United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 No. 132

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your Spirit in the decisions they make and be mindful of the millions of Americans who rely upon them to consider the welfare of the Nation in the negotiations of this day.

All this day and through the week, may they recall Your words spoken through the prophets, to be mindful of the most vulnerable among us, and so to do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARDNER 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUENTS PLEAD FOR REPRIEVE FROM OBAMACARE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every day, I appreciate concerned constituents reaching out to me and expressing their very real experiences with the health care takeover.

Jennifer from Chapin says:

> ObamaCare will put us out of business and make health insurance unaffordable for our family.

Charlotte from Batesburg writes:

> I do not feel our economy can afford ObamaCare. I am retired, with a history of lung cancer, and my followup care would be denied under this plan.

Terry from Aiken pleads:

> Do whatever you can to stop this. It will be an oppression of the people of this country both in terms of health care and jobs.

Sarah from North Augusta has valid concerns for the Nation's future:

> Our company has already spent time and money to be compliant with the plan, but there are many ''what ifs.'' This cannot be a funded plan.

Melissa of nearby Greenwood is correct:

> Free ticket, no show, putting people in need at risk.

I am grateful the House is making every effort to protect the American people from the unsustainable, unaffordable health care takeover law, which destroys jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THE FIRST NAME IN OUR COUNTRY IS ''UNITED''

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, 12 hours. In about 12 hours, we threaten to shut this government down.

Now is the time to exhibit leadership, Mr. Speaker. You are the leader of this body. It has Democrats and Republicans, so we've got to take the best ideas out of both parties. Negotiations can't take place just between conservative Republicans and Tea Party Republicans.

I stand here ready to work with you, Mr. Speaker. We've got ideas. Let's take the best ideas out of both parties. Let's put them together, and put the American people first.

This is the United States of America. The first name in our country is ''United.'' We've got to stop fighting, and we've got to start fixing these problems. We've got to come together and put we, the people, first—the American people.

Take the best ideas from Democrats and Republicans, and let's start working together. Mr. Speaker, my office is open, and I stand ready to work.

Printed on recycled paper.

OBAMACARE NOT READY FOR PRIME TIME

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as I travel around my district and travel around the country, the American people are worried about their jobs. They are worried about their incomes rising because they are all under pressure. The economy is not growing.

Why isn't it growing?

One of the issues that is standing in the way is ObamaCare—the fact that nobody knows what the rules are. Employers are scared to death to hire new employees and are cutting the hours of many of their current employees.

And for what reason?

This law is not ready for prime time.

The House has done its work. We passed a bill on Saturday night—and sent it to the United States Senate—that would delay ObamaCare for 1 year and would eliminate permanently the medical device tax that is costing us tens of thousands of jobs that are being shipped overseas.

The Senate decided not to work yesterday.

My goodness. If there is such an emergency, where are they?

It's time for the Senate to listen to the American people—just like the House has listened to the American people—and pass a 1-year delay of ObamaCare and a permanent repeal of the medical device tax.

CLIMATE CHANGE CAUSED BY HUMAN ACTIVITY

(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, on Friday, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published their latest report, confirming that climate change is happening and that it is the result of human activity.

The report was produced by 259 scientists from 39 different countries over the last 6 years, and it is the most comprehensive and authoritative assessment of the Earth's changing climate. The report shows that climate change is real, and it shows the urgency to reduce humankind's CO_2 emissions. The scientists now have 95 percent confidence that their findings are correct.

Mr. Speaker, the science is not up for debate. Human-caused climate change is happening. The evidence is overwhelming. Science shows that, if we fail to curb our carbon emissions, we will face catastrophic consequences.

We cannot continue to ignore this overwhelming scientific consensus. Let's work together to reduce our CO_2 emissions and prevent the most severe weather events.

THE SENATE NEEDS TO HUSTLE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just hours before a critical deadline for this country, the Democrat Senate is MIA.

On Saturday evening, House Republicans sent them a second legislative proposal to keep the government open, and the Senate is sitting on it. They have yet to take action or to even come in to work.

Make no mistake—the House is committed to keeping the government open. We are open to compromise. We know that's required of a Congress comprised of a Republican House and a Democrat Senate. That's why we have taken steps to come to the middle and find common ground. Our most recent proposal to keep the government open fully funds critical services, protects troop pay, provides fairness for all Americans under ObamaCare, and permanently stops ObamaCare's medical innovation tax.

There is so much potential for bipartisan efforts to advance this legislation in the Senate, but Senator REID needs to bring up the proposal and adopt an attitude that is broader than ''our way or the highway.'' There is time left for us to work together. The Senate needs to hustle.

REPUBLICANS: CYNICAL, NOT SERIOUS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the government shutdown Republicans manufactured by sending a proposal to the Senate they know is unacceptable and is not workable, there is an opportunity for Republican colleagues to show that they are serious and not cynical:

They could eliminate from their budget the savings of a half trillion dollars that ObamaCare would generate;

If they are serious and not cynical, they could bring their own spending bills to the floor. Remember, they abruptly stopped working on the spending bills last summer as they figured out that the T–HUD bill was so bad that their own Members wouldn't vote for it;

If they are truly serious about working in a cooperative fashion and negotiating out differences, then the Republicans should allow a conference committee to be appointed to work out the differences between the House and the Senate Budgets.

If you are serious about working together to solve problems, why don't you work together to solve problems?

IN HONOR OF JANE CALVO

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor one of my constituents from Henderson County, Jane Calvo, on her retirement after nearly 26 years in a career with the Federal service.

Mrs. Calvo spent the early part of her career in the Foreign Service with the State Department. For nearly 4 years, she served in the U.S. Embassy in Costa Rica. After some time away, she served as an exceptional district caseworker for one of my predecessors, former Representative Charles Taylor, for the entire eight terms of his service in Congress. Most recently, since 2007, Mrs. Calvo has worked at the Social Security Administration in western North Carolina.

Mrs. Calvo first moved to Henderson County 35 years ago, and her exemplary record of service to our Nation in her various roles merits the highest commendation, and I am proud to have her as a constituent.

Madam Speaker, today, I wish Mrs. Calvo all the best in her retirement, where she will have more time to spend with her husband of 40 years, Alfredo, and her two adult sons, Al and Michael. On behalf of the 11th District, I thank Mrs. Calvo for her distinguished career of service to this great country.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, instead of working with Democrats to prevent a shutdown, House Republicans have passed two bills that have no chance of becoming law. They are the 42nd and 43rd votes on undermining the Affordable Care Act.

While the old saying goes, ''if at first you don't succeed, try, try again,'' I say to my colleagues across the aisle: stop trying to shut down the Government of the United States of America.

Democrats have offered a compromise in which Republicans get the spending levels they want. It is time to stop pandering to the Tea Party and to do what is right—pass the Senate compromise and avoid a shutdown driven solely by radical Republicans.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago, one of the chief proponents of the President's health care bill in Colorado said this:

Your health insurance plan is being cancelled, and that's a good thing.

Yet President Obama said, If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health plan—period.

Over the past month, thousands of people around Colorado and this country have started receiving letters, notices, that their health insurance plans

that they liked—that they were promised they would be able to keep—are being cancelled. We heard promises from the President that they could keep them, and yet here we are—cancellation after cancellation.

The House has passed legislation to keep the government open; but to make sure that ObamaCare doesn't continue to be the drain on our economy, let's do the right thing—let's pass a bill, fund the government—and keep ObamaCare from doing harm to the American people.

□ 1015

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the Speaker say that the House has done its work by delaying ObamaCare. I'd like to remind the Speaker and all my colleagues on the GOP side that the work that has to be done is to pass a budget to keep the government open.

The issue of ObamaCare is over. It was resolved in the last Presidential election when the President was reelected and said that he was going to continue with it. Why do we continue to talk about ObamaCare? I assure my colleagues on the Republican side that people in my district are clamoring for ObamaCare. They want to sign up so that they can get health insurance and affordable health insurance.

That's not what we should be litigating here today. The fact of the matter is that Republicans are saying, It's my way or the highway. They're saying that if you don't agree to delay ObamaCare, we're not going to pass a budget and we're going to shut the government down. That is not leadership. They're in charge. They're the majority here. They're supposed to do their business and not try to go to the 45th and 46th vote on ObamaCare.

I could sit here and say I'm not going to vote for a budget unless you agree to pass gun safety legislation. That's not the way this place is supposed to operate.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and fellow Members of Congress, 10:15 in the morning. Where is the United States Senate? I was here until 12:30 yesterday morning.

As I recall, we passed a bill to keep the government open and we passed a bill that had compromise. Most Republicans voted over 40 times to repeal ObamaCare, but we agreed to just a 1-year delay in implementation. The President has already agreed to a delay of a year for employers. Why not for the American people in a train wreck that's about to happen to try to get our act together because people do need health care? Where was the United States Senate yesterday?

I say they were AWOL. They were not here. They don't come in until 2 p.m. today, and then they'll jam a bill through the House and Senate and try to make it look good.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we are just a day away from the opening of ObamaCare's exchanges, and it seems like every day there is more bad news that comes out about the health care law.

What the American people will be seeing once ObamaCare begins is a far cry from what they were promised. The American people were promised that ObamaCare would make health care more affordable; they were promised that there would be more choices; they were promised more coverage. For many Americans, it is already proving to be the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of North Carolina, it is expected that individual market rates will triple for young women and quadruple for young men. Recently, my office received a call from a man whose provider told him that his family's premiums were being raised to over $800 a month.

The administration is not ready for this. Small businesses are not ready for this. Doctors and health care professionals are not ready for this. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not ready for this, and they do not want this.

WHERE CAN THE SENATE BE? GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

The House has offered a compromise. We have passed legislation to fund the government and postpone ObamaCare for a year, but the Senate and the President refuse to work with us, refuse to negotiate, refuse to compromise, even refuse to talk to us.

While we were here until nearly 1 a.m. Sunday morning, the Senate was gone. The President, according to the New York Times, played golf over the weekend. So the President will negotiate with the Iranians, the President will negotiate with the Russians about Syria, but the President and the Senate will not talk to the House. Aren't Americans as important as Syrians, Russians, and Iranians? I guess the Senate and the President have other priorities, but their inaction of talking to us will cause a shutdown.

Where, oh where has the Senate gone? Where, oh where can they be? With time so short and issues so long, where, oh where has the Senate gone?

And that's just the way it is.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats who run this town seem to be in denial about the unworkability of this health care law. The President has said it's worked exactly the way it's supposed to, and HARRY REID has even said it's wonderful. If it's so wonderful, why does the administration continue to issue delay after delay of key provisions for key constituencies?

The truth is, this law is not ready for prime time for anyone. What's more, it's not fair. Not only is it not fair to those who own a business, it's not fair to those who work for one. Frankly, it's not fair for anyone at all.

House Republicans are simply requesting a 1-year delay in its implementation for everyone. That seems fair.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, America's health care system needs reform. There's no denying that. But the law signed by this President is not the answer most Americans are looking for.

We know health insurance is too expensive. The average American family has seen their premiums rise by over $3,000 since 2008. But under ObamaCare, premiums could increase by as much as 413 percent.

We know that young people in America are especially vulnerable. Under ObamaCare, young Americans could end up paying 19 percent to 30 percent more for their insurance.

We also know that far too many of our fellow Americans are left with no insurance coverage at all. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that even after ObamaCare is implemented, 30 million people will still be uninsured.

It's time to defund this law and replace it with commonsense health care reform.

DON'T STICK YOUR FINGERS IN THE LIGHT SOCKET

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of fighting going on right now in this Chamber, and I can tell you that there's nothing better than when I

get to leave Washington and go back home to see my grandkids. Nothing warms my heart more than Emily, Nathan, and Kathryn running up and giving me a hug.

As a grandfather, I find myself giving commonsense advice to my grandchildren. It's funny to tell them obvious things and realize that it seems like sage wisdom to them. ''Emily, look both ways when you cross the street.'' ''Nathan, if you want to be big and strong, you need to eat your vegetables.'' ''Kathryn, always wear your seatbelt.'' Finally, ''Don't stick your finger in the light socket.''

Since the passage of ObamaCare, the economy has stagnated as businesses try to figure out the new rules and the regulations.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

ObamaCare is turning running our Nation into a country of part-time workers as companies try to fall under the 30-hour threshold for their employees.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Premiums are rising rather than falling.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

By the President's own admission, the systems to implement ObamaCare are not yet ready.

Don't stick your finger in the light socket.

Americans are pleading with the Senate and the President to stop sticking their fingers in the light socket.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. NORTON. After 41 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the Republicans want the administration to believe that they now want only a delay. Why don't they state that forthrightly? Why don't they say they are now for the Affordable Care Act, but they want to delay it because of certain issues and bring them forward?

Instead, their call for delay is still about their opposition altogether to the Affordable Care Act. One hundred thousand Americans are already receiving benefits under the Affordable Care Act. Do you really want us to yank them back from benefits that they have never received before? That doesn't make a lot of sense.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). 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.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3174) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3174

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

SECTION 1. EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Transportation may obligate any funds made available to implement section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013, without any limitation on obligations for such projects resulting from a single natural disaster or a single catastrophic failure in a State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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 the bill before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3174 is a bill with a clear and simple goal. This legislation allows the Department of Transportation to obligate previously authorized and appropriated funds for emergency relief projects without limitation to the amount a State can receive for a particular severe weather event. This bill does not increase spending and only applies to funds that have been previously authorized or appropriated.

This bill is consistent with the authorizing language in MAP–21, which we passed with bipartisan support last summer. MAP–21 does not limit how much a State can receive from the emergency relief program for a particular severe weather event.

This bill restores the flexibility provided in MAP–21 to the Department of Transportation to determine how funds that have already been authorized and appropriated should be spent. This bill has bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3174. This legislation would lift the cap on the Federal Highway Administration emergency relief program funds that occur in 2013.

Earlier this month, Colorado experienced historic storms that resulted in severe flooding, landslides, and mudslides. As a result of these severe storms, more than 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed and over 200 miles of roads in Colorado have been affected by the flooding.

Initial estimates by the Colorado Department of Transportation are that damage to roads and bridges as a result of the storm could cost between $430 million and $475 million.

To assist States in dealing with unexpected destruction of surface transportation infrastructure because of natural disasters or catastrophic failure caused by an external event, Congress created FHWA's emergency relief program. This program provides funding to States to make emergency repairs and restore Federal-aid highway facilities to pre-disaster conditions.

While the ER program receives $100 million annually from the highway trust fund, demand for funding from this program usually exceeds this amount and requires supplemental appropriations from general revenues to address the backlog of funding requests from States.

Earlier this year, Congress appropriated $2 billion for the ER program in the Hurricane Sandy relief legislation. This $2 billion appropriation was intended to address rebuilding highways in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, as well as other natural disasters across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the House had a vigorous debate about Hurricane Sandy during that relief bill's consideration, with many of my friends on the other side of the aisle actually opposing the bill, including the sponsor of the legislation we are debating today. Thankfully, a majority of the House stood with our colleagues from States that suffered the incredible destruction as a result of Hurricane Sandy.

I would urge that we stand with our colleagues from Colorado today with the hope that prior opponents of such relief will see how important it is when it affects their own home State to understand that we are all in this together in this country when it comes to natural and catastrophic disasters.

□ 1030

Of the $2 billion provided by that legislation for highway ER projects as a result of Hurricane Sandy and other disasters, approximately $550 million remains available.

In addition to providing additional funding for the ER program, the legislation also restricted the amount that a State could receive of these funds to no more than $100 million per incident, with a separate cap provided for highway repair funds for States affected by Hurricane Sandy.

To address the concern that Colorado could not be fully reimbursed for the

cost of restoring its infrastructure, which could cost more than $400 million, in a timely manner, H.R. 3174 eliminates the $100 million cap on ER funds made available in the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act for all disasters that occur in 2013.

This bill is consistent with changes to the ER program made in the most recent Surface Transportation Authorization Act, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP–21, which also eliminated the historical $100 million cap.

Mr. Speaker, no State can plan for the type of destruction Colorado is dealing with as a result of the severe storms and flooding. That is why the ER program was created. That is why this House passed the Hurricane Sandy Relief Act and made additional highway repair funds available to all States that have suffered such natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174. Let us ensure that Colorado has the support and resources that it needs to rebuild its surface transportation infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative GARDNER.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and appreciate his leadership on this important matter as we try to bring relief to the people of Colorado who have suffered as a result of the floods that began on September 11.

I also thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia for her leadership on this issue as well and for her support of the underlying measure.

Thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and the Appropriations Committee as well, Chairman ROGERS, for supporting and making sure that this legislation moves to the floor as expeditiously as it has.

To the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, I would note that I voted for the $17 billion HAL ROGERS amendment on Sandy, making sure that we had emergency funding through FEMA for all victims of that atrocious storm and disaster. But I also tried to make sure that we had funding for another disaster that had happened in Colorado and the western United States, dealing with wildfires and forest fires.

In fact, I tried to amend the legislation with disaster assistance for Colorado that was rejected and was not allowed to go into the bill, and ultimately, I made a decision based on the fact that we were treating disasters differently. But it's important to know that we do come together for disaster assistance, to make sure that we take care of people who have been harmed around this country.

On September 11, just a couple weeks ago, a flood began that destroyed nearly 2,000 homes and damaged over 17,000 homes. Early reports indicate that almost 25 percent of the buildings at the University of Colorado received some kind of damage.

I have toured with other members of the Colorado congressional delegation—Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, our two Senators, Senator MARK UDALL and Senator BENNETT, as well as Governor Hickenlooper—as we have witnessed firsthand, both on the ground and from the air, the devastation that has taken place.

And for people who are rebuilding lives and rebuilding homes or rebuilding businesses that were lost, today this body takes a great step forward in providing at least one key component of certainty. And that certainty comes into those thoroughfares that allow them to get to and from school, to and from work, and farmers to get their goods to market.

Our transportation system was dramatically impacted by the floods. There were 200 line miles of highway affected. It's as if somebody had made a sand castle, built it, and a wave came and washed it away, a crumpled-up piece of paper, destroying hundreds of miles of Colorado highway. Fifty bridges were wiped out.

The Colorado Department of Transportation initially estimated that between $300 million and $500 million worth of damage was done to our highway system and has now settled on a figure closer to $475 million. I commend the Federal Highway Administration, who swiftly released $35 million to help with the cost of the most immediate repairs; but there must be more that is done.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I thank this body for its support of H.R. 3174, legislation that, with a ''yes'' vote, will not automatically lift the cap for other States that experience severe weather events, but allows the Secretary of Transportation to make that determination.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) noted, this is not a new appropriation. There is no new spending, but it gives flexibility to the Department of Transportation to make decisions that will help the people who have suffered in Colorado.

And as I mentioned, the cap was also raised to $500 million for responses in other areas and other hurricanes—whether it's hurricanes, floods, or other events this country will face. We have an opportunity to help the people of Colorado, the people of this country get back on their feet. And I appreciate the support that this body has given this bill today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding time to me so that I can speak about the catastrophe that we had in Colorado 2½ weeks ago.

Some portions of our State received more rain in 3 days than we get in a year and a half, and that amounted to tremendous flooding. Some people say it's a 200-year flood; others say it's a 500-year flood. But it damaged canyons, homes, businesses, roads up and down the front range of Colorado.

So our delegation has come together. There is some controversy as to the origins of this funding and whether or not the Republicans from Colorado supported this assistance for highways. That's in the past. We are together today because our State needs the assistance.

I rise to ask for quick passage of H.R. 3174, which will enable Colorado to quickly begin the process of rebuilding our damaged infrastructure. Almost 19,000 homes and businesses across Colorado were damaged or destroyed. I had friends, neighbors, and family affected by this storm.

I want to start by thanking our first responders—the police, the firefighters, the Colorado National Guard, the United States Army, and FEMA—for their heroic efforts to save lives. Individuals, volunteers, charities, the State, local, and Federal governments responded as one to help the people of the State of Colorado.

I witnessed firsthand, with Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POLIS, and our Senators and Governor, the National Guard rescuing a stranded family. These men and women, without a doubt, prevented these floods from taking more lives.

The damage throughout the State is catastrophic and truly unbelievable. I represent two counties of the nine that were declared major disaster areas. Now that the waters have receded, it is time to rebuild. At least 200 miles of State and Federal roads were damaged and 50 bridges were either damaged or destroyed by the floods; and that doesn't include local, county, and city streets, roads, and bridges.

In total, the Colorado Department of Transportation is estimating the damage to our State and Federal roads to be about $475 million. The Denver Post reported:

> The flooding that swept through Colorado is the biggest catastrophe to ever strike the State's infrastructure.

Current law restricts funds from this account to $100 million per State per incident. We know the damage to roads, bridges, and infrastructure in our State will well exceed that $100 million. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3174, with my friends in the Colorado delegation, to make sure Colorado has the resources needed to rebuild.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentlewoman.

This bill does not cost a dollar. It simply allows the Secretary of Transportation the flexibility needed for Colorado and other communities impacted by severe weather events this year to rebuild our roads and bridges.

I'm asking all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3174 and help us in Colorado rebuild.

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, September 23, 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, Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, 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.

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 or me should you have questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HUNT,
Executive Director.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative COFFMAN.

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership, as well as our own Congressman CORY GARDNER from the State of Colorado whose district was very significantly impacted by this.

I had the opportunity last Monday to go up with the Vice President, the Governor of the State of Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS, and Congressman CORY GARDNER, whose districts were both severely impacted by the flooding, to see that damage. And it was extraordinary how much—certainly the houses were lost, and we mourn for the people that were lost—but the road damage was extraordinary. There were miles and miles of roads that we saw with whole sections missing.

So this legislation, H.R. 3174, is vital to the State of Colorado to get those roads back to where they're usable and so that, in fact, our residents in those affected areas can get to and from their homes and their businesses.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

As you can tell, not just from what everybody from our congressional delegation has said but also from the many, many news reports that we've seen in the last week, this flood really was one of the worst floods in Colorado's history.

I'm a fourth-generation Coloradan, and I remember some of the previous floods: the flood in 1965 when I was a little girl. In the terrible Platte River flood that flooded Cherry Creek and the Platte, my home was right by there, and we had flood damage. And then, of course, the tragic Big Thompson flood where many, many people

were killed. This is what happens to us in the West sometimes.

Colorado's recent flood is so dramatic that it really was a 500-year flood, or worse. And we feel terrible for the eight Coloradans who have died. Many are still unaccounted for, and we pray for all of them that they may be safe and that their homes may be preserved by the time the snow flies, which is any minute now.

On September 15, President Obama issued a major disaster declaration for Colorado, ordering Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts.

You just cannot overstate the scope of this damage. As you heard from the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), Mr. GARDNER's and Mr. POLIS' congressional districts were severely impacted by this; but all the rest of us were severely impacted in our districts, too.

Boulder had over 16 inches of rain in the course of 5 days. Communities in El Paso, Fremont, Jefferson, Logan, Morgan, Pueblo, Washington, Adams, Larimer, Weld, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, and Denver were all impacted by this. It really was a State issue. Residents have lost their homes. Businesses have been devastated. Communities have been destroyed. Our friends, relatives, and neighbors still are without power. Many of them can't drink their water.

□ 1045

And as you've heard from all of my colleagues, the devastation goes everywhere, from mountain highways to agricultural properties on the plains.

Over 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed, and over 200 miles of Colorado roads have been impacted by the flooding. In the mountain areas, what happens is the roads go along the creeks; so when the creeks turn into raging rivers from this terrible rainfall, then the roads are completely wiped out and the mountain communities are isolated.

As you've heard from my colleagues, the funds for the Emergency Relief program under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 are restricted to $100 million per State per incident, unless the funds are being used to repair damage caused by Hurricane Sandy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I'm pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. If we remove the cap on the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds, Colorado can get the assistance and relief we need to rebuild. And since this does not authorize new appropriations, is not an earmark, the budget score is zero.

So I really respectfully request that we all come together and vote for this legislation. It's much needed.

And by the way, this is a good example, Mr. Speaker, of how, if Congress really wants to put its mind together to work on something, we can do it in a civil and efficient and speedy way. This is a thought we should keep in mind as the week progresses in front of us.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I appreciate the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill introduced by my Colorado colleague, CORY GARDNER, to help Colorado rebuild from the floods that have ravaged our State in recent weeks.

The flooding damaged at least 17,000 homes and other structures, several thousand of which were destroyed outright. Millions of dollars of public infrastructure have been washed away. Specifically, over 200 miles of Colorado roads, and at least 50 bridges, have been damaged or destroyed. The floods consumed an area of Colorado that is twice the size of Rhode Island.

Currently, the law caps emergency funding for highways and bridges at $100 million per State. According to a preliminary estimate from the Colorado Department of Transportation, the cost to rebuild our State's roads and bridges is several times that amount.

We are not asking Congress to appropriate any additional funds. We are simply asking that we be able to access money that Congress has already appropriated for reconstruction after a natural disaster. This legislation has a Congressional Budget Office score of zero, meaning it does not add a dime to our national debt.

The flooding was worse in the northern part of the State, but there were heavy rains and flooding even in the southern part of the State, which I represent, and two people, unfortunately, were swept away and lost their lives.

I do thank my colleagues for their consideration of this bill to help the great State of Colorado to rebuild.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this House should be proud to stand with Colorado. Anyone who saw the State seeming to be washed away and floods the likes of which I've never seen in my life would have her heart go out to the residents of the State.

Mr. Speaker, also I know that last week there was a United Nations report that found that, when they surveyed scientists from throughout the world, there was a 95 percent agreement, a 95 percent certainty that climate change is having its effects right now. That is a very high percentage for scientists to give to any issue. We know that a combination of factors produced these thousand-year floods, whatever you want to attach to them, in Colorado. But they certainly were aided and abetted by climate changes.

This House needs to take climate change seriously. As difficult as it is, we're going to see more and more catastrophes like this and, as usual, they will be in places we never expected them. In places where there are not tornados, we will see tornados. In places where there have not been floods, that is what we have seen in just the last few years.

So I certainly am pleased, and I'm sure every Member of this House will be pleased, to stand with the residents of Colorado as they try to recover from this flood which has devastated so many of their citizens.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3174 makes funds already appropriated to the Emergency Highway Relief program available for response to the devastating floods in Colorado this summer. Critically, the bill accomplishes this without providing additional budget authority on net, or increasing the deficit over 10 years.

Under our budget rules, discretionary appropriations that the Congress designates as an emergency are not subject to budget limits and do not have to be offset with other spending reductions. To ensure emergency appropriations are only devoted to emergency requirements, our budget rules do not allow emergency funds to be used as an offset for non-emergency purposes. If this were allowed, it would provide a backdoor means of allowing funds for non-emergency purposes to escape budget limits.

This legislation is attempting to make available funding for flooding in Colorado using funds already appropriated and designated as an emergency by Congress. However, this bill is not an appropriations measure. From a budget scorekeeping standpoint the effect of the bill is to decrease emergency discretionary budget authority and increase non-emergency mandatory budget authority. If this bill instead amended the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–2) and designated the funding for Colorado floods as an emergency, then the purposes of this bill would be accomplished without any scored increase in budget authority. Because there is no effective process for designating mandatory spending as an emergency, the non-emergency mandatory budget authority increase in this bill cannot be offset by the decrease in emergency discretionary budget authority.

In the end, this bill intends to meet new emergency needs making use of existing emergency funds. For that reason, I am going to support this legislation. However, I do not view this as a precedent and will not view a reduction in emergency spending as an appropriate offset for non-emergency funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3174.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S.

1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1348

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 ''Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION.

Section 108 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2013'' and inserting ''October 1, 2018''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect as of October 1, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1348.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1348, the Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1979, Congress enacted the Congressional Award Act to promote initiative, achievement, and excellence among young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old. To earn an award, participants must complete a self-designed program of challenging goals in four program areas: voluntary service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

Program participants can work toward a congressional award certificate or medal. In either category there are three achievement levels: gold, silver, and bronze. Minimum requirements must be met regarding the number of hours devoted to each of the four program areas, total hours worked toward the award, and the duration of the participant's efforts.

Senators and Representatives present the awards at local, city, or State ceremonies. It has been my great pleasure to make such presentations many times. The latest was a presentation of the silver medal earlier this summer to one of my constituents from Lewisville, North Carolina, Shelby Birkedal. Shelby worked more than 200 hours of community and 100 hours of physical activity to earn her very well-deserved honor, and we are very proud of her achievement.

As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would surely agree, it is of great importance to provide support and encouragement to America's young people, particularly when they're learning the value of giving back to their communities and becoming productive, upstanding citizens.

The legislation before us today provides an opportunity simply to extend this worthwhile program through the fiscal year 2018, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the majority and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for bringing this legislation to the floor. This is bipartisan legislation which promotes initiative, achievement, and excellence among young people.

The Congressional Award Act empowers young people to take greater responsibility for their own lives, to discover new talents, to advocate on behalf of others, and to take positive action in the community.

The Congressional Award Program has helped thousands of young people, including some of the most disadvantaged youth, find ways to get involved in public service. It shows young Americans how to set goals and to achieve them. Through this program, these young people gain self-confidence, problem-solving skills, and the ability to work as part of a team, traits that are valued by employers and institutions of higher education.

Since its inception in 1979, this program has grown substantially. Today, total participation in the Congressional Award Program exceeds 35,000 participants. In my home State of California, 6,491 participants have enrolled since 1979, completing over 450,000 hours of community service.

As a nonprofit organization that operates almost exclusively through private donations, the Congressional Award Act is an excellent example of successful public-private partnerships, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Again, I thank the committee for bringing it to the floor.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I'd like to thank my Senate colleagues, and Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware in particular, who worked diligently to ensure this important program is renewed in a timely manner.

Providing these awards to young people in my district has been a great honor and privilege for me throughout my tenure representing North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District. The participants of this program continually inspire me, and I look forward to many more ceremonies in the years to come.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on S. 1348, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1348.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1719

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 2:53 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the resolution H.J. Res 590.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 4:02 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3210.

That the Senate passed S. 1560.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–239) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 367 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 367

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendments to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House recede from its amendments and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 7, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my dear friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 367, of which we're here for today, provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Speaker, at midnight tonight, just a few short hours from now, the Federal Government will shut down if Congress, that is both the House and the Senate, do not act to provide the necessary appropriations to run our government. The legislation before us today will ensure that a shutdown does not happen, and we will take important steps to ensure that ObamaCare, known as the Affordable Care Act, does not have the opportunity to hurt American jobs and continue to drag down our economy by delaying the individual mandate for 1 year. Additionally, this CR will ensure that Congress is not exempt from ObamaCare and that Members and their staffs do not receive a special taxpayer-funded health care subsidy.

These are important issues, Mr. Speaker. They're being talked about all across America today. They were talked about on Sunday at tables all across America as families gathered together about the rightness of what we, as Republicans, are attempting to do, and that is we are attempting to save this country and the American people, the free enterprise system, and free people from having to have a government-run health care system.

This government-run health care system has already been estimated to cost twice what it was expected to do, and since this health care law has come into play, for every one full-time job, there have been six part-time jobs created. We do not want a part-time working America, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, our country cannot be the greatest Nation in the world if we're a part-time working society.

Mr. Speaker, the American people did not agree with this bill at the time it was passed. Despite that, the Democrats rammed this through the House and the Senate, and it was signed by the President in record time while millions of Americans were protesting all across America the same day it was passed in the House.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, this has been an issue that has harmed American businesses. Business leaders, businessmen, unions, and union leaders are all gathering together to say this is the wrong thing to do.

The law takes advantage of those people who have health care today. It is a direct violation of what the President said it would do; and in my State of Texas, if you have a deceptive trade practice, if you sell something one way and the product is another, it is talked about in a way that it would be against the law.

What we're trying to do is change the law. Republicans, over the last few years, have tried to delay it, defund it, get in the way of it, change it, talk about it, and to engage the President of the United States at the highest levels.

We are now at a point where there is a must-pass piece of legislation. Republicans do not intend to shut down the government; but we are insistent, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation that we bring forth today will level the playing field on a terrible piece of legislation.

The American people sense the unfairness, and they have seen it take place in their marketplace, in their workplace. And as we all become unemployed or move to part-time work, we will see that this devastating law of a ''one-size-fits-all for everybody'' health care plan, run by the government, is not a wise way to go. So that's why we're here on the floor today.

Republicans are on the floor today. We were here earlier in the week. We were here last week. We've been here ever since the day it was passed. We are consistent in our behavior. Every single Republican believes this is a bad way to do things. I think business sees that too.

The American people, in a poll of The New York Times and in a CBS poll just last week, 60 percent of those who responded to The New York Times and CBS said that they are not supportive of this bill.

So will someone stand up for the American people? Dadgum right: it's called the Republican Party. Our great Speaker and our great leader, JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, have asked us to come to the floor today to move a bill; and the Republican Conference is there. We're hoping that the United States Senate and the American people all get together on this, and then President Obama will see the wisdom behind learning from mistakes that have been made in the past.

I have every reason to believe that what we're doing here will be good for the American people. We will listen to the voices, and we will move forth together. We're giving everybody a chance to be heard from today, and tonight will be an opportunity for the American people to know that it was

the Republican Party that stood up on their behalf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague is certainly right: we have been here time after time after time on this issue. But we are standing on the brink of the worst government shutdown in modern history. Unlike 1994, the pending government shutdown would reach across the entire Federal Government. In 1994, half of the congressional appropriations bills had been signed into law by the President; and as a result, those Federal agencies were able to operate through the shutdown.

But this year, because of the draconian budget levels included in the misguided sequester, the majority was unable to pass a single appropriations bill into law. In fact, they ran out of money about halfway—well, certainly after we got through the Defense budget and, for the first time since I have been in Congress, were unable to pass the Transportation bill. And because of that, again, we find ourselves in this terrible position. Now as a result, should the government shut down, it is going to be more harmful and more widespread than the last one.

Mr. Speaker, these are very real and very serious consequences that we face, and it is in the face of these consequences that the majority has chosen to continue what can only be described as dangerous partisan games. We have, indeed, been here before. The first time, the majority wanted to defund the Affordable Care Act, and second, they decided to just delay it. But then on that bill, they threw in a chance to do away with the medical device tax, which will create a trillion-dollar deficit increase over the next 10 years and will hit women's reproductive rights next time.

Just today, we saw the first lady of Texas, Ms. Anita Perry, who said in an interview that abortion should be a woman's right and that she believed that women should have the right to choose; and we thank her for that and couldn't agree with her more.

