backlog of claims gets worse and worse. We all say we love our veterans, and I believe it when we say that. Don't shut down the government and hurt our veterans.

Republicans say they care about small businesses more than Democrats. How does it help our small businesses when they can't bid on government contracts or get small business loans through the SBA? I tell you, it hurts them. How is it going to help the more than 14,000 government contractors in California who may not get paid for their work on time? They will be hurt badly. They have bills to pay, they have employees to pay, and they won't be able to pay them. If you ask the average working person how close they are to seriously being homeless, not being able to pay the rent, it is only a few weeks for a lot of our people.

I would ask, how does it help our health in this country when the EPA cannot clean up toxic superfund sites? Those sites harm our families, they harm our children, and they will be shut down.

How does it help our fight against cancer and Alzheimer's when the NIH cannot enroll patients in drug trials? If you ask people who the real enemies are, a lot of times they will say we worry about someone in the family getting a heart attack, getting a stroke, getting Alzheimer's. How does it help our families when the NIH can't enroll patients in drug trials and the CDC can no longer monitor new avian flu cases?

And tell me, Republicans who want to shut down this government, how

does it help our businesses like our restaurateurs and people who run hotels when tourist visas cannot be processed and people who are waiting to come to America to stay in our hotels are turned away? That is bad for this economy.

How does it help a family buy a house when the FHA can't process a loan for the American dream of owning a home? But that is what is going to happen.

And tell me, how does it help a single mom when she can't get help from HHS in collecting child support to feed her family? How does it help the families in Colorado, their homes and roads and bridges destroyed, when the National Guard—we just learned from Senator UDALL—cannot start their work until the government reopens? It is downright dangerous.

How does it help our schoolkids who come to Washington to learn about our great Nation, they go to the Mall, and they can't get in any museums?

And do we want to hear the ultimate outrage? These Senate and House Members who want to shut down the government will get paid during a government shutdown that they caused. These Senate and House Members who want to shut down the government—they personally will still get paid. Their families will have a paycheck during a government shutdown.

In March of 2011, the Senate passed S. 388, the Boxer-Casey bill, to prevent Members of Congress from getting paid in the event of a government shutdown or a default. It is a very simple bill:

> Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or a continuing resolution; or if the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the debt limit has been reached.

Our bill, I am proud to say, passed the Senate. Senator CASEY and I wrote a letter—signed by 14 of our colleagues—to Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans, asking that they bring up and pass our bill. In that letter we said:

> Members who want to shut down the government should not continue to receive a paycheck while the rest of the Nation suffers the consequences. Members of Congress and the President should be treated no differently than every other Federal employee. We too should have to face the consequences of our actions.

Speaker BOEHNER had time to put lots of other things on the docket, but not our bill. So we introduced a new one. I am here to say we have a bill that is called S. 55. It says the same thing, we are not going to get paid if we don't do the two basic functions we have to do: keep this government running, and raise the debt ceiling.

I want to ask: How is it that Republicans, who are urging a shutdown of the government by virtue of their votes—and we have them in the Senate—why are they not cosponsors of our bill? They don't care if the government is shut down. Get on my bill. I invite Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE. They spoke for 21 hours. That took a lot of strength. Maybe they have strength left to pick up the phone and call me and go on my bill so they won't get paid, because as of now they will. They want to protect their pay. They want to protect their families.

Some of them even suggest taking away the employer contribution from our staff, that is treated like almost every other employee with a big employer, an employer contribution to health care. They want to take it away, but they want to get paid during a shutdown.

So pick up the phone, Senator CRUZ, and call me. I will be delighted to hear from you, and let me put you on my bill because that would be helpful. Then we can e-mail all of your friends and tell them to get everybody else on the bill. And maybe, just maybe, we can make a little sacrifice if things go wrong.

By the way, there is no reason for things to go wrong. We just passed a good bill, a clean bill. We know we are going to have arguments over health care, we are going to have arguments over Social Security, we are going to have arguments over the best way to move forward with sequester. That is fine. There is a time and a place. You don't put those issues on a continuing resolution to fund the government. You don't put those issues on a debt ceiling and, as Ronald Reagan said, put our economy in a very dangerous and precarious situation.

If you listened to the speeches of my colleagues, the 21-hour speech, and if you take away the time that was devoted to Dr. Seuss, most of it was about the Affordable Care Act. So I think we ought to take a look at the Affordable Care Act. This is the terrible piece of legislation that certain colleagues of the Republican side say is so terrible they are willing to shut the government down:

Right now, because of the Affordable Care Act, 3 million young adults are on their parents' plan. Isn't that terrible? Three million of them can stay on their parents' plan. I want to know why they would shut down the government and kick those youngsters off their parents' plan, because that is what they will do. They don't tell you that, but we won't be able to enforce this law. We won't have the funds. They would kick these kids off their parents' plan because, frankly, the law would in effect be suspended. And if an insurance company said, We are not going to do this anymore, those youngsters are out of luck. So that is the first question I ask them: Why do you want to kick 3 million youngsters off their parents' plan?

Now 71 million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Now when you don't fund this bill, delay it, or fool around with it, forget this. So now 71 million people who could have gotten immunized don't get immunized, a good bunch of them, because they can't afford it—under the Affordable Care Act it is free—then they get sick and then others catch what they get. Tell me how that makes America a better place. I am waiting to hear. No one has told me how it makes America a better place when we kick children off their parents' plan or we take away immunization or birth control or checkups from our people.

I mentioned this before. Senator KING was talking about how when he was a youngster he worked here and he had health insurance, and the health insurance allowed him to get a free medical checkup. He got a free checkup, and he found out that he had a melanoma, a mole that had gone cancerous. It was very serious. He was a youngster. This is a long time ago for him. As a result of that, he is with us today, living and well and here to fight for health care. That is a story we should think about. Because he went to the doctor, the doctor looked at him and found this mole, he got that mole removed, and he is alive.

Tell me why Republicans want to take away free preventive care from 71 million Americans. That is what the Affordable Care Act does. They call it ObamaCare because they polled it, and when they say ObamaCare, it is less popular. So I will call it ObamaCare. I thought the President was funny when he said that after this law is out there a few years and people like it, the Republicans will stop calling it ObamaCare, a moment of levity that had a lot of truth to it.

This is another benefit the Republicans would delay, stop, and put in jeopardy. They will even shut the government down. They don't like the fact that 17 million children with preexisting conditions such as asthma and diabetes can no longer be denied coverage. So I have to ask them, What is it you have against kids? I have met the parents. If a child had diabetes, if a child had asthma, the insurance company said, Sorry, you are out of luck. Because of the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, children can no longer be denied coverage.

I have met these little kids who have benefited, who have gotten the care, who are doing well because the moms and dads don't have to wait until they are gasping for air or have an absolute breakdown and then they have to rush them to the emergency room where they are patched up and don't get the kind of care they need.

Here is another thing. I don't understand why the Republicans feel it is a good thing for insurance companies to be able to cancel your health insurance when you get sick. That is what used to happen before ObamaCare, before the Affordable Care Act. Remember, this law has been in effect for 3 years, so all these benefits have gone into play. No more lifetime limits.

I remember once looking at our insurance policy many years ago that my

husband got through his employer, and we thought it was a great plan. Then we looked at the little print that said when you reach a cap of $250,000, no more health insurance. Anyone who has the misfortune to get a serious condition, a disease, can bump up against that cap fast and you have no more insurance until, you pray to God, you are 65 and you can get Medicare. We immediately said we have to look for a different policy that has no caps—and of course it costs more. Under ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, no more lifetime limits, no more annual limits. The Republicans are so distraught at these reforms they are even willing to shut down the government. They are willing to delay ObamaCare. They are willing to defund ObamaCare. They are willing to repeal ObamaCare.

Let me tell you, this is a pattern. I am going to tell you the pattern. I am going to show you what happened when a Democratic President in the 1960s came up with the idea for Medicare. I am going to tell you what the Republicans said then. This is not something that just happened to the Republican Party. They have been fighting these kinds of benefits, I think, for decades. They fought Social Security in the 1930s. But I will go to Medicare. Dick Armey said in 1995—he was Republican House majority leader. He had ERIC CANTOR's job. He said Medicare is ''a program I would have no part of in a free world.''

Earth to senior citizens: Wake up. The Republican leader of the House in 1995 said Medicare is ''a program I would have no part of in a free world.'' That same year, after leading an effort to raise premiums and costs for senior citizens, Newt Gingrich predicted that Medicare was ''going to wither on the vine.''

So when you hear these Republicans rail against ObamaCare, they railed against Medicare. They railed against Social Security. This is history. This is why there is a difference in the parties.

Listen to this. In 1965, this is what Senator Bob Dole said on the floor. Remember he bragged about this in 1996 during the Medicare fight. He said ''I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965.''

Really? The Republicans knew that Medicare wouldn't work in 1965. Here it is, 2013, and people are saying: Don't you mess with my Medicare. Don't you touch it. Whether they are tea partiers or rightwing Republicans, moderate Republicans, liberal Republicans, Democrats—from left to right, they all say don't mess with my Medicare. Look at where the Republicans were. Don't forget, PAUL RYAN's budget destroys Medicare. It would never look the same if he had his way.

I will even go back further in history and show you some of the things that the Republicans said about Medicare when it was brought to us by the Democrats. Sixty percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against it, and one Representative, Durwood Hall of Missouri said:

> We cannot stand idly by now, as the nation is urged to embark on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine

—that's what he called Medicare—

> the end of which no one can see, and from which the patient is certain to be the ultimate sufferer.

This man had it wrong. People love their Medicare. People tell me they are down on their hands and knees, praying to get the Medicare card, hoping they can hold out. Republicans have had it wrong. Why should we trust them and believe them when they say the Affordable Care Act is no good when we already see how many people it is helping?

Then there was Senator Milward Simpson, way back when, in the 1960s. He said:

> I am disturbed about the effect this legislation would have upon our economy and upon our private insurance system.

He didn't have to be concerned. Medicare has worked beautifully. In the Affordable Care Act we make it better. We fix the prescription drug benefit. We make sure that our people on Medicare can have free checkups and immunizations. We strengthened it.

Let's look at Medicare's success. Before Medicare became law, the majority of seniors had no health insurance. Today nearly all seniors, 50 million, are receiving guaranteed health care through Medicare, and 80 percent of folks on Medicare believe the program is working. If you look over history, over the years Medicare has been more successful than private insurers at holding down health care costs.

Let me sum up. What we saw here today is some good news. Working with our Republicans, we managed to bring up a bill and modify it and make it clean, strip it of any kind of debate, and fund the government until the middle of November. That will give Senator MURRAY time to sit down with her counterparts and try to get a long-term solution.

If you want a long-term solution to our deficit and debt, you have to have a budget. Yet Republicans over here have stopped us from going to conference. Once this is done we can have a conference move forward, a debate go forward. Let's keep these arguments where they belong, which is separate and apart from keeping the government going. Let's keep these separate and apart from paying the bills we have already incurred.

I also want to say this. If you listen to Republicans, you would think this deficit has gone up under President Obama. President Obama inherited a $1.2 trillion deficit. It is now down. It has been cut in half. But if you listen to them, you think: Oh my God, everything is awful. I took a look at the charts. I took a look at deficits under Democratic and Republican Presidents. Oh my God, I am so proud to be a Democrat. Under Democratic Presidents we have had surpluses. Under Bill Clinton we had surpluses. As soon as the Republicans took over, President George W. Bush said, I am going to have a party. I am going to put 2 wars on the credit card. I am going to give the biggest tax cuts to billionaires and millionaires. Do know what happened? We had a crisis. Not only the worst recession since the Great Depression, but the deficit skyrocketed.

All those supply-side economists were proven wrong. Give tax cuts to the mightiest among us and the deficit will go down. That is voodoo economics, as it was once called by a really good Republican President. That is voodoo economics.

You are going to hear all kinds of things today in these speeches. But history is history. Bill Clinton had the surplus. George Bush turned it into the worst deficit in history. Barack Obama cut that in half. He rescued us with the Democrats and some brave Republicans who voted for economic stimulus—thank the Lord. And we are getting out of this mess.

Now we have Republicans, on the far right in the House, who are holding our country hostage because they do not like the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare. They voted 42 times to repeal it. They are ignoring the fact that we had an election about it, and they are ignoring the fact that they do not run the Senate or the White House. They run one-third of the government. Fine. God bless them. But they have to work with us, not against us. We need to work together.

I served 10 proud years over there. I have never seen a situation where you are stopped from making any progress because 20 people belong to the tea party and are threatening the Speaker. The Speaker has to act like the Speaker of the House. He is not the Speaker of the Republicans, he is the Speaker of the House. Take our bill that just passed and put it on the floor. Some will vote aye, some will vote nay. Let's see what happens.

Meanwhile, there are a lot of people who are very worried today. They are worried that this government is going to shut down. They are worried that when they call about their Social Security check, if they have a problem, no one will be there. They are worried, if they have a problem, and they want to sign up for Medicare—no one will be there. They are concerned that their FBI agents are furloughed. They are concerned.

Maybe this concern may not sound like a big deal, but they saved for 2 years to take their kids to the Capitol, and they want to take them to all the great museums and the national parks and they are closed.

Why is this happening? Self-inflicted wound, self- inflicted wound.

Do your job. For God's sake, don't get paid if you can't keep the government open. Sign on in this body to S. 55 and say I won't get paid if the government shuts down. Tell Speaker BOEHNER to do that. They did it over there

for the budget. They said if we didn't pass a budget we should not get paid. We did pass a budget. Now they won't let us go to conference and finish the work.

What a mess we are in—self-inflicted—because people are in denial around here that there was an election. It was about health care. It was about being moderate. It was about working together. It was about compromise. It was not about who is the Presidential candidate who could lead us into the darkness and despair of complete warfare.

Let's end that warfare. We showed we could do it today. I thank my Republican colleagues who voted to allow us to offer our amendment. I appreciate it so much. I know they are getting yelled at. They should be praised. But it shows, right here in this Senate, that we can come together. We may not like our options or our choices. Believe me, I do not like the amount of money we are spending to run the government. It is really hurting my people back home. But I am not going to shut down the government about it.

Madam President, you are such a great new addition to the Senate. I am disappointed that you are not able to unleash your legislative prowess and move us forward, but we will get past this if we can work together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I want to share some remarks about the comments. I want to say Senator BOXER is a great advocate and does a good job as chair of our Committee on the Environment and Public Works. Pretty much we have had unanimous votes on bills that came out, Republicans and Democrats voting unanimously on the bills that came out. Sometimes we have differences and we fight over them, but a lot of times things are getting done around here.

But I will just say it is not actually fully correct to say the Republicans opposed the President's health care bill, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. The American people opposed it by huge numbers. They, through an election, a remarkable election, and in some very close wins, found themselves with 60 votes in the Senate of the United States. They had a majority in the House, and they decided to move this bill. They shut out Republicans, moved a partisan bill, and they got it through—even when Scott Brown, if you remember, was running for the Senate in Massachusetts to fill the late Senator Kennedy's seat. He promised he would be the vote that would deny the 60 votes and stop this bill, and he won in Massachusetts. But he couldn't get here quickly enough. They were able to get the bill passed before he got here to kill it.

This has never been a popular bill and the polling number shows it is even less popular today than it was when they rammed it through. So this is not a little bitty matter. It threatens our Republic, I think, in a lot of different ways. I have talked about that earlier. But I would say—to understand the dynamics on the floor of the Senate—you have to understand that the majority leader, having gotten his bill passed on Christmas Eve 2009, after all kinds of maneuvers to get that accomplished, has protected it from any further debate and discussion. He has blocked any ability to bring up the legislation and to be able to amend it and fix some of the obvious flaws in it. One of the top drafters, the Senate Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee, has called it a train wreck, and it at least at needs reform. It really cannot succeed in its present form. Senator REID has blocked any effort to bring up a bill and fix it. The American people might find that hard to believe, but I will repeat it: Since that time there have been numerous efforts on behalf of Members from this side to call up amendments and call up legislation to alter, amend, and replace the ObamaCare legislation.

He has utilized parliamentarian maneuvers, filling the tree, to block that. It cannot continue. This is about to become a law. It is going to hammer the American economy. It is already hammering the economy. The American people don't want it, and we are not going to go silent. So this is the beginning of the fight.

Senator CRUZ—maybe people can disagree with his tactics—but he drove and raised the issue. We need to keep talking about it; we just do. It is time for this Congress to listen to the voice of the American people.

Senator BOXER is a good person, and she said President Bush had $1 trillion deficits and President Obama has reduced them in half. The highest deficit President Bush ever had in the 8 years he served as President was $487 billion, which is a lot of money—too much. The year before, it was $168 billion.

When President Obama took office, what was the first thing that was passed within weeks? A $1 trillion stimulus bill to supposedly stimulate the economy, but the money went out to government agencies and departments, and it had no stimulus impact at all. It was $1 trillion—every penny of which was borrowed. That year the deficit went up well over $1 trillion. The next year it was well over $1 trillion, the next year well over $1 trillion, and the next year well over $1 trillion.

In the first 4 years of President Obama's leadership, we had the highest deficits ever recorded in America. It is a stunning event, and he fought every day—and there were fights on the floor—to spend more and borrow more.

Some of his advisers would say: The reason this economy isn't growing so well is because we didn't borrow and spend enough. We didn't have enough. We should have created more debt and should have spent more. It has resulted to this date in the lowest rebound economically from a recession since World War II, and we are not doing well in that regard.

It is absolutely not so that President Obama bears no responsibility for the unprecedented debt that he has run up during this time. He is still advocating for $1 trillion more in spending above the Budget Control Act levels that he agreed to in the summer of 2011. He wants to spend $1 trillion more than what he signed as an agreement to raise the debt ceiling.

I know he didn't want to, but Congress said: We are going to cut back on your credit card. Now we are going to raise the debt ceiling $2 trillion, as you said you need, but we demand that you reduce the growth of spending over 10 years by $2 trillion.

We were projected to have spending growth to $10 trillion over the current rate of spending, which is about $3.6 trillion a year. We were going to increase it by a total of $10 trillion. Under BCA, if we adhere to it, we would increase it by $8 trillion, not $10 trillion. That is not going to bankrupt America. There is no reason we can't run this government by growing the spending by $8 trillion instead of $10 trillion. So it is unbelievable that we make that point.

I know the budget balanced in the last years of the 1990s, and President Clinton proudly claims credit for that, and he was a part of it. But I haven't forgotten that the Republican House was in a constant battle over Democratic President Clinton's spending levels, and there was actually a fairly long shutdown of the government to contain the growth of spending, and it resulted in a balanced budget. That is how it happened. There was credit enough to go to both sides of that.

We need health care reform. It needs to be smartly and effectively done. We can improve health care in our country, but it does not have to tank the American economy, and that is what has been happening in recent days. I was going to talk about that, without much reference to ObamaCare and the health care bill—which is a negative factor of economic growth of very large proportions—but I just followed my friend and able colleague, Senator BOXER, and I wanted to share those points.

Last Thursday I delivered the first in a series of speeches looking at the state of our economy. I directed my staff on the Budget Committee—I am the ranking Republican there—to specifically analyze conditions facing working Americans so I could share those findings directly with the Members of the Senate. Both parties need to focus their efforts on defending working Americans from policies—Washington policies too often—that damage their financial well-being. It is happening. Last week I discussed the falling incomes and social challenges eroding the security of the middle class.

Today I will focus on the jobless recovery and the general problem of unemployment.

Few things matter more to a working family than the pace of the economy, especially after a hard recession. If on the one hand, it is a rapid, strong recovery, jobs will return quickly, people will return to the workforce, and a great deal of social suffering will be averted.

If, on the other hand, it is a slow recovery, then businesses don't create many new jobs, wages stagnate or fall, as they have been doing, and families continue to borrow from their savings to pay their bills. Life is spent wondering and worrying about the future.

We live today in the slowest economic recovery—they called it an economic recovery—since the end of World War II. No recovery from a recession since the end of World War II has been as slow as this one. Not counting the Great Recession, we have had 11 recessions since 1945. All had faster, stronger recoveries than this one—with all of them we bounced back quicker.

How slow is this economic recovery? Well, it has been nearly 6 years since the recession began in December of 2007. We still have not returned to the number of jobs we had 6 years ago. We haven't come back to the number of people working that we had 6 years ago. We are 1,988,000 jobs—almost 2 million—short of the 146,273,000 jobs we had when the recession began. This is not good.

Let's compare that with the other two bad postwar recessions: the contractions of 1973 through 1975 and 1981 and 1982—serious recessions. The recession of 1973 lasted 16 months. The recession of the 1981 collapse lasted 16 months, and the recession of 2007 lasted until June of 2009, or 18 months.

Working people were hit hard by these two earlier recessions. The unemployment rate rose to 9 percent in 1975 and 10.8 percent in 1982. The highest monthly unemployment rate for the Great Recession of 2007 to 2009 was 10 percent. Our unemployment rate didn't hit as high as 1982. There is not much difference in the severity and length of these recessions. They were pretty similar.

Even so, total jobs had recovered by 25 months after the start of the 1973 recession and by 28 months after the recovery from the 1981 recession. It has been 70 months, however, since the start of the 2007 recession, and employment has not yet recovered.

Lost hours of work is another and even better way to gauge the failure of the current recovery. It is not simply the number of jobs in the economy but the number of hours worked that strongly influences the pace of economic activity.

In the fourth quarter of 2007, just as the recession was starting, Americans worked about 236 billion hours—that is a lot of hours. We still have not returned to that level.

In the third quarter of 2013, this last quarter, the Labor Department estimated Americans still only worked 232 billion hours. That is a shortfall of 3.5 billion hours. This decline is greater per worker since the population of available workers has increased by 9 million. So we have got 9 million more workers and a decline in the number of hours worked, and it is still well below what the number was in 2007. This is not the kind of recovery we need to be looking for.

Still another way to show the slowness of this recovery is to measure how much higher GDP—the economy today—is compared to the start of the recession. It turns out that economic output is 4.4 percent higher. Compare this with the 1973 and 1981 recessions. By this time after the 1973 recession, GDP was 17.9 percent higher, and GDP after the 1981 recession by this time was 20 percent higher. That is, the economy was 20 percent bigger by this time after the 1981 recovery.

Our current economy is only 4.4 percent larger. The 1981 economic gains were five times as great as this.

These are the top line numbers. What do they mean to real people? Below this surface we find extensive economic suffering throughout our Nation. There are 25 percent more discouraged workers today—988,000 versus 793,000—than there were in June of 2009 when the recession ended. We had 366,000 discouraged workers when the recession started in 2007, which means we have had an increase of 172 percent in this sad number in 6 years.

One of the most stunning developments of this recovery has been the decline in the labor force participation rate. This is a fundamental indicator of the breadth and depth of a recovery and of economic growth. Today 58.7 percent of the noninstitutionalized population 16 years of age and older is working—58.7 percent today. In 2007 that number stood at 62.7 percent. The current rate of labor force participation is the lowest this Nation has seen since 1978. The percentage of the population working today in the age group of workers is the lowest it has been since 1978, and it is not getting better.

This decline is due to two factors: increased unemployment, and labor force dropouts—discouraged people who are no longer even looking for work.

How many people are we talking about? If the same percentage of the population was working today as was working in 2007, we would have 154,089,000 workers. Since we currently only have 144,285,000 million people working, it appears that 9,804,000 people are out of the labor force—9 million normally expected to be working are out of the labor force.

When they are out of the labor force, it does not show up in the unemployment rate. It is only people who are actually applying for jobs who show up in the unemployment rate. So the unemployment rate we see today hides the real depth of the unemployment problem we have in America.

Of the 5.7 million who totally dropped out, more retirements and more disability than in 2007 explain about two-thirds of those dropouts. People went on disability, went on retirement. Many of them went on retirement at 62 when it would have been better if they could have had a decent job opportunity to work to 65, 66, 70, but they have dropped out because they are older workers, perhaps, and were unable to find decent work. But it cannot be good for America for millions of people to take their Social Security at 62 rather than later, too often because no work is available.

More than 4 million unemployed Americans have been out of work for more than 27 weeks—4 million—more than half the year they have been unemployed. All told, 11.5 million Americans want to work but cannot find jobs.

The unemployment rate for those between the ages of 16 and 19 who are not in school or in the military or in prison stands at 24 percent. So teenagers have a very large number, and the number is much higher for minority teenagers and young men particularly. This is the highest teenage unemployment has ever been this far into a recovery. It is very dangerous for our society to have so many young people—especially young men whose unemployment rates are even higher than females—out of work. This is not good for America.

We need to have a growing economy that creates jobs, and we don't need to be bringing in—under the immigration bill that passed the Senate, we don't need to be bringing in twice the number of low-skilled workers as we have been doing, as we have a generous immigration policy. This bill would double the number of guest workers coming into America to take jobs that children need to be doing. They need to be working. We don't need teenagers and young people—19, 20, 22, 23—with nothing to do month after month, year after year.