But now what are we coming up with today? Well, we are not going to back away from anything. We are just going to try to kill the health care bill, which we know we can't do. It's taking effect tomorrow morning.

What we are going to do now, they say, is to delay the mandate, which is a large part of the funding for the bill; and in addition to that, they have decided that Members of Congress and our staff will not be able to get the government copay that most people get. In fact, most people who have health care in America get it from their employer. And we aren't going to be denied from being able to do that because the gentleman from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, who claimed that he made a mistake, inserted that into the bill when he said just this week that he did not mean for us not to be a part of the government health care system, but that somebody had misinterpreted his idea and wrote it wrong. So that's where we are with that today.

But the majority's proposal before us today is going to do that, and they are going to say to all these young people who come to Washington with such promise and such energy and such verve, really, to try to do something good for their country and who look forward so much to being able to have the great privilege of working in the Capitol of the United States that they're not going to have help with their health insurance, driving many of those, I think, to leave and to find other work and others to really not be able to get the health care that they need.

So why did we do that? Heaven only knows. But, frankly, I would be embarrassed—and I have mentioned this in the Rules Committee—to look around the room at the staff that we praise all the time for their ingenuity, for their faithfulness, for their willingness to stay, as we did Sunday morning until 12:30, without ever making a complaint at all and punishing them through health care.

As offensive as this proposal is, it's a fitting example of the vision for America that the majority has. It's a vision of an America where insurance companies are put back in charge of the health care system, where price-gauging and price discrimination go unchecked, where the most vulnerable among us, including cancer patients, the victims of domestic violence and children born with preexisting conditions, could be denied access to health care.

The New York Times did some wonderful pieces on that in The Sunday Times yesterday, talking about people who have been burdened so much that they are literally bankrupt from the cost of health care. This bill takes every step to avoid that in the future.

I'm not sure that people understand that what happens is that we have turned around what used to be the yearly cap that insurance companies would charge their clients and now say that if you are a single person with health insurance, that once you have paid out of pocket $6,400 for medical procedures and medicine, the insurance company then for the rest of the year will pay your costs. What's not to like about that? If you are a family, $12,000 is the cost.

After seeing what we saw yesterday and reading in The Times that people with cancer many times were unable at all to try to even get the care and that we know—and I know from the work that we have done with cancer patients—that many of them go untreated. If there's anything worse than getting cancer, being diagnosed with cancer, it has to be being unable to pay for treatment.

These are the things that the majority wants to do away with. I've never seen so much work in all my life to try to prevent 30 million Americans—our brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, everybody—from being able to have health insurance, many of them for the first time in their lives.

I met a woman in the last campaign who told me that she was so excited because she had just signed up for Medicare. The woman was born with cerebral palsy; and under the present insurance laws, she was not at all insurable. So she went through her whole life, bringing up children, running a household, driving a car, all the things that could cause the kinds of accidents that leave you permanently impaired without a dime's worth of health insurance.

She was not alone in that. Children who had head injuries or other members of the family could often use up their lifetime limit of about $1 million in less than a year, and they were never insurable again in the United States. We're not going to go back to that.

So there's something we can do here today. What we can do is vote this down, go back to the Rules Committee, take up the Senate's clean bill, which is over here at the desk, pass that bill in the House and the Rules, bring it here, pass it in the House in a bipartisan way—by the way, that wouldn't hurt. And then lo and behold, that bill is ready to go to the President's desk, and we could get that signed. A shutdown would be averted. Health care would be available to people who desperately need it and desperately want it.

We should not continue to be the only industrialized country on the face of the Earth that does not provide health care for its people. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and the underlying legislation and demand that we pass the Senate bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentlewoman from New York, my dear friend, makes many, many important points about not only the law that was passed but about maybe some comments about what we're doing here.

I have great sympathy, respect for men and women, people, children, seniors who are born with diseases that sometimes emanate during their lives, great respect for that. And I do agree with the gentlewoman that our government, in a public-private partnership—we are working with States—should, needs to, must create a better system to take care of those who are uninsured, or maybe had been ''uninsurable.''

And this is where, for years, there had been a big debate in Washington about how to best do that. And the facts of the case are real simple: that every time we had an opportunity in the Republican Party to try to get that

done, it became a point of decision-making by the Senate, and they blink. The House many times passed all sorts of bills that would allow people to be insured across State lines, better ways to make larger team sizes for insurance so that risk pools would have a better opportunity to be managed.

But instead of us taking care of some 23 million to 30 million people who were in this circumstance, the bill aimed at 230 million people. And it put rules and regulations and restrictions on business and hiring. And it was less about coverage and more about a hammer from Washington, D.C. There are lots of examples of this; but one of them might be the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which the Democrats wrote into the law that it could not receive any legislative or judicial updating. You could not challenge the law that they decided on of benefits and payments. That's just one part of this outrageously expensive and overbearing health care bill. We've talked about that. We've talked about how expensive it is and how it's causing business—

Delta Air Lines, as an example. And Delta Air Lines has a very good plan. But they came to the administration in February this last year and said, it's going to cost Delta Air Lines $100 million more in just the first year.

□ 1745

Now, that's not helping people. That's highway robbery. That is harming business, harming the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I'm for balance. I'm for reasonableness. I'm for opportunities, and so is my party. But we are not for diminishing the greatest economy in the world by arbitrarily doing it with a one-size-fits-all ObamaCare that not one Republican voted for and that Democrats are still gleeful about.

So we're here today; we've been here for quite some time, as the gentlewoman admitted, yes, day after day. We're kind of relentless about this because we're worried about what's happening. We've seen employment figures, higher taxes, more spending, more government. Oh, by the way, indecision along the way, where the administration really can't figure out what they're doing.

So what we're saying is that we think everybody ought to be into the same bucket that employers are in, and that is we've already delayed it, so we should do the same for individuals.

And we're going to shut down the government over that?

That's the question. We're going to shut down the government, Republicans, because we want to put individuals on the same footing as what President Obama gave a pass to business?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm from Texas, and I recognize that we like freedom and opportunity and less taxes and more opportunities. By golly, we employ a lot of people. But I think the whole country sees this, and what the whole country sees is the reasonableness that the Republican Party comes to the floor—and we're going to keep the battle going—to say we think everybody, at least the individual, ought to be treated the same as business. We think the President of the United States made a mistake, and we're politely, today, trying to say: Mr. President, can we please fix that mistake? Can we please give to the individuals of this country, men and women who pay their taxes and work hard, can we give them equal representation with what you gave to people who run businesses?

Now, I'm a business guy, but I'm also an individual, and that's why the Republican Party is doing what we're doing, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking for anything that's unreasonable. As a matter of fact, we're going to—if I'd hurry up, we could get it quickly to the floor to where we could vote on this, but an explanation's necessary.

Reasonableness, common sense, and doing the right thing, and that's what the Republican Party is here doing. That's what our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, is doing. That's what our awesome majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, is doing.

We are going to bring to the floor—our Republican majority will be here—and we're going to pass this that says we believe the same thing that happens to business, where the Obama administration was not ready for them and so they gave them a pass for a year, we think the same thing is true for individuals.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. As we look up at the clock, we see that there is only 6 hours and 10 minutes to a completely unnecessary and economically harmful government shutdown.

Now, I don't see the junior Senator from Texas on the floor, but I presume that he has signed off on the latest feeble Republican strategy since he seems to be the one calling all the shots around here.

So I say to my Republican friends: Enough. Enough of the gamesmanship; enough of the legislative ping-pong; enough of the high fives and cheers on the floor. It's time to put on your grown-up pants and do your jobs.

It's a job, by the way, that should have been done months ago. The House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. But instead of going to a conference committee to hash out the numbers, the Republican leadership refused to appoint conferees; they refused to negotiate. And, as a result, we are here on the edge of the cliff.

And here's the irony, Mr. Speaker: It's clear to me, at least, that there was a majority in this House, Republican and Democrat, for passing the clean CR sent to us by the Senate. Here's another irony: That clean CR contains the numbers of my Republican friends' beloved sequester, numbers that I believe are far too low.

For the life of me, I don't understand why the Republicans don't declare victory and let us get on with the business of governing. Part of that governing is ensuring that the Affordable Care Act works as well as possible for all the American people. It's the law of the land. It's going to stay that way, and neither the Senate nor the President is going to accept any changes.

Let me just say a word about the so-called Vitter amendment that is included this bill. Unlike what my Republican friends say, the Vitter amendment doesn't make the people who work for us live like everyone else. In fact, it singles them out for special punishment. It says to the people who help us draft legislation, who answer the phones in our offices, and who respond to constituent mail, who help a veteran get his benefits or a high school student apply to the military academies that, unlike every other Federal employee, their employer will not contribute a share toward their health insurance. It's a lousy, lousy thing to do.

And I say to my colleagues, if you want to see an exodus of smart, dedicated people away from Congress, of both parties, if you want to see this place get even dumber, then, by all means, pass the Vitter amendment. Otherwise, we should treat it like the cynical talking point that it is and vote it down.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it's time for my Republican friends to put on their grown-up pants and do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule, reject the underlying bill, and pass a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying continuing resolution to keep the government open, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

This rule, and the bill it brings to the floor, also makes sure that people know that we, in the Congress, will not receive any type of exemption or special benefit under ObamaCare.

For some reason, the national media has given the President a free pass by not calling on him to compromise, or even negotiate at all, to help keep the government open. The Republicans have compromised and have voted to fund the entire government except for only one bill—ObamaCare. If a Republican President were refusing even to negotiate, he would be criticized to high heaven by the national media.

We simply are trying to treat ordinary individuals the same way and give the same delay to individual Americans that was given to big business. I

think this is a very reasonable and moderate approach that Republicans in the House have taken.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, T minus 6 hours and 7 minutes till a shutdown of our Federal Government, the greatest country on the face of the Earth with such a dysfunctional Congress that we can't even keep our own government open. We'll be voting on a bill tonight that will lead to a government shutdown.

Now, look, why will it lead to a government shutdown? It's because we have a separation of powers in our Constitution. This House of Representatives does not unilaterally run the country. We have a House; we have a Senate; we have a President. It takes compromise and working together to move forward as a country. These kinds of positioning bills are fine a month or two before a crisis, but with 6 hours left, all this bill that we will be voting on tonight will do is cause a government shutdown.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this rule so that we can get to a serious discussion about keeping the Federal Government open rather than forcing a shutdown of the Federal Government tonight, which is what will occur if the House of Representatives passes this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the favorite son of Humble, Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House, again, will vote to fund the government, not shut it down. And when we fund the government, we're going to do two things that are in fairness, that do not discriminate against folks:

One thing, we're going to let everybody get a postponement for a year. Why should big business be treated better than the individual citizen? It shouldn't, so let's postpone the whole plan for 1 year.

And also, why should special folks in Washington get exemptions, like the White House, the White House staff, Members of Congress, Members of Congress' staff, leadership staff, committee staff? We should all be under the rules of the law that is passed.

It's interesting, ObamaCare, and Obama is not under ObamaCare, neither is the White House, neither are the Cabinet Members, neither are the staff. Why not? Let's treat everybody alike, not discriminate.

And that's just the way it is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of a shutdown, a brink of sending this Nation over the cliff.

Tonight, I speak to the American people and to my colleagues. We have a very simple task—a task of mercy and grace, a task of adulthood and recognition of our responsibility to keep this government open.

I'd like to shun the party of Marie Antoinette and let them eat cake, or those who would say let's work and play while Rome is burning, or maybe even the former Republican Presidential candidate Bachmann, who says: We're smiling; we got just what we want, a shutdown of the government. I would like to shun that kind of attitude and ask my colleagues to join together in a simple task—to support the clean continuing resolution that would fund this government as we are obligated to do under the Constitution.

We have the purse strings in the House, to make sure that the government works, to make sure that our women and children are served and our veterans are served, to make sure that our parks are open. So all we have to do is a simple task—to stop going over the top and be able to respond as Americans.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I felt obligated to come to the floor tonight to try to set a few things straight. All the words that have been spoken about the amendment from the Senator from Iowa that was in the original Affordable Care Act that was signed by the President in March of 2010, but like so many things that were in the bill that was signed by the President, there were errors. It really wasn't ready for prime time. It was hastily pushed through the Senate, never went through any sort of process in the House after that point, and then got signed into law.

As a consequence—and Senator GRASSLEY has been concerned about this, and he spoke just last week—he said that the original amendment required lawmakers and staffers to enter the ObamaCare exchanges, but he didn't intend for them to lose the employer subsidy. And he said it's frustrating. It's frustrating because if they had let those of us who knew anything about health care draft this amendment, we wouldn't have the controversy.

The Senator said that the Democratic majority leader did not properly draft the statutory language for his amendment, omitting language that would have allowed the staff to keep their employer contributions while in the exchanges. He said repeatedly that the Office of Personnel Management rule was in line with the original intent of the amendment, despite the amendment not being his.

And then Senator GRASSLEY went on to say: You understand that when we adopt an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee, unlike other committees, it's not in legal language. We describe it, but then it went to the majority leader's office, and when they put the statutory language in, they screwed it up.

He said: If you want to know the truth, they had people who didn't know what they were doing. I don't know what their intent was, the Senator continued. My goal, regardless of how the amendment was worded, was that we in Congress need to go into the exchange so we'd have to go through the same red tape as every other citizen.

And that's really what we're doing here tonight, saying that that concept, that Members of Congress go through that same red tape as every other citizen in this country is required to do.

Now, we can talk about things that have been delayed in this bill. Maybe we should spend a few minutes talking about that.

Republicans have tried to short-circuit parts of the Affordable Care Act, but it's actually been the President himself who's been the delayer in chief. Many people forget that there was a Federal preexisting program set up under the Affordable Care Act, but that preexisting program closed its doors to new applicants the 1st of February of this year.

□ 1800

That means for 11 months people are frozen out of the Federal preexisting program. The press has never held the President to account for that.

We heard comments as this debate started off about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses. But, Mr. Speaker, did you realize that those caps on out-of-pocket expenses were in fact suspended by the administration earlier this year? There was very little press about that.

So all of the heralding of good things in the Affordable Care Act, you don't know what it's going to contain when it finally kicks in because the President may stop any part of it, at his discretion.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, a simple question: Why is the Speaker of this House denying this House the opportunity to have an ''up-or-down'' vote on a clean continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government operating tomorrow and beyond? Why is he not allowing a vote? Why is he not allowing Democrats and Republicans together to have a vote on keeping the government open?

Because, Mr. Speaker, if he had that vote, it would pass. It would pass on a bipartisan basis and the government would still be operating. So, apparently, the Speaker is afraid that we

would actually pass a bill to keep the government going.

So why is he not allowing the people's House to do the people's business? Well, we've been seeing this playing out around the country in the last couple of weeks. You've got a far-right extreme Tea Party element in the Republican Party that is dictating what's happening here on the floor of this House. Senator CRUZ is running the show on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, why don't you just quicken it up and pass Senator CRUZ the gavel and let him run the House?

Now why is it that this group of Members wants to shut down the government? Because tomorrow, millions of Americans are going to get access to affordable health care. Millions of Americans are already benefiting from the protections of the Affordable Care Act. But tomorrow, millions more will get access to affordable care.

Republicans are so bent—at least this Tea Party faction—on blocking that from happening and preventing those millions of Americans from getting access to affordable care, they're prepared to shut down this government. That is a scandal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The other thing that's really puzzling is while our Republican colleagues want to shut down the government to prevent the American people from getting access to the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and access to the exchange, where you have a marketplace of different plans being offered and a little help for those who are stretched thin and can't afford it, while our Republican colleagues want to shut down that part and other important parts of the Affordable Care Act, guess what the Republicans kept in their own budget? They kept the Medicare savings. I remember Mitt Romney and the Vice Presidential candidate saying how those were going to be the ruin of the country.

Well, guess what? In the Republican-passed budget that virtually every Republican Member of this House voted for, they kept those savings. And guess what else they kept? They kept the same level of revenue that would be generated by ObamaCare. Just check the Heritage Foundation statement. Every penny of revenue from ObamaCare, that level of funding is assumed in the Republican budget.

So here we have Republicans running around the country saying they've got a balanced budget, which is balanced because of ObamaCare, and now they're here saying they want to defund ObamaCare. You just can't have it both ways.

Don't shut down the government. Let's pass the bill that came out of the Senate, send it to the President, and get it done tonight.

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

I appreciate my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland, coming to the floor and speaking. But I want to say something real fast, if we can, Mr. Speaker. This is to fund the government.

The second part. This is to say that the President of the United States gave a pass to business. The pass was because the President has not provided enough content and information to business to let them know how it's supposed to work. But we're not going to do the same for individuals.

And that's what this legislation says. We're going to fund the government. We're not trying to stop having people from receiving things. We're trying to say, Give us the same opportunity. Because the individuals that it does help, I do have a sense of responsibility about them. But those times thousands of more who will be harmed by what we're doing is not a balance that Republicans can put up with—the overriding effect.

So, in fact, we're here, and I can look myself straight in the mirror, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to do the right thing for the American people.

At this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and a very bright young man.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time. I thank him for his leadership in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here night after night after night, I say to my chairman, trying to keep the government open. And to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have an opportunity to work together.

I'm a hardcore, right-wing Georgia Republican, and I'm here to tell you I want to keep the government open. And I don't think there's one of you over there who questions my word that I'm here today to keep the government open, not to bring the government to a halt.

But there are also other concerns. And the biggest frustration I've had, Mr. Speaker, in my 2½ years here in the House is that the President doesn't want to talk with me and my 700,000 constituents about our priorities for America.

I carry a copy of the Constitution in my pocket, Mr. Speaker, and it lays out clearly our bicameral system here in Congress: our article I, the Congress; our article II, the White House; and our article III, the courts.

The President has been saying over and over and over again as we come upon this brink of a government shutdown, I will not negotiate. Over and over again, Mr. Speaker. I will not negotiate.

So often it's so easy for my friends to characterize Republicans as being folks who are just looking for a fight. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues as they have passed a bill to fund the government and completely repeal ObamaCare. I've been down here with my Republican colleagues when they came back and they passed a bill to fund the government but just delay the most troublesome parts for a year. And now I'm back down here again with my Republican colleagues with a bill that will fund the government but simply prevent the individual mandate from compelling individuals to engage in behavior they didn't want to engage in and to ensure that all Americans have access to the same set of rules that are applying to Congress. I don't know how to be any more fair than that.

HARRY REID said, We don't need to have any more conversations. Folks, we have more serious problems than keeping the government open if the rule book for how this place is to operate no longer means anything.

Mr. Speaker, if the President just gets to decide how it's going to be and that's going to be the way America runs, we no longer have a constitutional Republic. We have something very, very different.

We're here on the floor today to keep the government open. We're here on the floor today to continue to try to negotiate.

I'm very proud of what my chairman has done in the Rules Committee in terms of bringing us together and trying to build a program that unites people rather than divides people. You have to be seeing the same headlines I'm seeing. Delta Air Lines is dropping employees, Home Depot is dropping employees, UPS is dropping, Kroger is dropping employees. You have to be seeing that. And it has to hurt you in the same way it hurts me.

Let's come together and solve that problem. This is a step in that direction. There is much more negotiation to be done, and I hope we'll do it over the next few weeks.

Support this rule, support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been told that when elephants fight, the grass is bruised. And when Democrats and Republicans fight beyond what is reasonable, people are hurt. And many of them will not survive.

It's time for us to move beyond this debate.

Somebody said the other day that justice delayed was justice denied. I can tell you that treatment for a stroke victim that's delayed, treatment for cancer, treatment for dialysis, and treatment for liver ailments that's delayed, all of those are trips to an early grave.

It's time to vote in the Senate resolution, forget about shutting down the government, and breathe life into our process and life for the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, some of my favorites in the Democratic Party

are taking their chances to come down tonight in this spirited debate and opportunity—the very best of the Democratic Party is here. I admire these men. I began serving with Mr. DAVIS some 17 years ago. He's one of the most honorable and respected Members of this body, and I'm delighted that Danny has come down.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Sixth District of Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the realities of ObamaCare is that millions of Americans are going to lose their employer-provided health insurance and be put into exchanges. And as you look through the 2,500-pages, there's actually a provision that makes Congress eat its own cooking. It takes Congress—who voted on it in 2010, and it was signed by the President—out of the congressional and Federal plan and puts them into ObamaCare exchanges.

Well, as we get close to the day of reckoning—October 1, and January 1, when the exchanges fully take effect—a lot of people around here don't like that. And so as we were leaving for August recess, the administration issued a ruling through the bureaucracy granting subsidies to Members of Congress, essentially rewarding their political friends, without any basis in the statute, and indeed subsidies that Americans who get removed from their employer plan will not be allowed to get in the private sector.

And so I think this rule allows Members to go on record. Does Congress deserve this bailout? The statute wasn't read and understood. They're looking for an easy escape. You need to go on record and say whether you want to get this bailout.

Should Congress receive benefits for its Members that are not available to private sector employees who are in the same situation? I think the answer to that is ''no.'' And I'll cite James Madison in Federalist 57. Madison said that the beauty of a constitutional system is that the ruling class can make no law which does not have its full operation on them and their friends as on the great mass of society.

Congress should not be treated differently. This rule allows Members of this body to go on record. So I'm glad that the chairman has written it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. For well over a year, Republicans have forced our country to lurch from one politically manufactured crisis to another. Last year, they cost us over a billion dollars in a manufactured crisis over the debt limit. They began New Year's Day with a last-second pullback from a plunge over the fiscal cliff. And now they're up to their old shenanigans of shutting down the government—and that manufactured crisis is just a few days before the next one they've manufactured over the full faith and credit of the United States. This is no way to run a Congress, and it's no way to run a country.

The only path out is the same path that allowed us to escape the disaster on New Year's Day, the same path that we took that finally got relief for the Hurricane Sandy victims and the only way we passed the Violence Against Women Act—and that's to let majority rule apply on the floor of this House. And until we do that, we will have a crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. What we have to do is end the hammerlock of the ''shutdown caucus'' in the Republican Party.

□ 1815

When the Speaker finally lets a majority of this House, a bipartisan majority of Republicans and Democrats, vote on continuing the necessary operations of our government, if they'll do that tonight, it will pass in 5 minutes. It's just a question of whenever they decide to stop letting the ''shutdown caucus'' control what happens to the future of this Congress. It's the way we got relief on New Year's Day. It's the way we addressed the concerns of the Hurricane Sandy victims. It's the way we passed the Violence Against Women Act. And it's the way this country must move forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the springtime, the Republican Party passed a budget in the House; and a few weeks later, the Senate passed a budget in the Senate. And there was an attempt to bring the two parties together in a conference to work out the differences so there could be a budget before the year begins tomorrow. Now, House Republicans refuse to start that negotiation.

So when we came back after Labor Day, it became pretty obvious that we were going to reach this point on September 30 of a government shutdown unless something was done. The Republicans opened the bidding, as they always do, by saying, we want a lower level of spending, and we want to get rid of the health care bill. What's happened since then between the House and the Senate is the Senate has said, all right; we'll take the lower level of spending, but we'll keep the health care bill. You get one thing you want; you don't get both things you want. That's the compromise. Now, we could be voting on that compromise this evening and end the government shutdown because if it were on the floor, it would pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady. We have a chance in a couple of minutes to make that happen.

If the Members vote ''no'' on the question that is about to come up, it will have the practical effect of getting rid of this proposal and putting on the House floor the Senate bill that could pass and end the government shutdown.

Let's vote on the compromise. Let's give everyone here the chance to let the people work their will and end this ridiculous government shutdown that looms over the country.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the House GOP has once again exposed its extremism for all of the American people to see. The resolution that underlies this rule is dead on arrival in the Senate and will not be signed into law by the President. And so what we have embarked on is a futile legislative joyride that will only end in a government shutdown, that will hurt children, hurt families, hurt the military, hurt senior citizens, and hurt our economy. This is an unnecessary Shakespearean tragedy.

Why are we continuing to fight a battle that you have already lost? You lost it in 2010 legislatively when this Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. You lost it jurisprudentially in a court of law when the Supreme Court in 2012 declared the Affordable Care Act constitutional, and then you lost it politically last November when the President was reelected to a second term. Why are we continuing to litigate an issue that has already been resolved?

It's time to confront reality. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. Let's move on and get back to doing the business of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is—and everyone in this free world for that matter knows it—these amendments are intended for the soul purpose of shutting down the government. They're not going anywhere. Everybody knows it.

To deny this House of Representatives an opportunity for an up-or-down

vote is an affront to the American people, it's an affront to this institution, it's an affront to this democracy and every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, reject this rule so we can have a vote on a clean resolution and fund our government going forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for our Congress. Our colleagues across the aisle have chosen to pursue a pointless path of petty politics that will shut down the government of the most powerful Nation on the Earth and damage the world's largest economy.

It is the height of irony that the extremists who have taken control of the Republican agenda speak of listening to the will of the people. The will of the people? The will of the people was to vote for the Presidential candidate who promised to preserve the Affordable Care Act and to reject the Presidential candidate who promised to repeal it on day one.

The will of the people was to cast a million more votes for Democratic candidates for the House than for the Republican candidates, And the will of the people is to keep this government open and to vote on a clean CR that does not have a lot of stuff added to it unrelated to preserving our government and having our government function.

Shutting down the government will raise borrowing costs, slow the recovery, and cause financial instability. Let's get a clean CR and vote for a clean CR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the former mayor of Corning.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is an opportunity to send a message across America that there will be no special treatment in Washington, D.C. for Members of Congress and Washington insiders.

It is only fair that what we do is that we treat everyone equally under the law. That is what we're dealing with here today, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about is if the President of the United States has said to Big Business, you get a pass for 1 year under ObamaCare, all we're saying is if it's good for Big Business, it's good for Americans and that every individual in America should be treated the same.

I'm asking my colleagues to join me. Don't vote to protect your own self-interest and this special contribution under ObamaCare that Members of Congress get. Treat us equally. Treat us the same. It is only fair that we keep this government open and we keep the law of the land intact for everyone equally.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership on this very important issue. And what is that issue? Do we, as Members of Congress, intend to honor our responsibilities to the American people by making tough choices to keep government open and working for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, in the dead of night, the Republican majority had a simple, but clear, choice to make: they could make a choice to accept Democrats saying ''yes'' to them on their budget number to proceed to the negotiating table to come up with a budget for our country, or they could choose in the dead of night to continue, like hounds baying at the Moon, once again—for like the 44th and 45th time—to try to overturn the Affordable Care Act. And what did they choose—and I say this with great apology to hounds because I love dogs—they chose to bay to the Moon. It was a sad thing because so much is at stake.

We should all, as Members of Congress, have confidence in what we believe in and debate full throttle the issues that are important to our country and to our constituents. We shouldn't take hostages because of the weakness of our ideas. We should go confidently to the table of policymaking to debate them, but to say we're going to shut down government unless you overturn the law of the land—that has been upheld by the Supreme Court and validated by the last election—we are going to shut down the government.

Now, the decision that they made the other night—baying night—they're continuing today, attempting to put on the floor a resolution that has no possibility of becoming the law.

We as Democrats say, you have put forth two really unpleasant proposals; one, to overturn the Affordable Care Act; and the other is hiding the terrible budget bill that they are putting forth, which even their own chairman says does not enable government to function, does not even enable us to do the job that we're here to do for the American people.

Two ''noes'' do not make a ''yes.'' Two ''noes'' make matters worse. Democrats are absolutely, totally opposed and determined that we will not shut government down. We will not be party to shutting government down, and so we're willing to take your budget figure, with the accompanying 6-week opportunity to go to the negotiating table, and develop a bill that will get rid of sequestration and all the harm that that does to our national security and to our investments in the future. Take ''yes'' for an answer.

This debate is about the budget. Keeping government open is about passing a bill, a continuing resolution to do that. Don't be insecure about your own ideas and say the only way we can prevail is if we threaten to shut government down if we don't have our own way—if we don't have our own way, we're going to shut government down. You and that attitude are a luxury this country cannot afford.

So again I say, this is an explicit offer to the Republicans in the Congress to agree to your number in this legislation and take the next weeks ahead to come to the table and negotiate—something we should have done 6 months ago. In March, the Republicans said they wanted regular order. Regular order means you pass a bill in the House and a bill in the Senate, and you go to conference—at least that's what the book says. That's what regular order is. The Republicans wanted regular order. That's what they told the President of the United States in the Oval Office. How would you like to proceed, the President said. We want regular order, said Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCONNELL.

The House passed its budget bill. Republicans started saying things like ''no budget, no pay'' to the Senate, the taunt. The Senate had planned to—and did—pass its budget bill. That would be the regular order. Now we go to the table to reconcile our differences.

The minute the Senate passed its bill, the Republicans abandoned any interest in the regular order. Why? Maybe they were afraid that people would see the contrast of what they want to do in their budget compared to the investment in the future, the statement of our national values that our Democratic proposal had under Chairwoman PATTY MURRAY in the Senate and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN in the House.

Whatever the reason, for 6 months they have not wanted to negotiate, and for 6 months they were saying the President doesn't want to negotiate. But they are the ones who have the responsibility, under the regular order of the House, to come to the budget table to reconcile our differences.

I salute the President for saying that the full faith and credit of the United States is not negotiable. We will not default on the debts that we have all incurred already.

□ 1830

That is over here. So when he says that's not negotiable, that doesn't mean that we won't negotiate on the budget which is in the form of a continuing resolution, a separate issue.

You can only conclude that ''insecure'' because of the poverty of ideas or ''just determined to shut down government,'' maybe because they don't fully understand the consequences of it.

The Republicans have once again come to the floor with a bill which they know will shut down government. 5½ hours from now—5½ hours from now—we either bay to the Moon again or we'll make the right decision to take ''yes'' for an answer, we agree to your number for the purpose of going to the negotiating table.

Our number is what we agreed to with you in the Budget Control Act, a

bipartisan agreement—$1.58 trillion versus $986 billion. That's an $80 billion comedown. That number was a comprise to begin with. That wasn't like plush with spending. It was a comprise to begin with. Now we are underfunding government; and that's not good enough for you, to underfund in meeting the needs of the American people. You want to shut down government.

I would hope that all who think this is not a good idea will express themselves on the rule, because the rule does not allow us to have a vote, a clean vote, on your suggestion for a continuing resolution at $986 billion. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their number. Let's give the Republicans a vote on their proposal, and let's do it in a way that is clean and does not place in doubt whether government will be open in the morning to meet the needs of the American people.

I hope that in the previous question enough people will reject what the Republicans are putting forth, and certainly on the rule we can do that. Otherwise, we'll go time and time again—46 times—to vote against undermining the Affordable Care Act. Instead, we could have passed an immigration bill. We could have passed a bill to make sure we had background checks for people who are legally able to purchase guns to make sure that they are. God willing, we could have passed legislation creating jobs, investing in the future for our country.

But all of those things can be the legitimate—not all, but the stuff about the job initiatives and investing in the future are the legitimate debate of priorities that is the budget debate. That is what I hope the Republicans will allow: something they asked for—the regular order; something they asked for—$986 billion in the bill; something I think we all want—keeping government open.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, not only for coming down, but for her kind words about many commonsense things. I think she also knows that this bill that's before us tonight is not to shut down the government.

I come from a family that the former Speaker has known for a long, long time. She knows a lot about me. I'm a part of this bill. I was taught by my father, yes, but also others, that you stay at the table until you get something done. It may be a little bit late at night; it may take a little bit of hard work; it may take some creative thinking. And then the athlete in me says you run through the tape. As a track guy, I always ran through the tape. As a football guy, I ran until the clock went out.

I think what the Republican Party is here trying to say is we are here at work. We are going to get our work done. We are challenging the United States Senate to do the same. We are going to pass this bill tonight because it's the right thing to do. We will stay open tonight and we'll receive their, in ping-pong terms, the ping and the pong back and forth, and we'll be ready.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you'll stay on duty. You may drink a couple cups of coffee, but you're doing the right thing for the people of Johnson County, Kansas. I know where you are from and I know what kind of man you are.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I've been in this institution for 2½ years. The minority leader from the other side of the aisle talked about hounds. I heard a lot of howling from the other side of the aisle—howling about fairness and howling about equality.

Well, talk is cheap, because today you have an opportunity to live and vote ''fairness'' and ''equality.'' For months, big business has come to this town and they have asked for an employer exemption, an exemption from the employer mandate. All we are doing tonight is saying let's treat individuals in America the same way you are treating big business. They may not have as much money or as powerful lobbyists, but they have us fighting for them. Join us so we can treat individuals like the big businesses that you give an exemption.

The President talks about how great ObamaCare is, but we have to note that he has excluded his administration. The Press Secretary, Mr. CARNEY, he gets up off and then talks about how great this bill is. If it is so great, what we do tonight is we allow the administration, like us in Congress, to come into ObamaCare and we remove the subsidy from us and from the administration. Let's treat Congress with the same equality and the administration with the same equality as the American people, and let's treat the American people the same way you are treating big businesses in America.

This is easy. Walk the walk; don't just give us the talk.

Let's vote for this rule and let's pass this bill tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, bring us some leadership.

There is only one issue before the United States Congress, and that's the issue to keep government open. The bill to do that is in this House. The bill to keep the government open is in this House. If it were on the floor, we would pass it in 1 minute. It would go to the President and he would have it signed before he went to bed. That's all we have to do.

But this rule brings all kinds of other baggage and says, no, we don't want to keep government open; we want to get into other issues. Well, aren't all the other issues what we are about for all the other part of the year? This is the only day and the only moment when we can keep government open. It's the last chance.

They say: Oh, do you know what? Well, you know, this is a partisan thing. I heard the chairman say: You know, it was a mistake to pass, the President made a mistake. That's what you said.

Well, we thought President Bush made a mistake in invading Iraq. In fact, the majority of Democrats fought against it, argued against it, and voted against it. But when we went to Iraq, we didn't try to stop the whole Congress to block the budget. No. In fact, on the appropriations to pay for it, the Democrats voted for it. We admit it—we lost.

You lost on the ObamaCare, or whatever else you want to call it. It's the law. Some reports declared it. If you want to deal with other issues, put it in other bills, but don't attach it to this bill.

Reject this rule that brings the baggage. Bring the clean bill. Let's pass it in the next hour and, Mr. President, have it signed by midnight, and let's keep this government open. It does so much damage otherwise. So many kids, so many women, so many poor people really get hurt.

This is not leadership. This is meanness.