At 13 percent, unemployment among African Americans is about twice the national average of 7.4 percent. Unemployment among Hispanics stands at 9.4 percent. Unemployment among those with less than a high school education is 11 percent. But we want to bring in millions of people without high school educations to compete for the few jobs that are out there.

Again, these statistics, as bad as they are, mask the real-life implications of the slow economy. These are young careers that have failed to launch when they should, marriages perhaps put off until the economy improves, families not started until couples can afford children—a generation of children that arrive out of wedlock. We have retirements taken too early, loss of homes, perhaps; older children at home who should be out on their own, and we would normally expect them to be working; and lots of part-time, extra jobs at lower pay just to make ends meet.

Indeed, one of the most devastating statistics is the growth in part-time work instead of full-time work. It is a

stunning number. We have 5,188,000 fewer full-time jobs today than in December of 2007—5 million fewer. That equals a decrease in full-time employment of 4.3 percent, even though our population is growing.

At the same time, part-time employment has grown by 3 million over this same time period. That is an increase in part-time jobs of 13 percent. So make no mistake, the total number of jobs since 2007 is down, and for the people who are finding work, the work they find too often can only be part time.

Now 77 percent of the people who got a job since January of this year got a part-time job, not a full time job. When we see, colleagues, the reports of 190,000 jobs, 200,000 jobs, remember, 77 percent of those are part-time jobs. Those numbers hide the reality of the danger in our workforce.

Nearly 90 percent of the increase in part-time work represents people who, according to the Labor Department, ''could only find part-time work.'' In other words, they would like full-time but could only find part-time work. At the end of 2007, this number stood at 1.2 million. However, the most recent data shows that this population has grown by 127 percent to 2,714,000—a 127-percent increase in this number.

Job growth in the economy since 2007 has been principally in part-time work. We are becoming a part-time economy.

The President's health care law, without any doubt—I don't believe any economist, even if they try to sugarcoat it the best they could, would deny that the President's health care law is playing a major factor from the shift from full-time work to part-time work. As we all know, part-time workers don't enjoy the same health, retirement, vacation, and other benefits as full-time workers do. It is exceedingly hard indeed to succeed in this economy and in a career with only a part-time job.

We must recognize one of the biggest contributors to the decline in full-time jobs is the health care bill we have been debating. As others have observed, it is destroying the 40-hour workweek. That is what a union leader said: It is destroying the 40-hour workweek. It is even an assault on workers.

Let me tell my colleagues about one constituent who wrote my office. Linda Askew, from Sheffield, AL, wrote in July, asking Congress to do something to help. Ms. Askew has a small neighborhood business. She employs less than 10 people. According to Ms. Askew:

> We have been here for almost 50 years. We have tried to help our employees have health care for over 10 years now . . . The new premiums are $590 per month for single coverage and $1,520 for family coverage. . . . These costs are almost becoming unbearable for our company. More troubling than that, in the letter—

she got a letter from her insurance company—

> was that part of the reason for this increase was blamed on a new health care reform fees and taxes that health insurers must pay on behalf of all their groups . . .

So to reduce the cost of health care in America, the health care bill raised taxes on the insurance companies that provide it. It gets passed along.

She continues:

> Small businesses cannot keep up with these increases.

In the coming days, as I document the conditions facing American workers, I will also address the many causes of this economic deterioration—and there are many. There are many causes for the deterioration in the economy. Republicans and Democrats need to heed these problems I have stated, including a decline in wages, beginning in 1999 through a different administration.

The question is, What are we going to do about it, Republicans and Democrats? We need to consider these issues and deal with them.

What we are seeing is immensely troubling. As Washington grows larger, Washington grows wealthier and more powerful, American workers are being impoverished, sidelined, and marginalized. We see the numbers showing that the only area of America that has been showing raised growth is Washington. Washington! The government class is being enriched at the expense of the middle class. From deficit spending to Federal regulation to the immigration bill, Washington is pursuing policies that benefit lobbyists, the well-connected, government employees, regulators, and bureaucrats, but that are reducing the wages and job opportunities for everyday American workers. The numbers are clear.

Both parties need to shut out the special interests, work to develop policies that will restore our history of dynamic economic growth—and we can do so—growth that benefits all the people of our Nation.

What is the response we get from the governing class? What do they tell us the problem is? On the deficit, what do they say the problem is? We haven't spent enough money. It is your problem, American people. Just send us more money and we won't have deficits anymore. Trust us. Send us more money. The President proposed a $1 trillion tax increase in his budget. It was rejected, but that is what he proposed and that is what he advocates for. So they want to spend more.

They believe they can invest. We give the government more money, and it is going to invest in the economy and everybody is going to be better off. But we have seen that movie. It has been going on for 5 years, to a degree unprecedented in the history of America. They say, Don't worry, borrow and spend. Don't worry about the debt. We can just borrow more and spend more and that will stimulate the economy.

They say we need to regulate more. We need to block more American energy and import more, I suppose, from Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and that is going to improve our economy. Really? We are going to drive up the cost of energy and coal and that is going to improve jobs in America? That is going to help a working person who now has to pay $200, $250 a month for his gas bill to commute? That is supposed to be good for us?

All we have heard is more taxes, more regulation, more government, more debt. That is the policy we are seeing here. I haven't seen anything that has the power to produce the growth and prosperity that we need.

So I say we have to get over this. We have tried this. It is not working. These policies have made it worse. We have to get back to classical American policies that validate individual responsibility, that allow people to progress and make more, that don't drive us to import more oil, that don't put regulation by massive numbers all over the economy, driving down productivity and driving up costs. That is the kind of thing we need to be doing. If we will do that, and if we will allow the vitality of the American spirit to flourish and flower and get this burden off the backs of our people, I think we will be surprised how much better things can be.

It is a serious crisis. This trend has been going on far too long. We can't ignore it. We can't say it is just the recession. We have been going along like this since 2007. We have not seen the growth we need. The tax and spend and borrow policies haven't worked. It is time for us to confront that. I hope my colleagues will.

I will continue to examine the data we are seeing out there and share it with my colleagues and maybe we can surprise ourselves how much good we can do in the long run.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me and allowing me to follow the Senator from Alabama whose remarks I agree with.

I am disappointed in what happened this week. Those of us in the minority learned another lesson for the minority, is to get to a bill we wanted to get to, the majority then has the votes to amend that bill unless some of the majority would happen to side with us. And they did amend the bill in ways that I didn't agree with, taking the provisions out that would have defunded the move toward the health care plan that I think we are going to see more and more of the country isn't ready for. But the bill did go back to the House. The bill was changed from the bill the House sent over.

So the bill went back to the House, and they have a chance to see what else they might be able to do—hopefully, in the next few days. But between now and the end of the fiscal year—which is Monday, by the way—

hopefully, we will find a way to make the system work better, will do what we should have done in the budget debate process.

As I said here on the floor just a day or 2 ago, the great disappointment is that over and over we have failed to let the process work. Over and over we have failed to bring the bills to the floor, offer amendments, and set the priorities for the country.

So here it is, the last Friday of the spending year, the last Friday of our budget year, the last Friday of the fiscal year, and the Senate has not passed one single appropriations bill—except the 6-week CR that says we cannot decide how to do anything new, so let's just do for another 6 weeks what we did last year. Surely that is not good enough, and we need to get beyond that.

The vote today, taken on the Senate floor, did not send a bill to the President to be signed. It sent the bill back across the Capitol Building to see what the House of Representatives may want to do next, and I look forward to working with them and with my colleagues here in the Senate to see what that might be.

I want to talk for a few minutes about the debt ceiling itself. The White House announced just in the last few days that we reach that debt ceiling in about 3 weeks. That number always seems to me to be pretty much a number that can be worked with. It is not like the end of the fiscal year. But it is a date that the Secretary of the Treasury has said we need to look at.

The President said he would not negotiate on the debt ceiling. That is a very interesting position to take, and it is what is wrong with the government right now. I suppose the Congress could now say: And we will not negotiate on the debt ceiling either. So maybe that just means we do not have a debt ceiling increase because nobody wants to negotiate.

Then the President said to a group in Washington this week that—I think he said that nonbudget items have never been attached to the debt ceiling before. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of just a few days ago by Glenn Kessler who actually looked at that. Is that really accurate? Is what the President said accurate—that we have never done this before? This is totally new? This is a new demand that no Congress has ever made before—except, by the way, the Budget Control Act 2½ years ago that the President signed and a few other things that have happened?

It has happened before, and I want to talk about that a little bit.

This is not new moment for us. When Members of the Congress have been concerned about spending—certainly since the 1970s Budget Act, but even before that—when the debt ceiling had to be increased, Members of Congress wanted to talk about spending and other things that they could not get attention to any other way.

In 1953, during the Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in the Congress—at that time led by a Democrat from Virginia, Harry Byrd—did not believe we would be able to fund the Interstate Highway System. So they used the debt limit vote, the debt limit debate as a place to try to find out what they could do about the Interstate Highway System and how it was going to be funded. In 1953—that was a long time ago; almost longer ago now than the lifetime of most Members of the Senate—that is how it was used then.

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was President, Democrats in the Senate sought to attach a campaign finance bill to the debt ceiling. This was during Watergate and, of course, I guess that would certainly meet the definition of a ''nonbudget item''—a campaign finance bill that there was a great effort to do in 1973 and to add to the debt ceiling legislation.

In 1993, a study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, said that ''during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters.''

So certainly that is something we could talk about. Some would have economic consequences, others would not. I know one thought is, let's not move forward with the individual mandate in health care. Now, if you do not move forward with the mandate, there may be significant advantages in the pressure that takes off the spending in the exchange. But whether it is an economic issue or not, it is a fairness issue.

The President, who now has suspended the requirement that businesses offer insurance in 2015—it seems to me the only fair thing to do, if you take the obligation off businesses to offer insurance, is to take the obligation off individuals who the law would require to have insurance if they did not get it at work. You have just taken away the requirement for businesses. Surely you cannot justify saying businesses do not have to pay the penalty but individuals do.

I think that is a fair debate to have. It is a fair debate to have either over the weekend as part of how we move forward with funding the government or a fair debate to have if we are going to increase the Federal Government's ability to borrow money. We ought to talk about things that are going to result in spending lots of money.

Remember, the requirement for the individual mandate that the President also waived was the requirement to prove income. Now, why does that matter? On the exchange, depending on how high your income is, you get a taxpayer subsidy for the insurance you buy. But the President said the requirement to verify income will not be there in the way the law envisioned for this first year.

So again, how is that fair to the taxpayers that the taxpayers are subsidizing somebody's estimate of income? We just got through with the taxpayers subsidizing a lot of mortgages that could not be paid because that structure allowed people to estimate what their income would be on their mortgage application without submitting anything but their estimate of what their income could be. As it turned out, when people were trying to buy a house and prove they could make a mortgage payment, a significant number of people estimated they would make more money than they made. I think it is going to be equally true when it comes time to qualify for taxpayer assistance, a significant number of people may estimate—maybe even on some level of good faith—it could work out that way, that I am going to make less money than I made last year or less money than I am likely to make this year, but I am going to have a level of income that allows me to have a higher subsidy. I think it is certainly a possibility.

One of these two things is happening right now. We need to look at the equity and fairness of having an individual penalty and the President saying we do not have a penalty for businesses that do not provide insurance.

Let me get back to a few more examples.

In one of the debt limit debates, major changes in Social Security were attached. An amendment in one of the debates was to end the bombing in Cambodia. Twenty-five amendments that were nongermane to spending were in this discussion between 1978 and 1987.

The President maybe is proving here more than anything else that you better be very careful when you say something has never happened, particularly if it has happened over and over, and particularly if you think that somehow, as President, you can decide that the future of the country is nondebatable, that you can decide that how high the debt limit is is nondebatable. Whatever the Secretary of the Treasury says, that is what we need. And what would the President say about that? He would say, well, that is because we have already obligated this money. The fact that this money may be already obligated does not mean we should not look at every other way we are spending money or every way we control spending and do what we need to do about that.

In 1982, the Senate majority leader at that time, Howard Baker, said we will have a free-for-all on the debt ceiling legislation, and 1,400 nongermane amendments became part of that debate. They included limiting Federal jurisdiction over school prayer and other things.

In 1980, the House and Senate rejected a central part of President Carter's energy policy—an oil import

fee—as part of the debt ceiling discussion. No bigger stretch than not going forward with the individual mandate as part of the debt ceiling discussion.

Less than 10 percent of the debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. But many of them contained an amendment that was related to how we spend our money. When you are spending too much money, when you already owe $17 trillion, it is time to talk about: How are we spending this money and what can we do to do something about it before we further extend the line of credit?

If any of us went to a banker and said: We have spent all the money we have already borrowed. We still have a lot of bills coming in, and we need to borrow a lot more money, frankly, under any of the rules that this Congress has passed in the last several years, the banker could not loan you money, and if they could loan you money, they would not loan you money without saying: Tell us again, what are you trying to do to get your spending under control so you are not back here in a few days or a few months asking for more credit.

The thing we know is, under almost any imaginable circumstance, this is not the last debt ceiling increase we will ever make. So if we are going to be back in a few weeks, a few months, a year—however long this debt ceiling extends to—asking for more money, we ought to be talking about how we are spending the money we have.

October 17 will not be as far away as it might seem. It is very close to us now. The Secretary of the Treasury says that the country will have only approximately $30 billion to meet our country's commitments. But on October 17, money does not stop coming in. On October 18, you might be able to arrange the books in a way where you do not have quite enough money to pay all the bills coming in, but this is not a government shutdown scenario.

We need to solve the problem of this weekend and early next week and then get to the debt ceiling. Whether the President wants to debate it or not, it is going to be debated. I think it is going to be negotiated. The idea that this is going to be a so-called clean debt limit increase that will not be negotiated because it impacts the full faith and credit of the United States of America—we are going to pay our bills. I think we all know that. We have paid our bills since the founding of this government. But we are not going to pay our bills, we are not going to get another advance on our allowance, without somebody saying: Exactly how are you spending this money as fast as you are spending it? And why are you back again saying you need more of it?

The American people have overwhelmingly rejected the idea that this should not be negotiated. According to a new Bloomberg poll out this week, Americans by a 2-to-1 ratio disagree with the President's contention that the Congress should raise the debt ceiling without conditions. Instead, 61 percent said that it is ''right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised,'' and they said ''even if it risks default.''

The American people want us to fight—as we have this week and we will continue to—to try to defund a health care system that will not work. But they also want us to fight, to be sure that the money we are spending that we get from taxpayers—the money that we obligate future generations to, the bills that we are building up for somebody else to pay—to have the kind of debate, the kind of negotiation, the kind of important view of the future that they deserve to have.

I would urge the President and the majority leader of the Senate to sit down with leaders of the House and others and try to work this out as soon as we can. Understand, frankly, that whether you want to negotiate or not does not matter. There is nowhere in the Constitution that says when we owe more money than we pay, the President can decide whether there is going to be a discussion or not. That is not how this system works. It is not how it is going to work over the next 2 weeks or the next month or whatever it takes to resolve the debt limit. Hopefully, we will all be working hard over the next 2 days to do whatever it takes to keep the government of the United States working on October 1. Just because we have failed for the entire year to do the work the Senate is supposed to do does not mean we can continue to fail in a way that punishes the American people by not having a government that is functioning on the first day of the spending year.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 2013]

OBAMA'S CLAIM THAT NON-BUDGET ITEMS HAVE ''NEVER'' BEEN ATTACHED TO THE DEBT CEILING

(By Glenn Kessler)

''You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt being used to extort a president or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.''

—President Obama, remarks to the Business Roundtable, Sept. 18, 2013

When a president makes a lawyerly comment, it's time to start looking for the trap door. At first President Obama uses a sweeping ''never in the history of the United States'' but then he concludes with a caveat: ''nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.''

The issue at hand is the Affordable Care Act, aka Obamacare, which many congressional Republicans would like to repeal or delay as part of a vote to extend the debt ceiling—even though establishment Republicans, such as former Bush aide Karl Rove, regard the effort as a kamikaze mission with little hope of success.

Generally, raising the debt ceiling has been routine and not especially controversial. But, as we have noted before, starting in 1953 during the Dwight Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in Congress at times have used the debt limit as a way to force concessions by the executive branch on spending. Eisenhower, a Republican, had particular trouble with a Democrat, Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, over the debt ceiling because Byrd was skeptical of Eisenhower's plans to build the national highway system.

That dispute was about a budget issue, which the president seemed to exclude in his comment. But unfortunately for the president's claim, there are other, compelling examples that contradict it.

THE FACTS

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was president, Democrats in the Senate, including Sen. Edward Kennedy (D–Mass.) and Sen. Walter Mondale (D–Minn.), sought to attach a campaign finance reform bill to the debt ceiling after the Watergate-era revelations about Nixon's fundraising during the 1972 election. Their efforts were defeated by a filibuster, but it took days of debate and the lawmakers were criticized by commentators (and fellow lawmakers) for using ''shotgun'' tactics to try to hitch their pet cause to emergency must-pass legislation.

President Obama said that GOP lawmakers now are trying to ''extort'' repeal of the health care law via the debt limit, but that's also what Democrats wanted to do with President Nixon, who opposed the campaign-finance reforms.

Indeed, Linda K. Kowalcky and Lance T. LeLoup wrote in a comprehensive 1993 study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, that ''during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters.''

Previously, they noted, the debt limit bill had been linked to the mechanics of debt management, but now anything was fair game. Major changes in Social Security were attached to the debt bill; another controversial amendment sought to end the bombing in Cambodia. Kowalcky and LeLoup list 25 nongermane amendments that were attached to debt-limit bills between 1978 and 1987, including allowing voluntary school prayer, banning busing to achieve integration and proposing a nuclear freeze.

In 1982, Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker unleashed a free-for-all by allowing 1,400 nongermane amendments to the debt ceiling legislation, which resulted in five weeks of raucous debate that mostly focused on limiting federal court jurisdiction over school prayer and busing. The debt limit only passed after lawmakers decided to strip all of the amendments from the bill.

One of the most striking examples of a president being forced to accept unrelated legislation on a debt-ceiling bill took place in 1980. The House and Senate repealed a central part of President Jimmy Carter's energy policy—an oil import fee that was expected to raise the cost of gasoline by 10 cents a gallon. Carter vetoed the bill, even though the United States was close to default, and then the House and Senate overrode his veto by overwhelming numbers (335–34 in the House; 68–10 in the Senate).

''Foes of the fee succeeded in linking the two measures to gain added leverage for killing the fee,'' The Washington Post reported on Carter's stunning defeat. ''The Treasury Department immediately announced it was resuming the sale of bonds, which it suspended Thursday night when the debt ceiling expired.''

To be sure, the success rate of attaching nongermane amendments to a debt-limit bill is relatively low. Anita S. Krishnakumar, in a 2007 paper for the Harvard Journal on Legislation, said that less than 10 percent of the

debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. Only twice—in 1980 and in 1995—did Congress successfully pass amendments opposed by the president. But as Carter's defeat shows, Congress has used the debt limit to repeal a key legislative priority of a president.

In response, the Obama White House provided us with information on the negative impact on the economy during the 2011 debt-ceiling impasse, but did not comment on the examples listed above.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

Clealy, Obama's sweeping statement does not stand up to scrutiny, even with his caveat. Time and again, lawmakers have used the ''must-pass'' nature of the debt limit to force changes in unrelated laws. Often, the effort fails—as the GOP drive to repeal ObamaCare almost certainly will. But Kowalcky and LeLoup speculate that one reason why Congress has not eliminated the debt limit, despite the political problems it poses, is because lawmakers enjoy the leverage it provides against the executive branch.

There's an old reporter's rule that you want to avoid using the word ''unprecedented.'' Otherwise, a professor might call or e-mail the next day to dispute it.

Let's add this rule for politicians: Never say ''never.''

Mr. BLUNT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELIUM STEWARSHIP

AUCTION AMOUNTS ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to engage my colleagues Senator WYDEN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator MORAN in a colloquy regarding legislation the Senate adopted yesterday for the modernization of the Federal helium reserve. I first would like to commend the leadership of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their commitment to this effort and to thank my friend from Kansas for his partnership in this process. I know how long and hard the Chairman and Ranking Member and their staffs have worked on this complex piece of legislation, and they deserve our appreciation.

I think it is important that we discuss one of the aspects of the proposed new auction program. The text before us today creates an auction and Section 6(b)(5)(A) allows the Secretary to auction less than the statutorily mandated amount if the Secretary determines the adjustment necessary to minimize market disruptions. The Secretary may make such adjustments only after only after submitting a written justification to the congressional committees of jurisdiction. I wish to ask Chairman WYDEN whether he believes this provision will be exercised?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his help in crafting this bill and I appreciate that he has taken the time to raise this issue. One of the primary goals in drafting this legislation was to ensure stability of supply. The Senator is correct. The Secretary may lower the amount of helium that is auctioned if he or she determines the adjustment is necessary to minimize market disruptions that pose a threat to the economic wellbeing of the United States and only after submitting a written justification to Congress. I expect the Secretary would exercise this provision if those criteria are met.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I again wish to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their tireless efforts and their willingness to work with us on these important issues. I yield the Floor to the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise to echo the Senator from Connecticut's comments and to ask the Committee leaders for one more clarification.

The issue is the definition of ''excess refining capacity'' and its requirement that it be made available at commercially reasonable rates as a condition of continued participation in the sales and auctions provided for in this legislation. I ask Senator MURKOWSKI if it is the intent of the legislation that the BLM consider the economic impacts of defining ''excess refining capacity'' once the auction level reaches 100% of the Federal helium reserve.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Yes, it is our expectation that BLM will consider economic impacts throughout the implementation of this bill and develop regulations for this and other provisions in the bill accordingly. I do not anticipate that the definition of ''excess refining capacity'' would change over the course of the law's implementation, however. Our intent is to ensure that refiners with excess refining capacity make that capacity available at commercially reasonable rates. As the auction system is phased in, I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues and the BLM to ensure that market disruptions are avoided and American taxpayers are protected.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Committee leadership for their dedication and cooperation, and I yield the Floor.

REMEMBERING MARYLAND NAVY YARD VICTIMS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, the fatal shooting at the Washington Navy Yard last week is a senseless tragedy. I mourn the loss of life and offer my prayers to all who have been affected by this heinous act, especially the families of the victims. Our Navy and their civilian colleagues work day and night to protect the American public. An attack on the people tasked with keeping this Nation safe is unacceptable. I thank our Federal, State and local first responders and law enforcement for swiftly and dutifully responding to this appalling attack despite the personal dangers. I thank our dedicated doctors, nurses, and staff at the MedStar trauma center who helped care for the injured that day.

Today I want to remember the six Marylanders who died in this terrible tragedy, and to express my condolences to their family and friends.

Sylvia Frasier was 53 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. She was a computer expert and served as the enterprise information assurance manager at Naval Sea Systems Command. And she worked a second job as well, working several evenings a week as a customer service manager at the Wal-Mart in Waldorf. The assistant manager at the store said she often gave co-workers rides home, and he once asked her, ''How come you work a second job?'' She just said, 'I love it. I like working with people.''' Her co-worker said that Sylvia could talk to customers and turn negatives into positives, and that they will miss seeing her smile and gold-colored hair at the store. She leaves behind her two parents and six siblings.

John Roger Johnson was 73 years old and lived in Derwood, MD, in Montgomery County. He was a civilian contractor and performed environmental assessments of systems used to located mines. He also provided support to the NAVSEA's Command Information Officer. He often greeted colleagues with a ''How ya doin', buddy?'' He leaves behind a wife and four daughters, and his 11th grandchild is due in November.

Frank Kohler was 50 years old and lived in Tall Timbers, MD, in St. Mary's County. He was a computer systems specialist. Frank had been the president of the Rotary Club. He had earned the nickname of ''King Oyster'' for his service, and received a crown and robe, leading the national oyster shucking competition. He leaves behind a wife and two daughters.

Vishnu Pandit was 61 years old and lived in North Potomac, MD, in Montgomery County. He was born in Bombay, India, and moved to the United States in his early 20's. His family said in a statement that ''He took great pride in being employed by the United States Navy, which he very proudly served in various capacities as a civilian for over 25 years. He felt extremely privileged to have contributed to the superiority of the U.S. Navy and the country that he served.'' He leaves behind a wife and two sons.

Kenneth Bernard Proctor was 46 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. He worked as a civilian utilities foreman, and had worked

for the Federal Government for over two decades. His oldest son recently enlisted in the Army. He leaves behind his ex-wife and two sons.