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

I would like to advise the gentlewoman I have no further speakers, and I'll wait for her to run through her time and close, then I will do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one further speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that if we want the government to stay open for just another 45 or 75 days, we should torpedo the Affordable Care Act. Then what happens in November or December? Are we told that to keep the government open any further we have to strip-mine Yellowstone, we have to abolish Medicare?

The fact is it is wrong to take hostages. It is wrong to say that the government will shut down if that is the only way that you can achieve your legislative objectives.

What would the country think of us if we said we are going to shut down the government unless we get gay rights, gun control, cap-and-trade, immigration reform? Or what would the country think of us if we said gay rights, but only for 1 year; keep the government open for 1 year, get gay rights for 1 year.

Taking hostages is wrong. Holding hostage the greatest country in the world is wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I had a chance earlier today—because we are not doing a whole lot other than arguing for the last few days—to run up The Mall and go for a little jog. I went by the Washington Monument, the World War II Memorial, ran all the way out to Arlington where the Iwo Jima Memorial is.

I got to thinking about all the great people in this country who have built this government and invested so much, sacrificing their very lives to preserve this government and to elevate it to a point where it is respected around the world. I thought about the debate that's going on here today. We should not be disgracing their memory, all of those people from Jefferson to FDR and others, by dissolving this government, by defunding it and allowing it to fail. We owe the American people better than that. There's a solution here.

Hey, look, I didn't vote for the Affordable Care Act either. I thought it was a flawed bill. But that's a different argument about how to make that work best for the American people. We are failing the American people by allowing this government to shut down. It's a terrible precedent to set. It's disgraceful, and the American people deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague has no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. That would be correct.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today is a truly shameful day in the distinguished history of this House. Far from the noble mission that some from the other side may claim, what is before us is an extreme—and extremely cynical—attempt to extract a ransom from the American people. They have issued their demands knowing full well they will not be met. Yet they are taking another step towards a government shutdown in order to deny 30 million uninsured Americans health care.

Time has run out. We are down to our last chance. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and ask once more that we be given the opportunity to vote on the Senate bill, a clean bill, that can go directly to the President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we are here tonight because the Republican Party recognizes that men and women of this country are worried about their future, worried about economics, worried about taking care of their family. We've seen food prices double since the President has been our President. We've seen energy prices double. We've seen more rules and regulations. We've seen a war on coal. We've seen all sorts of things that have taken place.

But taking over your health care is a pretty serious matter. We disagreed with it then, but we've tried to work with the President. We've had seven or eight bills that actually did work, but the President recognized that there were fraudulent parts of the bill that needed to be taken advantage of and we got rid of those.

□ 1845

Tonight, we are here to say ''fairness.'' You should not give one group of people one thing and not give to the others. Likewise, we believe the President of the United States and his administration should be in the exact same health care that Members of Congress are in. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

Best of all, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 367, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on S. 1348, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Clay
Grimm
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1908

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 204, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—204

Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

McCarthy (NY)
Rush

□ 1915

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 1348) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 35, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—387

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
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
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
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
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
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
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
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
Stutzman
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
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—35

Amash
Barton
Benishek
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Fleming
Franks (AZ)
Griffith (VA)
Harris
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jones
King (IA)
Kingston
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Schweikert
Stockman
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Chabot
Gohmert
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Royce
Rush
Schrader
Schwartz

□ 1922

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 367, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113–6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113–6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113–6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113–6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112–175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 15, 2013.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the

first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, $273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and $469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113–6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113–6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting ''fiscal year 2014'' for ''fiscal year 2013'' each place it appears.

SEC. 116. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''December 31, 2012''.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available under section 101 for ''Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction'' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 119. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''October 1, 2012''.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20–127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services'' at a rate for operations of $1,012,000,000.

SEC. 122. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''October 4, 2013''.

SEC. 123. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 125. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'', ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'', and ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 113–6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems; and

(3) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading ''Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 113–6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 126. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for ''Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management'', there is appropriated $36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That of the funds provided, $15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 127. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for ''Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management'', there is appropriated $600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 130. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 131. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading ''Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses'' in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting ''is authorized to collect and retain up to $2,499,000'' for ''may retain up to $1,499,000''.

SEC. 132. The first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' in division F of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting ''2014'' for ''2012''.

SEC. 133. Amounts provided by section 101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 134. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englebardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, $174,000.

SEC. 136. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'' at a rate for operations of $2,455,490,000.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration'' in division C of Public Law 112–55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky moves that the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate, and concur therein with the amendment printed in House Report 113–239.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment, insert at the end (before the short title) the following:

SEC. 138. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the date referred to in section 106(3) shall be December 15, 2013.

SEC. 139. For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction'' in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 140. Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section in fiscal year 2014 during the period ending on December 15, 2013 shall be the sum of—

''(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

''(II) 2,000.

''(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

''(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 15, 2013.''.

SEC. 141. (a) DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' in clause (i) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''2016''.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''2016''.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SEC. 142. Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES.—'';

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''and congressional staff'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees''; and

(B) by striking ''or congressional staff'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress'';

(B) in subclause (II), by inserting after ''Congress,'' the following: ''of a standing, select, or joint committee of Congress (or a subcommittee thereof), of an office of the House of Representatives for which the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the office for the year involved is provided under the heading 'House Leadership Offices' in the act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year involved, or a leadership office of the Senate (consisting of the offices of the President pro Tempore, Majority and Minority Leaders, Majority and Minority Whips, Conferences of the Majority and of the Minority, and Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate),''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—The term 'political appointee' means an individual who—

''(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

''(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart D of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee for coverage under this subparagraph.

''(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

''(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the motion shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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 the further consideration of H.J. Res. 59.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to move forward once again with H.J. Res. 59, the short-term continuing resolution that will keep the government open after the end of the 2013 fiscal year at midnight tonight.

We simply can't wait a second longer. At this late hour, we must move ahead at an accelerated pace to keep the doors of our government open. For the sake of our Nation, we must pass this continuing resolution. Mr. Speaker, the operative word here is ''continuing.''

The bills we've had on the floor, including this most recent version, do not shut down the government, as many colleagues on the other side of the aisle have falsely said. This bill, and the ones before it, continues the important functions of the Federal Government. That means our citizens will continue to benefit from these programs and services, and passing this bill will allow this Congress to continue to make progress on our important legislative work, including finding meaningful, responsible, bipartisan solutions to our fiscal problems, like the debt ceiling, sequestration, and the most immediate issue at hand, funding the government for the 2014 fiscal year.

We did not bring a resolution to shut down the government, Mr. Speaker. We brought a continuing resolution to continue the government.

A shutdown will help no one. It will only harm our Nation's security and

our economy. It will hurt our people, who rely on the Federal Government's programs and services in some way or another and who put faith in their government to act in their best interests.

Mr. Speaker, the House is not the body that is refusing to act. We aren't the ones who are not willing to budge. This is the third or fourth compromise we've offered to the Senate. They simply ignore us, throw it in the trash can.

House Republicans have now offered multiple bills, including one with just a repeal of the widely unpopular medical device tax. We've even incorporated changes that the Senate had proposed, but the Senate still refuses to engage, as does the White House. Today we offer yet another piece of legislation designed to keep the government open.

As with the previous CRs that the House has considered, this continuing resolution will fund the government through December 15 at the current post-sequestration funding rate.

□ 1930

It will incorporate most of the Senate's changes to our first CR, and include the few additional changes that I proposed as an amendment and that were added in the House on Saturday night. It will also delay for 1 year ObamaCare's individual mandate, and eliminates the employer subsidy for the health insurance plans of Members of Congress and our staffs and for political appointees at the White House.

No one, Mr. Speaker, is going to like everything in this bill. I don't like everything in this bill. But the continuing resolution before us today is the most immediate path to avoiding a shutdown. I expect that the House will do the right thing and approve this CR today.

I remain hopeful that the Senate will work with the House and pass this legislation. The people of this great Nation deserve more. They deserve a government that works for, not against, them. At the very least, that is a government that keeps its doors open.

So I urge all Members, every single Member, to vote ''yes'' on this continuing resolution.

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

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

Here we go again. Republicans insist on including riders that do not belong in an appropriations bill. Both the Senate and the President already made clear they will not accept these provisions. Still, the majority insists on taking the country toward a shutdown in a few short hours.

As the clock ticks toward midnight, when appropriations will lapse and the government will shut down, Republicans have put forward the third version of a bill that is designed to shut down government unless we delay, defund, and deny affordable health care to American families.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim Democrats refuse to negotiate. Let's review the history and Democrats' support for a compromise to keep government running:

Republicans pushed us to the brink of default in the summer of 2011, resulting in a credit downgrade;

Republicans walked out of negotiations with the President last December aimed at reaching a budget deal for this year;

Republicans have refused to work with the Senate on the budget all year long;

Republican leadership caved to the Tea Party and withdrew a plan that, in all likelihood, would have ended this standoff by separating health care legislation from a bill to keep the government running;

And now Republicans refuse to say ''yes'' to the great concession made by Democrats in the Senate and the White House on the Republican spending level.

The shutdown isn't only tarnished by Republican fingerprints, it is entirely of their making. We could avoid a shutdown by allowing a vote on the Senate's clean bill, but Republicans just won't allow it.

This is no way to run the House of Representatives. This is no way to serve the hardworking people of the United States of America whom we represent. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican government shutdown.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I never supported ObamaCare because it's not sound policy. But if my fellow Americans have to endure this law, then why should not the Congress, the President, and the Vice President endure it as well?

You see, today's vote is about fairness. It's why I introduced my amendment to the continuing resolution, to make sure that we would eliminate the ObamaCare fix that was given to us by the Office of Personnel Management.

The American public understands what's going on. They understand that Congress always carves out their own little special interest, their little special treatment. The amendment today, this CR, would eliminate that. It would do one thing that this Congress so desperately needs, and that's to gain the sense of credibility that the American people are looking for.

It's not about gamesmanship. They're tired of that. This is about leading by example.

And while I laud my colleagues for allowing us to have this vote here today, I stood on this floor on Saturday explaining why this was so important to the American people, why it is so important to Congress. And therefore, I will say to you, even though it's politically difficult and sometimes politically hard to do the right thing, doing the right thing is always the right thing to do.

I would urge support of this CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, within hours of shutting down most of the programs that this Congress has approved or funded.

Do my Republican friends know how silly it sounds to threaten shutting down the government just to ensure that Members of Congress, our staff and White House staff don't receive the same health care benefits as other federal employees do?

To gamble with valuable federal programs should be embarrassing.

Here are just a few examples of programs that will be affected if the GOP pursues this strategy that I doubt they'd want to see happen.

The GOP shutdown would mean that the Centers for Disease Control would be unable to support annual seasonal influenza program.

Also, in the event of H7N9 influenza or Middle East Respiratory Syndrome related incident, preparation and response could be delayed.

The GOP shutdown means we rely more on foreign energy as the issuance of permits for energy production on federal lands stop. I certainly know that my Republican colleagues wouldn't want to see that happen.

Head Start centers around the country will close. During FY12, an estimated 1,600 Head Start agencies served over 950,000 children, including 71,963 children in Texas. Apparently, our children are okay to target in this political debate.

Under the GOP shutdown, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives will be affected and gun permits will not be processed.

And very importantly, veterans' educational, compensation, and pension benefits processing would likely be delayed, as happened in the 1995–96, shutdowns. Texas has the second highest number of veterans in the country at nearly 1.7 million.

To make this even more unreasonable, the Affordable Care Act, which you hate, will continue to go forward even if you shut down the United States Government since it's mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to be reasonable and pass a clean CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We are hours away from a shutdown of the Federal Government that will damage our economy and make life harder for millions of families, especially families living on the edge.

If the majority continues down this path, hundreds of thousands of workers will be sent home; many others will

continue to work without pay; antihunger and nutrition support for women, infants, and children will dry up; home and small business lending will freeze; lifesaving research will be put on hold; parks and museums will close.

The one thing this will not stop is the Affordable Care Act going into effect. That act is the law of the land, passed by the Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and endorsed by the American people last November. Tomorrow, regardless of what the majority tries to do here tonight, enrollment begins so that affordable health insurance coverage is available.

Instead of working with Democrats to move a budget forward, the majority's leadership is allowing the fringe ideologues in their party to turn the budget process into a hostage crisis. Kill the Affordable Care Act, they argue, or America gets it. This is not responsible leadership.

Nonpartisan studies have shown that the delay in this amendment will cause higher health insurance premiums, higher costs for the government, and worse health care coverage for everyone.

The majority knows exactly what they are doing. Two days ago they introduced amendments that were poison pills. Now we see an equally poisonous amendment to the budget today. They are rooting for a shutdown. One Republican Member even said, and I quote, ''We're very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.''

Another said, and I quote, ''It's wonderful.''

It is not wonderful. It is terrible for our economy and for our families.

This is extortion and this is hostage-taking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together as we, the people, to solve the serious challenges facing our country, yet we find ourselves on the precipice of a GOP-driven government shutdown.

The standoff between the Tea Party and other Republicans is now leading to a GOP shutdown of our entire Federal Government. Extreme partisanship threatens our economic recovery and job creation across our country. Thousands of workers at Ohio's largest employer, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, are about to be furloughed. Most NASA employees, including the NASA Glenn Research Center at Brook Park, near Cleveland, will be sent home.

Here in Washington, World War II veterans on their way here with Honor Flights across this country to visit the World War II Memorial on The Mall will find the Visitor Center closed.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to govern by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis. The madness must stop. America needs leadership, not extreme partisanship. We need statesmanship, not brinksmanship. America has work to do putting our people back to work, educating the next generation, curbing crime, and improving health care.

So the Republicans want to shut down the government? This will deeply hurt our country. It will hurt Ohio. There's no reason for it beyond shameful, partisan politics. It's time for the Republicans in Congress to come to their senses.

Vote against the GOP shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lexington, Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my neighbor.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House is voting once again to fund the government and to prevent a shutdown. The House is also continuing the effort to listen to the American people and give a voice to those who want to limit the harmful impact of ObamaCare.

The President said that the House is shutting down the government, but the House has acted multiple times to prevent a government shutdown. It is the President and the Senate majority leader who are refusing to negotiate, refusing to compromise, refusing to seek a bipartisan solution or a middle ground.

The President will negotiate with Vladimir Putin, the President will negotiate with the leaders of Iran, but he won't negotiate with the duly elected Representatives of the people in Congress.

In divided government, the only way forward is to negotiate. The American people witnessed one-party rule in 2010 when Congress rammed through ObamaCare on a party-line vote, and they didn't like it. The only thing that was bipartisan about ObamaCare in 2010 when it was enacted was the bipartisan opposition to it, and so they elected a different Congress and they divided power. So when you have divided power in government, the only way forward, when there is a difference of opinion, is to negotiate and compromise.

I come from the district, Mr. Speaker, of Henry Clay, a great Speaker of the House. Henry Clay is a model for this President and this Congress. We need to come together and negotiate and abandon the stubborn refusal to lead, which will guarantee a government shutdown. The President needs to work with House Republicans to find a middle ground, and this bill is the middle ground, Mr. Speaker.

When I found out that Members of Congress, the President, members of his Cabinet, and the political elite in Washington got a special exemption from ObamaCare, I introduced a simple, two-page piece of legislation, and it's called the Live by the Laws You Write Act, and it's a simple concept:

Why should we allow the administration to delay ObamaCare for large employers and exempt Members of Congress, himself, and the elite, but not also provide relief for individuals and families?

I believe that the President and Members of Congress should live by the same health care law that they have imposed on the American people. And so I call on my colleagues in the House, both on this side and that side of the aisle, to support fairness for the American people. If ObamaCare is what the President insists on, then it should apply to everyone, and that includes the politicians in Washington.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of discussion about the budget. I have heard a lot of discussion about a continuing resolution, and I have heard a lot about the Affordable Care Act; but I see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee here on the floor, and I see the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee on the floor, and I don't hear a lot of discussion about what I would call the operative word tonight, and that is ''appropriations.''

In article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the Congress is charged with constituting tribunals, courts, inferior to the Supreme Court. In the very next section, we are told we need to appropriate those monies to do so. We are told in article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution that Congress must provide and maintain a Navy. In section 9, we are told, absent an appropriation from the Congress, that will not happen.

The fiscal year begins tomorrow, and my great fear is that when a resolution of this continuing resolution occurs, if the date is December 15, we are going to make every agency and every department of United States Government operate just as they did last year—and, of course, last year we made them operate the way they did the year before—and have them wait for another 2½ months before we tell them what we are going to do.

□ 1945

I would suggest the operative word tonight is ''appropriations.'' We should do the Defense appropriations bill. We should do the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We should do the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We should do the Military Construction/VA appropriations bill.

We should do the other appropriations bills that are necessary to fund the operation of the greatest country on the planet Earth, and we should stop what we're doing here.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fact one: ObamaCare passed the House with 219 Democrats. Thirty-four Democrats joined the Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many of those will join us in this upcoming vote.

Fact two: Republicans have been and are poised to fund everything in government at the current levels—and are eager to do so.

Fact three: polls show that Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of defunding ObamaCare.

Fact four: the House, like it or not, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is the keeper of the purse under the Constitution, and we are well within our authority to defund an ill-conceived and unpopular program in the law.

They say that the Republicans are going to shut down the government, but I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: the Democrats began to shut down the government in 2010, when they passed ObamaCare without bipartisan support. They not only began to shut down the government but the recovery of the American economy. And for them to come now and say that this is a Republican shutdown is unbelievable. We stand ready, willing, and able to fund the Government.

There's only really one question that remains, Mr. Speaker. Four facts, one simple question. Will those same Democrats that voted in opposition to ObamaCare and the Senate listen to the American public, will they listen to their constituents, and will they vote with us this time so that our government can be funded, no shutdown will be necessary, and the American economy can continue to thrive?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, apparently we're here, largely, because a bunch of folks on the Republican side—Tea Party folks—fancy themselves strict constructionists. But I would remind them that the Founders set up the Senate to ensure that the House would act rationally and responsibly on a consistent basis.

George Washington warned us against factualism. They expected us to fund the government, to pay our debts, and they underscored the fact that when you have a disagreement, it ought to be resolved democratically.

So here we have a bill that passed the House and the Senate. The conference report passed the House and Senate. It was signed by the President. We had two national referenda, called Presidential elections. President Obama wins by 5 million votes.

We don't have the right to repeal ObamaCare. Call it what you want, it's the law of the land.

But now I understand that we are being told that unless you gut this legislation for an entire year, the Republican majority will not even fund the government for 45 days. Really? What kind of a deal is that? That's not reasonable.

The idea that you would send 800,000 people home tomorrow, not knowing when they can come back to work, not even allowing them back to their offices, and take billions of dollars out of this economy, erode the confidence that people in the United States and around the world ought to be able to have in the United States, and you are going to do all this because you want to repeal a bill that is the law of the land, just because you have the leverage that you can hold up the government from being able to operate for 45 days? That's nuts.

Our Founders would be ashamed of what this Congress has become. We're dysfunctional. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. This ought to be defeated.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker we're now just hours away from the Tea Party-inspired government shutdown. Here our Republican colleagues go again, holding the economy hostage to their ideological demands and their take-it-or-leave-it politics. This isn't the behavior of responsible legislators or of a serious political party willing to do what it takes to govern.

The only party that has actually compromised on the bill before us is Democrats, who have agreed to a short-term funding level below the Senate budget resolution, despite our belief that we should be replacing sequestration instead of locking it in.

By contrast, Republican leaders have steadfastly refused to go to conference to work out a budget with Senate Democrats. They walked away from negotiations with the President on a comprehensive budget deal in December. And now it is Republicans, as the President said, who are demanding a ransom merely for doing their job of keeping the government open. That ransom, incredibly, is health insurance for millions of our fellow citizens.

The Affordable Care Act has been upheld as the law of the land by a majority of Congress, a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a majority of Americans at the ballot box. If the junior senator from Texas and his acolytes think they can overturn those decisions unilaterally, I suggest they consult the Constitution. I'd be happy to loan them a copy.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to reject this latest Republican ploy, and this body, this country, has got to get back to the basics: keep the government running, pay the country's bills, and negotiate a comprehensive budget plan that ensures our fiscal future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Congresswoman LOWEY, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for those that may not understand what we're trying to do, all we have to do is pass one simple bill that was here in the House—the Senate gave it to us—and let's keep the government up for a number of days and continue to argue the other issues. But no, that's not what we're doing. We're taking that bill and just loading it up with a bunch of stuff that's been rejected time and time again. The consequence of that is you're not going to have a bill to the President tonight and the government will have to shut down.

It's a huge mistake. And it's not something we do. We've never done it. In fact, in the time I've been here, we've had big partisan disputes. Our party fought vehemently against President Bush's decision to go to war in Iraq. We thought it was without evidence and certainly was going to cost the government a lot of money and probably not have a great outcome. We didn't shut down the government after we lost that debate. Instead, we tried to make it work.

We fought against welfare reform. We thought that that reform of making everybody go to work even though they didn't know how to read and write—and mothers should be taking care of their children—we fought vehemently against it. And we lost. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

We fought again when Wall Street came in and said, Tomorrow, we fail. We thought, Well, it's the Republican watch. They're responsible for this. Wall Street is their business. They like that. But when we were told that this was going to bring down the economy of the Nation and the world, we helped get it passed. In fact, there were more Democratic votes than Republican votes. We didn't shut down government. We made it work.

Tonight, we're on the verge of shutting down government. It's going to hurt a lot of people. It's going to hurt farmers who want to export food. It's going to hurt 8.7 million mothers in this country who want to feed their children on the WIC program. It's going to hurt 13 million children who go to school and will lose access to a school breakfast. It's going to hurt 31 million children who will lose their school meals. It will hurt 47 million low-income people who will not have food stamps.

It's a mean, reckless, ill-conceived idea to shut down the government.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me just say: here we go again, Mr. Speaker. It's really no secret that the Tea Party Republicans came here not really as public servants but to destroy and to decimate our government. We are only hours away from Tea Party extremists achieving their goal of shutting down the government. This is their dream goal. They want to shut down the government and declare victory.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is shameful, and it is downright wrong. Their dream of shutdown will create a nightmare for millions. What about the government workforce, who have families to feed and mortgages or rent to pay? What about small businesses that stand to pay the costs of these Tea Party antics? And yes, what about women and children who will lose nutrition assistance? This is downright mean.

Make no mistake, the unnecessary GOP shutdown will have serious consequences for millions. And it's entirely unnecessary. It's not enough that the Republicans already voted 45 times to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. It's not enough that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and was upheld by the Supreme Court. Tea Party extremists now want to violate this law in a very sinister way.

It's not enough that their shutdown will hurt families and our economy. This Tea Party obsession—and it's an obsession—to kill the government and to deny health care to millions of Americans must end. They need to do their job and keep the government open.

As President Obama said this afternoon:

> You don't get to extract a ransom for doing your job.

This hostage-taking must end. We must vote ''no.'' We must keep the government open. I urge all of us to think about those people who will wake up tomorrow morning with their lives in such disarray and the uncertainty that's going to exist. We should not do this. The American people don't deserve this. We need to keep the government open. We're pleading with the Tea Party extremists, Do not shut the government down.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are here tonight to keep the government open. I keep hearing that we want to shut the government down. And yet this is actually our third attempt to send something to the U.S. Senate to give them an opportunity to negotiate with us.

And why are we here talking about a continuing resolution to begin with? We're here because this year, the House Appropriations Committee, with my colleagues on the other side, has passed five separate appropriations bills. There are 12 in total. Unfortunately, during the time period that we've passed five, the Senate has passed zero. Last year, the House passed seven and the Senate passed one.

After a while, you see there's a pattern. The Senate doesn't want to work on regular order. The Senate really does prefer continuing resolutions because then they can pull stunts like the one HARRY REID is doing now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, where were they yesterday? Where were they this weekend? The Senate adjourned. Where was the President? He was playing golf. He was so concerned about the government being shut down.

Now, what is the issue with ObamaCare? The Speaker at the time, Ms. PELOSI, said we need to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it.

□ 2000

Now, that bill has grown to 7.5 feet in height, and we are reading what's in it. But two things we know that it does not accomplish is it does not decrease the cost of health care, and it does not increase the accessibility. Those were the two major objectives. Those were the selling points.

Health care is one-sixth of the economy. Therefore, I think it's the right thing to fight over.

This is something that affects every American. We know already that premiums have skyrocketed under ObamaCare and that they will only grow worse. We also know that many major companies and smaller companies are stopping providing insurance to their employees. Accessibility is going down as well.

So ObamaCare has been a failure. Why is it that the Democrat Party believes in it so bad? Even when it fails, they can't let go. I don't think it's a bad thing to say, hey, you know what, we were wrong. We tried to decrease the cost of health care, we tried to increase the accessibility, but we did not achieve that. Therefore, maybe HARRY REID should sit down with Speaker BOEHNER. Maybe the President of the United States can interrupt his negotiations with the Iranians and come and talk to the Americans, i.e., Republican Americans. I think it would be a good thing. Again, Mr. Speaker, this will be our third attempt to work with the Harry Reid Democrats to keep the government open.

But I want to say this also to my friends on the other side of the aisle who have said they want to shut down the government. Let me mention, we had 17 shutdowns since 1976. And often one might say, well, that's when you had split government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. In 1977, the government shut down three separate times—once for 8 days, a second time for 8 days, and another time for 12 days. The Democrats controlled the House, the Democrats controlled the Senate, and there was a Democrat in the White House. Indeed, over the history of the last 25 years, there have been a number of government shutdowns until the Senate, the House, and the White House sat down and negotiated. That's all we're saying tonight is, you know what, we understand we don't control government, but we are willing to negotiate.

It is time for cooler heads to prevail in the U.S. Senate. It's time for the U.S. Senate to have some adult leadership and sit down with House leadership and hammer out the differences. That's why we're here right now, while the Senate, I believe, has already gone home. I guess the President is no longer playing golf. But we are ready to negotiate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as 800,000 Federal employees think about what their fate is going to be in a very few hours from now, we are on the House floor as our Republican colleagues say, well, we'll pay for the government if you accede to these three or four demands. It seems like every day they come up with some new demands, but they don't ever arrive at funding the government.

The American people know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a Senate bill, a CR, a continuing resolution, which is ready that we can put on the floor now and fund the government and avert the shutdown. My question is, Will our Republican colleagues, will our Speaker do that?

There are moments when leadership is at issue, and this is one of them. We need the leadership that will stand here and put the Senate's clean continuing resolution on the floor so that we can avert a government shutdown and make sure that Federal employees can pay their mortgage, can buy groceries, and can have a future.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

The American people don't want a shutdown, and neither do I. I didn't come here to shut down the government. I came here to fight for a smaller, less costly, and more accountable Federal Government. But here we find

ourselves in this moment dealing with a law that's causing unknown consequences and unknown damage to the American people and to our economy, and that issue is ObamaCare.

For those of you who don't recall, it was passed in the middle of the night, 2,300 pages that no one had ever read, and it's having all types of consequences for the American people, our constituents; having all kinds of consequences for employers. As a result, over the last couple of years, the President has given his friends in the labor unions some 1,100 waivers to this law.

This summer, the President decided, well, we're not going to enforce the employer mandate. Big employers around the country are all upset about having to make sure they provided health care for their employees, causing big problems. The result of all this is you've got employers all over the country who can't hire people and who are cutting the hours of their workers. It's having a devastating impact. Something has to be done. So my Republican colleagues and I thought we should defund the law for a year. We thought we should delay it for a year. Our friends over in the Senate don't seem to want to go down that path.

But I'm going to tell you what, this is an issue of fairness. How can we give waivers and breaks to all of the big union guys out there, how can we give a break to all of the big businesses out there, and yet stick our constituents with a bill that they don't want and a bill they can't afford? That's what this fight is all about.

I talked to the President earlier tonight: I'm not going to negotiate. I'm not going to negotiate. We're not going to do this. Well, I would say to the President, this is not about me and it's not about Republicans here in Congress. It's about fairness for the American people.

Why don't we make sure that every American is treated just like we are? But, no, under the law and some decision, there's this idea that we're going to get some exemption. No, we're not going to get an exemption.

So the bill before us is very simple. It funds the government, and it says let's treat our constituents fairly. No more mandate for the next year that you have to buy insurance that you can't afford. No more mandate that Members of Congress get some so-called ''exemption.'' Those are the only two issues here. All the Senate has to do is say ''yes'' and the government is funded tomorrow. Let's listen to our constituents, and let's treat them the way we would want to be treated.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, tonight is about the continuing destructive obsession that our Republican friends have and their refusal to recognize that there was an election just some months ago. You made the argument to the American people, and they rejected that argument and reelected President Obama. You have not gotten over that to this minute; and as a result, you are about to shut down the government. You can get up here and say over and over and over and over again, We don't want to shut down the government; but, Mr. Speaker, their actions belie their words.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats—as will surprise no one—are against shutting down this government. It's bad for our people, it's bad for our security, it's bad for our economy, it's bad for jobs. And you all know that.

And you don't have the votes because the people elected Democrats as the majority in the Senate and the President of the United States, and they don't agree with you. Newt Gingrich said when that was the case, you had to compromise.

What compromise are we talking about? We're taking your number—your number—and you will not take ''yes'' for an answer. How sad. What a shameful day this is in the history of the House of Representatives.

A shutdown would be harmful to our economy, our national security, and the creation of jobs, as I just said. That's why we have compromised and said we'll take your number to keep government open while we negotiate over the next 6 weeks.

Nobody in your party rationally believed that you were going to succeed in your objective—nobody. It's a political ploy. It's a message, Mr. Speaker, to their most radical contingent. We are willing to take the next 6 weeks to discuss how we get from where we are to where we need to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We could do that, Mr. Speaker, if only Republicans would take ''yes'' for an answer.

Their Tea Party faction has made clear where it stands. They don't like the Affordable Care Act—I don't think anybody doubts that—but the Affordable Care Act has been upheld by the Supreme Court and remains the law of our land.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now voted twice to send us a clean CR. Now it's time for the Speaker and the majority leader to put the Senate's clean compromise CR on this floor and, in their words, let the House work its will. Have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to have the majority party put on this floor a bill which will keep the government open and which the Senate will pass.

Mr. Speaker, have the Republican Party have the courage of its rhetoric and let the House work its will. I dare you to do that.

Let democracy work. Don't be dictating to America that they're going to shut down the government. Let's vote on it. Put a clean CR on this floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many speakers the gentlelady has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the very distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It's interesting, my colleague who just spoke, the Democratic whip, talked about democracy and insisting that we bring democracy to the House. Well, I would respond to my friend and tell him that democracy is founded upon the principle that there is equal treatment under the law.

So tonight's debate is not about trying to stifle democracy. Tonight's debate is trying to insist that the minority party and its policies, it's trying to stop the administration from carving out special treatment for its special interests. It's about telling this administration and this President that there should be no special treatment for Members of Congress, there should be no special treatment for big business. We all live under the same laws.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans around this country want a government that puts people first. Since ObamaCare was passed—in a highly partisan manner—the President himself and other Members of his party have offered unilateral exemptions and delays for special interest groups and for Members of this Congress. So you've got to ask, Why are Members of Congress exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Why are these special interests exempt from the pains of ObamaCare? Shouldn't we also exempt the hardworking families of this country from the pains of ObamaCare?

There should be no special treatment for anyone under the law. That is a founding principle of this country. No special treatment for anyone. Equal application, equal treatment under the law.

Delaying the individual mandate for American families and withdrawing the exemption for Members of Congress is what this bill is about, and it is the right thing to do.

Now is the time for our President to lead. Now is the time for the Senate to act. Their stubborn refusal to work across the aisle is the reason why Americans today are so frustrated by what they see in Washington.

House Republicans have now offered three possible solutions to fund our government and to protect working middle class families from losing a job, from losing their health care, or losing part of their paycheck due to ObamaCare.

□ 2015

Senate Democrats have offered nothing. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, they didn't even show up for work.

No one should shut down the government in order to protect special treatment from Members of this House or

the other body. No one should shut down this government in order to protect special treatment for big business and special interests. It is time for all of us to think about America's hard-working middle class families.

Now is the time to pass this resolution to keep the government working on behalf of the people who sent us here, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this continuing resolution.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Continuing Resolution to fund the Federal. The Senate sent over a Continuing Resolution that would fund the government and included an agreement that the men and women of the armed services should receive their pay.

Unfortunately, the House Rules Committee, which must review and establish a rule for all bills brought before the House has once again changed the Senate bill to require a 1 year delay in the personal mandate for the Affordable Care Act, but added another change that would remove a subsidy for members of Congress and their staff.

What they fail to say is that Congress and Congressional staff are the only group in the nation that is required by the law to only get its healthcare through the Affordable Care Act Health Exchange Marketplace.

Ecclesiastics says that ''To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: There is a purpose or reason for everything that happens, be it called good or be it called bad, by whomever perceives it as such. No matter, there is a time and place for everything.''

The men and women of this Congress know that the time and season for making decisions regarding the budget of our Nation ends at midnight tonight—Monday, September 30, 2013.

The season for making decisions about funding the government began in January of this year, stretched on through the Spring, and was with us during the Summer now the end is upon us.

The majority of this body has not been able to organize themselves to do—or consider anything during the season for budget drafting and appropriations' legislation except to attempt to end the Affordable Care Act.

The members of the United States House of Representatives know the rules for the legislative budgetary process very well, but for the benefit of the millions of people who are watching this debate or listening to it—you might find it helpful to understand why there is so much dissention.

I would like to give you a brief outline of the work we are supposed to do on your behalf regarding funding the government: The Congress is to:

Pass a budget that is agreed to by both the House and the Senate;

Pass 12 appropriations bills that do not exceed the agreed upon budget to fund the entire Federal Government for the next fiscal year;

Complete the appropriations bills with both the House and the Senate agreeing to the language of each before and agreed to by both the House and the Senate and sent to the President's desk for signature; and rarely use Continuing Resolutions when Congress fails to complete all 12 bills before the fiscal year ends to ensure that the business of the Federal Government continues uninterrupted.

For most Americans this may mean very little because it is a Congressional administrative function that often used to help fund a few appropriations measures that may not be completed before the end of calendar year, which is midnight, Monday, September 30, 2013.

This year the use of the Continuing Resolution is different because we have not completed work on a budget bill nor have we completed work on any appropriations bill—not even the Defense Department's Appropriations legislation.