Richard Michael Ridgell was 52 years old and lived in Westminster, MD, in Carroll County. He was a Maryland State Police Trooper for nearly two decades, and spent 3 years working in Iraq, helping train civilian in local policing. He was known to text his children several times a day to check up on them and tell them he loved them, and coached his daughters' softball teams. He was an avid photographer and loved taking pictures of his family. He leaves behind his wife and three daughters.

Mr. President, the tragedy of every recent mass shooting in America has underscored the importance of Congress passing sensible, Federal gun safety legislation. We know that we won't be able to stop every tragedy, but we absolutely can save lives. Earlier this year, some 4 months after the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary, there was a glimmer of hope that the Senate was finally working together on a bipartisan basis to pass reasonable background checks for all gun purchases. This effort was fleeting, but it must be revived.

We must use common sense and act responsibly. I am sympathetic to the interests of legitimate hunters and collectors, but we should follow the lead of states like Maryland and reinstate the Federal ban on assault weapons and prohibit high-capacity ammunition clips. We should enact universal background checks. We must take steps to strengthen our mental health system so that individuals who need help with mental illness can get appropriate help and not have access to hand guns or other weapons. I know that we can protect our communities while still protecting the Constitutional rights of legitimate hunters and existing gun owners.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HELYSE S. TURNER

• Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant from my home State of Nevada, Helyse Turner. For the past several years, Ms. Turner has served as the Business and Community Liaison with the Sierra Nevada Job Corps Center. In this capacity, she has contributed to an organization whose mission is to assist young Nevadans obtain the skills they need to become successful professionals. She has worked closely with my Reno office and has been a resource to them as they work to meet the needs of my constituents.

Ms. Turner has an impressive record of public service in both the non-profit and government sectors. In addition to her community service while at the Sierra Nevada Job Corps Center, she has assisted the needy by working with the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, and she has helped to responsibly manage Nevada's vast public lands while serving with the Bureau of Land Management. She also volunteers on a number of local civic boards, including the local Chamber of Commerce Ambassador program and the Sierra Nevada Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America.

Ms. Turner exemplifies the values of philanthropy and community service, and in so doing she has had a profound impact on many Nevadans. I and my staff deeply appreciate her dedicated efforts and her years of service, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing her the best of luck as she begins a new chapter with Utah's Clearfield Job Corps Center. She will be greatly missed in the Silver State.•

TRIBUTE TO JIM RUBRIGHT

• Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I wish to honor Mr. Jim Rubright, chairman and CEO of RockTenn, headquartered in Norcross, GA, on his retirement.

Jim came to the paper industry with a wealth of prior experience in the energy business, public company management and served as a partner in the law firm of King & Spalding LLP.

Jim was named PaperAge's Executive Papermaker of the Year in 2009 and 2012 as well as North American Forest Products CEO of the Year in 2008 and 2011. He received the first ever Global CEO of the Year award at the 2009 Pulp & Paper International, PPI, Awards in Munich, Germany. Jim is a leader in the global forest products industry, and his philosophy is to lead his employees by example. He focuses on the importance of corporate citizenship, giving generously of time, talent and funding to take care of the communities where he lives.

Under Jim's leadership, RockTenn has grown to become a highly respected leader in its industry. He has increased shareholder value eight-fold with annual dividends of 18.6 percent for 14 years, and earlier this year led his company on to the Fortune 500 list for the first time in its history primarily by engineering large acquisitions. He has grown RockTenn from $1.3 billion in 1999 to an estimated $9.5 billion this year, with 26,000 employees whom he is leaving on sound financial footing even in these tough economic times.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize Jim Rubright, a dedicated family man who has also left an incredible legacy in his outstanding career. I have enjoyed working with him on issues in Washington over the years and wish him the best in his retirement.•

JOEY'S PARK

• Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to a little boy named Joey O'Donnell. Joey was a great kid. Full of energy. Full of imagination. Smart as a whip.

Joey suffered from a rare pediatric disease called cystic fibrosis. The disease attacks early and it affects the lungs, pancreas and several other critical systems of the body.

It is in honor of Joey that I started the Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus in the House of Representatives. Joey died in 1986 as a result of his worsening condition. Back then we didn't have the amazing life-changing therapies we have now. Today, we have a novel and life-saving therapy known as Kalydeco that gives those suffering from cystic fibrosis and their families hope. It was developed by Vertex, headquartered in my home State of Massachusetts. It is the first and only FDA approved medication to treat a particular mutation associated with cystic fibrosis.

It is in that spirit of hope that I wish to acknowledge the extraordinary efforts happening today in Belmont, MA to once again honor Joey. Hundreds of Vertex employees are volunteering their time along with hundreds of others to rebuild the original ''Joey's Park'' in Belmont.

I congratulate and thank those hundreds of volunteers for building this fantastic playground, which will inspire hope and imagination in all kids. It will serve as an important place in the community and is a fitting way to honor Joey and his spirit.•

ARKANSAS NO KID HUNGRY CAMPAIGN

• Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, today I wish to address the serious issue of childhood hunger in my home State of Arkansas, and the important work of the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance and the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign in addressing this issue.

New data released by the United States Department of Agriculture on our Nation's food insecurity showed that nearly 20 percent of Arkansas households struggle to provide adequate food during the year. Today, more than one in four kids in Arkansas face hunger. Since 2010 the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign, a partnership between the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance under the leadership of Kathy Webb, the office of Arkansas Governor Mike Beebe, and other stakeholders, has been committed to ending childhood hunger and food insecurity for families in my State.

Fortunately for Arkansas, the No Kid Hungry campaign is hard at work to make sure that kids across the State have access to the healthy, nutritious foods they need. Since the No Kid Hungry campaign came to Arkansas, it has brought 1.2 million additional meals to kids who need them. They are dedicated to expanding access to school breakfast, free summer meals, and afterschool meals. Additionally, through its Cooking Matters nutrition education program, the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign empowers families with the skills, knowledge, and

confidence to prepare healthy meals on a budget. More than 1,800 families across the State have already participated in Cooking Matters programming.

Research shows eating breakfast has a dramatic and positive effect on students, and as Arkansas kids head back to school, more will be starting their days with a healthy breakfast. However, there is a large gap in the number of kids who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals at school and those who are accessing the Federal School Breakfast Program. In Arkansas, only about 55 percent of the students who eat free or reduced-price school lunches each day are also getting school breakfast. The Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign is working to change that by moving school breakfast out of the cafeteria and making it a part of the school day, ensuring more low-income students are able to start with a healthy meal. In 2012, the campaign helped to connect approximately 4,400 additional kids to the School Breakfast Program.

Summer continues to be a challenging time for low-income kids. The Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign ensures that kids have continued access to healthy meals. Again, the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign stepped up to the challenge, increasing the number of meals served to kids during the summer by more than 730,000 between 2010 and 2012.

''Hunger in Our Schools,'' a new report by the No Kid Hungry campaign, found that three in four public school teachers see their students arrive at school hungry. In the report, an Arkansas teacher spoke about kids in her classroom impacted by hunger. She said, ''Asking a student to come to school and learn while they're hungry is like trying to tell an adult to sit in their cubicle and work with a nail in their foot; the pain is all you'd be able to concentrate on, just like food is the only thing hungry kids can focus on. Before you can focus on grades or behavior, you have to make sure kids have the basic necessities of life.''

There is still work to be done across Arkansas to ensure kids and families have consistent access to healthy, nutritious foods. I am confident that with the continued strong work of the Arkansas No Kid Hungry campaign and the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance, with its six Feeding America member food banks, we can create an Arkansas where no child goes hungry.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2600. An act to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums.

H.R. 3095. An act 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 rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) announced that he had signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

At 1:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3096. An act to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center''.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and an amendment to the title.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1412. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. REID).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2600. An act to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3096. An act to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1556. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1558. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program of outreach for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1559. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 491

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit

attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1537, a bill 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 through a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition.

S. RES. 262

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 262, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of suicide prevention awareness.

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1980

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1980 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1987

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1987 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1992

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1992 intended to be proposed to H.J. Res. 59, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1559. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Benefits Fairness for Filipino Veterans Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN FILIPINO VETERANS FOR FULL-DOLLAR RATE OF BENEFITS UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 107(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretary may not determine that a person is not an individual residing in the United States for purposes of this subsection solely because the person is outside the United States for any period of time less than one year.''.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 204 and 205; that there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 214 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 214) designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as ''National Case Management Week''

to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 214) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 1, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that from Friday, September 27, through Monday, September 30, the majority leader and Senator BOXER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. REID. Madam President, I wish to thank all my Republican colleagues and, of course, Democratic colleagues who acted responsibly today to prevent a government shutdown. House Republicans should follow the example set by Republicans in the Senate.

I want everyone to listen and to hear. The Senate has acted. This is the only legislation that can avert a government shutdown and that time is ticking as we speak. The Senate will be back in session on Monday. In the meantime, if Speaker BOEHNER wants to avoid a government shutdown, he will pass our resolution; otherwise, it is a government shutdown.

The President just spoke on national TV outlining how bad that would be. We have said it on the floor, but it doesn't have the power of the President telling everyone how bad it will be, and it will be very, very negative for our economy and for the American people in general.

House Republicans should think long and hard about what is at stake and who would be hurt by a government shutdown. Each of us, all 535 Members of Congress, were elected by the American people to serve them, and the American people deserve better than a government that lurches from crisis to crisis caused by a handful of people. American families deserve a government that works for them, not against them.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and that the majority leader be recognized at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senators will be notified when the next votes are scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:15 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 30, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMON WATERS FOUNDING

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John J. Donahue, the Superintendent of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and the Middle Delaware Scenic and Recreational River. Superintendant Donahue contracted with the Pinchot Institute to develop an organization rooted in engaging leaders in both private and governmental areas. As a result, Mr. Donahue became the driving force behind the establishment of the grassroots organization known as Common Waters.

Common Waters is a non-governmental group that coordinates efforts and policies of private partners like land trusts and county, state and federal planning organizations.

Delaware River provides clean drinking water for approximately 15 million people within the tri-state areas of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The preservation of forest land within these areas helps to ensure a healthy watershed, which is imperative to clean drinking water.

The group has targeted strategic grants to over 90 private forest owners who control over 38,000 acres of land, resulting in the best management practices and greater Delaware River watershed and ecosystem protection.

Additionally, Common Waters has become a voice for all of the member organizations on Landscape Scale Connectivity, resulting in easements being secured for over 1,000 acres of protection.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donahue and Common Waters have shown that the government can have a dramatic benefit to the local area by providing opportunities to the private sector and I commend them for all of their work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013 and on Thursday, September 26, 2013, I was necessarily absent from the House chamber.

If I had been present, I would have voted, the following on September 25, 2013:

Rollcall 484 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 1961, To amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 485 on the motion to suspend the rules and p ass, H.Res. 354, Providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment, I would have voted, "aye."

If I had been present, I would have voted, the following on September 26, 2013:

Rollcall 486 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 3095, To ensure 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 rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 487 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, H.R. 2600, To amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 488, on approving the journal, I would have voted, "aye."

Rollcall 489, on agreeing to the amendment of H.R. 687, Grijalva of Arizona Part A Amendment No. 1, I would have vote "nay."

Rollcall 490, on agreeing to the amendment of H.R. 687, Napolitano of California Part A Amendment No. 3, I would have vote "nay."

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF GALENA, IL

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Galena, Illinois, for earning a place on the Executive Travel Magazine's list, America's Best Small Towns.

On a recent visit to Galena, I met with local small business owners who are all very proud of the town's history, a pride I share with them. With over 85 percent of the town's buildings designated as National Register of Historic Places and the general awe that the area's beautiful landscape inspires, it is clear why Galena deserves to be labeled as a great American town. I always enjoy visiting Galena and look forward to many trips to come.

It is important that all of our communities across Illinois continue to highlight why they are great places to live, work and raise a family. As always, I am proud to serve all the hard-working people of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, and I look forward to communities across my region continuing to receive many well-deserved awards.

H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Port Angeles—a town whose lifeblood was the timber industry. As the local economy suffered, I watched as my friends' parents lost their jobs. This experience motivated me to pursue a career in economic development to help communities and families get back on their feet.

I came to the House of Representatives to fight for hard–working families across our region. I know just how hard our communities have been hit by the changes in the timber industry. It is important to me that we get folks back to work and strengthen rural communities.

With that in mind, I'm supportive of finding ways to sustainably increase harvest levels and increase the health of our forests. In fact, I'm a Co–Chair of the Healthy Forests Caucus here in the House.