The House and the Senate have found agreement that a Continuing Resolution for the next Fiscal Year that will begin at 12:01 Tuesday, October 1, 2013 should provide that the Armed Forces who risk their lives to protect our freedoms deserve the support and resources needed to perform their duties, and that includes being paid in full and on time so they can provide for their families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary to have to devote the considerable amount of time needed to debate and pass this legislation in the House and Senate and present it to the President if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed yesterday by the Senate.

The CR approved by the Senate funds the government and avoids a shutdown. President Obama has stated that he will sign it into law.

The clean CR passed by the Senate ensures that all the employees of the federal government are paid for the valuable and important service they provide to our nation.

Mr. Speaker, instead of exempting certain groups and persons from the harm caused by a government shutdown, we should instead be focused on avoiding a shutdown, which helps no one and hurts our economy.

Those of who were serving in this body 17 years ago remember the harm caused when the Republicans shut down the government on two different occasions, which directly cost taxpayers $1.4 billion. That is $2.1 billion in today's dollars.

The last time Republicans engineered a shut down of the government:

368 national park sites were closed.

200,000 applications for passports went unprocessed.

$3.7 billion of $18 billion in local contracts went unpaid.

My state of Texas would be hit very hard and suffer unnecessarily if a government shut down is not prevented.

Within days Texas would begin experiencing the impact of cutbacks in the $64.7 billion in federal spending that it receives annually, including the loss of:

$518 million in federal highway funds,

$411 million for interstate highway maintenance,

$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor,

$71 million in Homeland Security grants,

$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure and

$97 million in federal adoption assistance.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am particularly concerned over the impact of a government shutdown on operations and activities that protect and secure the homeland Impacts of shutdown in Texas on homeland security.

For example, a shutdown would adversely affect the following:

Law Enforcement and Other Training: Law enforcement training would cease, including those conducted through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Secret Service's J. Rowley Training Center. This would impact CBP, ICE, Secret Service, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and would delay their ability to bring new hires into operational service. TSA would also not be able to conduct training for screeners, Behavior Detection Officers or canine units.

Frontline Personnel Hardships: The majority of the workforces in Custom and Border Protection's (CBP) Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, (ICE) enforcement efforts, Transportation Security Administration (TSA) aviation passenger screening, and the Coast Guard, who are heavily reliant upon receiving biweekly paychecks, would not be paid biweekly during a federal funding hiatus

Grant Programs for State and Local Preparedness: All DHS and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) personnel working on grants programs would be furloughed, ceasing any further activity intended to help build state and local resiliency. Should a federal funding hiatus be prolonged, state and local communities may have to eliminate jobs that are dependent upon grants funding. Further activity under the Securing the Cities program would be suspended.

In addition, a government shutdown will hurt children, seniors, working families, and the economically vulnerable:

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around $274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds for Crime Prevention and Prosecution: Funding will be halted to Texas on an annualized portion of the $1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will not receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for personnel who administer programs that provide funding for vaccinations.

Nutrition Assistance for Seniors: Texas would lose approximately $3,557,000 in funds that make it possible to provide meals for seniors.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the Federal Government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Continuing Resolution to delay the individual mandate for a year and undue the ObamaCare exemption for Members of Congress. This is about fairness to the American people, who are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the political class.

We are a nation of laws and when the ruling elite are given a free pass while millions of our constituents are forced into a new health care

regime that drives up premiums, erodes the quality of care and puts the government between them and their doctors, we lose the trust of the American people.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said, "No man is above the law and no man is below it." Yet, through administrative ruling the Obama Administration has exempted Members of Congress and their staff from the very health care law that bears the President's name. Meanwhile, the President, Vice President and their political employees are not even required to be part of the new health exchanges. If this law is so great, Mr. President, then why won't you and your political appointees be subject to it?

The answer is simple: ObamaCare is not working and the doctor doesn't want a taste of his own medicine.

Karen, from Cypress, Texas in my district wrote to me this week that "as a benefits department employee of an independent oil and gas exploration and production company, I have major issues with ObamaCare. I abhor the waste of my department's time and expense in documenting our policies just to show Congress that we already comply with the mandates, despite the lack of guidance we get. Seems to me Congress is punishing employers who offer good coverage. How is this going to help anyone? And don't even get me started on the administration exempting themselves all from it. That rankles more than almost anything else."

Another one of my constituents, an insurance agent who also happens to be the Mayor of Tomball, Texas, called my office this week and told me that her clients—which include businesses in and around my district—have no idea what is required of them under the law. The Obama Administration has given thousands of waivers to businesses, delayed implementation of dozens of provisions of the law and no one know what to expect next.

What we do know if that ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. We must give our constituents the certainty of a full year delay of the individual mandate. Anything short will only result in more chaos and confusion, not to mention skyrocketing premiums, billions in new taxes and the erosion of the doctor-patient relationship.

Most importantly, elected officials must be treated the same as the people they represent. No exemption for Members of Congress!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 367, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 201, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—201

Andrews
Bachmann
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Stockman

□ 2040

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2335

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 10:00 p.m.:

That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution H.J. Res 59.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–240) on the resolution (H. Res. 368) relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

Resolved, That the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, (2) insists on its amendment, and (3) requests a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 368 directs the House of Representatives to go to conference with the Senate to resolve differences between the two Chambers on how to appropriately fund the Federal Government. Like any other time the House goes to a conference, Mr. Speaker, the minority will have an opportunity to instruct conferees and have their ideas heard.

For nearly 3 weeks, this body, the United States House of Representatives, has made numerous legitimate efforts to find a compromise to avoid a government shutdown. Unfortunately, Senate Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats have been unwilling to negotiate and have stonewalled any attempt to find common ground.

No one wants a government shutdown, but Mr. REID's unwillingness to work with House Republicans to find a solution is what brings us to a point now this evening. I know that we want to get our work done tonight. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me be clear: the proposal before us is nothing but another way to run out the clock. I think while we're speaking here, in just a little while we will find in 20 minutes—21 minutes, because I think we will go 1 minute after midnight—that this government will shut down.

This amazing government that we are supposed to be overseeing—America, the United States—can't manage its business and shows that to the rest of the world over the fact of trying to stop the bill you hate that is the law of the land, that has already been verified by the Supreme Court as to its constitutionality and where our President won election handily when this was the main idea.

I don't believe anymore that this is the product of a few people with strange ideas. This is the Republican Party. I think people who watch the news, jaded—I do; every idle moment I have to be finding out what's going on in the world—were quite stunned to watch a Republican conference over, and the Members coming out absolutely gleeful, many of them expressing glee—one of them said that he was almost giddy with joy about closing down the House.

Earlier this evening, I saw after the 2010 elections some new Members who were saying on the news that their intention was to shut down the House. Well, they've done it.

At any time we could have taken up a clean bill for the Senate. All we had to do was vote for that Senate amendment resolution and pass that here, which could have been done easily with bipartisan votes. It would then have gone to the President of the United States. Government workers could sleep easier tonight if we had done that. They wouldn't have to worry about paying the rent, or being able to buy groceries, or being able to pay the tuition for their child in college.

What we are doing to the psyche of America—not ''we.'' I'm not going to say that again, the universal ''we.'' What Republicans are doing to the psyche of America will be a long time in healing.

I think the absurdity knows no bounds. We want to say again that if anybody has any mistaken notions that the Democrats were involved in it, there are no Democrats' fingerprints on any of these bills. I'll say that again: Democrats had no input at all at any time on what any of these bills were going to say in the greatest matter before the House of Representatives to keep the government going, to meet our obligation to fund the government.

In fact, by cutting out the people's Representatives on my side of the House, almost half of the people in the United States' voices were stilled throughout this whole process. The only time we got to talk was when we were up here, and we were trying to run and catch up to see what was going on. We had no idea what this was about, that this was coming tonight. We were able to pick up bits and pieces maybe off the floor, and people passing around some things that maybe they heard. But the whole Democrat side has been shut out—not just on this measure, but on everything in the world that we have done in this term and last term as well. Now, I don't want anybody to forget that because everybody is going to yell if something goes wrong here, they're going to try to blame it on us. It's not on us. I have never seen anything like this.

In addition, for well over 6 months this Democratic side has begged, cajoled, done everything they could to try to get this House to appoint conferees and to go to conference with the Senate of the United States on bills that each Chamber had already passed. We couldn't do the farm bill—couldn't do much of anything. And I said earlier today one of the reasons is sequestration. So we had only gotten two appropriations bill. They've run out of money, and there was no way in God's Earth we could have ever done the 12 that we needed to do.

But even that hasn't caused any idea of changing what we're doing. And we want to be a part of that. We would like to take the 6 weeks—imagine, on one hand, we are appointing conferees for a 6-week measure when we wouldn't do it for the budget of the Federal Government.

Now we would like to be as much a part of it as we can while we're trying to deal with the debt limit and certainly to do away with sequestration that even my friend, Mr. ROGERS, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, said was far too draconian and that the government would be seriously underfunded.

□ 2345

But tonight, here we are, tragically here. Let me see now, it's 15 minutes

away from time where it will be useless; so I am not going to say anything more about we could take up another bill, we could pass it, it would go to the President, he would sign it, and we could avoid it. It's simply too late. How could you, with any common sense at all, think that, as we have moved to this point without changing from the left to the right with moving ahead, throwing up every kind of thing on a clean CR that would kill it when it arrived at the Senate.

We are hearing—and I hope it's not true—that when we get to the debt limit in about 2 weeks, that the Christmas list that they want to pass—everything that they wanted all their lives and couldn't get—again, holding the country hostage, is what we have ahead of us.

Now, given a clear choice between serving our country and serving ideology within these ranks, the majority has chosen to stand against the country and shut the government down. Make no mistake about it, there is going to be a lot of hurt.

At this point, all I can do is urge everyone on our side of the House to vote ''no'' for no other reason than because of the rules in the House being broken and regular order being so far from reality. The rules of the House say that any Member can call for a vote on the Senate bill, but this rule takes that away from everybody but the majority leader. Only the majority leader can call for that vote.

Very little is left on our side except to vote ''no'' and to express our great displeasure and hope to goodness that when this is over and all that pain is out there, that we can move as quickly as possible to try to right this dreadful wrong that is about to land on the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope we really find a way to avoid that by agreeing to a conference. I think a conference is important. The United States House of Representatives will be on a vote here in a few minutes where we are asking for that. I believe the American people see what we are doing is trying to legislatively resolve the differences that we have.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our first CR was a clean CR at sequester levels and simply defunding ObamaCare. Our second CR was a clean CR at sequester levels with a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. The third CR was a clean CR with a 1-year delay of the individual mandate and removal of certain benefits for Members and congressional staff.

I have, during these times, found that some of the wise counsel that I have received in the deliberations that I have had, in the duties and responsibilities as the chairman of the Rules Committee, leaned upon several people. One of them is here, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS.

HAL ROGERS has provided me—and I hope I have provided him—some bit of working knowledge of what we were trying to accomplish, a desire to accommodate House and Senate Members to complete more work on appropriations. That is still a part of the goal that we are going to tonight, to go to conference so that we can fund the government and get it done right.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS OF Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those kind words. It is likewise. I have relied upon the gentleman for advice all through this process as well, and I appreciate his leadership in this body, especially as chairman of the very important Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just rejected the House's third attempt to avoid a government shutdown. This body has voted time and time again to keep the lights on in our government and to stop the train wreck that is ObamaCare. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate have rejected these offers and have refused to come to the table to find a solution.

To be absolutely clear, the House has debated and approved three separate continuing resolutions. These bills do what they are named for—they continue government. We do not want a shutdown, and we have done what we can to avoid it. Given the situation at hand and the late hour, we will now vote to send the CR we just passed and a request for a conference to the Senate.

Our challenges are great, but they are not insurmountable. This conference will provide a venue to discuss the differences between the House and Senate, having productive negotiations, and come to a final agreement that most can support.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, this is a logical next step. When the House and the Senate are unable to resolve their differences on other pieces of critical legislation, the appropriate action is to appoint a conference. That is the time-honored way of this great body.

I understand that this is not the first or the second or the third choice of many Members here tonight. It is not my first choice either. But I believe this motion can help us move forward and provide at least a gleam of light at the end of this very long tunnel.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we watch this train wreck in slow motion, this Republican shutdown of government, I ask myself, in trying to understand what the Republican majority is doing: Why—why are they seeking to close down government? Is it because some of them are against government and want to see it closed and—I think it's been quoted—this is exactly what they wanted?

That might be the case for a few of them, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think most Republicans want to abolish the United States of America Government. I think that's a position that very few Republicans hold.

So why are they closing the government? Now, I understand that many of them don't like the health care reform, the Affordable Care Act, a law that was passed by the House and Senate, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court; it's the law of the land. Some of them don't like that.

Do you know what? Some Americans are uncomfortable with that. They want to learn more about it: What does it mean to them? How does it help them afford health care? How does it help their families?

But the American people don't want to see our government close down over disagreeing with a particular law. That seems to be what my friends on the other side are arguing. They are arguing: Do you know what? We've been unable to repeal this law under the process set up by our Constitution. We've been unable to pass a bill in the House, pass a bill in the Senate, send it to the President, and have the President sign it. We've been unable to follow the Constitution to get what we want. So instead of doing that, we're just going to shut down government until we get what we want. By the way, we want a lot. We want to change a law that was passed by the House and the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court that helps middle class Americans afford health care. We want to change the way that benefits are conducted. We want to change different tax systems.

These are all policy discussions to be had through our process. In fact, some of these things have actually been passed by the House of Representatives and either have been rejected by the Senate or are awaiting action in the Senate.

But that is the genius of the Founding Fathers in setting up our constitutional system in the separation of powers. It was to provide for a way to pass laws that had broad buy-in from the American people and had the checks and balances that have kept our democracy strong for over two centuries. Yet here today we are short-circuiting that. The Republicans are seeking to say: We are going to close down the entire Federal Government.

This is the most powerful, strongest country that the Earth has, the freest democratic Nation. We are going to shut down the government. We are going to shut down because we can't pass our laws the way we want them.

Do you know what? The country has had an election. The country has elected a President. This was discussed in the Presidential election. This was discussed in Senate elections over and over again.

In 5 minutes, the government will shut down. This bill does nothing to

prevent that. Until the Republicans change their mind, we won't have an operating Federal Government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just entertained a piece of legislation that came from the Senate. There is a lot of business that needs to be done. We had the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was here, who spoke very favorably not only about his optimism of being able to work through this with his colleagues, not only the gentlewoman NITA LOWEY, his ranking member, but also the working relationship that the Appropriations Committee has with our Senate colleagues.

I think if there is one thing that is a takeaway from tonight, that is that HAL ROGERS, a man who has been in this body for a long period of time and who has great wisdom about not only the intricacies and the running of the government but also, I think, a good bit of esprit that comes with it, not just optimism, but his desire to make sure that good things happen, that is what HAL ROGERS was on this floor talking to us about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself—most Americans do understand the concept of fairness—when did fairness become a partisan issue? Certainly tonight it seems that is the case.

Now, look, no secret I have opposed the Affordable Care Act ever since I heard the first stirrings, the first musings about it in our Energy and Commerce Committee. I opposed it in committee, opposed it here on the floor of the House, opposed the Senate bill that came over to the House. I have opposed it at every opportunity.

Yes, there have been multiple attempts to repeal it since the Republicans took majority in January of 2011. Seven of those times actually got passed by the Senate, went to the President, and he signed them into law. So there have been some restrictions on the Affordable Care Act over the past 3 years.

But honestly, the changes that have occurred to the Affordable Care Act that have been the most dramatic and the most profound are those changes that are brought about by the President himself, by the administration itself. They are sort of like the delayer in chief for parts of the Affordable Care Act.

I've had constituents email me, text me, and say: What blog post do I need to follow if I'm going to keep up with the changes in the Affordable Care Act? I had an HR director say: What Twitter feed should I keep up with? I have had other constituents ask me: Is there an Instagram place I should look at to keep up with the changes that are occurring with the Affordable Care Act? We are all familiar with them. We have discussed them the past several days.

The fact that the preexisting condition program—the Federal preexisting condition program—that the President and Speaker PELOSI talked about with such high regard, the sign-up window has been closed since February 1. No one can sign up for the Federal preexisting program.

There was supposed to be caps on out-of-pocket expenses starting in 2014. Well, guess what? Those got delayed by a whim.

We are all familiar with July 2, when on a blog post the employer mandate was just suddenly set aside, and then 3 days later, all of the reporting requirements were sort of laid aside.

So people are concerned that parts of this law seem expendable, but they just don't know which parts are.

The most egregious one was what happened in the early part of August, right before this body went back to their district work period, where the fundamental fairness, where a different set of rules were going to apply to Members of Congress. Constituents do not understand that.

So this week we have had an opportunity to repair that damage, repair that credibility with our constituents. That went over to the Senate tonight and, unfortunately, it failed. I wish that it hadn't. Perhaps we could be talking now about the funding of the government to December 15 and things could continue on as planned, but it didn't work out that way.

□ 0000

But this issue of fundamental fairness is not going to go away; it's going to be a recurrent theme. People are going to be asking us questions: Why couldn't we settle on the issue of fundamental fairness and do what's right for the American people and, in the process, keep the government open?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is midnight, and the great Government of the United States is now closed.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joke that we are having this debate at all at this particular time now that it's midnight and the government is officially shut down.

My Republican friends say they're coming here to try to keep the government open. They're here, and they're presiding over a Congress that has now shut the U.S. Government down. After 6 months of refusing to go to conference on the budget—18 times I've been told the Republicans objected to going to conference on the budget with the Senate—now they say they want a conference committee. It's too late. It's past midnight now. The government has been shut down. This is both cynical and disgraceful. Republicans have shut down the Government of the United States of America.

I would say to my Republican friends that you own this. This is your shutdown. This represents an absolute failure of your leadership. Real people in this country—your constituents—are going to be hurt by your inability to do your job.

Now, the funding levels in the continuing resolution are unbelievably low. They are at your beloved sequester levels. You should be declaring victory that the Senate actually agreed to your low numbers, but that's not enough. You had to overreach. You had to add in the dismantling of the Affordable Care Act and 1,000 other things that were pet projects of the Tea Party right wing in your party.

The fact of the matter is you knew all along that the President would never sign a bill that dismantled the Affordable Care Act—nor should he—nor would the Senate go along with that, but you did it anyway. You are shutting down this government because you didn't get your way. You didn't get your way, so you're shutting down the government.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that elections in the United States of America still do matter. Your candidate for President lost badly, and this was his No. 1 issue—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Your Senate candidates lost badly. In fact, you lost seats in the House, and the Democrats got a million more votes than you did in House elections, but because of some very clever redistricting, you were able to hold on to the majority.

The American people rejected your call to overturn the Affordable Care Act, and the American people overwhelmingly do not want you to shut this government down, which you just did 2 minutes ago.

This is the people's House. We are supposed to be doing the people's business. We are not supposed to be doing the business of some right-wing Senator from Texas who somehow wants to run for President and wants to get the Tea Party all excited. You are supposed to represent your constituents. We all are. Our constituents—the people of this country—do not want the United States Government to shut down.

This is a failure of your leadership, and I would say there is one way for us to kind of make things better at this point, which is to let us bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—a clean bill, a clean CR. Even with those low levels that I have some problems with, I guarantee you that it will pass with Democratic votes and Republican votes. We can reverse this shutdown now by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Please do it. Please don't shut this government down.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New

York, Congressman REED, a second-term Member and one of the clearest thinkers in our party.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear as to what we did tonight.

We sent a request to the United States Senate to simply treat all Americans equally under ObamaCare. We sent a request to the Senate to keep the government open. Because the President has chosen to give a pass to Big Business for 1 year, we are asking to give that pass to American individuals for 1 year.

The law isn't ready. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it's not ready. Why can't we just treat American citizens—individuals—the same as our President, who, by his executive order, has said Big Business should get a pass?

Most egregiously, why wouldn't you agree with us that Members of Congress should not be treated any differently under the law? You know the truth, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker: Members of Congress are getting special treatment under this law because of what HARRY REID and the President did through the OPM. Our contributions for our health insurance premiums as we go into the exchanges are different and are not allowed to every other American citizen.

So what we stood up for tonight was a simple request: we will keep this government open, but let's just treat American citizens no differently—no special treatment for Members of Congress, American citizens no different than Big Business.

Why don't you join us. Why don't you join us in those commonsense reforms by which Americans across the country are saying, We don't want this law. It's not ready to go.

At a minimum, just treat us the same as Big Business America. Treat us the same, and don't give Members of Congress—yourselves—to my friends across the aisle, special treatment under the law.

That simple agreement would have kept the government open, and I hope that you will heed that fundamental call for fairness. Yet you turned your ear to the American people. In the U.S. Senate, you turned a deaf ear to the American people and said we are going to continue the status quo and that somehow we in Washington, D.C., should be treated differently.

I reject that message. I reject that notion. I stand for equality for all Americans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say that, if the Members of Congress are going to be treated like everybody else in the country, we would be the only group that's forced not to take our employer's health insurance.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, who has tried valiantly to do away with sequestration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, since the very moment the Affordable Care Act was passed, we have heard a massive campaign of misinformation and distortions from our Republican colleagues. From the beginning, we heard about death panels. Then we heard it was going to be the government takeover of health care. That earned them the independent PolitiFact lie of the year in 2010.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the floor, we just hear massive distortions, and what's shameful is that they want to use that now as the cover to shut down the United States Government. They want to use that so that, tomorrow, millions of Americans can't sign up for or access affordable care. Members of Congress—all of us—we have affordable care, but, tomorrow, you want to deny that affordable care to millions of Americans and take it away from the millions of Americans who already have protection as a result of the Affordable Care Act. That is shameful.

Now, this notion that they are going to go to conference on the continuing resolution is a fig leaf that's not going to get them any political cover. The only way to have kept the government open tonight, which is now closed, was to take up the Senate's continuing resolution and fund the government. Yes, then we should go to conference on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to go to conference on the budget to negotiate our differences since March, when this House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget. In fact, back in April, I and my Democratic colleagues introduced a very simple resolution saying that the Speaker should obey the regular order and appoint budget negotiators here from the House to meet with the Senate. What did the Speaker do? Nothing. He blocked the ability to have those budget negotiations.

We actually voted on it three times in this House. My Republican colleagues voted against the opportunity to appoint budget negotiators. In the United States Senate, what happened? On 18 occasions, Senator LEE and other Republican Senators blocked the effort to go to budget negotiations.

Now, Senator MCCAIN said that was insane for Republicans in the Senate to do because he pointed out that our Republican colleagues claimed that they wanted to work on these budget negotiations all along. They said ''no budget, no pay.'' What they forgot to tell the American people was that they didn't mean a Federal budget. They meant the House passes a budget and the Senate passes a budget, but then they were going to block the effort to negotiate the differences.

Now, why would you block that, Mr. Speaker? Because, when you go to a budget negotiation, you've got to compromise, and you've got to meet the other party halfway. You've got a Tea Party right wing in this House that refuses to compromise. So what did they say? We're not going to go to conference. We are going to vote three times against negotiations. In May, in June, and in July, no negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady.

So what do you do if you don't want to negotiate, if you don't want to compromise? You back the country up against the wall, and here we are with that strategy.

The idea is, since you don't want to compromise in the regular order, let's try and get what we want by threatening to shut down the United States Government. If that doesn't work, we are going to make sure the United States Government can't pay its bills on time so that we can enact our radical agenda that way because you're not willing to do it through the regular process of compromise.

So nobody should be fooled about this idea of trying to get fig leaf cover on going to conference on this. We should have voted on the bill and kept the government open. It is a shameful day for the United States Government and especially for this Congress.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans came to the floor of the House several weeks ago—we've done it lots of times and have probably had 41 votes on ObamaCare. We've talked about how $716 billion was cut from senior care, Medicare. We think that's a problem. We think that was wrong. We think pushing this off on seniors is the wrong thing to do. We know the cost to employers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that point on Medicare?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

I do appreciate the gentleman because I know what he is going to tell me. He's going to say, Well, we used that money in our budget. In fact, we did, because this was an action that was done 3 years ago, and we are trying to repeal the bill that took $716 billion from seniors. We disagreed with it, but after 3 years, you have to use the money. We promised at that time that we would stay after it.

Look, the gentleman is the one who voted for it. Not one Republican voted to take the money. I know what their dialogue is, and I appreciate the gentleman. He is a very dear friend of mine. I know they're frustrated when we tell the truth about how bad this bill is.

With regard to the cost to employers, Delta Air Lines marched up to the White House in February and said, Hey, guys. Just so you know, you're

going to cost Delta Air Lines over $100 million this year. In the first year, it's going to cost $100 million.

Trust me. They were listening over there. That may be why they said, Whoops, we'll let business off the hook.

They should have done the same thing for everybody. Mr. Speaker, that's part of why we're here—we are here for fairness.

What do Members of Congress hear when they go back home? They hear a lot of things, but here is the one that we hear more than anything. What we hear about is that there have been seven part-time jobs created for every one full-time job in America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we were promised. We have talked a lot about what Republicans have said and not said and what's right and wrong. What is true is that the President of the United States stood right here and said: not one dime of taxpayer money, and you can keep the insurance that you've got if you want it. That's our promise to the American people.

□ 0015

Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare has passed, there have been for every seven part-time jobs that were created, only one full-time job. We're becoming a part-time job Nation. Mr. Speaker, you cannot be the greatest Nation in the world as an economic power, you cannot get kids, our young children, to want to go to college for a part-time job. It's just not working well.

That's why the Republican Party is here. That's why we have Members here tonight. That's why we've sent three CRs. That's why we have meeting after meeting after meeting trying to determine how do we best get after this. We didn't stay after the same way. We sent one offer, a second offer, a third offer. We're now asking something very simple: a chance to appoint conferees, get together face to face, talk about the issues and ideas, find room for compromise, and do something better. That's what we're asking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, although what we're doing here is an exercise in futility, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who has been doing a wonderful job.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, now Republicans want to negotiate. After the shutdown clock has struck the witching hour, after weeks of making threats of insisting on your way or the highway, of arrogantly demanding repeal or delay of affordable health care, now the Republicans say, Please negotiate.

This is not a motion to go to conference or a motion to negotiate. There's no time left for that. This is a motion to shut down our government. There's been plenty of time for negotiation, and Republicans said ''no'' at every turn. Forgive me if I remain skeptical that Republicans actually want to negotiate now.

Republicans can stop this shutdown right now if they bring to the floor the Senate-passed continuing resolution that removes divisive provisions that House Republicans insist upon.

This stunt tonight doesn't do one thing to end the government shutdown. We should call it what it really is: a pathetic, last-ditch attempt to not be blamed for a government shutdown. This is too little too late. We should greet this motion with the same cynicism with which it was offered.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, Congressman JOE BARTON, the dean of the Texas Republican delegation.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee as I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is past midnight. Officially, the government is shut down. That is not a good thing, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. We have been arguing politically the last several weeks various proposals to fund the government short term in a continuing resolution. We've been having some debates on the debt ceiling. If you're like me, most of your constituents, regardless of whether they're Republicans or Democrats, they're saying, Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and work things out. I think the Republican leadership in the House has been trying to do that. I know there's some disagreement on the other side about that.

In any event, we've come up with the novel idea of going to conference. I know a lot of the junior Members on both sides of the aisle don't know what a conference is. It's where the Speaker of the House and the House minority leader each appoint a certain number of Members, normally senior Members of the committee of jurisdiction, and the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate minority leader appoint Members of their respective parties. If they actually do it, according to regular order, lo and behold, the Members meet and they discuss things.

House Republicans would put a proposal on the table, House Democrats would; Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans. They would argue over it and debate it, maybe amend it. Then you take a vote. The House Members vote. If they agree, that's the House position, if the majority agrees. The Senate votes, and if they agree, that's the Senate position. If they don't agree, they have a stalemate. At least we'd be talking, and it would be Members, not leadership, rank-and-file Members. And it's just possible, if they open the conference, C–SPAN could cover it and the American people could see what's going on. There's no preordained outcome, Mr. Speaker, but it would be good for democracy.

I can see no reason why my friends on the minority side don't want to go to conference with the Senate. I would assume that the distinguished ranking member, NITA LOWEY, would head the Democrat conferees and that HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would head us. That's up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint that, but I assume that. I trust them. We can disagree on what the solution is, but for Heaven's sake, I can't see why we can't agree that actually doing what the rules say we should do is somehow partisan and somehow is a negative thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I rise in strong support of the resolution that we should go to conference with the other body and hopefully make it an expeditious conference and work this out.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

I've seen this act before, but most Americans don't recall the shutdown under the Clinton administration. What they recall is the 25 million jobs moving our economy forward, having peace and prosperity. And I would bet 20 years from now, this fleeting moment is not going to be recalled by many people in our country. They're going to think about the 42 months of straight employment gains, the return of the housing market, the auto industry, and bringing our young people home from Iraq.

This majority has managed this brilliantly. Now the ObamaCare affordable health care exchanges are open all across the land, but they've managed to shut the national parks and to do a lot of other damage to our reputation even by this meaningless shutdown. Senator MIKULSKI has said she'd be glad to go to conference once we pass a CR so that the government stays open.

What the majority comes to the floor with is, Well, we don't want the government to stay open; we want to go to conference. This is not going to work. The Obama record, from eliminating Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to Wall Street reform, to the stimulus, and, most importantly, for opening the door to health care for tens of millions of Americans who have never had the access to be able to go to a marketplace—those marketplaces are open. They're going to stay open no matter what this majority does. Never again is health care going to be denied to people who are American citizens here in the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Members come from diverse districts all over this country. Men and women get together, we meet, we talk, we have clear voices. We listen to each other about what people are hearing from back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr.

HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He is one of the clearest voices in the discussion that we've had. He represents a largely rural district—people who get up and go to work every day, people who have a lot at risk, people who care about this country, men and women who provide for their children, and their children are part of the military. They believe in this country, and they know that America's greatest days need to be in our future. It requires vigilance, and every day you have to stay after it.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing us to this point with his leadership in trying to get America back to work to take us off the road to bankruptcy and to ensure that there is fairness for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this debate—I'm sure the Americans perhaps on a little bit more Western time zone hopefully are still following this. If they are, I understand how they could get confused. But, Mr. Speaker, we're down to only debating two different matters here.

Should the bosses in America get a better deal than their employees in ObamaCare? That's what we're debating here. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are debating should Members of Congress get a better deal than every other American in ObamaCare? House Republicans say, No, that's not fair. That's not equal protection under the law. Yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle are now saying, No, no, no. They're going to protect this sweetheart deal.

It's not in the law, ladies and gentlemen, yet they want to protect this sweetheart deal. And people wonder why there's cynicism about Congress, about why Washington elites get to have a better deal than everybody else because they know more. Now Members of Congress, thanks to the Obama administration, are going to be the only people in America to get subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Clearly, the other side of the aisle wants to preserve this special deal for Members of Congress granted by the President of the United States. Where is the fairness in that, Mr. Speaker? Again, where is the fairness in letting employers—no, no, we're going to give you a year delay, but no fairness for the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon to make America great. That's what this debate is about.

Here we have one party who, because they won't treat employees as well as their employers because they're preserving a congressional sweetheart deal, are prepared to shut down the government. That's what we're debating. We've got two matters.

Mr. Speaker, we've come time after time after time in the spirit of negotiation, but, no, the President will negotiate with Iranians, he'll negotiate with Syrians, he'll negotiate with Russians, but he will not negotiate with Americans if they happen to be Republicans. No negotiation.

Again, is it any surprise that America gets cynical? Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Is it arrogance? Is it hubris? Is it pride? We know that this law apparently is not perfect already. The President has signed several changes into ObamaCare. Now we've had delay after delay after delay. Income verification, delayed; high-risk pools, delayed; out-of-pocket cost limitations, delayed; small business health options—just 3 or 4 days ago, as the President was extolling the virtues of the great rollout of ObamaCare, 20 minutes later his own administration announced yet another delay; small business health option.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has perhaps realized that his signature law is not perfect.

All House Republicans are saying in a spending bill—and ladies and gentlemen, this does spend money. This isn't some little sideshow. This is what we do in the Constitution. The Congress has the power of the purse. It's not the power of the rubber stamp. It is the power of the purse. ObamaCare is about the purse.

We're saying two things, Mr. President. In a law that you have already delayed time after time after time, if you're going to delay it for the employers, delay it for the employees. And, Mr. President, how can you decide that Members of Congress, to placate them, are going to get a sweetheart deal? This has to end, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are sitting here defending it, refusing to support a conference.

We need fairness for the American people. We need to go to conference. End the sweetheart deals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago, the House and Senate approved and the President signed the Affordable Care Act. Our friends on the other side said it was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court said they were wrong.

They nominated a candidate for President of the United States who said that if he was elected, the first thing he would do would be to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The voters said that was wrong.

And tonight their obsession continues, and they have shut down the United States Government because of that obsession. The American people rise up and join us in saying, you were wrong twice before, and you are wrong again this time. This is the wrong thing to do for the American public.

There's a way out of this debacle. It's to put on the House floor a bill that passed the United States Senate, that the President said he would sign, that most of us believe a majority of this House would vote for right now.

So I want to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if he would agree with me that the right and decent thing to do would be to put on this floor right now the Senate bill so that we can have an up-or-down vote.

Will the chairman agree to do that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. The House has attempted three times to send something over, and it's come back rejected every time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, will the chairman agree that the fair thing to do would be to put the Senate bill on the floor so that each Member could cast an up-or-down vote?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, the question I have is, Did the Senate pass the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the Senate passed a bill to keep the government running at your numbers that you wanted in budget.

We are asking, give every Member of this House a fair up-or-down vote on that bill. Will you do that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you put back in the language that we asked for, we will be very pleased to agree to it.

And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people in politics don't want to say ''yes'' or ''no,'' they just keep talking.

We could do a lot more tonight than just keep talking. We could cast a vote that would say to the American taxpayers, the services you are still paying for you're going to get tomorrow morning. The absence of that vote from the majority should tell you all you need to know. They are afraid to put that vote on the floor because they would lose.

Well, the American people are losing because of their bankrupt and invalid choice.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, our great government, on October 1, was going to be open for health care. Mr. Speaker, all anybody has to do is to go online right now and try to sign up for this after years of our friends in the Obama administration

getting ready. And the site says, I'm sorry, your account cannot be done. The system is unavailable.

So here we are at the great day of October 1, at 12:30. Mandatory funding by the government can't get in the way of that. Right here, system unavailable for the American public. Why am I not surprised?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), our side of the Texans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, let me disabuse my friends of any myth. Right now, the Republicans have shut the government down.

SOS message from Texas: we are a diverse State with different opinions. One that says, with so many people that need health insurance, we like ObamaCare.

But another SOS message: Ellington Field right now is shut down. The towers in Ellington Field in Texas are shut down. Why? Because the Republicans are on the floor of the House with a phony procedural vote that is not going anywhere, and the government is shut down.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, shut down. The SBA with no loans, shut down. Projects to improve our transportation, shut down. Federal economic reports and businesses, shut down. Workers in region 6 offices in the State of Texas, shut down. They will not be able to go to work tomorrow.

I only hope that we will have a moment of reconciliation and common sense to speak on behalf of the American people. Please know that Texas recognizes that the American people are important. I don't want a government shutdown. I want a vote on a clean continuing resolution now. Texas believes in the best for America, not special interests.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I've heard a number of the Members on the other side make reference to the notion that we ought to have a conference, and I have heard some eloquent commentary referencing the point that we ought to talk to one another.

Well, I know it's been said before, but I'm a new Member; and I heard a bit of a lecture, that maybe some of the new Members don't know what a conference committee is. Well, we know. We understand. We know how this works, so much so that many of us joined the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), on our side, on April 23 of this year asking that a conference committee be appointed to reconcile the differences in the budgets passed by the House and by the Senate. I didn't hear any of those speeches then about the value of talking to one another. Not until 15 minutes before the government of the United States was to be shut down did suddenly something that a freshman has known for a long time, did it occur to folks on the other side that it might be time to have a conversation. It's too little. It's too late. Bring the Senate-passed CR here, and we will adopt it.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, this is the latest gimmick in the latest game by people who simply cannot govern, and the casualty will be American families and the risk that they are inflicting on our economy.

Tomorrow in my home State and the ranking member's home State, the Statue of Liberty will be closed. The last time the Statue of Liberty was closed, Mr. Speaker, was when a hurricane struck it. And may I add that the majority refused to pass a bill to provide relief assistance when the Statue of Liberty was closed as a result of the hurricane. This time, the Statue of Liberty is going to be closed by their recklessness and their irresponsibility in order to advance a selfish political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect two things from us. They expect the government to stay open and operate efficiently, and they expect their Congress to communicate. Our position is that we should keep the government open and operating efficiently while we communicate and go to conference. Their position is, shut it down, close the Statue of Liberty, and talk later.

The American people want us to talk now, and they want this government to remain open. We have heard over the past several days and over the past 2 weeks our friends on the other side saying, listen to the American people. Our friends on the other side should listen to themselves. They have asked us for a budget today. They said, We want a budget. Take it or leave it. We gave them their figure. They said, Take it or leave it. We said, We'll take it; and they left it.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of chronic chaos continues every day, every night; and the American people deserve better.

Open the Statue of Liberty tomorrow. Keep Small Business Administration loans going to small businesses. Keep college loans going to kids who need the college loans. Keep middle class families afloat. And communicate while the government remains open.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me advise my colleague, Mr. Speaker, that I have one further request for time, and then I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before us this evening, and that question has been proffered by so many on the other side of the aisle. That question, as articulated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), is to do what's fair, to do what's fair for the American people—not Democrats, not Republicans, not Green Party, not Tea Party, but the American people.

The American people in the greatest land, the greatest country in the world deserve to have their government open; and they deserve to know where their Members stand.

Do you stand with your country? Do you stand for your country? Or do you want to take it down this evening?

Stand up for your country. Stand up for America. Stand with us this evening, and keep this government going in the name of fairness.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, I feel such a combination of both sadness and anger that it makes it really difficult for me to express it. On the one hand, the chaos and the lurching from crisis to crisis that this Congress has continually gone through leaves me not just perplexed but absolutely bewildered.

At the same time, I think what overrides everything for me tonight is a sense of terrible sadness that all of us here who have sworn to protect and defend the United States of America have completely given up on that idea. Because the majority has moved so assiduously towards this moment, this is on them. This government shutdown belongs to them for the rest of their lives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the great country of the United States, the beacon of light for almost everybody in the world, the defender of all the people in the world is out of a government now. The most important institution of government anywhere ever devised is now closed.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a night that we will remember. The things that will be remembered about this night are that our party has attempted to work with, reach out, and deal with our colleagues in the United States Senate.

We have sent a CR, a clean CR at sequester levels and defunding ObamaCare. It was shipped back to us. A second CR, a clean CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay of the entire ObamaCare law. A third CR at sequester levels, a 1-year delay, and removal

of certain benefits that we believe is fairness.

But the overriding suggestion that we have made tonight goes back to a little bit over an hour ago with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1245

He is asking for the opportunity for us to go to conference to resolve our differences, people working together, people looking at each other. As was suggested by the gentleman, Mr. BARTON, yeah, probably a TV would be in the room and the American people would get a chance to weigh and balance both sides also. We think that's important. That's what we're asking for. That's why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and this is what we stand for.

We're after fairness. We're after an opportunity to get these ideas and the issues resolved for the American people. So I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican majority has decided that appeasing radical Tea Party extremists is more important to them than providing necessary funding for the continued operation of the federal government, even on a temporary basis. Passing a common sense continuing resolution would ensure vital government services for millions of American families and business. These are the basic services provided everyday by federal agencies that keep our communities and country strong.

It is now the early morning hour of October 1st and Fiscal Year 2014 has commenced, but the government is shutdown. Here we are and the Republican majority in the House has failed to pass a simple, common sense extension to fund the government that the U.S. Senate passed three times.

The Tea Party GOP success in shutting down the government tonight means that over 800,000 federal employees will immediately be furloughed and vital federal services will be suspended indefinitely. Government services and functions we all take for granted for things like food inspections, government permitting, and essential scientific research will all immediately stop. They don't need to stop, but Republican House members have made this choice as part of a cynical, dangerous and harmful political strategy intended to appease conservatives, anarchists and those who disregard the value of government.

Why? Why would Congress want the government to shutdown? Because Tea Party Republicans are determined to repeal, defund, or delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), denying healthcare to tens of millions of uninsured Americans, in exchange for allowing the federal government to keep operating. This political stunt is beyond irresponsible, it is irrational when considering the damage it will cause to the economy, job creation, and families all across America.

Despite the fact that ObamaCare is the law, upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional, and was the basis of President Obama's re-election in 2012, House Tea Party Republicans still feel they can ''negotiate'' the dismantling of ObamaCare by holding the entire federal government hostage.

Ironically, the Affordable Care Act's exchanges will open today and this government shutdown will do nothing to deter, delay or derail this critical health program from being implemented. ObamaCare is going forward and millions of Americans will have access to affordable healthcare. House Republicans have voted as many as 45 times, including tonight, to repeal, replace or defund ObamaCare. They are obsessed with this law and it has become a mania that has now resulted in a shutdown of the U.S. government—it is outrageous and it angers me greatly. It is a disgrace.

When will House Republicans end the dangerous game they are playing and put the needs of our Nation above their narrow, backwards, and irresponsible ideological demands? I was optimistic that Democrats and Republicans could find common ground on a clean continuing resolution that passed the U.S. Senate to fund the government for the next six weeks.

It is clear to the American people that the Republican strategy has been to create a crisis and use a government shutdown as a bargaining chip to advance an extreme agenda regardless whether there are millions of Americans who get hurt.

Yesterday in Politico my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho, Rep. MIKE SIMPSON, was quoted as saying, ''We bitched and moaned about the Senate not doing a budget. Then they did, and we didn't go to conference. You need a big plan, Democrats and Republicans in the same room. We should have gone to conference.''

He is right. House Republicans refused to negotiate on the federal budget. The ignored calls from Democrats to appoint conferees.

Tonight the New York Times reported, ''The House's most ardent conservatives appeared ready to see their war over the health care law through to its inevitable conclusion, a shutdown that would test voters' patience. But cracks in the Republican caucus opened into fissures of frustration.''

The Times article then goes to quote one of our colleages: ''You have this group that keeps saying somehow if you're not with them, you're for Obamacare,'' said Representative DEVIN NUNES, Republican of California. ''If you're not with exactly their plan, exactly what they want to do, then you're somehow for Obamacare, and it's just getting a little old. It's moronic to shut down the government over this.''

That's right ''moronic.'' And I could not agree with my Republican colleague more.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the passage of a continuing resolution is about funding the government—not re-writing law to repeal, defund, or derail health reform. Democrats would like to see a Farm Bill, immigration reform, and responsible gun safety legislation passed into law, but we are not holding the federal government and the American people hostage to advance our legislative priorities. It is not responsible. Congress needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, re-open the government, and govern responsibly.

The situation the American people find themselves in at this moment is appalling, it is maddening. This Republican Congress has abdicated its responsibility and duty to the citizens of this country. This federal government shutdown is a manufactured crisis for political gain propagated by the extremists who disdain government itself.

My job as a member of Congress is to govern. I am committed to work With my Republican colleagues, my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and the Obama Administration to pass a clean continuing resolution that funds the government without legislating radical riders or hostage taking.

This great nation is being tested by the irresponsibility of a House Republican majority that refused to govern. I sincerely hope the American people voice their displeasure, disdain, and disgust at the political game playing.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, the 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—199

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Bachus
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Velázquez

□ 0110

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUIZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER Pro Tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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. 1566. An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 368, the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 0115

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on House Joint Resolution 59:

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky, FRELINGHUYSEN, CRENSHAW, and CARTER.

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CANTOR, CAMP, RYAN of Wisconsin, and GRAVES of Georgia.

Additional conferees may be appointed on the recommendation of the minority leader.

REPUBLICAN-LED HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHUTS DOWN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a real sad day in the House of Representatives.

You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. What happened tonight is the Republican-controlled extremists—bullies or hostage-takers—took the American Government and our economy hostage to their demands. This is a shameful day. This Congress makes the Gingrich Congress look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the United States Government because they don't want the American people to have affordable health care. Shame on the Republican Party. Shame on you.

Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time.The American people know that there is a small minority who are controlling the Republican Party in the House, and they are acting like bullies . . . or rather hostage takers. Taking the American government and our economy hostage to demands that will not be met.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republicans. Here we go again: I have been in office for over 20 years and this is the worst, the most extreme Congress I have ever worked with. Today's Republican Party make the Gingrich era members in the mid 1990's look like moderates.

The Republican Party has shut down the government because they don't like the idea of providing health insurance to ALL Americans. And remember: The Affordable Care Act passed both chambers of the United States Congress, was signed into law by the President of the United States, was upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and received a stamp of approval by the American public when they voted to re-elect President Obama. It is now time for House Republicans to accept the ACA and assist their constituents to receive the many heath care benefits that Obamacare offers.

On this day, the President helped move the country forward with open enrollment for the Affordable Care Act, and the GOP moved the country backwards by shutting down the government.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try and act like grown-ups so we can all work together to pass a Continuing Resolution to keep our government open to provide the services that our citizens pay for and deserve.

NO SPECIAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, all we did is we asked the Senate to negotiate with the House.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, the Majority Leader in the Senate

doesn't even want to talk to the House about as fundamental an issue as funding the government starting an hour and 20 minutes ago, and whether or not there should be no special treatment for anyone under the Affordable Care Act—no special treatment for big corporations at the expense of the average American, and no special treatment for Members of Congress and their staff and the President and the Cabinet and their staff.

Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader should negotiate on those, and I hope he changes his mind tomorrow morning.

REMEMBERING DR. CECILE HARRISON

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the family of a very, very dear friend who lost her life a week ago, Dr. Cecile Harrison, a professor at Texas Southern University with a Ph.D. in sociology and a heart as large as the world can imagine. She was a professor's professor; a teacher's teacher; she was a mentor to students; and, yes, she loved politics and the process of government.

What I was so grateful for, because it is often not done, is she taught young people the value of this great Nation, the three branches of government, the constitutional interaction given by the Constitution of the United States, and the respect for the three branches of government. She taught students to love the idea of political participation without personal gain.

I was delighted to see her involve herself in campaigns all over the State and in our community, but most importantly, a friend to the Honorable Barbara Jordan and an initial campaign manager for her. A Wheatley graduate.

Dear Cecile, thank you for your sincerity. You are a great American. May God bless you and your family, and may you rest in peace.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, so it's after 1 a.m. on October 1 and the government has shut down. And what's the best that we could get from the House Republican majority? A proposal to invite conferees to sit down and talk about resolving our differences.

The fact is that we've known what our responsibility was—it is to fund the government. It's not to allow 800,000 Federal employees to be told they can't go into work, they can't get paid. It's not to close down our national parks and monuments. It's not to take hundreds of millions—potentially billions—of dollars out of our economy needlessly. It's not to disrupt the stock markets. It's not to create these financial crises. These are crises of our own doing.

We've got a great country, a strong economy, a terrific society, and all we can do is to erode trust and confidence in our government. We should be ashamed of ourselves.

''LET'S PLAY TWO!''

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's late back here, but I'm from the west coast, so ''let's play two.''

I'm really disappointed with the rhetoric that's been flying out of here in recent days. You hear all Republicans this, or Tea Party that, or you're in the hold of the Tea Party.

You know, we're in the hold of the American people here because we see this Obama health care plan is not affordable; it's not going to work. We're just trying to go back and take another bite and see if we can revise, delay, or do something different than foist these costs and an unworkable program that's going to ruin people's health care. Let's go back to the table.

Instead, we get ''no'' from the President, we get ''no'' from the Senate, we get a lot of ''no'' from the other side of the aisle.

Aren't we supposed to have a negotiation? Aren't we supposed to have a discussion here? The American people demand that. They're seeing that this program is not going to work. It's going to cost them; it's going to cost their jobs; it's going to make their health care less accessible. And yet all we get are ''no.''

So if we want to look at who's causing this government shutdown, listen to the people yelling the most about it over on the other side of the aisle—yes, yelling.

So we're here. We're ready to play two here tonight if we need to.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say they're for the middle class, but I can't hear what they say because their actions speak far more loudly.

The working man just got a $100-per-month pay cut with the expiration of the payroll tax cut. The President's war on coal will deny our power companies the cheapest fuel and will increase American families' monthly utility bills by another $50 a month.

The administration's energy policy is designed to drive up cost at the pump, up over $1 a gallon in the last 4 years, costing the average American family $150 per month. Every day folks will pay more for medical equipment which they desperately need with the medical device tax.

Now comes ObamaCare. Forbes magazine estimates that medical insurance will cost 90 percent more for the average man, 60 percent more for the average woman, which will cost families in South Carolina hundreds of additional dollars per month. And if they don't want to buy health insurance, they will be fined.

It appears that my colleagues across the aisle have a plan, Mr. Speaker: break the middle class with taxes and higher costs on necessities, and then they will take care of us as we will all be dependent on the government. But, hey, then at least we will get subsidized health insurance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 1 on account of unavoidable pressing business in district.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 3 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

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. 310. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 27, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 527. 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. To amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 28, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following 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.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 30, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3210. Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, October 1, 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:

3143. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Privacy Protections of Information From Applicant Households [FNS-2009-0024] (RIN: 0584-AD91) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3144. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interstate Movement of Sharwil Avocados From Hawaii [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD70) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3145. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge [Docket ID: ED-2013-OESE-0046] (RIN: 1810-AB18) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3146. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top — District [Docket No.: ED-2013-OS-0050] received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3147. A letter from the Program Analyst, Financial Operations, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2013; Procedures for Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2008 [MD Docket No.: 13-140] [MD Docket No.: 12-201] [MD Docket No.: 08-65] received September 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3148. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Potomac River, Georgetown Channel and Tidal Basin; Washington, DC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0790] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3149. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; York River; Gloucester, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0750] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3150. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Flying Machine Competition, Chicago, IL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0685] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3151. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Suisun Bay Electromagnetic Scan and Ordnance Recovery, Suisun Bay, Concord, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0692] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3152. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Bulk Packaging to Allow for Transfer of Hazardous Liquid Cargoes [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0088] (RIN: 1625-AB63) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0361; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-17527; AD 2013-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0362; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-030-AD; Amendment 39-17531; AD 2013-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1297; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-100-AD; Amendment 39-17285; AD 2012-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. and Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0145; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-17554; AD 2013-16-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1158; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-16847; AD 2011-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0566; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-17065; AD 2012-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller, Inc. Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0130; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-17520; AD 2013-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3160. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disease Associated With Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Peripheral Neuropathy (RIN: 2900-AO32) September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3161. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vet Center Services (RIN: 2900-AN92) received September 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3162. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Deduction and Capitalization of Expenditures Related to Tangible Property [TD 9636] (RIN: 1545-BE18) received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–228, Pt. 2).

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 113–239). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–240). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3219. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide copyright owners in sounds recordings with the exclusive right to negotiate in the marketplace the performance of their works to the public by means of an audio transmission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3223. A bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224. A bill to withhold the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution requiring reaffirmation of the Affordable Care Act and making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69. 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 Ms. CLARKE (for herself and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 369. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a ''National Americans of African Immigrant Heritage Month'' in September to celebrate the great contributions of Americans of African immigrant heritage in the United States who have enriched the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. WATT:

H.R. 3219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, section 8, clause 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

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 Governemnt of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3221.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1; Sec 8; Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress can determine salaries and compensation of Members of Congress under Article 1, Section 6 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.J. Res. 67.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 68.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this.legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

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. 7: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 182: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 184: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 366: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 474: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 523: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 533: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 636: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 647: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 664: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 679: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 685: Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 712: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 719: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 724: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 831: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 920: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 942: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 956: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 961: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 983: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1005: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1015: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1094: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1095: Mr. COOPER and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1130: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1150: Ms. BASS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1179: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1180: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1240: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1295: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1389: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1440: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1461: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1518: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1573: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1587: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1650: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1666: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1763: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1787: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1803: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1878: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1905: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1941: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2053: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2134: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2199: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2224: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2241: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2288: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2328: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2399: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 2429: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2500: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2504: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2510: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2575: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2638: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 2647: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2662: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2669: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2720: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2728: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2735: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2772: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2797: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2809: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2831: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2841: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2866: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2887: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2909: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2916: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2928: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2932: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2974: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2994: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3040: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3076: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3097: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3099: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3103: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3116: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3121: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RADEL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3128: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3152: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YODER, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 3160: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3166: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3172: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3173: Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3178: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3179: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3196: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3205: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3206: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3215: Mr. ENYART.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.J. Res. 64: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 63: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 72: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 104: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 227: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 281: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 353: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 356: Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 363: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 No. 132

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD J. DURBIN, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our ever-present help in trouble, as our Nation stumbles toward a seemingly unavoidable government shutdown, keep our lawmakers from sowing to the wind, thereby risking reaping the whirlwind. May they remember that all that is necessary for unintended catastrophic consequences is for good people to do nothing. Lord, lead them away from the unfortunate dialectic of us versus them, as they strive to unite for the common good of this land we love. Let them not be content to wait and see what will happen but give them the determination to make the right things happen. Bless them with the courage to stand for something, lest they fall for anything.

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 assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD J. DURBIN, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DURBIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H. J. Res 59.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H.J. Res. 59) entitled ''Joint Resolution Making Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014, and for other purposes,'' with amendments.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table the House amendments and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Cardin
Baucus	Boxer	Carper
Begich	Brown	Casey
Bennet	Cantwell	Coons
Donnelly	Landrieu	Reid
Durbin	Leahy	Rockefeller
Feinstein	Levin	Sanders
Franken	Manchin	Schatz
Gillibrand	Markey	Schumer
Hagan	McCaskill	Shaheen
Harkin	Menendez	Stabenow
Heinrich	Merkley	Tester
Heitkamp	Mikulski	Udall (CO)
Hirono	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Johnson (SD)	Murray	Warner
Kaine	Nelson	Warren
King	Pryor	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	McConnell	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to table the House amendments to the Senate amendment to the House resolution prevails.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

to a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the time until 4 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority leader to be recognized at 4 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that the first speaker to be recognized be the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are at the brink. We are only hours away from a possible government shutdown. All over my State and all over the Nation there are very devoted Federal employees who are waiting to hear: Are we going to be called nonessential to performing important government services?

Should they come in tomorrow? People have applied for small business loans. Are those loans going to be processed? People have applied for student loans. Are they going to be processed?

What is going to happen to the National Weather Service? What is going to happen at NIH? What is going to happen at the Food and Drug Administration, where people stand sentry over the safety of our food supply and our drug supply.

We don't know because we have just tabled the radical bill that the House sent over to us. It was deliberately designed to be politically provocative. Continuing resolutions were always about disputes over money. They were not about political, ideological viewpoints over past legislation.

I am pleased that what we did was to table it and send it back to the House. The Senate acted very responsibly last week on a short-term continuing funding resolution that got rid of politically motivated riders and kept the government working for the American people until November 15 to work out our differences on funding bills.

The House sent this back—yet one more bill that says if you don't delay the Affordable Care Act for 1 year, we will shut down the government. If you don't eliminate the benefits affecting prevention and particularly women's health, we will shut down the government. If the government shuts down tomorrow, it will be because of the House's viewpoint: My way or the highway.

A government shutdown is a serious matter. These are a few things that will happen if we don't come together across the aisle, across the dome, and across town to pass a clean short-term continuing resolution. I wish to take a minute to highlight how damaging a government shutdown is on the day-to-day lives of our American people and our economy.

Shutting down the Federal Government will have immediate and harmful consequences on our economy. Small Business Administration approval loans will be put on hold, and 28 million small businesses will no longer have access to federally assisted loans or technical assistance.

In the rural areas, the USDA Rural Development housing, farm loan and grant program will stop.

Let's go to the safety of our waterways. The Army Corps of Engineers will stop work on all flood control and navigation projects. This is what helps ensure that our ships can travel through America's waterways, whether they are coming up the Chesapeake Bay into the Port of Baltimore or they are traveling down the Mississippi River or the Missouri River or coming into the gulf.

The Department of Commerce will stop economic development, minority business, and international trade assistance programs.

I know that the House passed a separate amendment funding active duty military. I would hope so. These are men and women who put themselves in the line of duty.

I also wish to remind people that there are other people every day who are doing a job to protect the health, safety, and laws of the American people. I represent all of the men and women who work at the Food and Drug Administration. It is headquartered in my State, and 2,000 people—or 55 percent—will be furloughed at midnight.

FDA will stop monitoring imports at our borders. What does that mean? Those men and women whose job it is to stand sentry over the food supply of the United States of America, we are going to tell them they are nonessential. If they stand sentry over the safety of our drugs and our medical devices, we are telling them they are nonessential. I don't think the American people support that. They might be a little bit cranky about the Federal Government here or there, but I think they want their food to be safe, their drugs to be safe, and they want us to move ahead with these devices to make sure they are in clinical practice.

Over at the National Institutes of Health, which is located in Bethesda, MD—the National Institutes of Health and their subsidiaries that receive extramural funding throughout the United States of America—70 percent of the staff at NIH will be furloughed. Seventy percent of the 10,000 men and women who work at NIH will be furloughed at midnight. These are the people who are working on the cure for Alzheimer's, they are working on the cure for autism, and they are working on the cure for arthritis, and I am just going through the ''a'' words. We could go on to the ''b'' words. How about breast cancer? How about cancer itself? Last year, when the NIH announced that cancer rates in America had been reduced by 15 percent, instead of pinning medals on the people at NIH and the private sector who worked with us on important drugs and biological products, we announced sequester. What kind of government would destroy the very agency that is set up to come up with cures in the case of Alzheimer's cognitive stretch-out? Seventy percent. And who are they? They are the lab technician people. They are the people who help run the administrative end of things, which enables those talented researchers to be able to do this.

The NIH Clinical Center won't be able to admit new patients or start new clinical trials. The NIH Clinical Center is a hospital at NIH. You don't go there unless you are really sick and unless you are really desperate and unless you really have no place to go. You go in with no hope. But that is what they have nicknamed NIH around America—not the National Institutes of Health but the National Institutes of Hope, that what they are doing today is going to lead to solving the problems of tomorrow. Why? Why are we furloughing 70 percent? And not only are we furloughing, we are saying: Bye-bye for now. You are nonessential.

Well, I think they are crucial. I think they are not only essential, but I think they are crucial. So I worry about what are our priorities.

Then we go to the weather forecasters. Oh, they will be on the job. They are located in my State too.

You might say: Well, do you have any people who work in the private sector?

People in Maryland work in the private sector because of the public sector.

Our law enforcement, our FBI, will be on the job. They are in the line of fire too, but they will be getting an IOU. Instead of an IOU, we should say to the FBI and to our border patrol and to our marshals, who are chasing sexual predators and human traffickers, not an IOU, we owe you a debt of gratitude. We owe you getting your pay on time. We shouldn't hide the fact you haven't received a cost of living for 3 years. And we shouldn't be dancing around with ideologically motivated shutdowns.

Social Security checks will go out, but the 18,000 people who will visit Social Security offices will find they are understaffed. On the average, half a million people call Social Security every day. They are going to get either no answer or a busy signal.

I could go on and on about what the consequences of a shutdown will be. We really cannot do that. So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the dome, please, let's pass a clean CR. Let's pass it to November 15. Let's negotiate on a middle-ground number. They have a budget number of $988 billion, and they accept sequester as the new norm. Let's find a way to cancel sequester at least for 2 years.

I marked up the appropriations bills at $1.058 trillion. That is the number the Senate passed in its Budget Committee in April. There is a $70 billion

difference. I am ready to negotiate, but we can't capitulate. Let's find a middle ground.

There was a great American general and a great statesman and a real American icon—Colin Powell. Over and over during the Reagan administration he would say: Let's find that sensible center. Let's find that sensible center.

Let's avoid a shutdown. Let's stop playing slam-down politics. Let's come together and find a way to solve the problem of keeping the government open as well as a long-term fiscal solution for paying down our government's debt. I understand that. But also let's make sure we have a progrowth budget that lowers the unemployment rate, raises educational achievement, finds those cures for diseases affecting the American people. Let's have an FDA that can get them approved, ensuring safety and efficacy in the hands of our doctors here and doctors all over the world. Let's make sure that when we talk about American exceptionalism, we know where it comes from.

Mr. President, I know there are other colleagues who wish to speak. I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I find the position we are in right now beyond frustrating, and I can imagine what the American people must be thinking right now. It is very hard from a distance to figure out who has really lost their minds—one party, the other party, all of us, the President. But I really want to boil down what has occurred because it is stunning when you boil it down.

The House sent us a piece of legislation where they wanted to defund the health care reforms—ObamaCare—and that was the price they were demanding in order for the government to stay open. The ticket to admission for an open government was our getting rid of the health care bill. Well, we took that up and we defeated that bill. By a 10-vote margin, 54 to 44, we defeated that bill, and we sent it back to them with just the ticket to keep the government open—without an extra price of admission.

This is where it gets interesting. What happened after we sent that back? Did they take it up and defeat it? No. No. They didn't vote. I want to make sure the American people understand this. All of the Members of Congress who were elected to serve the people of this country didn't get a chance to vote because the Speaker decided there wouldn't be a vote in the House of Representatives on the Senate-passed measure.

Somebody said: Well, it is the Hastert rule.

I have searched the Constitution, and I can't find the Hastert rule. It is not there. So the question we have to ask right now is, Why won't they let the House vote? Maybe they will defeat a clean attempt just to keep the government open.

By the way, nobody here is against negotiating or compromise. We have compromised on the number in this continuing resolution, and we are perfectly willing and, in fact, we have been desperately trying to negotiate and compromise on the budget for months. Senator CRUZ has blocked our attempts to go to conference on the budget.

So it is not that none of us are willing to compromise. Maybe some of us aren't, but there is a good healthy bipartisan margin of Senators who want to compromise on issues surrounding Federal spending but not on keeping the government open and not on paying our bills. Let's get those done. Let's get those done. That is basic. Let's get it done.

So my plea today to Speaker BOEHNER is this: Quit making decisions on behalf of all your Members—a small group of you huddled in a back room—because that is what is happening. There are two or three men in a back room down the hall, and they are deciding whether they are going to allow the elected representatives of this country to vote. I say let the House vote. I think the American people may be surprised that there would be a healthy bipartisan margin to, in fact, keep the government open when the clock strikes midnight tonight.

Elections matter, and elections are what dictate what happens around here. We had an election last November. I remember it very well. I stood for election last November. There were two candidates for President of the United States, and every American citizen had a chance to decide who they wanted to lead this country. The contrast was very clear. One candidate said he was going to repeal ObamaCare on the very first day he was President. He was going to, by Executive order, wipe out ObamaCare on day one. The other candidate said: I am going to implement ObamaCare. That candidate won, and it wasn't even close.

Every single Democratic Senator who ran for reelection and voted for ObamaCare was reelected. Red State, purple State, blue State—all of us were reelected who voted for ObamaCare. In fact, a couple more were elected in States where Republicans had represented those States. We didn't lose seats, we picked up seats. Even in the House of Representatives, the raw votes, there were more Democratic votes cast in the House of Representatives than Republican votes. They have the majority because of the way the districts are drawn. And I understand they control that House, but should they control whether people get to vote? Let the House vote.

They say: ObamaCare is so unpopular; the American people don't want it.

Now, I get that the polling is not good for this reform, and I am perfectly willing, as we implement it, if we need to, to make tweaks and changes to make it better.

I hope my friends across the aisle will quit using this as a political 2 by 4 and help us make it as good as we can possibly make it because this isn't about any plot, this is about accessible and affordable health care for all Americans with a free market solution. These are all private insurance companies. There is not a government program in this. People are going to be able to choose between various private policies and various options, and they are never going to have to pay more than 9½ percent of their income for their insurance. The insurance companies aren't going to be able to swallow fat profits for golden parachutes for big CEOs anymore. They are going to have to spend 80 cents of every dollar for your health care. But it is all free market.

This was a Republican solution in the beginning. The candidate for President forgot that—former Governor Romney—this was his solution for Massachusetts when he was Governor.

Now, I will give the Republicans this: It is unpopular in the polls right now. But let's take this proposition: Guess what background checks for guns polls right now? I know the Presiding Officer knows painfully well what those numbers are because of the tragedy in his State. It is much higher, frankly, than those who say they think ObamaCare should be repealed—the Americans who support background checks on weapons purchases. So what would everyone on the other side of the aisle think if we decided, well, you know, we are going to shut down the government if you won't pass background checks on guns. It is what the American people want. We will just shut down the government if you won't pass it. That is not the way we legislate. That is not the constitutional framework our Founding Fathers put together. There would be outrage that we would try to shut down the government over background checks on guns. Yet the very same premise would apply to what they are doing.

The President won. The majority of the Senate are in fact individuals who support this valiant attempt to try to do something with a health care system that was headed off the rails, becoming more and more unaffordable every day. By the way, everything that is bad now is ObamaCare. I laughingly made a joke in my State that our university's team didn't do very well in offense during the first half. I said, it must be ObamaCare. Because no matter what is out there that people are upset about, somehow they manage to paint it with the ObamaCare brush.

I think people are going to be pleasantly surprised. It is not going to be as intrusive as some of the talking heads warned. It is going to provide a marketplace where people can pool risk and get a better deal. It is going to provide a lot more nights where parents can rest easy because they are not rolling the dice every day and depending on the emergency room for their day-to-day health needs.

My message today is very simple. All of this is premised on the notion that

one should be able to shut down our government because they don't get their way in an election. I don't think that is the role model we want to serve to the other governments in the world, much less to our kids. I think we can compromise on a lot. We can even work on making this bill better. But let's keep the government open, let's pay our bills, and then let's sit down and have some meaningful negotiation and compromise about Federal spending. I am somebody in my caucus who is always open to other ways we can cut spending. Some in my caucus don't feel as strongly as I do about that, but I am willing to listen to all sides and negotiate around the budget.

Let's not hold our economy hostage in the process. Real people are going to be hurt. This isn't just about who is on the Sunday morning shows, who is your primary opponent, what are they saying on cable news. This is about real folks, and we need to be focused on them.

I implore Speaker BOEHNER, let the Members vote. Just let them vote. Put it on the floor. He can do it in an hour. Put it on the floor and let them vote. If it is defeated, then let's talk. I will bet it won't be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

DEFICIT-NEUTRAL DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I believe the Deficit-Neutral Disaster Relief Act Senator BENNET and I have drafted is at the desk. It is my understanding both sides have cleared the bill, I would add, after a lot of pushing from Senator BENNET and me and other Coloradans, along with the Governor and Department of Transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1560, introduced earlier by Senators BENNET and UDALL of Colorado, that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1560) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1560

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 ''Deficit Neutral Disaster Relief Act''.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY RELIEF PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may obligate not more than $450,000,000 of the amounts made available to carry out section 125 of title 23, United States Code, under chapter 9 of title X of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2; 127 Stat. 34) under the heading ''EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM'' under the heading ''FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS'' under the heading ''FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION'' for emergency relief projects in the State of Colorado arising from damage caused by flooding events in that State in calendar year 2013.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR STATUTORY PAYGO.—This Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues and once again outline what this important act we passed will do. It is critically important.

I was on the floor Friday, and the Presiding Officer was here on Friday and was patient and listened to the case Senator BENNET and I made at that time. This is critically important because it will allow Colorado to begin rebuilding our battered roads and bridges and highways without having to wait years for relief. We are close now to getting this legislation to the President's desk, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House, with Senator BENNET, to get this bill signed into law as soon as possible.

Senator BENNET and I have been on the floor on a number of occasions in recent days to highlight how devastated certain parts of our beautiful State are as a result of these biblical floods we suffered a few weeks ago. Many communities are just now beginning to comprehend how serious the damage is and to see firsthand how many hundreds of miles of highways, roads, bridges, and other parts of our infrastructure are ruined or in some cases even washed away entirely.

I have had many occasions to see this damage firsthand in the last few weeks, starting in my own neighborhood, which was evacuated, but all over the northern front range. I was in Jamestown on Saturday. Senator BENNET was there a few days earlier. It is one of the worst-hit communities in Boulder Canyon. It is almost beyond description. The homes are literally washed off their foundations, cars were embedded in the ground, completely buried. Families were left in some cases with 2 to 3 feet of mud and silt, river cobbles literally inside their homes. I was in one home in Jamestown standing on the mud and silt, and my head was touching the ceiling because of the 3 feet of debris that was inside that house. We have seen entire roads and highways completely decimated. Without this help, it is a fact that communities will not be able to rebuild.

By passing the Deficit-Neutral Disaster Relief Act, we have lifted the statutory cap of $100 million to a limit of $450 million. The money applies to highway relief, so it will be enough to help us rebuild swiftly.

As I have done here before, I want to again make it clear that this isn't new money. It doesn't increase budget authority or increase net outlays. It simply allows us to access an already existing appropriated fund of money.