Unfortunately, I have serious concerns over certain aspects of H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This legislation would undermine core environmental laws, reduce opportunities for stakeholder input and pathways to consensus, and leave our region without a legitimate plan to help us adequately balance multiple forest uses.

The region I represent has some of the most pristine land and waters in our country. Protecting our resources while balancing the needs of resource–dependent communities and industries has been an issue my region has struggled with for decades.

Since taking office, I have been working closely with both sides of this issue. I am firmly convinced that we can protect forest health and get people back to work.

I do not believe bypassing the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act as laid out in H.R. 1526 is the only way—or even the best way—to do this.

Setting harvest levels by legislative mandate rather than by sound science sets a dangerous precedent and could lead to the destruction of long and hard fought agreements throughout the country.

These decisions must be made with scientific analysis and stakeholder involvement. The approach H.R. 1526 takes does not encourage consensus around federal land management and does not promote a path to a mutually agreeable resolution. H.R. 1526 would only further root stakeholders in oppositional positions. We should pursue a path forward that will reduce lawsuits. I want to see more work for folks in the timber industry—not more work for lawyers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work the Committee Chair and Ranking Member have put into this bill, but must voice my opposition.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL FREDERICKSEN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the retirement of KCCI's president and general manager, Paul Fredericksen, and to

express my appreciation for his years of service to KCCI and the people of Iowa.

A Newell, Iowa native and alumnus of Buena Vista University, Mr. Fredericksen has been a part of the KCCI family for more than four decades and has served as the president and general manager for 27 years. Under Paul's leadership, KCCI, a CBS affiliate, has expanded its statewide and nationwide influence on its path to becoming the top-rated station in central Iowa.

Paul's many accomplishments at KCCI have earned him deserved recognition across the nation, including numerous broadcasting and broadcast journalism awards at the regional and national levels. It goes without saying that the KCCI central Iowans know and love today would not be the same without Mr. Fredericksen's tireless efforts and thoughtful guidance.

Mr. Speaker, Paul's contribution to broadcasting excellence and to the great state of Iowa cannot be overstated. While Mr. Fredericksen's expertise and experience are sure to be missed, he leaves behind a grateful viewing audience and an excellent example of leadership for which to strive. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Paul and wishing him the best as he begins a new chapter in life.

HONORING MS. SU WEBB

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Ms. Su Webb, who will be receiving a Loudoun Laurels Medal for her lifetime of civic leadership in the Loudoun County community.

Ms. Webb is receiving the award in the category of ''Extraordinary Stewardship'' on October 11, 2013 at the River Creek Club in Leesburg, Virginia. The Loudoun Laurels Medal recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the common good in our region.

Ms. Webb has long been committed to cultural and environmental preservation in Loudoun County. She is the chairman of the Loudoun County Farm Heritage museum and serves on the boards of the Aldie Heritage Association and the Lovettsville Park Advisory Committee. She has also served on Loudoun County's Parks, Recreation and Open Space Board for over twenty years, during which time she was instrumental in transferring the operations of Historic Mt. Zion Church and Aldie Mill Park to the Parks authority, the establishment of Gilbert's Corner Regional Park and the planning for White's Ford Regional Park.

I want to commend Ms. Webb for her tireless commitment to preserving the wealth of cultural history and environmental beauty in Loudoun County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I was unavoidably detained due to meetings with constituents in my district. Had I been present on the House floor, I would have voted ''aye'' on the following bills and resolutions:

H.R. 1961, to amend title 46 to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line;

And H. Res. 354, providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, with an amendment.

LETTER FROM REV. BILLY GRAHAM TO THE PRESIDENT ROUHANI OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, attached is a letter from Rev. Billy Graham to President Rouhani of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This is the letter I referenced in my one minute speech on September 26, 2013.

MONTREAL, NORTH CAROLINA,
September 23, 2013.

President HASSAN ROUHANI,
Islamic Republic of Iran.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROUHANI, I have been watching with great concern about the case of Pastor Saeed Abedini, an American citizen who is currently a prisoner in your country. He was in Iran working to build an orphanage when he was arrested and later sentenced to eight years in prison. His situation has been receiving an increasingly high level of attention in the United States. Unfortunately this publicity has been entirely negative for Iran, with the belief that the primary reason for Pastor Abedini's imprisonment was because of his Christian faith.

As you may know, as a religious leader I have often spoken (both publicly and also privately with our national leadership) about the need for greater understanding and peace among the nations of the world. As you come to the United States this week for the UN General Assembly in New York, it is my sincere hope that ways may be found to reduce the current tensions between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The announcement on Monday that your country has freed eighty political prisoners is very encouraging. I fear, however, that the current publicity surrounding the continued imprisonment of Pastor Abedini, an American citizen, may further harm the already fragile relationship that presently exists between our two nations.

On September 26, the one-year anniversary of Pastor Abedini's imprisonment, thousands will attend prayer vigils in more than seventy U.S. cities, calling on your country to release this husband, father, and servant of God. I join them by respectfully asking you to release Pastor Saeed Abedini from prison. Such an action would, I believe, have a positive impact in our nation, and might well be perceived by our leadership as a significant step in reducing tensions.

Respectfully yours,

BILLY GRAHAM.

HONORING HUGH OLIN HALL, JR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Hugh Olin Hall, Jr. who passed away on September 24, 2013 at the age of 93. Mr. Hall, Jr. is a brother of my dear colleague, Congressman RALPH HALL.

Mr. Hall, Jr. was the youngest person to graduate from Rockwall High School at the age of 15. He attended the University of Texas at Austin and North Texas State University in Denton.

Hugh Olin hall, Jr. was born on January 29, 1920, in Fate, Texas. Hugh honorably served in the in the Field Artillery Unit of the United States Army during WWII and served in the Field Artillery Unit in Germany. After his military service, he worked on the pipelines with his father for the Oklahoma Contracting Company. He was employed with Lone Star Gas, where he worked until his retirement in 1989.

He was a member of the Rockwall Masonic Lodge and member of First United Methodist Church of Rockwall. He was an avid reader and a historian of WWII, later having the opportunity to travel back to Europe and Germany to visit the areas where he had served.

He is survived by his loving wife Doris Jane Hall; brother Ralph M. Hall; sister Rosemary Hall Scott; grandchildren Christopher Andrew Jeanes, Hugh Olin Hall IV and Christopher Leigh Hall; four nephews: Ralph Hampton Hall and wife Jody, Brett Allen Hall and wife Karen, Jay Blakeley Hall & wife Catherine and Dr. Victor Mark Scott & wife Vickie; grandnephews Jay Hampton Hall and wife Katherine, Steven Lule and wife Leeanna and Alexander Cole Scott; and grandnieces Haley Nicole Scott, Sarah Elizabeth Hall, Amanda Ellen Hall and Crystal Tucker Hall. Hugh was preceded in death by his son Hugh Olin Hall, III; daughter Rebecca Ann Hall Jeanes; and sister-in-law Mary Ellen Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Hugh Olin Hall, Jr. I urge my colleagues to please join me in conveying my condolences for their loss.

TRIBUTE TO COLBY COOK

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the heroic actions of eighth-grader Colby Cook of West Des Moines, Iowa.

During a typical lunch hour in the lunchroom of Indian Hills Junior High School in Clive, 13-year-old Colby noticed his good friend Kyle in distress. A large piece of Kyle's sandwich was lodged in his airway, cutting off his ability to breathe. Colby wasted no time upon recognizing his friend was in danger and expertly employed the Heimlich maneuver to save Kyle's life and avert the life-threatening situation.

It is also evident that Mr. Cook is as humble as he is heroic. Immediately after saving a life

through his quick thinking and swift action, Colby simply headed to Social Studies class as he would on any other day without saying a word of the incident. It was only after Colby's parents, Clay and Teri, heard their son recount the day's events at dinner that Colby's great story, and the need to recognize his actions, was brought to light.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent future leaders like Colby in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I applaud his lifesaving effort today. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Colby, thanking him for a job well done, and wishing him a bright future.

HONORING JOSEPH R. PLUENNEKE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joseph R. Pluenneke. Joseph is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joseph has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joseph has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joseph has become a member of the Order of the Arrow and led his troop as Patrol Leader. Joseph has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Joseph completed much needed improvements to the White Tail Trail at the Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joseph R. Pluenneke for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING JENNIFER VAUPEL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing Washington, DC physician assistant Jennifer Vaupel, who practices at Bread for the City. We commend Mrs. Vaupel for the valuable health care services she provides to medically underserved populations in DC. She should be honored for her compassion and the quality medical services she provides to these vulnerable patients.

Mrs. Vaupel has served as a physician assistant for almost six years at Bread for the City, which is a premier safety-net service organization in DC Bread for the City has been providing comprehensive support services—food, clothing, medical care, and legal and social services—to the city's low-income population for nearly 40 years.

As the sole full-time physician assistant working at this nonprofit, Mrs. Vaupel ensures patients receive the health care and other services they need. Throughout her career in health care, Mrs. Vaupel has gone above and beyond what is required of her. She seeks to understand the socioeconomic challenges her patients endure, and, as a result, she is able to ensure better health care outcomes for her patients.

Because of Mrs. Vaupel's courageous work, Bread for the City was awarded the prestigious Caring for Communities Grant from the Physician Assistant Foundation. This $5,000 annual award was presented to Bread for the City in May 2013, in recognition of the manner in which the nonprofit has used physician assistants in providing care to people with disabilities or for those without the ability to pay for medical services. The award also recognizes the numerous educational experiences Bread for the City has given physician assistants and students in physician assistant programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the successful and compassionate work of Mrs. Vaupel. Mrs. Vaupel improves the quality of life for many residents of Washington, DC, as exemplified by the awarding of the Physician Assistant Foundation grant to Bread for the City. Her work not only directly helps her patients, but it also sets a wonderful humanitarian example for us all.

CONGRATULATING FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY'S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ON THEIR RECOGNITION AS AN ''EXAMPLE OF EXCELENCIA''

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Florida International University's College of Education for their recognition by Excelencia in Education as an ''Example of Excelencia'' for the College's ''Creating Latino Access to a Valuable Education'' or CLAVE program. CLAVE is a truly outstanding program that aims to increase the number of graduate degrees awarded to Hispanic American teachers and administrators by providing scholarships to complete masters and doctoral degrees.

It brings me great pride to represent a university that not only leads the nation in awarding bachelor's and master's degrees to Hispanic students but is also deeply invested in its surrounding community.

After receiving a $2.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, CLAVE was created as a collaborative effort between the College of Education and Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS). The program targets low performing urban schools within the school district as a way to enhance the professional development of teachers working in challenging academic environments and ultimately enhance the performance of the students they serve. CLAVE selects teachers that come from schools where more than 50 percent of the student population is Hispanic and less than half of the faculty holds Master's degrees.

The financial support offered by CLAVE doesn't only expand the educational opportunities of Hispanic Americans through direct scholarships. This program also provides the College with resources to expand its institutional capacity by improving its Student Support Services, enhancing its mentoring support at the graduate level, strengthening academic quality, expanding technological infrastructure, and targeting the professional development of faculty.

While this project focuses on expanding educational opportunities for Hispanic Americans, all students attending the College of Education benefit as do the MDCPS students who will gain better trained teachers. The results of the pre/post test that is used to measure changes in students' performance resulting from improved knowledge and skills of participating teachers and administrators in the program prove the benefits of CLAVE.

CLAVE is a vehicle to enhance access for Hispanic-Americans to post-baccalaureate degrees, and like FIU President Mark B. Rosenberg said, ''it is a great example of FIU's commitment to Miami-Dade's public schools, its teachers and its students.''

Mr. Speaker, FIU and its College of Education are truly ''Examples in Excelencia'', and more universities should follow suit.

IN RECOGNITION OF WORCESTER TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL AND PRINCIPAL SHEILA HARRITY

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the incredible accomplishments of Worcester Technical High School under the leadership of Principal Sheila Harrity.

Worcester Technical High School, located in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, is on the cutting edge of career and technical education. Recognizing the importance of coupling academic rigor with hands-on experience, Worcester Tech has developed a curriculum to ensure students graduate college-and-career ready. With a focus on robust STEM education, faculty members at Worcester Tech are preparing students for careers in highly technological industries. In recognition of this academic excellence and improved student achievement, Worcester Tech was recently named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education.

Worcester Tech is a well-respected institution in our city, and students of the school have demonstrated their commitment to giving back to Worcester by completing various community service projects that range from land maintenance and water testing to constructing a low-income LEED certified house. The school has also partnered with institutions of higher learning to advance their knowledge. For example, Worcester Tech recently partnered with Worcester Polytechnic Institute to construct a modular, zero-energy home and compete in a Solar Decathlon in Datong, China.