Historically, this $100 million cap on relief has routinely been recognized by Congress as an unwise impediment to helping States recover and it has been raised for nearly every natural disaster in recent years. Examples would be familiar to anybody listening. We raised the cap on transportation disaster relief for Hurricanes Gustav, Ike, Irene, Sandy, as well as during the Missouri River basin flooding in 2011.

I am truly appreciative and truly grateful that all of our colleagues have come together to recognize that the floods in Colorado are no exception. We are all in this together when it comes to responding to national disasters. I am glad that today we can say to Coloradans Members of Congress from all across the United States of America have stood with us in our recovery efforts, and we will stand with them in their recovery efforts as we have in the past as we experience natural disasters.

I thank the Senate for clearing this crucial legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and look forward to the remarks of my colleague Senator BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I will be brief because I think Senator UDALL has covered it very well. But I also want to rise today on this floor to thank all 100 of our colleges who were necessary for getting this done and for getting it passed. We have to move it along to the President's desk.

There are a lot of times when people at home wonder whether anybody in this place is listening to them and whether we are doing something other than playing politics with each other. This is a clear case where people here have listened to the people in Colorado, who have generously from time to time helped people in other States that were confronting disasters. Now it is our turn to ask for help, and that help has been granted.

I wish to thank Senator UDALL for his leadership in particular, but also all the Members in the Senate who made this possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls during the period of morning business be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments about the crisis that is unfolding before us. Right now some colleagues in the Senate and others over on the House side are holding the entire American economy hostage to make their favorite point on policy. I must say that this blackmail against ordinary working class Americans—threatening to steal whatever momentum our economy has rather than build greater momentum and greater job growth—is deeply misguided. That is really as polite a way as I can possibly put it.

Think about what working families have been through over the last few years. The deregulation of Wall Street leading to predatory mortgages that hurt millions of families, and then the securities that those were based on, proceeded to derail our entire economy, hurting millions more. Families lost their savings. They lost their jobs. They lost the equity in their house.

All that working families are asking for is a little bit of common sense. Don't do further damage to the economy that is struggling to recover. Yet certain colleagues here in the Senate and over in the House seem to believe that the little people don't matter, the working people do not matter, the stability of the foundation for families and living-wage jobs doesn't matter because they can play whatever political games they want and the only people hurt are ones they do not see in their life. Maybe they live in a gated community. Maybe they live in a bubble. But I see those people. I see them every day. They are the salt of the Earth. They are the workshop that takes America forward. They are the small businesses across this Nation. All they are asking for is a little reasonableness and common sense.

Some of my colleagues have said this crisis comes because the majority party in the Senate has refused to negotiate. Nothing could be further from the truth. Negotiation in the budget process starts with each side passing a budget resolution and holding a conference committee. But it is Members of the minority of this Chamber who have come to this floor at least 18 times to block the start of a conference committee in order to work out the budget. I cannot imagine in my wildest dreams why they are terrified of there being a conversation between leadership in the House and leadership in the Senate, meeting with the television cameras on to work out the details of a budget compromise. But they seem terrified, petrified, scared to death that there will be a conversation between the House and Senate that would lead to a compromise.

So, indeed, there has been obstruction on compromise, and we know exactly where it is. They are the same individuals who are trying to drive the economy over the cliff right now. Moreover, members of this party said let's go further. The Senate has a number. The House has a number. But the budget conference committee is being blocked. Let's simply accept the House number, and not split it down the middle, not insist on our number, let's take the House number. That is going far beyond the middle path, if you will. That is a major compromise. If you are looking for compromise, it is happening with the leadership of the Senate putting forward a compromise that takes the House number for the budget. It appears that certain individuals in this body just do not want to take yes for an answer.

I am going to conclude my remarks. I see my colleague, the esteemed Senator from Illinois has arrived. I want to close with this notion. This is not the first crisis that has been artificially manufactured that has damaged the American economy. Let us remember that similarly we faced this in April 2011 with the continuing resolution. We faced a manufactured crisis with the debt ceiling in July of 2011. We faced the December 2012 fiscal cliff that did substantial damage; in March of this year, the continuing resolution, which brings us up to right now.

This is not all. The same individuals who are threatening at this moment to drive our economy over a cliff are saying we will do it again in a couple of weeks over another debt ceiling issue and when this continuing resolution expires a few weeks from now, if we get one done, we will do it again a few weeks from now—three crises in a period of just a few weeks. If you want to destroy the economy for working Americans, this is how it is done, and it is unacceptable. We need a bipartisan, commonsense caucus to come together and simply say no to those who are trying to create this terrible blackmail using American working families in the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are just hours away from a government shutdown. I think tea party Republicans saw the ''Breaking Bad'' dramatic depiction of reckless behavior last night and thought they could put on an even better finale, create even more drama, and cook up even more toxic ideas. They thought they could break this government in every bad way possible. These tea party antics are the stuff of fairy tales. The way the GOP is writing this story at the stroke of midnight as we turn the calendar toward October, our government and potentially our economic recovery turn into a pumpkin.

But it is the tea party GOP who are in fantasyland by thinking we will allow them to cut off ObamaCare, shut down government, and melt down our economy. Democrats are not going to allow them to do this.

What do the American people want? Americans want our military to get paid on time. Americans want our seniors to get the benefits they have earned and depend on. Americans want to be able to respond to floods in Colorado or wildfires in the West.

The American people don't want the government to shut down. Americans want a business plan that completes this recovery, creates jobs, and gets our economy back on track. They want us to work together to accomplish this goal.

What are the effects of the tea party Republican tactics? By forcing Congress to govern by going from crisis to crisis, tea party Republicans hope to chip away at the bedrock programs that run our country and help our people.

First, the tea party did this with sequestration, which is a fancy word for mindless cuts in programs that help ordinary families in our country. Now they are going after the ObamaCare law. What is next are their enduring targets such as Social Security, Medicare, and the safety net programs that millions of Americans depend on. These are the same Republicans who want to privatize Social Security. They want to turn Medicare into a voucher program. Now they want to reverse the progress achieved by the legendary Ted Kennedy, who made it clear that in the United States of America health care is a right and not a privilege.

The tea party Republicans are playing high-wire politics with our economy so they can take away the social safety net for millions of American families. This bill is just a preview of coming attractions. Two weeks from now we will be careening to the next crisis, this time over whether America will pay its debts. If we do not raise the debt ceiling, we will not be able to pay our bills starting on October 17.

What is the harm of defaulting on our debts? Our Nation's stock and bond markets could go into a free fall that will damage the full faith and credit of our country, the bedrock of the entire American economy. What does that mean? The full faith and credit of the United States is in question.

If you took out a mortgage, had a car loan, bought some furniture, and when the bill came due you said: I am not going to pay these bills, what do you think would happen? Your credit score would plummet. It would throw your financial life into chaos for years. No one would lend you money, or, at a minimum, you would be hit with sky-high interest payments because of the risk that you wouldn't pay the next time either.

Americans ran up these bills. We promised these payments. We should pay what we promise, and then we need to stop lurching from one crisis to another, scrambling to stitch together last-minute deals that only last until the very next crisis.

It is time to end these games. It is time to end the uncertainty. It is time to do what we were sent here to do—to get to work creating jobs for American families so they can have a mortgage and put their kids through school. That is what we should be talking about here, the prosperity of all Americans.

This shutdown today is a preview of a debate over a meltdown of the American economy. If, in fact, we go to a debt ceiling and we haven't found a way of working together here on the Senate floor, Democrats and Republicans, along with Democrats and Republicans from the House of Representatives, those who are in the most jeopardy are those who are watching us with their mouths open, agape, wondering how their system of government can operate this way.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in less than 9 hours, unless there is an intervening effort that is successful, the government will shut down. I know people across America are scratching their heads and saying: Why? How did it ever reach this point?

I went through O'Hare this morning—I have done that a lot in my life—on my way back to work, and the reaction of people was interesting. People I didn't know walked up to me and said: Hang in there. Good luck. We hope you can do it.

I realized people across America are listening and watching this, and they are trying to figure out who is right, who is wrong, and what difference does it make?

About an hour ago I was presiding as we took the vote on the latest House amendments. In the middle of the vote, my staffer came up and handed me an e-mail. The e-mail said there was a House e-mail that was circulating, and here is what it said: After the Senate tables the House amendments to the CR later this afternoon, and the papers come back to the House, we will send it back to the Senate with another amendment delaying the individual mandate and ObamaCare for a year and affect the Members' health subsidy as well.

Unfortunately, that message kind of betrays what is going on here. We made it clear on the Senate side that we are sending a clean CR, with no political strings attached to it, to extend the government services and allow them to continue for at least 6 weeks while we try to work things out on a bipartisan basis. What we keep getting back from the House of Representatives is all sorts of political strings, such as the medical device tax, ObamaCare, conscience clause when it comes to family planning. All of these are being thrown back to us as conditions for us if we are going to fund our government.

If we want to on the Democratic side, we have the votes to put our own conditions on this. I can think of a couple: that the House takes up the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill we passed months ago here and they have never even addressed in the House. That would be a good one, wouldn't it? At least from my point of view.

How about the bipartisan farm bill we passed twice in the Senate that they failed to pass in the House of Representatives for years? Why wouldn't we make that one of the conditions? I can think of a few more. But we didn't do it. We sent them a clean CR, a clean spending bill, and said to them: Let's extend the functions of government.

John Kennedy's book, ''Profiles In Courage,'' talks about men and women who served our Nation and showed extraordinary courage. Some of us would like to think that at least once or twice in our public careers we get close to that standard. There is no political courage in what the House Republicans are doing. They are not standing up, putting themselves at any political risk. They are threatening to shut down the government to affect the jobs of hundreds of thousands of innocent Federal employees. These are people who get up and go to work every single day for this country because they love their jobs and they love this country and they do a great job every day. They are viewed with disdain by so many critics of government, but were it not for those men and women and the contribution they make, we would not be the great Nation we are at this moment in time.

At midnight tonight—in less than 9 hours—our government will shut down. Many—hundreds of thousands of them—will be told: Don't come to work. If that happens, we will be lesser for it—not just the fact that we cannot produce the services our government needs to produce to help our people, and not just the fact that innocent Federal employees will lose their paychecks. Many of them will not get paid for the time we are losing.

But equally important is what it says about us and what it says about America. We stand and we say: We are different, and we are proud of being different. We are the oldest democracy on the face of the Earth. We are, in many ways, different from some other Nations, and we are proud of that difference.

Sadly, at midnight tonight the difference is not going to be something of which we can be proud. It is the failure of political leaders in Congress to fund the government of the United States of America. It is the failure of political leaders in Congress to fund our government.

What this comes down to is very basic. There is a reason why we have elections. There is a reason why ultimately the decision on this issue, and all the other issues, will be given to the American people. What I ask them to do is to watch carefully what is happening in Washington and whether they want to continue it.

Senator MERKLEY of Oregon came to the floor and talked about the beginning of this tea party effort and the first threat to shut down the government. This is not altogether new, but it is unusual that we face this. Now it is becoming more frequent, more regular, business as usual that we are going to shut down the government. That is the tea party approach. That is how they get their attention: 21 hours speaking on the floor or threatening to shut down the government. I don't think that is the answer to America's future. I think it is a problem.

If you listened to Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, he talked about the fact that we passed a budget resolution in the Senate—I thought it was a good effort—to try to figure out what our spending will be in the next fiscal year. We came up with a number, and the House came up with a different number. The Founding Fathers of the Constitution anticipated that and created an opportunity for the House and Senate to work out their differences through a conference committee.

Senator MURRAY of Washington chairs our Budget Committee. She brought this to the floor and asked for unanimous consent to take this budget resolution to the conference committee so we could agree. She brought that request to the floor 6 months ago. The tea party Republicans stood—some of the same Republicans we are seeing now—and objected to this meeting. They said: No way. We won't allow this meeting between the Democrats and Republicans.

Senator MURRAY and her backers, on the committee and off, renewed that request over and over and over, and every time the tea party Republicans objected. They did not want us to do the orderly, constitutional thing of sitting down to work out our differences. They wanted a confrontation, and now they have it. We were unable to reach a budget number, unable to pass appropriation bills because of their objections, and now we face a government shutdown.

If this is what you want as the ordinary course of business in Washington, if this is what you want for America and our Federal Government and the good people who work for it, then keep on voting for tea party folks. This is their attitude and their idea. This is their idea of the new normal.

Well, it shouldn't be the new normal. America is better than this.

There is something that is encouraging. There are a handful of Republicans who are finally standing and saying: I have had enough of it.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN and I disagree on so many things, and agree on a few things, but we are different politically.

I admire him not just for his service in the Senate but what he has given to this country. He came to the floor and gave a 10-minute speech after the Texas Senator finished his 21-hour speech. Senator MCCAIN made more sense in 10 minutes than in the 21 hours that preceded it.

He said: I don't like ObamaCare. I voted against it. I want to change it, but get real; it is the law. It was found to be constitutional by the Court. The President, who authored it, was reelected by 5 million votes in America. That is how a democracy works. Those who won't accept ObamaCare and want to try to stop it will not accept the verdict of this democracy. We need to go forward and prove it. That was Senator MCCAIN's speech to us. It was a good speech.

Upstairs Senator SCHUMER talked about what we could have done in the past. What if we said: Unless all of the Bush tax cuts are repealed, we are not going to allow the government to be funded? We didn't do that. We shouldn't have done that. It is not responsible.

I hope this doesn't come to pass. I hope at midnight we don't shut down this government. There will be a lot of unhappy people in the Federal service, and they don't deserve it. These are innocent people who want to do a good job for this Nation. There will be a lot of people hurt on the outside because they can't have access to government services. There will be things that we will miss doing that will have an impact, and we may never know it.

What impact will it have at the National Institutes of Health if they suspend medical research until this is over, just put it off a couple of days or maybe a couple of weeks if it gets really awful? Then what happens? A delay in finding a cure, a drug, a medical device. All of these things make a difference in the lives of a lot of innocent people. So it is not an act of courage to play politics with the lives of other people, with the future of America, and with the future of our economy.

Yes, this is why we have elections, so the American people can say: Enough. We are not going to put up with this anymore. We need to have responsible Republicans and Democrats working together to solve our problems.

I think that is why we were sent here, not to lurch from one confrontation to the next.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, after 5 years of being a parent, I have gotten used to temper tantrums. It is an unavoidable part of having kids. They demand something—they want a second dessert, they want another 10 minutes before bedtime—and if they don't get it, they storm out of the room. That aspect of early human nature—the inability to deal with defeat and the unwillingness to compromise—luckily goes away over time as we get older and wiser and more thoughtful—everywhere except for Washington, DC.

By now everybody gets what is going on. As Senator DURBIN said, we are only a handful of hours away from a government shutdown—another manufactured, made-up, totally avoidable crisis. This one is just because we can't pass a 6-month continuing resolution. We are having a problem just keeping the government open under the exact same rules that it has been open because a small set of tea party Senators and Congressmen are basically throwing a temper tantrum because they haven't gotten their way.

It is not news to anybody that Republicans oppose the health care law. They opposed it back when it was passed by both Chambers and signed by the President. They opposed it when the Supreme Court upheld the legislation. Their Presidential candidate opposed it when he got roundly defeated in the 2012 election. My opponent and the opponent of every single Senator who stood for election who voted for the law opposed it as well, and every single time they lost.

Over and over Republicans have made it clear that they don't like the Affordable Care Act. They voted 40 times to repeal it or defund it or postpone it in the House of Representatives. This is despite the fact that today the Affordable Care Act is saving millions of seniors millions of dollars because they don't have to pay for drugs in the doughnut hole. This is despite the fact that starting in January it is going to save millions of people across the country from having to go into bankruptcy because they can't afford their health care. But Republicans are refusing to vote for a budget that will keep the government operating unless this health care bill is stopped.

For too many of those urging a government shutdown, government has just become an abstraction. They have sold themselves on the idea that government is so twisted and malignant that shutting it down just wouldn't really do anything. After all, if the goal is to starve the beast, then what better way than putting the beast into a coma for a couple of days or a week.

But that is not how this works. Government does real things for real people. It provides paychecks for 9,000 people in Connecticut. It pays Social Security benefits and processes claims for disabled veterans. It inspects our food. At the NIH, it comes up with cures for diseases. The markets watch whether the government operates because they actually know that the private sector works better when the public sector is working better. So that is why today the market once again has been falling through the floor, as it will if we move forward with this madness.

Just as we don't give in to our kids when they threaten us if we don't give them what they want, America cannot reward this ''my way or the highway'' approach from the tea party. I have strong beliefs, just as my tea party Republican friends do, but I also get that I am part of a majoritarian deliberative body. Senator MCCASKILL and Senator DURBIN made the point, as did the Presiding Officer. We all would love to attach things to this continuing resolution. There are 20 grieving families in Newtown, CT, who do not understand why 90 percent of the American public wants background checks on weapons and we can't pass that in the Senate. I bet some of them would think it might make sense for us to condition our support of the continuing resolution on getting background checks on gun purchases. Ninety percent of the American public supports that. But we are not doing that. That is not how we govern—hold the entire Federal Government hostage to get what we want.

Ultimately, though, this just can't be how this place works. This is a 6-week continuing resolution. As the Presiding Officer said, it is just going to happen 6 weeks from now and 6 weeks after that.

I heard that a long time ago this place used to actually be involved in the business of running the country. It doesn't feel like that anymore. As I sat there on the dais a week ago now watching the middle act of Senator CRUZ's long, long, long speech, it didn't feel a lot different than it has for most days that I have watched the tea party over the last several years. It felt as if I were a theater goer.

What is happening this week really isn't exceptional. It is just the latest and worst example of a long trendline away from legislating and toward playacting. With rare exceptions usually prompted only by deadlines and cliffs and fake crises, we don't do anything here any longer. We just dig trenches and we make arguments. We pass fake bills. We playact. Occasionally, when the stacks of all the things around us are about to come teetering down we stop and we push them back up again instead of thinking for a couple of seconds that if we just stopped, sat back, and actually restacked those sets of things so they didn't come crashing down, we would probably be better off. We just play parts.

There is nobody better at playing their part than the tea party Republicans. Their character is recalcitrant, uncompromising, and destructive, and we have seen all of that on display this week. If we get beyond this crisis, we will just see it once again. But there is no curtain call here in Congress after which we can pull back our masks and share a good laugh. We are still all going to be left on stage tasked with picking up the pieces.

I think I am past believing that these folks are just going to start playing a different role. It is time for the American public to start asking some questions about people before they send

them here: Are you willing to compromise? Are you interested in actually running the government? Are you going to score your term based on whether you deliver for the American people rather than how many Twitter followers you have or how many times you showed up on the TV news that week?

If this government shuts down tonight, it is just because of a temper tantrum or, put another way, a really, really bad play, the third act of which has gone on way, way too long.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DARREL THOMPSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is not the time for me to stand and speak about the loss of a staff member whom I feel so strongly about.

The man I am talking about is Darrel Thompson, who, as most people know, has been with me for 10 years. He was Obama's campaign manager when he ran for the Senate, and he is a wonderful man. I am sorry it is not appropriate for me to take Senate time now.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 3210, which was received from the House in the last 24 hours. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3210) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. The order now before this body is that we have morning business until 4 o'clock today. I ask unanimous consent to extend that until 6 p.m. under the provisions of the previous order and that I be recognized after that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican leader.

PROTECTING MILITARY PAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the unanimous consent request the majority leader just propounded was one a number of my colleagues were about to ask that dealt with a military pay issue, and a number of them are here on the floor. I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy on the issue of protecting military pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the Republican leader noted, there are a number of Members here on the floor who have come en masse from a meeting we just held following the tabling of the latest House proposal that would keep the Federal Government operating and make sure all of our uniformed military would continue to get paid, together with the other operations of the Federal Government. It is clear that it was under the pressure of the knowledge that we were coming to the floor to ask for unanimous consent and the knowledge of how, frankly, untenable it would be to object to that that the majority leader has quite skillfully come to the floor to try to preempt this issue. The truth is that none of us should be under any illusion that the majority leader has done anything other than make it more likely that we will have a shutdown of the Federal Government tonight.

The House has sent over several reasonable proposals which would keep the Federal Government operating and which would also make sure our troops would be paid—not just uniformed military but other government personnel performing important jobs. Rather than calling us in yesterday after the House acted—we know that perhaps the majority leader and other Members enjoyed watching a little bit of professional football yesterday—they waited until this afternoon to cut the legs out from under the House proposal and make it much more likely that the government will shut down.

The House worked late into the night this weekend to draft a compromise proposal that would fund the government and avert a shutdown. The House Members sent the proposal over to the Senate, and the majority leader did nothing until today—no emergency session, no bipartisan negotiations.

There is a report in Politico that President Obama was suggesting calling the leadership in both of the Houses—Republicans and Democrats alike—to the White House to have a meeting to say: What can we do to solve this impasse? If the story is to be believed, it was HARRY REID who shut that down, just as he is going to be responsible for shutting down the Federal Government by the actions he took earlier today.

So the question is, Who is really being unreasonable? Who is really being stubborn? Who is really seeking to gain partisan advantage over the best interests of the country?

Of course, we know the President has been eager to negotiate with the President of Iran about a very serious issue: Iran's nuclear aspirations, but he will not talk to the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the Republican leader of the Senate. He will not talk to them, but he will negotiate with the Iranian President.

He seems absolutely allergic to doing his job. He can give a heck of a speech. He is a skillful orator. But when it comes to actually doing his job, he is missing in action. He will not negotiate over a government shutdown, and he will not negotiate over raising the debt limit.

In the past, President Obama has urged Republicans to offer just a little bit of compromise when he likes to be the voice of reason. But now he himself refuses to engage in any sort of negotiation and refuses to offer any kind of compromise whatsoever.

Is it possible the President of the United States thinks his own health care law is perfect in every way? Seventy-nine Members of this body voted against the medical device tax. The House could pass that piece of legislation and send it over here and attach it to the continuing resolution. The President himself has repeatedly delayed different provisions of the health care law, including the employer mandate. What we would like to do is get the same break for the rest of the American people as he gave businesses.

The bill that was passed by the House of Representatives would have delayed ObamaCare for 1 year, and it would also have repealed the medical device tax, which is already killing jobs and hammering medical innovation.

Now we are being told that those sort of very same proposals, which mirror the same proposals the President has unilaterally taken or which are supported by a bipartisan majority of the Senate—they are called an act of extremism.

What is more extreme, trying to negotiate through an impasse to resolve this issue of the Federal Government functioning or to refuse to negotiate, to stonewall against any reasonable proposal by the House and to make it more likely that the Federal Government will shut down tonight? I ask who is being more unreasonable and more stubborn?

We know the clock is ticking. The American people are absolutely disgusted. I share their frustration. I can only hope cooler heads will prevail among our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I appreciate being part of the colloquy with the Senator from Texas, and I was listening to his comments.

I remember being asked by Senator MCCONNELL and the House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER to speak on behalf of Republicans at the President's health care summit 3 years ago about the new

health care law. I was the first speaker there and since that time have done my best to try to void its passage and then to repeal and replace it.

But I'm not in the shut down the government crowd. I'm in the let's-take-over-the-government crowd and elect a number of more Republicans and even a Republican President who agrees with us and who wants a different kind of health care law, one that introduces choice and competition and that actually reduces health care costs for most Americans.

What bothers me so much about this impasse today is the effect it might have on our military men and women around the world. I'm trying to imagine what it must be like for someone fighting in Afghanistan whose check might be late, whose spouse is at Fort Campbell, and whose mortgage is due today or tomorrow or the next day, or what if the Department of Defense school closes there and that spouse has a job and no childcare? These are very practical problems we need to be thinking about. We need not be thinking about shutting down the government. We need to be thinking about a way to fund the government and change the health care law at the same time.

Now, the House of Representatives has tried once and now is trying it again to make a reasonable offer. These discussions are all about compromise, about taking suggestions that come from one body to the other body and taking what you can. So if they have come back and said: Well, the United States Senate had 79 Senators, including many Democrats, who voted to repeal the medical device tax. And they said: Let's delay the individual mandate for a year.

I'm surprised the President himself has not done that. The President himself has delayed seven provisions, major provisions in the health care law, including the employer mandate. The regulations aren't ready. The program is supposed to start tomorrow. It would seem to me it would actually be to the President's benefit, as well as the country's benefit, to say instead of just delaying parts and exempting these people, let's get it right. Let's delay it for 1 year.

That is what the House of Representatives, the Republican House, has said to the Senate. They have said let's repeal the medical device tax, a particularly onerous 2.3% tax on top of revenues that increases the cost of medical devices for millions of Americans. We all agree we ought to get rid of it—79 of us do anyway, including about as many Democrats as Republicans. And the President himself has acknowledged this law isn't ready. The chairman of the Democratic Committee that wrote it says it is a coming train wreck.

So it seems to me this is a reasonable suggestion from the House of Representatives to say let's work on getting rid of ObamaCare, that is what we would like to do, or changing it, that is what they would like to do to make it work, but let's fund the government. Let's not run the risk that one single soldier fighting in Afghanistan has a paycheck that is one day late because his spouse is home in Fort Campbell and the mortgage can't be paid or the Department of Defense School is closed and there is no childcare for the spouse who has a job while her husband or his wife is fighting overseas. Now, that's something we should not allow to happen, whether it's Republicans or Democrats.

It may be that the majority leader agrees with that and he has brought that up and we have brought that up, but we should do more than bring up political points. People expect us to act like adults, work together, come to a result, so we can change the health care law and we can keep the government going.

I've said for three years that instead of the historic mistake we passed which expanded health care delivery systems that already cost too much, we should go step by step to have a health care law that actually reduces health care costs: Make Medicare solvent instead of taking one-half trillion dollars out of it for other programs. Give Medicaid more flexibility so Governors can serve more people. Repeal the medical device tax. Make it easier for employers who want to help employees have a healthier lifestyle so they can have cheaper insurance. Allow people to buy insurance across state lines. Allow small businesses to pool their resources and offer insurance. I have listed a half dozen already, steps we could agree on that would reduce health care costs in the country.

I'm not in the shut down the government crowd, and neither are most everybody I know around here. We are in the take-over-the-government crowd, and let's elect enough Republicans and a Republican President to change the health care law.

But in the meantime, we should make absolutely sure that men and women, whether on Active Duty or in the National Guard, not on Active Duty at this time, we should make sure they are paid on the day they are supposed to be paid and their spouses are not waiting for the check.

I thank the Senator from Texas for engaging in this colloquy, and I wish to join him in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, thank you.

The idea that ObamaCare—the Affordable Health Care Act—over time will be seen in history as having been a good thing for the American people, I guess that is a bit in doubt. The President keeps saying there will come a day when we will look back and claim to have voted for this. Maybe he is right. Maybe that day, around the bend, down the road, over the hill, is there.

All I can say is don't we know enough now about the Affordable Health Care Act—ObamaCare—to slow down, take a time out, and see if we can make it better? Because the problems associated with the act are real. We do not need any more information. We do not need any more time. We just need to fix it in a bipartisan fashion. We passed it in a partisan fashion. Can we begin to look at the law anew in a bipartisan fashion? America would be better off.

What do we know? We know a lot of people are working 29 hours, when they had 40-hour work. If you do not believe me, ask the unions. I never thought I would live to say this: Just listen to the unions. I do not say that a lot about their positions, but they are telling the President and anybody who will listen that ObamaCare—the Affordable Health Care Act—is denying the 40-hour workweek. Why can't we do something about that?

The medical device manufacturers, the people who do all the very neat things to make life better, particularly for people who have been devastated in Iraq and Afghanistan, coming up with ways to make better the lives of people who had catastrophic injury—thirty-four of our Democratic friends have said this tax is not a good idea for that sector of the economy.

So the jury is in on enough for us to slow down and start over and get this thing right. The good news for today is that we are not going to agree to blame each other. They are not going to accept blame. We are not going to accept blame about where we are. But the one thing today is I think we have solved the problem, at least partially, for the military. The people on the civilian side who work for the military, I do not know if they are covered.

But I want America to understand that the Congress did something appropriate just a few minutes ago; that is, to tell the men and women in the military: Do not worry about this debacle up here in Washington when it comes to your paycheck. You are going to get paid. I will talk later on down the road about what kind of military we are handing to the next generation, what kind of funding we have for the military and how smart sequestration is.

But I just want to ask my colleagues, don't we know enough already about the Affordable Health Care Act to stop and work together before we plunge on, because it starts tomorrow. I do not know why our Democratic friends are so insistent that we cannot take a timeout, start over, and see if we can find some bipartisan consensus. Until we do that, this problem only gets worse.

I would conclude with this thought: The Democratic Party came up with the Affordable Care Act. They passed it on a party-line vote. But this thing is just not helping Democrats or hurting Republicans, it is hurting the economy as a whole.

So the one thing I can tell you about big ideas: When one party pushes it through and nobody else on the other side signs up, we need to be wary about that product.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Texas who gave a very high-profile speech for about 21 hours the other night on the subject of ObamaCare. I know he feels passionately about it, and his efforts have captured the imagination of the American people and reminded them of the various failures of this piece of legislation, some of which we have talked about perhaps fixing in the course of this ping-ponging of the continuing resolution.

But I might ask him, through the Chair, there have been so many failures, so many promises that have been made about ObamaCare that are obviously not going to be kept—things such as, if you like what you have, you can keep it. I think that is one of the complaints the Senator from South Carolina mentioned earlier, that organized labor—Mr. Trumka, among others—went to the White House to get a special carve-out for. We were told the President said: The average family of four would see a reduction of $2,500 in the cost of their health care, and that had not proven to be true—so many promises that have not been kept, so many broken promises, so many reasons why we ought to be working together through the course of this to fix it.

So I would ask my colleague, through the Chair, perhaps he can list a few more reasons why he believes we need to be dealing with ObamaCare.

I know his preferred method was defunding ObamaCare. I know he has not given up on that. I am a cosponsor of his legislation that would accomplish that. But I would ask my colleague, through the Chair, if he might comment on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the majority leader is to be recognized at 4 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was happy to ask unanimous consent to pass the bill that we just passed to ensure that the troops will be paid. But I do disagree with the remarks of my Republican colleagues and much of what they said in the last few minutes.

Let's talk about what was in this amendment that they sent us, this message they sent to us. Among other things, here is what it had in it: A provision—this is hard to comprehend, but listen to this—that would allow any employer, insurance plan or individual to refuse to cover any of the women's health preventative services that were included by Senator MIKULSKI in her women's health amendment, things like contraception, for virtually any reason during the 1-year delay.

That was in their amendment. It was spoken of clearly—I will talk about it a little later—by a cancer survivor in the House of Representatives, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It would have an adverse effect on cancer survivors, on women. That is one thing they did. There has been a lot of talk here about the medical devices revenue issue. This is something that we will take a look at. We need to do that. But remember this magnanimous offer to get rid of this by the Republicans in the House and in the Senate would run up the debt by $30 billion. How do you like that? $30 billion. No offset. No pay-go. What does it matter? They are fixated on ObamaCare. I mean fixated on it.

My friend from Texas referred to it as a bill. It is not a bill. It is the law. It has been for 4 years. My friend from Tennessee said he thinks that this should be resolved by having a Republican President. Less than a year ago, the American people took a look at that. The No. 1 issue in the campaign: ObamaCare. That was the No. 1 issue.

Overwhelmingly, the American people said: We reject the Republicans' efforts to get rid of it. Republicans always oppose big things. They opposed Social Security. They opposed Medicare. I have carried with me for 25 years—I have it in my wallet here, and it is getting old and frayed. But here is what it says:

> I was there fighting the fight, one of 12 voting against Medicare because we knew it would not work in 1965.

Senator Dole.

> Now, we did not get rid of it in round one because we do not think it's politically smart. But we believe Medicare is going to wither on the vine.

Newt Gingrich.

> Medicare has no place in a free world. Social Security is a rotten trick. I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over time.

Former leader in the House Dick Armey.

They opposed Social Security and they opposed Medicare. But even though they opposed it, Social Security is popular with Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. Medicare is popular. Why is it popular? My first elected job was on a big hospital district in Nevada. It was an indigent hospital, in some frame of reference.

But 40 percent of the people that were senior citizens that were admitted to that hospital had no health insurance. We made sure that somebody vouched for their hospital bill: father, mother, son, brother, neighbor. If they did not pay, we went after them. We had a big collection agency in the hospital.

The reason they like Medicare is because today virtually 100 percent of seniors that come into a hospital have Medicare. That is why they like it.

ObamaCare. Tomorrow in Nevada 600,000 people will have the opportunity to sign up on the exchanges. By the way, the exchanges were established by a Republican Governor, Brian Sandoval. People there can buy—some people can buy health insurance for $100, people who have nothing. Just give this ObamaCare a little time, and it will be looked back at as Social Security and Medicare. Right now, people love what they are able to get off this. I will go through some of that stuff.

Let's review where we are. This weekend Republicans in the House of Representatives did what we all feared they would do; they voted to shut down the government. Republicans knew their empty political stunt would fall on its face in the Senate. It did. Yet they voted to hold the government hostage until Democrats agree to return to the days when insurance companies put profits before patient care. That is the way it was.

Their vote was strikingly irresponsible and stunningly callous. Republicans do not seem to understand that stripping health insurance from millions of Americans would literally cost lives. Maybe none of those Republicans have received a doctor's bill that they could not pay. Maybe none of those Republicans spent a night awake worrying about whether a heart attack or a car accident would drive them into bankruptcy or what they would do with their mom or their dad, their brother or sister who has no health insurance and who is sick.

Millions of Americans have experienced the fears I just described. For a glimpse of just how little regard Republicans have for struggling American families, look no further than the chief Senate rabble rouser, Senator TED CRUZ. Listen to this. He told David Gregory of Meet the Press how easy it is for the average American to get health insurance, even during these difficult times. Here is what he said: ''If you want people to get health insurance, the best way for them to get health insurance is to get a job.'' That is what he said. I am not making this up.

His comment comes at a time when more than 11 million Americans are still struggling to find work and when millions more who already have jobs still lack health insurance. That is why we passed ObamaCare in the first place, to ensure access to quality, affordable health insurance for all Americans.

To Republicans, ObamaCare is a punch line to rile up their base. But for American families, ObamaCare is not a punch line, it is a lifeline. For millions of Americans, the Affordable Care Act is the only option to access quality health care at an affordable price. I have indicated that 600,000 uninsured Nevadans who are eligible to purchase insurance from Nevada's Health Link beginning tomorrow.