Additionally, Worcester Technical High School is leader in robotics education. The school is home to the nationally recognized Robotics and Automation Technology Team

known as the Tech-Know Commandos, winners of the 2013 VEX Robotics World Championship trophy.

All of this would not be possible without the talented faculty and staff of Worcester Technical High School, including Principal Sheila Harrity. Ms. Harrity has demonstrated a deep passion for and commitment to advancing educational outcomes for the students of Worcester Tech, and has transformed the school into an innovative learning center. Her incredible efforts have earned her the 2014 National High School Principal of the Year award by MetLife and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

I'm so proud to represent the faculty, students, and staff of Worcester Tech, a leader in career and technical education, and look forward to their future successes. I ask you to join me in congratulating Worcester Technical High School for being selected as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School, and in honoring Principal Sheila Harrity for her lifelong commitment to education.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SYLVIA FRASIER

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute and to honor the life of Sylvia Frasier, who was one of 12 dedicated civilian employees and contractors that were senselessly murdered at the Navy Yard in Washington, DC, on September 16. Mass shootings are always difficult to bear. My heart breaks for their loved ones and for the tight-knit military, government, and contractor community found in the Washington metropolitan area.

As her funeral service is tomorrow at the Rhema Christian Center Church in Northeast Washington, DC, I want to remember the legacy Ms. Frasier leaves behind. She earned a bachelor of science in computer information systems and a master's in information systems. Ms. Frasier worked at Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) as an information assurance manager since 2000. Her duties at NAVSEA included providing policy and guidance on network security, and assuring that all computer systems operated by the headquarters met Department of Navy and Department of Defense requirements.

According to those that knew her best—her family and colleagues—Ms. Frasier was a friend to everyone she met and a stranger to no one. One friend stated that her personality was "bright, just like her blond hair, and lit up a room." A colleague at work recalled what she would miss most about Sylvia are all the jokes they shared at the beginning of their phone calls before they got down to business. In a statement, her family said "if there are any words to describe her, it would be faithful, family oriented, and dedicated professional."

Ms. Frasier's outgoing personality just wasn't suited to sitting still. She had choir rehearsal every Saturday morning, church on Sunday mornings, lots of travel for the Navy, friends and family to spend time with, and yet she still worked a second job in the evenings and on weekends because she was a people person.

Ms. Frasier was a deaconess, altar counselor, and member of the arts and music ministry at Rhema Christian Center Church. So, her faith was obviously very important to her.

Sylvia Frasier's record of service was characterized by sacrifice, by hard work and dedication to duty, and most of all by achievement. She leaves behind a legacy of service that others can aspire to.

Now that her time on earth has come to a needlessly premature end, it is my hope that Sylvia Frasier has found the peace she has earned. On behalf of this House, I extend the thanks of a grateful nation and our sincere condolences to James and Eloise Frasier, her parents; each of her siblings and their families; and to the many friends whose lives she touched. My thoughts, prayers, and deepest sympathy go out to all of the victims of this horrendous tragedy and their families. May God continue to comfort and sustain each of you.

HONORING GRANT MICHAEL DOWNES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Grant Michael Downes. Grant is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Grant has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Grant has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Grant has become a member of the Order of the Arrow and led his troop as Patrol Leader. Grant has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Grant led an effort to assist inner city youth participating in soccer through the Police Athletic League.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Grant Michael Downes for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today I am glad to lend my support to legislation that will provide for a one-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools program. The Secure Rural Schools program provides needed funding to counties nationwide, and these payments are critical to Oregon's rural timber counties. The funding supports vital public services, including emergency personnel, schools, and infrastructure, and it represents our commitment that Federal forest policy shouldn't drive rural counties into bankruptcy.

But this is only a one-year extension, and Oregon's rural timber counties need long term certainty. Congress must help these counties develop a long term solution to their revenue problems, one that strikes a balance between increasing timber yields on Federal forest land and environmental conservation. This is a difficult process, and although we are making progress, counties need relief right away. For this reason, I strongly support this one-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools program, and will continue to work on a lasting solution with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I am also pleased to support the main purpose of this legislation, which is to allow for the continued functioning of the Federal Helium Reserve. This program supports important work across a broad spectrum of industries, from chemistry research in our public universities to semiconductor manufacturing done by high-tech firms in Oregon's First Congressional District. The House and Senate have reached a noble, bipartisan solution to guarantee the uninterrupted supply of this critical resource. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

ASSAULT AND MURDER AGAINST THE MEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, not all is well in the world. In the 21st century, there is still a fight that must be fought against those bent on killing innocent people. These people's crime? Simply wanting to be left alone and live how they please. In the early morning hours of September 1, Iraqi gunmen raided Camp Ashraf. Camp Ashraf is a camp out in the hinterlands of Iraq where members of an Iranian opposition group used to live after Iran started executing their Members. But 2 years ago most residents were forced to move to a new camp closer to Baghdad and out of over 3,000 people originally at Camp Ashraf, only about 100 remained in the camp on the morning of the attack. By the time the sun came up, they had killed fifty-two unarmed residents and kidnapped seven more. I have seen footage of the attack. Unarmed civilians are running around trying not to get shot while the evildoers systematically gun them down. The evildoers were not trying to talk. They were trying to kill. And they succeeded. A United Nations delegation conducted a visit to the camp the next day and verified that the 52 deceased had "suffered gunshot wounds, the majority of them in the head and the upper body, and several with their hands tied." These people were executed when they had not done anything wrong. They had no weapons. They did not pose a threat to anyone. They were murdered in cold blood. To make matters worse, this isn't even the first time that something like this has happened. Despite repeated assurances by the Iraqi government that they will be safe and protected, since 2012 alone, 113 members have been killed in five separate attacks. It should be clear to all by now that the Iraqi government cannot be

trusted to keep these refugees safe. I have traveled to Iraq several times. On my last trip, I asked Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki to let me visit Camp Ashraf. He refused. It seemed like he had something to hide. Mr. Speaker, there were 7 hostages taken on September 1. All we know is that they are somewhere in Iraq still. If we don't find these hostages soon, it is almost certain that they will be killed in Iraq or taken to Iran and executed. Our government must do everything in its power to secure their release. And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I missed the following votes: H.R. 1961—To amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line. H. Res. 354—Providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 527, with an amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall No. 484, "yes" on rollcall No. 485.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I regret I missed votes on September 27, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote "yes" on Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412—Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act. Further, I would have also voted "yes" on H.R. 3096 to designate a Federal Bureau of Investigation building as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center."

A meeting in Detroit to address the economic situation of the City with senior White House officials, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Shaun Donovan, Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx, and Attorney General Eric Holder and others in the Michigan Congressional Delegation was the reason for my absence. Additionally, Governor Rick Snyder, Mayor Dave Bing, and Emergency Manager Kevyn Orr were in attendance. I felt my participation vital to the interests of my constituents.

HONORING TRISTAN MICHAEL OTT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tristan Michael Ott. Tristan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tristan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tristan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tristan has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Tristan has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Tristan completed a much needed landscaping project at St. Therese School in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tristan Michael Ott for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, today's legislation proposes to give two of the world's largest, foreign-owned mining companies—Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton—2,400 acres of the Tonto National Forest, which has been protected since 1955, in exchange for land the companies currently own. The companies believe the Federal land contains significant copper ore deposits.

I am not opposed to responsible domestic energy and mineral production as long as Americans get full value for the use of their resources and environmentally sensitive areas are protected. Today's legislation does not meet either test. The bill includes a convoluted appraisal process that fails to take into account the copper deposit on the land and requires no future royalty payments for that resource. It does not require mitigation or even analysis of damaging effects on the local ecosystem, waiving environmental review and Endangered Species Act protections. Finally, the bill does not guarantee preservation of traditional Native American sacred sites.

Ultimately, the bill gifts an environmentally sensitive and historically significant area to a foreign company without proper review or compensation for the American taxpayer. I urge a no vote.

HONORING CHARLES M. GOSSELIN III

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Charles M. Gosselin III. Charles is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Charles has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Charles has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Charles has earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a member of the Order of the Arrow. Charles has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Charles designed and constructed a changeable billboard sign, along with the accompanying landscaping, at Divine Mercy Park in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Charles M. Gosselin III, for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JACK E. HIGHTOWER

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House that one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Jack E. Hightower, has passed away at the age of 86.

Jack Hightower was the very definition of a Texas gentleman and leader, leading a life of public service until his death. His life-long dedication to serving his country began with military service during World War II, before going on to become a lawyer, a member of the Texas House, District Attorney, member of the Texas Senate, U.S. Congressman, Assistant Attorney General of Texas, and later, Justice of the Texas Supreme Court.

He was born in Memphis, Texas, to Floy and Walter Hightower on September 6, 1926. After graduating from Memphis High School, he enrolled in summer classes at Baylor University. However, that fall he joined the Navy and served two years during World War II. After being discharged, he returned to Baylor where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree, followed by a law degree. It was during this time that he married his wife, Colleen Ward, of Tulia, Texas. He joined the Storey, Storey and Donaghey law firm in Vernon, Texas, and soon thereafter, served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1953–1955. He was appointed District Attorney for the 46th Judicial District, followed by a term in the Texas Senate for the 23rd District. In 1966, he was elected to the new 30th Senatorial District and eventually became President Pro-tempore of the Texas Senate. During his service as a Texas State Senator, he received a Doctor of Laws degree from Howard Payne University.

Mr. Hightower served the constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1974 to 1985. After Congress, he served as Assistant Attorney General of Texas. He was then elected to the Texas Supreme Court, where he stayed until 1996. In 1999, Mr. Hightower was

appointed by President Clinton as a Commissioner on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, where he served until 2005.

His passion for Texas was only surpassed by his love for God, his family, his church, and Freemasonry of Texas. Jack was an active member of the First Baptist Church, not only in Vernon, Texas, where he spent most of his life, but also in Austin, Texas, the latter part of his life.

Jack was a member for over fifty years and Past Master of Vernon Lodge #655, Vernon, Texas. He also belonged to University Lodge #1190, Austin, Texas, and the Texas Lodge of Research. He served the Grand Lodge of Texas as District Deputy Grand Master, Grand Orator, member of the Masonic Jurisprudence Committee, and was elected to serve as Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Texas in 1972.

Jack was also a Knight of the York Cross of Honor, a member of the Red Cross of Constantine, and a Thirty Third Degree, Scottish Rite Mason, and served as the Sovereign Grand Inspector General of Texas. Jack was also a member of the Maskat Shrine, Wichita Falls, Texas, and served on the boards of the Scottish Rite Hospital in Dallas, Texas, and the Scottish Rite Dormitory at the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, and the Scottish Rite Education Association of Texas.

Jack is survived by his wife, Colleen, and his three daughters, Ann Thornburg; Amy Brees; and Alison Suttle.

With more than 50 years of public service, Jack Hightower will always be remembered for his selfless devotion to the people of his State and his country. Whether holding a position at a local, state, or national level, he always put the interests and considerations of his country above all else—the living embodiment of a public servant. He will surely be missed.

HONORING OUR GOLD STAR MOTHERS OF UTICA, NEW YORK

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of this Nation's Gold Star Mothers, especially those in New York State and in particular in New York's 22nd Congressional District.

It is fitting that we recognize the American Gold Star Mothers, whose sons and daughters have died in defense of the ideals of individual liberty. On Sunday, September 29, 2013, our Utica chapter will host its Gold Star Mother's Day at 2 p.m. at the CPT George A. Wood Postal Facility at 100 Pitcher St. in Utica, New York.

This day is made possible in large part due to the Vietnam Veterans of America Chapter 944, which annually honors our Gold Star Mothers and families during this event complete with Color Guards, a rifle salute, the singing of our national anthem, and a wreath-laying at Gold Star Mothers monument.

Our Gold Star Mothers should be honored and offered respect and gratitude for their personal sacrifice. Gold Star Mother's Day is intended to honor women who deserve special recognition and gratitude for their tremendous personal loss on behalf of our country.

During the early days of World War I, a Blue Star was used to represent each Soldier in military service of the United States, and as the war progressed and Soldiers were killed or wounded in combat or died from wounds or disease, a Gold Star superimposed over the Blue Star designated the loss of these individuals. This tradition recognized Soldiers for their ultimate sacrifice to our country and the Gold Star offered families an outward symbol by which to honor the loss of a loved one.