ObamaCare means access to affordable doctors and hospital stays, prescription drugs, and more. Uninsured Nevadans will have access to good insurance plans that cost as little as $100 a month. In fact, many Nevadans will get quality coverage for less than they pay for their monthly cell phone bill. Republicans would rip that lifeline away.

Republicans want to return to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against women. Why? Because they are women. I am not making that up. That is the way it was. That is how it was before ObamaCare.

Republicans want to return to the days when insurance companies could deny care because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes, epilepsy, and breast cancer. Even acne was a preexisting condition. Again, I am not making this up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, she is a breast cancer survivor. Sunday, I saw her say on the House floor that Republicans are trying to ''make sure that every single day . . . each of us who survived cancer or another life-threatening illness . . . stay living in fear for an insurance company to boot you off your insurance.''

That is what it would do. I am not making this up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare. They want to return to the days when even children could be denied lifesaving coverage because they were born with a heart murmur or some other disability. Again, I am not making this up. That was the way it was before ObamaCare.

They want to return to the days when insurance companies could overcharge you when you were well and drop your policy when you were sick. That is the way it was. I am not making it up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, millions of seniors are saving money on prescription drugs. No one can dispute that. The doughnut hole is being filled. That is all because of the Affordable Care Act. Millions of seniors are saving money on prescription drugs and many other things. Seniors today at no cost can go get a wellness check. They could never do that before.

Millions of young people are staying on their parents' insurance. Does the presiding officer know how important that is? I will tell you how important it is. In the little town of Searchlight where I am from, a woman who was assistant postmaster retired and her husband retired. They have a son Jeff. He is going to school. He was going to school at a community college. He had to go off his parents' insurance when he turned 23.

Within a few weeks of his turning 23, he was sick. He did not know what was wrong. But he went to the doctor. He had testicular cancer. He had to interrupt his education. He had three surgeries, and his parents struggled to pay for that. They are not people of means. One doctor friend of mine did one of the surgeries for nothing. But other people did not have the benefit of my being able to help them or parents like his who struggled to take care of their son. That is why more of that will not happen. Again, the Jeff Hill story, I am not making it up. That is the way it was before ObamaCare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act millions of seniors are saving money. That is the way it is. I have said that. Millions of young people are staying on their parents' insurance, and hundreds of thousands of businesses that already offer their employees health insurance are getting tax credits for doing the right thing.

But the Republicans want to turn back the clock on all of these benefits and more. They want to force more than 25 million families to once again rely on crowded, expensive emergency rooms or go without the lifesaving care they need. Many of them go without that care.

That is how it was before ObamaCare. Unless Democrats agree to all of their demands, unless we agree to strip tens of millions of Americans of their health insurance and force tens of millions more to live in fear, they will shut down the government. That is where we are headed. Why do you think the Republicans came over here thinking by some reason we would not agree to fund the troops? They know that BOEHNER is going to shut down the government. The House of Representatives could have voted yesterday—they could vote today—to keep the government running.

But they are going to vote, I am sure, to shut it down. Many House Republicans have admitted that Speaker BOEHNER has the votes to pass a clean bill to keep the government open and functioning. Here is what Republican RAÚL LABRADOR from Idaho said. He said this on Meet the Press:

> I am not willing to vote for a clean continuing resolution. But I think there are enough votes in the Republican party who are willing to do that. I think that is what you are going to see.

Republican Congressman CHARLIE DENT from Pennsylvania, here is what he said: ''I am prepared to vote for a clean resolution tomorrow. . . .''

That is today. He said that yesterday.

It is time to govern. I don't intend to support the fool's errand—and it is a fool's errand. That is what he called it and that is what it is.

These reasonable Republicans are correct. The House easily could and should pass a clean continuing resolution today. All Speaker BOEHNER has to do is let every Member of the House of Representatives, Democrats and Republicans, all 435 of them vote on a clean CR, and it would pass big time. The Speaker has another opportunity to do the right thing.

This afternoon, the Senate voted to strip the hollow political ransom notes from the House. We rejected the House amendments. The House has what we passed. They have had it since last Friday. The Republicans will face the same choice tonight, this afternoon, or this evening, whenever they choose, as they did this weekend, to pass the Senate's clean bill to keep the government functioning or force a government shutdown. Democrats have already met Republicans in the middle and agreed to their lower funding level even though Republicans have refused to negotiate a responsible budget for more than 6 months.

Let's talk about what a lot of my Republican friends have talked about this afternoon. They need more time to negotiate. Democrats have already met Republicans in the middle.

Senator MURRAY, the chairperson of our Budget Committee—because the Republicans said they wanted it and it was the right thing to do, and we acknowledged that, we passed a budget 6 months ago. Where are the Republicans in this 6 months, a half a year? Why couldn't we go to conference? Because they wouldn't let us.

What has happened and why they can't take yes for an answer is hard for me to understand. Our number was a lot higher than theirs. We took their lower number.

Senator MURRAY doesn't like it; Senator MIKULSKI doesn't like it. We took their lower number, 98. Why can't they take yes for an answer?

In addition, all these people who whine that we haven't done any negotiating—how many times has the President taken Republican Senators to dinner at the White House, this restaurant, and that restaurant?

What did he do? He put in writing what he was willing to do. Many of us were concerned that he had given far too much. We didn't like it, but that is what the President did because he wants a deal. He wants something big to help the government.

All of these meals that he paid for, have we gotten anything from the Republicans? Not a single sentence. Not a single sentence. They refused to put anything in writing.

Let's not talk about not negotiating. We have negotiated, negotiated, and negotiated. The last 2 weeks, we have had enough, and we are not going to negotiate. That is where we are.

For shrill Republicans in the House to demand more time to negotiate is simply ludicrous. I looked up today what ludicrous means. It means comically ridiculous. That is a good definition. When I put in ludicrous, I wasn't sure what it meant. I wanted to make sure I had the right word and I got it—comically ridiculous.

The President met with Republicans at the White House over dinner and other places. He has given a list of difficult cuts he is willing to make to reduce the deficit, but Republicans haven't reciprocated. They have never once put down in writing what they are willing to concede, not once. Democrats are through negotiating with ourselves. This is what it amounts to.

The fate of our country and our economy now rests with JOHN BOEHNER. Tonight we will see whether the Speaker is willing to shut down our government and risk our economic recovery to extract callous political concessions. I hope he makes a responsible decision. I doubt that he will, but I hope he does, and helps avert a government shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, it is no secret that the majority leader HARRY REID and I disagree on a great many

topics. Yet I rise today in praise of Senator REID. In particular, I wish to praise Senator REID for agreeing to pass the bill the House of Representatives passed at 12:30 in the morning yesterday that would fund our military.

For weeks President Obama and Senate Democrats have been threatening to hold in jeopardy the paychecks of the men and women of our military if there is a government shutdown. I commend the majority leader for agreeing to pass it, for not objecting, for not standing in the way.

For everyone who thinks that compromise is impossible in Washington, that working together is impossible in Washington, I would point to this as an example. That bill passed the House of Representatives unanimously. It came over to the Senate, and a few minutes ago we all saw it pass the Senate unanimously. It should be able to be on President Obama's desk for signature by tonight.

That is exactly as it should be. The soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who risk their lives defending our Nation should not have their paychecks held hostage to any potential government shutdown in Washington. I salute the majority leader for doing the right thing. I salute the Senate Democrats for not blocking the paychecks of the men and women in the military, taking them off the table and saying, regardless of what happens, we are going to pay our troops. That was the right thing to do.

I also note, for those who would like to see a resolution of this impasse, I, for one, don't wish to see a government shutdown. I think it is unfortunate that the majority leader seems bound and determined to force a government shutdown. In the course of the past several weeks we have seen the House of Representatives repeatedly attempt to compromise. In my view and the view of a great many Republicans is that ObamaCare is a disaster, a train wreck, a nightmare. Of those last two terms, the term train wreck comes from the Democratic Senator who was the lead author of ObamaCare. Nightmare is the term that was used by Teamsters president James Hoffa.

My view is we should repeal it in its entirety. I would note that was not my starting position on this debate. It was not the starting position of the House of Representatives. Instead, they started with the position that it should be defunded, which itself represented a compromise. The House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the entire Federal Government, every bit of it, except for ObamaCare and to defund ObamaCare.

They sent it over to the Senate and what did the majority leader, what did the Democrats do on a straight party-line vote? Every Democrat voted no, absolutely not. We reject it in its entirety. They voted, in effect, to force us into a shutdown.

The House of Representatives was not done with that. They came back at 12:30 in the morning late Saturday night, early Sunday morning and passed yet another continuing resolution that represented a second compromise where yet again the House said, we want to fund the government, we don't want to shut down, we want to keep government going. Instead of defunding, which is what the House preferred, the House instead said: Let's delay ObamaCare, let's delay it. President Obama has already delayed it for giant corporations. He has already exempted Members of Congress. Both of those actions were contrary to law.

The House of Representatives said let's delay it for ordinary families the same way it has been delayed for big companies. It shouldn't be the case that giant corporations get treated better by the Federal Government than hard-working American families.

That was a compromise, and it was a compromise even though the Senate under Majority Leader REID had not compromised at all and held an absolutist position. At 12:30 in the morning, early Sunday morning, the House voted on that.

Did the Senate come back yesterday? No, we did not. The majority leader could have called the Senate back. We should have called the Senate back. We were only 48 hours away from a government shutdown, but apparently the majority leader made the decision it was more important for Senators to be home on vacation, home playing golf, home doing anything but being here on the floor of the Senate doing the people's business.

Instead, many Senators came back today. We voted only a couple of hours ago and once again Majority Leader REID and every single Senate Democrat voted to shut down the government, responded to the House's second compromise—not with any discussion, any compromise, not with any middle ground, but simply said no.

The position of the Senate Democrats is absolutely not. Are we going to listen to the millions of young people coming out of schools who are not able to find jobs because of ObamaCare? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to the millions of single moms who are struggling to feed their kids and finding themselves forcibly put into 29 hours a week because of ObamaCare? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to millions of recent immigrants who are struggling to provide for their families and facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums? The majority leader says no. Are we going to listen to millions of retirees, people with disabilities, and spouses who are covered on their spouse's health insurance plans, all of whom are losing or at risk of losing their health insurance? The majority leader says no.

Instead, the majority leader shared with this body that I was—and I wrote this down—the ''chief Senate rabble-rouser.'' I am not entirely sure what that is. I wasn't aware that was an official designation.

I would note previously the majority leader from the floor of the Senate had described me as a ''schoolyard bully.''

It is entirely the majority leader's prerogative if he views the way to carry out his job as engaging in personal insult and ad hominem attacks. I, for one, do not intend to reciprocate.

I note that what he seems most dismayed about is in the past 2 weeks the voices of the American people have begun to be heard in this body. In the past 2 weeks the voices of millions of Americans losing their health insurance, losing their jobs, being forced into part-time work, millions of Americans who are struggling, have begun to be heard. We have begun to make DC listen. Apparently, the voices from our constituents, from the men and women of America, apparently to the majority leader, constitute ''rabble-rousing.'' I have a different view of what our responsibility is.

I would also note that the majority leader told us only moments ago, ''We have had enough. We are not going to negotiate.''

I find that quite remarkable because to date it has been the House of Representatives that has been negotiating, that has been compromising and has been trying to find a way to resolve this so we can keep the government running and at the same time answer millions of Americans who have been hurting. The answer from the majority leader over and over has been no, no, no, we will not compromise, we will not talk.

As the majority leader said, he hasn't compromised yet and he doesn't intend even to negotiate. This is unfortunate.

Mr. CORNYN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield to the Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. CORNYN. The Senator has described accurately the back-and-forth between the absolutist position the majority leader has taken that says nothing can change ObamaCare because apparently he thinks it is absolutely perfect—we shouldn't change a letter, even though, as the Senator pointed out, a number of ObamaCare's biggest advocates are now coming back and saying it is a nightmare. I think the Senator quoted Jimmy Hoffa as one of them.

But is the Senator aware, reportedly, the House is going to be voting later on today and be changing once again the continuing resolution and sending it back over here? This time the report is that they will vote to delay the individual mandate to make it match—as the Senator points out, the employer mandate that has already been unilaterally delayed by the President, in an act of lawlessness. Unfortunately, it is not an isolated event.

Then the Vitter language, which will overturn the Office of Personnel Management interpretation, which basically carves out Congress and congressional staff from the law that would apply to everyone else, strikes me as

another attempt by the House to enter into some negotiation.

Would the Senator care to venture a guess as to what sort of good-faith attempt by the House to keep negotiations open—what that will lead to? I would be interested in the Senator's observation about whether he believes, as I do, that Senator REID is marching toward a government shutdown. Nothing the House does, nothing the House passes will deter him from shutting down the Federal Government at midnight tonight.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Texas. I think he is exactly right. Indeed, the conduct of the majority leader, as it has recently been reported in the press, the majority leader advised President Obama do not even engage in conversations or negotiations with congressional leaders.

As the senior Senator from Texas observed, the House is repeatedly trying to solve this problem to keep the government funded and to do it in a way that responds to the millions of people who are hurting under ObamaCare.

The answer for the majority leader over and over and over has simply been, no, we will not talk, we will not negotiate, we will not compromise, we will not listen to the American people.

I am reminded of the old philosophical question: If a tree falls in the woods and no one is around to hear, does it make a noise?

Likewise, if the House endeavors to compromise responsibly, and the majority leader and the President refuse to participate at all, can you solve the problem?

Ultimately, the only way to solve the problem is for Washington to listen to the people. If Majority Leader REID insists on forcing a government shutdown, then we may face a government shutdown. I think that is an irresponsible course of action.

If the House of Representatives acts tonight, I believe this Senate should come back immediately and pass the continuing resolution, whatever the House passes. I don't know what it will be, but it will be yet another good-faith effort to keep the government running and to address the train wreck of a law that is ObamaCare, and I very much hope this body begins to listen to the people.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we have listened to the people. I recall we had a Presidential election. We had two people running in a bad economy. Normally, the nonincumbent would win. That was a Republican. He ran on the platform: I will repeal ObamaCare if you elect me President. He was actually ahead in the polls when he started saying that, but we all know what happened—he lost disastrously. Did the American people speak? Yes, they spoke pretty clearly on that one.

Now, the other body has voted countless times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They all get out their press releases and talk about how they stand up against the Affordable Care Act as they vote to repeal it 40 times knowing it will go nowhere.

Wouldn't it make a lot more sense if the other body's leadership said: Look, we lost the Presidential election saying we were running on doing away with ObamaCare. The American people shut us down on that. We have become the butt of late-night jokes every time we vote like this.

Maybe it would help if their leadership said: Why don't we take 10 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and those folks can deliberate and suggest how we can make improvements to ObamaCare. If they have improvements, they can bring it back by June, and we can vote those specific improvements up or down. We have already shown that after 40 votes to repeal and a Presidential election, we are not going to get rid of it. If they have improvements, let's debate and vote on them. That would make some sense.

Or we could return to regular order and between now and the end of the year, we could vote up or down on every single appropriations bill so we are on record as voting yes or no.

Instead, we have a small group of extremists insisting on shutting down the Federal Government, putting their own political agenda ahead of the rest of the country, throwing people out of work, costing hundreds of billions and making the United States look like the laughing stock of the world. The obsession with defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act, which will continue to be implemented in the event of a government shutdown, is out of touch and it poses serious threats for our economy and the well-being of thousands of hardworking Federal employees and those who rely on important government services.

Defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act will do nothing to solve our fiscal troubles. In fact, some repeals sought by House Republicans will add $30 billion to our national deficit. It is a shame that some members who claim to be concerned about wasteful spending are willing to throw away the billions of dollars that a government shutdown will cost, all simply to prevent access to affordable health care for Americans.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Of course I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Vermont, I just missed Senator CRUZ. I was rushing down from my office to ask the junior Senator from Texas a question, which I have asked him repeatedly. He has come to the floor and spoken at great length about why ObamaCare and the health care reform act is unnecessary for Americans. What I read is that 40 million Americans as of tomorrow will be able to shop on these insurance exchanges to buy their health insurance.

He has also spoken—as the other Senator from Texas did—about Members of Congress and their own health insurance. I have asked the junior Senator, Senator CRUZ of Texas, to tell us about his health insurance. He has told us he is not in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Since he is addressing the health insurance of millions of Americans, I think it is not unreasonable for him to disclose publicly what his health insurance is, how much he is paying for it, and how much the employer contribution is on his health insurance.

Mr. LEAHY. How much of a tax break he is getting on it.

Mr. DURBIN. It is a reasonable question. I am prepared to disclose that, and I think most Members are.

So I say to the Senator from Vermont, shutting down the government to keep the American people—40 million uninsured people—away from the opportunity under the Affordable Care Act is hardly the kind of work we want to be part of.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership on so many issues, and I thank him for coming here today in personal witness to the need for good medical care, even for Senators.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank my colleague.

The Senator from Illinois has heard me mention—and with pride—the time I was able to serve in law enforcement as a prosecutor. Well, I was talking to some police officers in Vermont this weekend. They were saying: What happens here in Vermont? Will the Department of Homeland Security discontinue the training it provides for state and local law enforcement?

As the other distinguished Senator from Vermont knows, in a small State such as ours, support from federal agencies for our law enforcement is extremely important. It is one of the reasons we are able to keep our crime rate down.

The Vermont Passport Agency provides spectacular passport services out of St. Albans, Vermont. What is going to happen? Oh, you have a dying relative abroad and you need your passport in a hurry? Sorry, we may not be able to get you your passport on time.

Members of Congress are elected to lead, not to play bumper-sticker politics. It erodes confidence to continue to bring government to the brink in every debate. There is too much in the country and around the world of tremendous importance that demands our attention.

Instead of helping Americans get back to work and stimulating the economy, House Republicans are intent on playing political games that do nothing but weaken America and harm Americans. When they showed they weren't willing to do anything, the stock market collapsed, just as it has the last 3 days. How many people have seen their savings for their children to go to college wiped out while they play political games? How many people have seen their retirement wiped out

while they play political games? It is wrong.

I hope those who have set this course will reconsider before more damage is done. Congress has a real opportunity to reject the slogans, the politicking, the influence of pressure groups, and show real leadership. It is what we have done in the past. We have to do that now and in the future. Stop this always voting for slogans. Let's debate the appropriations bills and vote for them or against them. Vote to repair those crumbling bridges or vote against doing it. Vote for that medical research in cancer or vote against it. Right now they are allowed to go home and say: I am on your side, whatever side you are on. No. It is damaging our economy, it is destroying our image abroad, and it is stopping everything from cancer research to the education of our children. And in a rural State such as mine, in Vermont, it is of extreme danger.

We have seen this before, in 1995 and 1996, when a handful of Republicans turned a looming debt limit crisis into a political standoff with President Clinton that led to a shutdown of the government for three weeks. It is now happening again, as some Republicans seek to gain political advantage over President Obama. Continuing operation of our government's responsibilities to its citizens is too important to be sacrificed for partisan political advantage.

The effect of a government shutdown on law enforcement operations is also significant. Agencies like the FBI are already strapped for resources due to sequestration and the general budget environment. According to the Washington Post, FBI Director James Comey learned from his field agents across the country that funding was so limited that agents were left unable to put gas in their cars and training for new recruits has ceased. Agents are unable to build anti-fraud cases at a time when incidents of mortgage and investment fraud are on the rise, and staffing constraints have meant fewer cases opened overall and slower hiring throughout the Bureau. The needless shutdown of the Federal government will only compound an already challenging situation and make the job of law enforcement more difficult.

According to the Department of Homeland Security's shutdown plan, staffing at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center will go from 1,074 employees to 61. This means that all training for Federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement officers will cease immediately. Last year, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center trained nearly 70,000 people. The Department of Homeland Security would be compelled to reduce staffing at the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office from 115 employees to six. This office plays an important role coordinating nuclear detection efforts among Federal, state, local, and international governmental entities.

The partisan brinksmanship in 2011 that led to the downgrade of our national creditworthiness should be a cautionary tale that convinces all Americans that the risks of a government shutdown and ideological impasses to them, to interest rates, to financial markets, and to our household budgets are too great.

Madam President, I am privileged to be the President pro tempore of this Senate as the most senior Member here. I have seen Republicans and Democrats come together. Democrats are prepared to come together here. Where is the Republican leadership, as it has been in the past?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to concur with much of what my colleague from Vermont just said. Clearly, in our small State a government shutdown will be devastating—devastating for many thousands of Federal employees. If a shutdown continues, it will be devastating for families who have kids in Head Start. If a shutdown continues, it will be devastating for seniors who are on the Meals On Wheels Program and for pregnant women and young mothers and their kids who are on the WIC Program. This is going to hit Vermont hard, and it is going to hit America hard, and this is something that should not be taking place.

This debate is not about the Affordable Care Act. That is something which should be debated. I think it can be improved. What this debate is about is blackmail and hostage-taking.

What my Republican colleagues—especially the rightwing extremists in the House—are upset about is not so much ObamaCare; what they are upset about is that they lost the election in November. President Obama won by some 5 million votes. They lost seats. The Republicans lost seats in the Senate and they lost some seats in the House.

What they are upset about is that they cannot legislatively accomplish what they want to through the normal legislative process. What legislation is about is the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill, they both get together, work on something, compromise, and then the President signs it. They do not have the support to do that, so what they have now concluded is the only way they can go forward is to say: If we don't get our way, if we don't shut down the government or kill ObamaCare or delay ObamaCare—that is the only game in town. That is all we are going to do. We can't do it the normal way.

So what they are doing is holding the Congress and the American people hostage. That is unacceptable. It is unacceptable not only in terms of the Affordable Care Act, but let's be very clear: If we were to succumb and agree to this type of blackmail, does anybody not believe that 2 weeks from now, when the United States needs to pay its debts, we will be threatened and for the first time in the history of this country we will be in a situation where we may not be able to pay our debts, which economists tell us could lead not only to a major financial and economic crisis in this country, but it could impact the entire world.

So if we say: Hey, no problem, we are going to yield to your blackmail now, what do you think will happen in 2 weeks? They will be back then. And next year when we go through this process again, it may not be the Affordable Care Act, it may be Social Security. Many of our rightwing extremist Republicans want to end Social Security. If we go through this process and submit to this blackmail now, I certainly will not be surprised if a year from now this same group of people says: Hey, look, you are not going to have a budget unless we end Social Security or we end Medicare as we know it right now.

So I think submitting and allowing blackmail to take place is very bad public policy. If Republicans or anybody else wants to have a discussion about how we can improve the Affordable Care Act—and I certainly think we can because I think it is too complicated in many respects, I think it leaves many people still uninsured. We are the only country in the industrialized world that does not provide health care to all of our people as a right, and ObamaCare doesn't do that. So I want to see some improvements made in it, but let's do it in the normal legislative process, and let's not say that if we don't get our way, we are going to shut down the government; we are going to impact hundreds of thousands of Federal workers; we are going to impact many vulnerable people who are dependent on Federal programs.

Another point I wish to make is that we hear from some of our Republican colleagues that the world is about to come to an end because the Affordable Care Act will be implemented. But it is important to understand that many of these same arguments have been made in the past around the time or shortly after major pieces of legislation were passed which today are enormously popular.

Right now we have over 50 million people who benefit from Social Security. Social Security is an enormously important and popular program in this country. But let me take you back to April of 1935 when Social Security was just passed, and I will quote what some Republicans had to say about Social Security at that time.

April 19, 1935, Republican Congressman John Taber said this about Social Security:

> Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery, to enslave workers and to prevent any possibility of the employers providing work for people.

Ask most working people in Hawaii and in Vermont whether Social Security is enslaving them. I think they

would not understand what you are talking about because since its inception Social Security has been enormously successful in reducing the poverty rate among seniors.

But it was not only Congressman Taber in 1935. Here is what Republican Congressman James Wadsworth told the American people:

> This bill opens the door and invites the entrance into the political field of a power so vast, so powerful as to threaten the integrity of our institutions and to pull the pillars of the temple down upon the heads of our descendants.

The world was just about coming to an end in 1935 because they passed Social Security.

Republican Senator Daniel Hastings in 1935 called Social Security ''un-American'' and told the American people that Social Security would ''end the progress of a great country and bring its people to the level of the average European.''

I am not sure what that means but looks pretty scary.

On May 6, 1935, former President Herbert Hoover said:

> As a matter of economic security alone, we can find it in our jails. The slaves had it. Our people are not ready to be turned into a national zoo, our citizens classified, labeled and directed by a form of self-approved keepers.

That is a former President of the United States on Social Security.

It is not widely known, but in 1936 the Republicans campaigned to repeal Social Security. That year the Republican nominee for President said that Social Security is unjust, unworkable, stupidly drafted, and wastefully financed. He called Social Security a fraud on the working man and a cruel hoax and said: We must repeal Social Security. The Republican Party has pledged to do this.

It has turned out not quite to be the case. It turned out that Social Security will probably go down in history as maybe the most important and successful program ever passed by the U.S. Congress, and it plays an enormous role in keeping seniors out of poverty, helps people with disabilities, helps widows and orphans. It has been enormously successful and enormously popular despite all of these cries about how it was going to destroy our Nation. Maybe we should learn something from these prophets of doom.

Furthermore, we have a similar situation regarding Medicare. In the fairly dysfunctional health care system we currently have today where so many people are uninsured, so many people have high copayments, so many people have high deductibles, and yet we end up spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as do the other industrialized nations with guaranteed health care to all of their people—in 1965 Congress passed Medicare. Today Medicare is a very popular program. Today nearly 50 million seniors are receiving guaranteed health care benefits through Medicare. But when Medicare legislation was being debated in 1965, this is what some of the Republicans from Washington had to say. Remember, today Medicare is quite a popular program, generally regarded as a successful health care program for seniors.

On April 8, 1965, Republican Congressman Durward Hall had this to say about Medicare:

> We cannot stand idly by now as the nation is urged to embark on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, the end of which no one can see and from which the patient is certain to be the ultimate sufferer.

I don't know where Mr. Hall is today, but I think if he were to ask the seniors throughout this country whether they are suffering from Medicare or whether they approve of Medicare, I think most of them would say they approve of Medicare.

In terms of the Medicare debate we had on July 8, 1965, Republican Senator Milward Simpson said this about Medicare:

> This program could destroy private initiative for our aged to protect themselves with insurance against the cost of illness. . . . Presently, over 60 percent of our older citizens purchase hospital and medical insurance without Government assistance. This private effort would cease if government efforts were given to all older citizens.

In 1965 Congressman Joel Broyhill wrote:

> Medicare would initiate what would ultimately become a Federal monopoly in regard to the financing and rendering of health care with respect to our aged to the detriment of endeavors of the private sector; this would impair the quality of health care, retard the advancement of medical science, and displace private insurance.

In 1961 Ronald Reagan warned that ''Medicare will usher in Federal programs that will invade every area of freedom as we have known it in this country. If you don't speak out against Medicare, one of these days you and I are going to spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like in America when men were free.''

On and on it goes.

So the point to be made is not that the Affordable Care Act does not have its share of problems—it does—and not that it will take some work to implement it—it will—but what we have heard from Republicans in the past whenever a major government initiative was introduced was constant doomsday discussion about how the world would collapse.

Let me conclude by getting back to my major point that, in fact, this debate really is not about the Affordable Care Act. We can argue about the Affordable Care Act. We can change the Affordable Care Act. All of that is certainly legitimate. What this debate is about is whether 20 or 30 extreme rightwing Members of the House of Representatives are able to hold our entire government hostage. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers, many of whom are trying to bring up their families, are going to lose their paychecks, lose their jobs. People who are going to be applying for Social Security, for Medicare, for veterans benefits will have that process significantly slowed down. Depending on how long the shutdown continues, if it takes place—and I certainly hope it doesn't—it will mean that Head Start centers will be closing and other important programs will not be available to the people who need them.

Once again, this is not a discussion about the Affordable Care Act. What this is about is whether a small number of Members of the House are able to use their position to blackmail the American people and the President and the Senate and say: If you do not do what we could not accomplish—what they could not accomplish legislatively—we are going do render terrible harm to our country.

Furthermore, as bad as the government shutdown may be—and I certainly hope it does not take place—what we are looking at in 2 weeks is something that may be even worse. If some get their way, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we, the largest economy on Earth, may not pay our bills. That will certainly cause a huge eruption not only in our country but throughout the world in terms of markets, rising interest rates, and all kinds of terrible things.

Once again, their understanding of government is, well, I guess it is too bad we lost the election for the White House, we lost seats in this Senate, and we lost seats in the House. That is too bad, but we are still going to do what we want to do regardless of what the election was about.

We cannot allow that to happen because if we do, it is not going to stop now. It will continue and continue.

So my hope is that Speaker BOEHNER will do something he should do. He is not the Speaker of the Republican Party; he is the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. I suspect very strongly that if he put the bill that we passed on the floor of the House, he would have virtually all Democrats and a number of Republicans voting for it, and a majority would say: We are not going to shut down the U.S. Government.

So my request to Speaker BOEHNER is let the people in his body—all of the people, not just Republicans—vote on what we passed here. If he does that, I suspect we will not see a government shutdown and we will have some common sense over there.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have just a few hours, absent some

last-minute agreements on the continuing resolution, to a government shutdown. This is a manufactured crisis that we are imposing upon our country. Make no mistake about it, it will cause harm. People will be hurt by a government shutdown.

I am honored to represent the people of Maryland. We have one of the largest number of Federal workers on a per capita basis of any State in the Nation and I am proud of the work they do every day keeping our country safe, doing the important research into incredible life sciences, protecting our food supply, making sure people get their Social Security checks—the list goes on and on. These are men and women who are on the front lines of public service. At midnight they will be asked to have another sacrifice added to their public service.

These public workers have gone through a lot: 3 years of a pay freeze, fewer Federal workers to do more work, furloughs as a result of sequestration—in other words, they are not getting their full pay today. Now what will happen after midnight? Some will be asked to work and not be clear whether they will get a paycheck or when they will get their paycheck. Others will be furloughed not knowing if they will ever get paid for the time they are off.

This is unfair to our Federal workers once again. Our Federal workers want to show up at work, do their work, and get fair pay for what they do on behalf of their country. That is what each one of us wants. Yet once more they are going to be the victims of the fight we see taking place here on Capitol Hill, particularly among our Republican colleagues in the House.

This is going to hurt people of this country such as small business owners trying to get an SBA loan, finding out there is no one there to help them process that loan. That person's business cannot wait. Yet a government shutdown will jeopardize that person's ability to get badly needed capital for their business. It will affect people who are now entitled to get Medicare benefits or Social Security benefits or they may have some questions about it or veterans trying to get their veterans' benefits worked out. Those issues will be delayed as a result of a government shutdown.

Individuals who depend upon the basic research which will be done by government—slowed down or in some cases stopped as a result of a government shutdown. People will get hurt as a result of a government shutdown.

This is going to be wasteful for the taxpayers of this country. It will cost the country valuable resources which should be used to provide services to the people of this country. This is wasteful. It will hurt our economy. When people do not get a paycheck, they do not go to the local shops as they would otherwise; they do not travel as much. Our whole economy will suffer.

From a logical point of view, it is hard to understand why we have reached this point. Let me explain. This body passed what is known as a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution would keep government open until the middle of November. It did not represent one party or the other's view as to what that level should be. If anything, it represents the Republican view because the number we picked for continuing government is the number the Republicans thought was the right number. We did not take the number that was in the Senate-passed budget bill. So we have already made an accommodation in an effort to make sure we do not get into that budget fight as we keep government operating.

We passed that resolution, known as a clean CR, and sent it over to the House. We are told—you listen to the comments of Members on both sides of the aisle—it looks as though we have the votes to pass that on the House side. Yet the Speaker will not bring it up for a vote. He refuses to do that. Talk about democracy. We passed it here, looks like the votes are on the other side to pass it, the President is prepared to sign it, and government will not shut down in 7 hours, but there is no indication that the majority will prevail in the House of Representatives. Instead, a minority, with extreme views, is saying we are going to use this shutdown of government to try to advance our extreme agenda.

It gets us to what we have seen in other parts of history. This is not much different than some of the tactics that were deployed to try to prevent Medicare from coming into law, or Social Security from coming into law. The Republicans in the House who are trying to block ObamaCare are saying they do not want to see this happen. They say they are afraid of what will happen when ObamaCare becomes a reality. They are not afraid it will fail; they are afraid it will succeed. President Obama observed—and I happen to agree with him—regarding the naysayers on ObamaCare, the one thing he knows is in a few years when this program is successful, they will not call it ObamaCare.

I can talk about the merits or I can talk about the process. The merits of the Affordable Care Act—I am proud at last the United States, the wealthiest Nation in the world, is moving toward universal coverage so we can at long last say health care is a right, not a privilege. We are the only industrial Nation in the world that has yet to move in that direction.

I am proud we improved Medicare under the Affordable Care Act. Our seniors are seeing that coverage gap in Medicare prescription drugs closed. They are seeing preventive health care services now available without copayments. By the way, they are also seeing a Medicare trust fund that is solvent. The future looks much brighter than it did before the Affordable Care Act.

American families are happy they can keep their adult children on their insurance policies to age 26, and they are getting value for the dollar.

I hear these negative comments about ObamaCare. They are talking about how our health care system used to be. Talk to American families who saw every year their coverage erode and their premiums go up before we passed the Affordable Care Act. Under the Affordable Care Act, we see you are getting value for your dollar. The insurance company has to return 80 to 85 percent of your premium dollars in benefits. If not, you get a rebate. Millions of Americans have seen rebates because the insurance companies charged too much. They are getting money back. They are getting value for their dollar.

For affordability, of the people who will be able to enter the exchanges starting tomorrow—tomorrow they can enroll in the exchanges—three out of every four who are eligible to enroll in the exchanges will be entitled to some help. This is affordable coverage and it is good coverage—no lifetime caps; no preexisting conditions. You are getting solid insurance coverage for an affordable rate. That is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

Small businesses, I have heard a lot about small businesses. If you have under 50 employees, there are no new mandates and at last you are able to get competitive products, insurance programs with a little variety. You can pick the plan that is best for you rather than being told by the insurance company this is all you can get, and there are larger pools so you don't have to worry about one of your employees getting sick and all of a sudden the premiums go up. That is the situation that is changing.

I can talk about the merits of what we are trying to do but that is not where we are. This is a process issue. There is a time and place to talk about how we can improve our health care system in this country, but in a few hours we are talking about whether government is going to stay open.