Our Gold Star Mothers serve as the strength and inspiration for this country. They are part of an exclusive group—one that no one ever hopes to belong. One can imagine that there is no pain more far-reaching or deeper than losing a child.

While it's not possible to ever find solace in losing a child, our Gold Star Mothers find comfort in the women standing beside them. Their hurt may be soothed by knowing the lives of their sons and daughters live on through them. Their children live not only in their hearts, but in the heart of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe to serve one's country—particularly during times of war—is one of the most noble and selfless acts available to man. I urge all of my colleagues to appreciate the services rendered to the United States by the mothers of America who have strengthened and inspired our Nation throughout history. May we always honor the Gold Star Mothers of America for their courage and their strength.

IN RECOGNITION OF GENE RUDDY FOR RISKING HIS LIFE TO SAVE THE LIVES OF OTHERS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patrolman Gene Ruddy, whose heroic action saved the lives of at least eight people in Dunmore, Pennsylvania on Saturday, September 21, 2013. Patrolman Ruddy was on patrol just after 2:00 a.m. Saturday on Chestnut Street when he smelled smoke nearby. He immediately searched the area near Chestnut and Drinker Street and looked for the source. He saw smoke coming from 113 Chestnut Street, a building that housed five apartments and a business.

As he approached the building, Patrolman Ruddy saw flames and he knew he needed to act quickly. He called 911 and ran into the building through a stairwell. Patrolman Ruddy went to the second-floor apartment that appeared to be the source of the growing blaze. He yelled into the apartment, pounding on the door, but no one responded. Undaunted, he ran up to the third floor to make certain the building was completely evacuated. Fortunately, he found a group of several young adults who were completely unaware the building was on fire and guided the group to safety.

Patrolman Ruddy ran to the neighboring apartment, breaking down the door and evacuating a family of three. Shortly thereafter, the situation escalated and the building became too dangerous to re-enter. Thankfully, by that time fire fighters had arrived on the scene.

Patrolman Gene Ruddy is, in every sense of the word, a hero. Without a moment of hesitation, he risked his own life to remove several people from grave danger. Patrolman Ruddy deserves full recognition from his community and country for his acts of valor in the line of duty.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THE UPDATED GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF ACUTE CERVICAL SPINE AND SPINAL CORD INJURIES

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 12,000 spinal cord injuries every year in the United States. These injuries most often result in temporary or permanent loss of sensation and paralysis, and they can forever change the lives of those who have been injured. However, thanks to the dedication of top scientists and medical professionals across the country, we hold out hope for more effective treatments, and one day, a possible cure.

In recognition of September as Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month, we'd like to take this time to acknowledge the leadership of several neurosurgeons who worked diligently to review and update the Guidelines for the Management of Acute Cervical Spine and Spinal Cord Injuries, published in the March 2013 edition of Neurosurgery. This work describes the ''state of the literature'' with regard to the treatment of patients with cervical spine and spinal cord injuries and is a useful guide to help clinicians make important decisions in the care of their patients.

The contributing members of this work include Mark N. Hadley, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Beverly C. Walters, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham and Inova Health System in Falls Church, Virginia; Bizhan Aarabi, Department of Neurosurgery, University of Maryland; Sanjay S. Dhall, Department of Neurosurgery, Emory University; Daniel E. Gelb, Department of Orthopaedics, University of Maryland; Mark R. Harrigan, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham; R. John Hurlbert, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary in Alberta, Canada; Curtis J. Rozelle, Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham and Children's Hospital of Alabama; Timothy C. Ryken, Iowa Spine and Brain Institute, University of Iowa; Nicholas Theodore, Division of Neurological Surgery, Barrow Neurological Institute.

Mr. Speaker, the standardization and refinement of surgical techniques over the last decade embodied in this work is a substantial accomplishment. It is a testament to the experience and dedication of its contributors, and I, along with Representatives TERRI A. SEWELL, ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, JOHN LEWIS, BRUCE L. BRALEY, and ED PASTOR, hope you will join us in recognizing them for their impressive work. Due to their commitment, numerous lives are improved daily through the increased understanding and treatment of spinal cord injuries.

REMEMBERING MR. NELSON DRAPER, SR.

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Mr. Nelson Draper, Sr. of Barstow California who passed away on Sunday September 22, 2013.

After being recruited to join the U.S. Marine Corps in 1944, Draper joined the ranks of 420 others who used their native language to aid the United States military in World War II. At the age of 25, Draper left his home on the Navaho Indian Reservation in Chinle, Arizona to become a Navajo Code Talker. At the time of his passing, aged 93, Mr. Draper was the sole Code Talker veteran in San Bernardino County. The Navajo language was chosen as a secret weapon in the United States' war efforts because it was impossible for a non-Navajo speaker to learn and it had no written form. Before the use of Code Talkers, it would take military personnel up to two hours to encrypt and decipher secret codes. In 2001, Draper was recognized with one of the highest awards bestowed by this body, the Congressional Silver Medal. After his retirement from the Marine Corps, Mr. Draper and his wife moved to Barstow where he worked at the Marines Corps logistics base for more than thirty years.

Today, I join with the City of Barstow and the whole country in remembering a great Marine, citizen, and family man. My thoughts and prayers are with Draper's wife, Lena, their seven children, thirty-five grandchildren, and forty-nine great grandchildren.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF GLORIA JOHNSON

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I mourn the passing of one of San Diego's greatest advocates for women's and LGBT equality, Gloria Johnson.

Gloria Johnson has moved on but her legacy as a San Diego champion of limitless equality will not be forgotten. Gloria has participated and organized civil rights and peace movements for more than 50 years. She has received many awards and honors that make evident her commitment to equality for all.

Gloria's commitment to humanity was not only apparent in her volunteerism, but also through her professional career as a social worker. While working for the County of San Diego, Gloria was one of the first in San Diego County to work with people diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in the AIDS Case Management Program.

After Gloria retired from her 30 years as a social worker with San Diego County, she was just getting started. Not only was Gloria committed to equality for women and LGBT issues, she was committed to working closely with elected officials on all levels to create the progress she so deeply sought.

Gloria was even more in life than the impressive list of her accomplishments on paper. Having worked closely with her for decades, I remember her energy and her unforgettable smile. She was just so vibrant. Gloria was always there at big events in San Diego and small ones wearing stickers and buttons proclaiming loud and clear what she thought needed to happen. I can remember so many times pulling up in the parking lot for an event and seeing her tiny car covered in clever bumper stickers already there and knowing that Gloria would be there as always, early and enthusiastic. Gloria's positive vibe and commitment to justice year in and year out were simply contagious.

I'm glad she got to bear witness to so much progress in her lifetime. She was so proud of the women and gay and lesbian people in public office in San Diego and of all the milestones those two movements achieved in the past half century thanks to Gloria and those like her.

As we all remember Gloria's strong commitment to equality, let's commit to working hard for women and members of the LGBT community so we can ensure that Gloria's life work will not be in vain.

HONORING MR. EDGAR B. HATRICK III

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Edgar B. Hatrick III, who will be receiving a Loudoun Laurels Medal for his lifetime of civic leadership in the Loudoun County community.

Mr. Hatrick is receiving the award in the category of "Extraordinary Stewardship" on October 11th, 2013 at the River Creek Club in Leesburg, Virginia. The Loudoun Laurels Medal recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the common good in our region.

Mr. Hatrick has been a tireless advocate for quality public education in Loudoun County. His tenure with the Loudoun County Public School System began in 1967 as an English teacher at his alma mater, Loudoun County High School. He worked in a variety of roles within the Loudoun County Public School System, including chair of the English Department and Assistant Principal at Broad Run High; principal of Loudoun County High School, then director of special education, guidance supervisor, foreign language supervisor, director of instruction, and assistant superintendent for planning and pupil services. He has served as the superintendent of the Loudoun County Public School System since 1991.

I want to commend Mr. Hatrick for his work to make public education in Loudoun County a model for the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my staff, especially Mr. Isaac Fong, for his dedication and hard work on the issue of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

RECOGNIZING DR. LOURDES FERRER

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Dr. Lourdes Ferrer, a nationally recognized scholar and researcher with an extraordinary life story.

Growing up in a disadvantaged family in Puerto Rico, Dr. Ferrer came to value the importance of education at an early age. She knew that the way for her to get out of the cycle of poverty was through education.

After completing her undergraduate degree in mathematics she moved to Guatemala, where she established schools, an orphanage, feeding centers and clinics. When she later moved to the United States to pursue the American dream, she overcame enormous financial, linguistic and cultural barriers and became a teacher. Despite all of these obstacles, she continuously prevailed and completed a doctoral degree in leadership and took a position to help schools implement improvement programs.

Today, she works as an academic consultant for numerous school districts throughout the state of Illinois and the nation, designing programs to increase the academic achievement of all students and close the academic achievement gaps between diverse student populations. Notably, she has also started a $1,000 scholarship to help female Hispanic students who excel in mathematics, attend college and have the same opportunities that she had.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Ferrer for her remarkable dedication to helping our students and our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, I missed the following votes: H.R. 1961, H. Res. 354. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H. J. Res. 59, Continuing Appropriations Resolution, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6971–S7009

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1556–1559. **Page S7007**

Measures Passed:

Continuing Appropriations Resolution: By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 209), Senate passed H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, after taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S6971–92**

Adopted:

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 208), Reid/Mikulski Amendment No. 1974, to perfect the joint resolution. **Pages S6971, S6992**

Withdrawn:

Reid Amendment No. 1975 (to Amendment No. 1974), to change the enactment date. **Pages S6971, S6991**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 79 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 206), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the joint resolution. **Page S6991**

Reid Motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 1976, to change the enactment date, fell when cloture was invoked on the joint resolution. **Page S6971**

Reid Amendment No. 1977 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1976), of a perfecting nature, fell when the motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 1976 fell. **Page S6971**

Reid Amendment No. 1978 (to Amendment No. 1977), of a perfecting nature, fell when Reid Amendment No. 1977 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1976) fell. **Page S6971**

By 68 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 207), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and any other applicable budget points of order with respect to the pending joint resolution and amendments, pursuant to Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. **Page S6991**

National Case Management Week: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 214, designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as "National Case Management Week" to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S7008–09**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that from Friday, September 27, 2013, through Monday, September 30, 2013, the Majority Leader and Senator Boxer be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **Page S7009**

Bruce and Ellis Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader with the concurrence of the Republican Leader, the Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, and Sara Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations, in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S7008**

Messages from the House: **Page S7007**

Measures Referred: Page S7007

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S7007–08

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Page S7008

Additional Statements: Pages S7006–07

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—209) Pages S6991–92

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 4:15 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7009.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 113th Congress:

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security: Senator Warner (Chair).

Subcommittee on Competitiveness, Innovation, and Export Promotion: Senator Blumenthal (Chair).

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 3200–3209; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 66 and H. Res. 362–365 were introduced. Pages H5921–22

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H5922–23

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 185, to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse" (H. Rept. 113–232);

H.R. 579, to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (H. Rept. 113–233);

H.R. 2251, to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse", with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–234);

H.R. 3096, to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center" (H. Rept. 113–235); and

H.R. 2189, to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs, with amendments (H. Rept. 113–236). Page H5921

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Poe (TX) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H5887

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Alexander, the whole number of the House is 432. Page H5887

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013: Concurred in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412, to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 491 and Pages H5888–90, H5894

Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center Designation Act: H.R. 3096, to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center", by a ⅔ recorded vote of 403 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 492. Pages H5892–93, H5894–95

Recess: The House recessed at 9:40 a.m. and reconvened at 9:57 a.m. Page H5893

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse Designation Act: H.R. 2251, amended, to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse". Pages H5890–92

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, September 28th, for morning hour debate and 12 noon for legislative business. **Page H5896**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5899.

Senate Referral: S. 1348 was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce. **Page H5920**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5894, and H5894–95. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:16 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to receive a briefing by the Office of the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on its investigation of career employee John Beale, 4 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, and Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, September 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), the Majority Leader will be recognized.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Saturday, September 28

House Chamber

Program for Saturday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1392
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1389
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1394
Chu, Judy, Calif., E1390
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1393
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1395
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1393, E1395
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E1392
Foster, Bill, Ill., E1395
Garcia, Joe, Fla., E1391
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1391, E1392, E1393, E1393
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E1394
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1390
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E1395
Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E1389
Langevin, James R., R.I., E1394
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1389, E1390
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1391
Marino, Tom, Pa., E1389
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E1395
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1391
Pittenger, Robert, N.C., E1390
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1392
Roby, Martha, Ala., E1389
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E1393
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1393
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1390, E1395

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.