I can make a very strong argument that the reason we do not have a budget that starts October 1 is because of the obstructionist policies of the Republicans, particularly in the House. We have tried to go to conference. We passed our budget. They said we could not. We did. We passed a budget in the Senate. The House passed a budget. They were different. Would you think you go to conference? Republicans refused to go to conference. They refuse to go to conference. They refuse to negotiate a budget agreement. We are now up to October 1 and they will not agree to keep government open. I acknowledge it is not the majority, but there is an extreme element, particularly on the other side, that wants to see government shut down. They want to see government closed. That is what we are confronting, which is terribly irresponsible. It is affecting families, it is affecting our economy.

New York Magazine got this right. I don't normally quote from them:

The Republican party has spent 30 years careening ever more deeply into ideological extremism, but one of the novel developments of the Obama years is its embrace of procedural extremism. The Republican fringe has evolved from being politically shrewd proponents of radical policy changes to a gang of saboteurs who would rather stop government from functioning at all.

That is what we are up against. I think most Members of this body know that I believe in pragmatism. I believe we need to work together. I believe Democrats and Republicans need to come together and forge agreements to move the process forward. That is what I think the Framers of our Constitution envisioned, sitting around a table working out our differences. We have had divided government before. It is not new. We have gotten through those days. We have gotten through those days by listening to each other, sitting around the table and working out our problems.

But there are three things that are happening right now that need to end. No. 1, we have to keep government open; No. 2, we have to pay our bills and not be threatened in 2 weeks with the inability to pay our bills; No. 3, we have to get rid of these senseless, across-the-board, mindless cuts known as sequestration. We have to get rid of those three.

Yes, we do need a budget. That budget will not be what the Democrats want or the Republicans want. It has to be negotiated. It will contain, I hope, the best of what both parties can offer in dealing with the future needs of our country. That is what we should do, put America first. If we do that, we will help the people of our country.

I know we are just a few hours away from the shutdown of government. I still hold out hope that we will put the country's business first and stop playing this extremism politics of trying to say it is my way or no way. Let's keep government open. Let's pay our bills. Let's get rid of sequestration. Then let's negotiate a budget that allows this country to grow and unleashes our potential so that all Americans can enjoy the opportunity of this great land.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise tonight—with the question of whether the House will allow government to continue or shut down—to actually talk for a few minutes about a simple concept but that is apparently difficult in this body, and that is compromise. I want to talk for a few minutes about compromise.

Based on the action that was taken by the Senate earlier today, the House has an opportunity to accept a compromise that the Senate has put before them. The CR bill the House drafted contained a budget number that was their number, not our number. We weren't wild about it, but we accepted it. And the question is: Will the House accept yes for an answer?

Over the weekend, I was traveling in Virginia—especially yesterday when the weather was great—to different events in central Virginia where there were big festivals, so people were gathering outside. As I traveled, I heard again and again: Don't shut down government and can't you find a compromise?

People are aware in Virginia, and in Hawaii I know they feel the same, that there can be severe consequences to a shutdown. I know the Senator from Maryland may have already offered a number of these thoughts. A great agency such as NASA that funds science and research will see furloughs of 97 percent of its employees. The Commerce Department, which is about commerce, our business and our economy, will see furloughs of 87 percent of its employees. The National Institutes of Health, dealing with research and other important health matters, will see furloughs of 73 percent of their employees. Even an agency such as Treasury—the core Treasury function, separate from the IRS—will see a reduction of their staff at 50 percent at a time when we need the Nation's fiscal system to be strong.

The consequences of shutdown are severe, and that is why the citizens of Virginia are saying: Don't shut the government down. Find compromise. It is not just employees either, and that is significant enough. It will affect tens of thousands of employees in Virginia and services people rely on. To pick one as an example, the number of VA employees who will be furloughed is actually fairly small as a percentage, but the people at the VA who will be furloughed are the folks who work at the VA Benefits' Administration, which is the organization within the VA that processes veterans' benefits claims.

If you are a veteran who has come home from Iraq or Afghanistan, and you have been part of a war that has now lasted for 12 or 13 years and you want to file for your benefits, which is something you are entitled to because you fought for the Nation—and we have heard the stories of the backlog in veterans' claims—you will be delayed even more because of the furlough. It is unfair to do this to our veterans. It is unfair to do this across government.

I said I wanted to talk about compromise because I think this is not even fundamentally a battle about the budget. It is not a battle about the Affordable Care Act. It is a battle about whether compromise is good or bad.

I don't know if anyone had a chance to read this, but there was a wonderful article in the Washington Post—an opinion article on Friday, September 27—that was authored by a columnist of the Post, Michael Gerson. Michael was the former speechwriter for President Bush 43, George W. Bush. He worked in the Bush administration and wrote an excellent piece that was published, and I want to read a bit of it. The title of the piece is ''A compromised reputation among the GOP.'' Again, it ran in The Washington Post last Friday. I will read a couple of quotes:

The real target—

Not the ACA, not the budget—

is the idea of compromise itself, along with all who deal, settle or blink.

In the middle of this unfolding Republican debate comes a timely National Affairs article by Jonathan Rauch. It is titled ''Rescuing Compromise,'' but it might as well have been called ''James Madison for Dummies.''

Rauch argues that Madison—

I have to mention a Virginian in my speech—

had two purposes in mind as he designed the Constitution. The first was to set faction against faction as a brake on change and ambition—a role that tea-party leaders have fully embraced. Madison's second purpose, however, was ''to build constant adjustment into the system itself, by requiring constant negotiation among shifting constellations of actors.''

Following the Articles of Confederation, America's founders wanted a more energetic government. But they made action contingent upon bargaining among branches of government and within them. ''Compromise, then, is not merely a necessary evil,'' argues Rauch, ''it is a positive good, a balance wheel that keeps government moving forward instead of toppling.''

Compromise, of course, can have good or bad outcomes. But an ideological opposition to the idea of compromise removes an essential cog in the machinery of constitutional order. ''At the end of the day,'' says Rauch, ''the Madisonian framework asks not that participants like compromising but that they do it—and, above all, that they recognize the legitimacy of a system that makes them do it.''

Finally from the Gerson article:

It is a revealing irony that the harshest critics of compromise should call themselves constitutional conservatives. The Constitution itself resulted from an extraordinary series of compromises. And it created the system of government that presupposes the same spirit. ''Compromise,'' says Rauch, ''is the most essential principle of our constitutional system. Those who hammer out painful deals perform the hardest and, often, highest work of politics; they deserve, in general, respect for their willingness to constructively advance their ideals, not condemnation for treachery.''

That is what this debate is about: Is compromise good or is it bad? We have to be willing to compromise.

I want to talk about what the Senate has been doing to advance the spirit of compromise. On the 23rd of March in this body—after a very late night—at 5 a.m. in the morning, the Senate passed the first Senate budget that we passed in 4 years. In that same week, the House passed a budget as well. We have talked about this often. Once that happens and the two budgets are passed,

there is a budget conference to sit down and try to find compromise between these two different documents.

These budgets passed more than 6 months ago, but there has been no budget conference. There has been no effort to find compromise. Why not? Because the Republicans—a tiny handful in the Senate and the majority in the House—do not want to compromise.

Senate Democrats have made a motion 18 times since March 23 to begin a budget conference, and in every one of those instances, a handful of Republican—and when I use the word handful, I am quoting the Senator from Utah who objected to a budget compromise and said ''a handful of us object''—Members of this body, working together with House colleagues, have decided they do not want to put in motion the process for dialog and compromise.

The Senate Democrats were, are, and will be ready to sit down at a budget conference table to negotiate, listen, and compromise to find a budget going forward. We have tried 18 times. We will try it a 19th time. We will try it a 20th time. We will keep working to compromise.

We also compromised in the very matter of the bill that is pending before the body today. As the Presiding Officer knows, the continuing resolution bill was sent from the House over to the Senate last week. That is the way these bills start; they originate in the House. The bill had two components. The first component was ''defund ObamaCare,'' and the second was ''and then we will fund government.''

The House bill said they would fund the government at their proposed budgetary number, which is $986 billion in discretionary spending. That was their number; that was not our number. We had extensive discussions among Senators about what we thought of their proposal. Frankly, we thought the $986 billion number was too low. It includes all of the sequester cuts we disagree with. We think the right number to the budget compromise should be $1.05 trillion, not $986 billion.

The Senate has a different idea about the number, but guess what. The Senate was willing to accept the House's number. We accepted the House's budget number out of the spirit of compromise, and we stripped away the ''defund the Affordable Care Act'' provision and said: Let's put that into a budget negotiation. In a budget negotiation, we can talk about that or anything else they want, but we won't tie it up with the threat of a government shutdown.

So we sent the budget bill back to the House at their budget number and said to them: Can't you take yes for an answer? They have proposed funding at $986 billion. We do not agree with that number, but for purposes of the short-term CR, we will agree, out of the spirit of compromise: Can you take yes for an answer?

The Presiding Officer knows the answer. They would not take yes for an answer. They brought it back and added new provisions: the repeal of a tax that would increase the deficit, and a delay in the Affordable Care Act provisions that would provide maternity service to expecting mothers, that would protect adults from not getting insurance on the grounds of preexisting conditions, that would give a significant tax credit to small businesses to help them pay for insurance. They wanted to delay all of those provisions.

We have taken action again today. We have again made this bill what we call a clean spending bill. We have taken out anything other than what this bill was supposed to be: At what level should government be funded? We have gone back to the House and we said: We are accepting your proposal. We are accepting your number even though we have a different number we want to argue for, and we will save the other arguments for a budget conference if you will finally go to the table with us.

I want to conclude and say that James Madison was right, and not because he was a Virginian. He was just right to recognize that compromise is the essential element of our system. Think about it for a minute. If you set up a government, you have three different branches. The legislative branch has two Houses. You have to find compromise between the two Houses to move forward.

The Supreme Court in the judiciary has nine Justices. They have to work together and find a compromise, or a consensus, by a majority on any case.

Even the President's power, which is unilateral so it seems as though it is not a compromise branch because we put the executive powers in the President's hands. How do we choose the President? We choose the President through the fundamental constitutional compromise of the electoral college. So the choice of a President is based on compromise.

The entire constitutional system we have requires compromise. The Senate was willing to compromise and go to a budget resolution, and we have been blocked by the House. The Senate was willing to compromise and accept the House's budget number and they have not been willing to say yes even to their own budget number.

We stand here tonight at 5:27 p.m. ready to compromise, and we will be ready the next hour to compromise. We will be ready to compromise and find a deal to keep this government open every minute, every second, from now until we get this right. But we do feel very strongly that no one should threaten to shut down the government of the United States.

If a foreign enemy threatened to shut us down, we would unify, as we have so many times, to repel that threat. But we are allowing elected Members of Congress to threaten to shut down this body, the government of the greatest Nation on Earth? It is unfathomable to me. The only way I understand it is in exactly the terms Michael Gerson indicated in the Washington Post. This is not fundamentally about the Affordable Care Act or a debate about the budget. It is a fundamentally an attack by some upon the very notion of compromise that is at the core of our system of constitutional government.

I stand on behalf of Virginians—and I don't think Virginians are different from the rest of America—by saying we have to be willing to compromise to find the common good. It is my hope that the House, when they act tonight, will act in the spirit of compromise and the common good and allow this government to remain open.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise again to urge both the House and this body to pass into law what should be the rule and the law for everything we do in Washington; that is, to apply the same rules to Washington as are applied to the rest of America, across the board, certainly including ObamaCare. Of course, what I am talking about is ending the special Washington exemption from ObamaCare.

That exemption is moving forward under what I consider a clearly illegal rule issued by the Obama administration. It is illegal because it is contrary to the statute, contrary to the clear language, contrary to the clear intent of an ObamaCare provision that says every Member of Congress and all congressional staff need to be treated the same as the millions of other Americans who are going to the so-called exchanges for their health care; 8 million, against their will, losing their previous employer-provided subsidy.

Let me recount briefly the history of this because it is important. Several years ago during the ObamaCare debate there was a proposal made by many, including myself and one of the leaders was Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa, and that proposal was actually adopted, amazingly, to my pleasant surprise at the time, and put in the ObamaCare bill. It said just what I mentioned a few minutes ago: Every Member of Congress and all congressional staff need to go to the so-called exchanges for their health care. They need to leave our present Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan which includes our employer-provided subsidy. The idea was simple, and it was a good one, so that we would actually walk in the shoes of other Americans who are living under the challenges and the burdens of this law, including having to get our health care in the exchanges

with no special deal, no special subsidy, no special exemption.

That law was passed as part of ObamaCare, pure and simple, exactly those words.

I guess this is an example of what NANCY PELOSI said: We need to pass the law in order to figure out what is in it. Because after the law passed, with that language in it, lots of folks on Capitol Hill started reading that and they said, Oh, you-know-what; we can't stand for this, we can't live by that. We can't be subject to the same situation as other Americans. So there was furious scheming and gnashing of teeth about how we are going to get out of this burden, even though there was very little broad-based discussion about how we are going to get all of Americans out of that burden they were subjected to.

That developed into furious lobbying of the Obama administration. Many folks in the Senate, led by the distinguished majority leader HARRY REID said: Mr. President, you need to issue a special rule that exempts Congress, that takes the pain out of that provision—a special, unique, special rule, special bailout for Congress. Sure enough, that is what the Obama administration did, conveniently right after we left town for the August recess, right after Congress got away from the scene of the crime.

According to numerous press reports that are not rebutted, President Obama personally got involved. He personally had discussions within his administration, at the urging of HARRY REID and others, and he ensured that this special rule was issued. It does two things, basically. No. 1, it says that even though the ObamaCare statute states plainly and clearly that every Member of Congress and all official congressional staff have to go to the exchanges, we don't know what official staff is, so we are going to leave that up to each individual Member of Congress, and we are not going to second-guess that. So any individual Member of Congress can say certain folks aren't covered by that mandate. They can stay in their current plan. They don't have to be disrupted. In theory, a Member of Congress can say nobody on my staff is part of that official staff for purposes of this mandate. That is silly and ridiculous on its face because the statute is clear.

The second thing this illegal rule does is it says that for Members and any staff who do go to the exchange—what is supposed to be the fallback position for Americans and for Congress—for Members and staff who do go to the exchange, they get to take their very generous taxpayer-funded subsidy with them, even though that is not available to any other person losing employer-based coverage and who is going to the exchange against his or her will. So that deal isn't available to anyone but the select ruling class.

That is why I think this rule is completely illegal, and that is why I know it flies in the face of what I consider the first most basic rule of democracy; that laws passed by Congress, by Washington, should be applied to Washington the same as they are applied to America. That should be true in ObamaCare. That should be true across the board.

To react to this illegal Obama administration rule, I joined with many colleagues in the Senate—and I wish to thank all of my cosponsors, including Senator ENZI, Senator HELLER, and several others—I am forgetting the entire list—and Members of the House who have identical legislation and identical language. They are led by Congressman RON DESANTIS of Florida. RON JOHNSON is another colleague I was trying to think of from Wisconsin who is another leading coauthor. I wish to thank all of them for leading this fight.

Our language does two simple things. First of all, it negates this illegal Obama administration rule that is a special exemption, a special bailout for Congress against the clear language and intent of ObamaCare. Secondly, it broadens that rule and also applies it to the President and the Vice President and all of their political appointees.

That is the ''no Washington exemption'' language. That is the Vitter amendment in the Senate, with many other cosponsors. That is the DeSantis amendment in the House, with many House cosponsors. I urge all of my colleagues to come together around that commonsense, fair language, which again simply ensures what I think should be rule No. 1 of our American democracy: Whatever Congress passes for America, it applies equally to itself; whatever Washington imposes on America, it applies equally to Washington, to policymakers in Washington.

We are making progress because there are reports that the House may very well take up this exact language tonight as part of the continuing discussion about a spending bill, and I urge the House to do that, to stand with the American people—not to stand with Washington but to stand tall with the American people—and say, yes, it should be that even playing field, and whatever is passed on America should be applied equally in the same way. No special deals or exemptions or subsidies should be applied to Washington.

I urge all of my colleagues here, Republicans and Democrats, to support that effort, to support that simple, basic, fair language, to support it on ObamaCare, to support it across the board because it is essential that what Washington passes on America is applied with equal force and effect on Washington. If we did that under ObamaCare, I am convinced we would rush with greater determination, speed, and focus to fix the very real problems of ObamaCare because we would be vested in it. If we did that on other laws, I am convinced it would have the same positive effect. Let's do it, No. 1, because it is fair and right; and No. 2, because our personal interests should be completely aligned, should be the same as those of the American people, and that will get us to act. That will get us to fix things. That will get us to fight in the right direction, Republicans and Democrats together.

Again, I urge support of this new Washington exemption language. I urge the House to vote positively on that tonight. I urge the Senate to accept that fundamental principle, that important language, which, as I said, I think is the first core rule of democracy.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business with debate only be extended until 8 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 8 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I come to the floor today in a state of disbelief. With millions of people out of work, with an economic recovery still far too fragile, with students and families being crushed by student loan debt, with millions of seniors denied their chance at one hot meal a day, with Meals On Wheels, and millions of little children pushed out of Head Start because of a sequester, with the country hours away from a government shutdown and days away from a potential default on the Nation's debt, the Republicans have decided that the single most important issue facing our Nation is to change the law so employers can deny women access to birth control coverage.

In fact, letting employers decide whether women can get birth control covered on their insurance plans is so important that the Republicans are willing to shutter the government and potentially tank the economy, over whether women can get access to birth control in the year 2013,—not the year 1913, the year 2013.

I have a daughter and I have granddaughters, and I will never vote to let a group of backward-looking ideologues cut women's access to birth control. We have lived in that world and we are not going back—not ever.

This assault on birth control is just one more piece of an ongoing Republican assault on the orderly functioning of our government and the orderly functioning of our economy. In effect, the Republicans are trying to take the government and the economy hostage, threatening serious damage to both unless the President agrees to gut the Affordable Care Act.

This assault is utterly bizarre. Congress passed the Affordable Care Act to solve real, honest-to-God problems. Our health care system is broken. Forty-eight million people in this country had no health insurance. Women couldn't get access to cancer screenings. People with diabetes were denied health insurance because of a preexisting condition. People with cancer hit the caps on health insurance spending. Health care spending in this country was growing way too fast. So we worked hard. We compromised. We came up with a solution—a solution that will substantially improve the lives of millions of Americans—because that is the way democracy works.

It is time to end the debate about whether the Affordable Care Act should exist and whether it should be funded. Congress voted for this law. President Obama signed this law. The Supreme Court upheld this law. The President ran for reelection on this law. In fact, his opponent said he would repeal it and his opponent lost by 5 million votes.

I see things such as this and I wonder what alternate reality some of my colleagues are living in. So let me be very clear about what is happening in the real world. The ACA is the law of the land. Millions of people are counting on it—people who need health care coverage, people who need insurance policies that do not disappear just when they are their sickest. Women will get insurance coverage for birth control. The law is here to stay, and it will stay. Earlier today the Senate emphasized that reality by flatly rejecting the Republicans' newest ransom note, just as we did last week.

We should be having a real debate about our budget because we have real problems to solve. Earlier this year automatic across-the-board cuts went into effect throughout the Federal Government. That is the sequester. The sequester hits American families where they live. During my visits to cities and towns across Massachusetts, I have heard from families, small business owners, and community development organizations—from the Berkshires to the Cape. They tell me what it is like trying to stay afloat with mindless, across-the-board spending cuts weighing them down.

More than a thousand employees at Westover Air Force Base and Barnes Air National Guard Base in western Massachusetts are facing furloughs. This fall, more than 2,000 Massachusetts kids could not get into Head Start because of cuts, and the Head Start Program in Billerica will close completely at the end of this year. Federal workers across our State stand to lose as much as 30 percent of their salaries. Every one of those losses will tighten family budgets. And when families make less money, they have less to spend with local merchants and less money to pay off bills and less money to save and less money to do all that keeps our economy humming.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says ending the sequester would add 900,000 jobs to the economy by the end of next year. Next time you think about someone you know who is looking for a job or who is working part time but hoping to get full-time work, think about the 900,000 jobs the sequester has destroyed.

Scientists and medical researchers in Massachusetts are also getting pounded by the sequester. They are working hard to expand our medical knowledge and develop new cures for devastating diseases. They are working on discoveries that will help us in ways we cannot even imagine. Yet here we are, bluntly hacking away at their funding, delaying their research, and cutting off promising new work before it even starts—not because we have to, not because it is inevitable, but because Washington has its priorities all wrong, and it is making some truly terrible decisions.

Consider the Framingham Heart Study. It is a generations-long study of the causes of heart disease, a study that has helped create groundbreaking advancements in medical knowledge. There are people across this country who are alive today in part because of the work that began with this study. This study continues to yield extraordinary results, but it is scheduled to lose 40 percent of its funding—40 percent. Next time you think of someone you love who has heart trouble, think about the sequester cutting one of the world premier heart research programs.

Senate Democrats have put forward alternatives that would adequately fund the government while also addressing our budget deficits. Back in March the Senate passed a budget that would have ended the sequester. It was not easy. We had to make some compromises. No one loved everything in the final bill, but we debated it and we passed it. This is what Congress is supposed to do. But after we did all of that, Senate Republicans decided to filibuster the budget again and blocked us from going to conference with the House on the final bill. That is just pure obstruction, plain and simple.

In July the Senate attempted to pass the first of several appropriations bills to keep the government open and to end the sequester. We had a bipartisan Transportation and Housing bill that would have helped repair crumbling roads and bridges in our communities. It would have created more jobs, and it would have rolled back sequestration in these programs. But, once again, Senate Republicans filibustered and blocked that bill.

Now we are just hours from the government running out of money. We have not fixed the sequester because of all the obstruction. We have not finished a budget because of all the obstruction. We have not even passed a single appropriations bill because of all the obstruction.

The least we can do—the bare minimum we can do—would be to pass a continuing resolution to keep the doors open and the lights on. We can ensure that over a million Federal workers are not simply sent home for no reason. We can avoid a government shutdown. But the Republicans have refused to do even that. They have continued to threaten to shutter the government unless the President agrees to gut the Affordable Care Act. The Senate rejected that position twice. Yet the Republican response has been to continue to threaten to shut down the government.

These threats may continue, but they are not working, and they will never work because this is democracy, and in a democracy hostage tactics are the last resort for those who cannot win their fights through elections, cannot win their fights in Congress, cannot win their fights for the Presidency, and cannot win their fights in the courts. For this rightwing minority, hostage taking is all they have left—a last gasp for those who cannot cope with the realities of our democracy.

The time has come for those legislators who cannot cope with the reality of our democracy to get out of the way so that those of us in both parties who understand the American people sent us here to work for them can get back to work solving real problems faced by the American people. We have real work to do, and that is what we should be doing.

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. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I urge leadership in the House of Representatives to simply schedule a vote on the Senate-passed bill. I understand a number of people in the majority party are going to vote no. I also believe that—and the Presiding Officer used to be in the House of Representatives, as I was years ago. It is a democratic House, and I mean ''democratic'' with a small ''d.'' They should schedule a vote. I believe a majority of Members of the House of Representatives would vote for the bipartisan continuing resolution that passed the Senate. I believe they would pass it in the House if the Speaker of the House would let it come to a vote.

Is the Speaker of the House going to be the Speaker of the radical right of the Republican Party or is he going to be the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? Fundamentally, that is the question. Is he going to be the Speaker of the radical right in the House of Representatives or is he going to be the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives? If he chooses the latter, if he chooses before midnight, there will not be a government shutdown because a majority of the House

of Representatives—not necessarily a majority of the Republicans, but a majority of those who took the oath of office on January 3, 2013, who were elected in November of 2012, and then took that oath—I believe a majority of them will support it.

I think it is always a good idea to look back in time a little to what happened in the past. We know that more than 30 times when President Reagan was President and President Bush Senior was President and President Bush Junior was President, the Congress raised the debt ceiling, even with a Democratic Congress, without preconditions, without threatening to shut the government down or without threatening default; and a number of times the same situation on continuing resolutions, passing budgets, all those things.

But never really before in the House of Representatives or the Senate has there been a body of Members who have tried repeatedly to have their way to, in a sense, attach their political platform from the election of the year before to a continuing resolution, and if they do not get that political platform attached, they are simply going to shut the government down. That is really what is happening.

There is all this talk about that the public does not like the Affordable Care Act. Some call it ObamaCare. The official name is the Affordable Care Act. There is some talk from the House of Representatives, really ad nauseam, that they do not like the Affordable Care Act and they say the public does not like the Affordable Care Act. But let's look at that.

(Mr. DONNELLY assumed the Chair.)

In 2012, the President of the United States was reelected—a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act.

In 2012, supporters of the Affordable Care Act were elected, including the new Presiding Officer, who replaced the Senator from Hawaii, who is a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. I was reelected—a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. A strong majority in the Senate support the Affordable Care Act, many of whom stood for reelection and were successful. In fact, two more were elected this time who held office prior to this election and who supported the Affordable Care Act. More people voted for House candidates who supported the Affordable Care Act. More people voted for Democrats in the House races than Republicans, even though redistricting made the outcome a little different, obviously, from that.

So the point is, there is no public sentiment to shut the government down in order to defund or repeal or hold back or delay or emasculate or pull apart—or whatever—the Affordable Care Act.

But let's go back a bit in history.

In July 1965—48 years and a couple months ago—President Johnson signed Medicare into law. It passed bipartisanly, although a number of Republicans were strongly against it, especially the far right. In 1965, when Medicare passed, the John Birch Society did not like it. That was sort of the tea party of today. A lot of doctors did not like it. A lot of insurance companies did not like it in 1965. But a lot of people who were suspicious of government overall said they did not like it and opposed it, and a lot of them continued to oppose it after the election.

But 5 years later, the country clearly was very happy with Medicare. Certainly 48 years later, the country is very happy with Medicare. I do not think there is much question that 5 years from now people will be happy with the Affordable Care Act. They know it will have worked for people in this country. Much of it already has worked, as the Presiding Officer knows.

In my State, almost a million seniors have already received benefits. They have gotten free preventive care with no copays, no deductibles. Seniors from Youngstown and Toledo have had screenings for osteoporosis and physicals and all and there is no copay or deductible for those living on Medicare. People from Cleveland to Cincinnati, people in their twenties—100,000 Ohioans in their twenties—have been able to go on their parents' health care plan up until the age of 26. Because of a rule in the Affordable Care Act, we have seen thousands of Ohioans get a rebate check from the insurance companies because the insurance companies charged too much.

We know a lot of those benefits have been out there. Families who have a child with a preexisting condition are no longer being denied coverage because of the Affordable Care Act. So we know much of it has taken effect and much of it has been to the public benefit. We also know come tomorrow, October 1, much more of the Affordable Care Act—the rest of it—will be rolled out.

Seniors have saved in my State—and I think in the State of Indiana—an average of about $700. Those who are in the prescription drug plan have saved about that amount of money on their prescription drugs, again, because of the Affordable Care Act. We know that. Put that aside.

Let's simply ask the House of Representatives to bring this bill up. We know what happens if we do not. A shutdown would hurt the financing of more than 1,000 small businesses per week in my State—from Hamilton to Chillicothe, to Mansfield, to Ashtabula. The Small Business Administration in 2012 approved nearly 54,000 applications through their credit loans program, supporting over half a million jobs. A shutdown would stop the ability of the SBA to loan to small businesses through this program.

A shutdown would put 52,000 Ohio federal employees at risk of being out of work. Most of them would temporarily lose jobs. We know that is a drag on the economy. We know it would mean government services are not being rendered. It would mean those tens of thousands of workers would not get paid. It would mean a stumbling, a faltering, a sputtering of our economic growth and the economic recovery, because people are not making the money and putting money back into the economy.

Senior citizens would be ineligible, if there is a shutdown, to apply for new Social Security benefits. The Social Security applications would not be taken as a result of Federal furloughs and service cuts. In 2012, more than 2.2 million Ohioans received—obviously many had been receiving for years—Social Security benefits.

All we ask is that the Speaker of the House do what one should do in a democracy. Let the elected representatives of Congress have the opportunity to vote. Give them the opportunity to vote yes or no on the Senate-passed, bipartisanly passed continuing resolution. Speaker BOEHNER needs to make a decision. Is he going to be the Speaker of the radical far right Republican party or is he going to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives? That choice is clear. Bring that bill to the floor. Let all 435 Members of the House of Representatives who were elected last November and sworn in in January have the opportunity to vote.

I think if they do, it will mean the President will sign the bill before midnight and keep this government operating. There is simply no reason for it, as we lurch from crisis to crisis, all created by a political agenda, that most of the people in this country have rejected at election time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, we are here tonight in the Senate, hours away from a deadline which, if action is not taken on the House side, the other body, will lead to a government shutdown. Unfortunately, when I have been asked today by either constituents or reporters, and they ask: Is it less likely or more likely that there will be a shutdown, I have had to be honest and say: At least at this moment it seems more likely than less likely.

I think we have to examine not just how to try to resolve this in a way that makes sense, but also to remind ourselves how we got here. This is not the typical battle in Washington. We have had a lot of those. We should all try to work in a bipartisan fashion. But this one is unique in the sense that you have, on the one side, Democrats in Congress and across the country who

are united in an effort to continue the operations of the government and not have a government shutdown, even if we want to make a point, even if we want to make an argument about this or that policy.

We see a growing number of Republicans here in the Senate and across the country, and maybe even a few in the House, even in the last 24 hours or so, who are saying: Let's just get the government funded so we can move forward. We might be able to have a debate in the middle of November or somewhere down the road. But let's not hold up the operations of government or default on our obligations for the first time since 1789 in order to make an ideological point or a political point.

It is clear from the national data that Independents are on that side of the argument as well. So you have this consensus on one side, with Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, who say that we should not—in order to make a point about an issue, whether it is health care or the economy or whatever it is—we should not act in a way that would shut down the government to do that.

On the other side, you have the far right of the Republican party which not only believes that in order to make their point they are willing to allow the government to shut down, but they also have a determination to do that to the extent one wing of one party is really driving the train in that party. It happens to be the Republican Party.

So this is unusual. It is not the typical Democrat versus Republican debate. It started months ago when politicians who work in this town would go home to their State or their districts and make the point that, no matter what, they were going to argue that this is the moment where they should stop the health care bill. No matter what was in their way, they were going to continue to drive in that direction.

That is how we have gotten here. What happens if we go past the deadline and there is a shutdown of a few days or longer? Here is what some of the data show from some of the folks who are not in the Congress but who observe broader trends, especially economic trends.

Mark Zandi is Moody's chief economist. He is widely respected. I think people in both parties respect his opinion. According to him—and I am not quoting, I am just summarizing what he said—a shutdown lasting a few days would cost the economy 0.2 percent of GDP, while a longer shutdown could cost as much as 1.4 percent.

Sometimes it is difficult to say what 0.2 percent of GDP means. What it means for sure is the economy, which has been moving in the right direction—we have had tremendous job growth, over 9 quarters now, and many months of job growth. But we are not moving fast enough. We are not creating jobs at a fast enough pace.

When I go home to Pennsylvania people do not say to me: Score every point you can for your point of view. They say to me: Work together with the other side to create jobs. Work together with the other side to put in place strategies that will lead to economic growth and to job growth.

If you are going to go in the wrong direction when it comes to growth, and you lose 0.2 percent of growth, and then, if the shutdown goes longer you lose 0.4 or 0.5 or 0.6, over time you are going in the wrong direction. But we know when you lose even 0.2 percent of growth you are killing jobs. So first and foremost, any shutdown is a big job killer. A default on our obligations would be a much bigger job killer.

A shutdown would not just slow growth, but it would spread anxiety. This is just human nature. It will spread anxiety among consumers. We know that in the summer of 2011 the almost default on our obligations caused consumer confidence to take a nosedive. We did not come out of that hole of consumer confidence until many months later. A government shutdown has a similar effect.

How about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not usually on my side of a lot of debates or on the Democratic side? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has urged Congress to keep the government open and has said that a shutdown would be ''economically disruptive and create even more uncertainty in the U.S. economy.'' So this is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is often making arguments about uncertainty in other contexts. They are saying that a shutdown would create even more uncertainty.

How about the economic recovery? I mentioned those 9 quarters of growth we have had. We have had job growth as well. Just in terms of how you measure it: 7.5 million private sector jobs—7.5 million added in the last 42 months. That will take a nosedive. So instead of growing at 160,000 jobs a month, roughly, which has been kind of the pace for a while now, which is not fast enough—we need to be at 200,000 or 230,000 or 240,000 if we really want to say that the economy has taken off. But instead of growing at 160,000, 170,000, or even higher, we will go backwards. Maybe the job growth for the next couple of months will be substantially less than that. A shutdown all but ensures that to happen.

We don't know exactly how much slowing or how much damage would be done to the job growth, but there is going to be a job impact for sure, and I think that is pretty clear from the data.

Both sides in a lot of debates in Washington say they stand for small businesses. We can debate which side does a better job for small business. We know when a small business person needs some help, a measure of help from the Federal Government, they usually turn to the Small Business Administration. We know the SBA, their approval of applications for business loans guarantees and direct loans to small business would cease. If we take the Small Business Administration off the playing field, they average about 1,000 loans or loan guarantees per week. That is national.

What does that mean for Pennsylvania?

From October 2012 through August of this year, 2013, the SBA supported over 1,400 loans for over $600 million for small businesses in Pennsylvania. On average, that is about 30 loans for over $13 million to entrepreneurs each week—every week, on average, based upon the recent data in Pennsylvania, 30 loans and $13 million helping small businesses in Pennsylvania. To shut that off would make our economic circumstance even worse.

In Pennsylvania, we had many months in a row where the unemployment numbers were 500,000 people unemployed or more. Thankfully, it dipped below 500,000 for a couple of months. We just received the numbers from August because the State numbers are always behind. The State data for August unfortunately shows we are just above 500,000 people out of work. A shutdown will bring that 500,000-persons out-of-work number and send it higher and send it in the wrong direction.

What about veterans? People say veterans' disability checks would go out, just as Social Security checks would go out, in the aftermath of a shutdown. That is only part of the story. If you are a veteran getting disability checks or a pension benefit—in our State we have 109,000 veterans who receive disability or pension help. They may get their check, but it is highly likely, if not a certainty, that those checks will be delayed.

If you are a veteran and are entitled to this because of what you did for our country, because part of a political party wants to make an ideological point, you have to wait for your check. You have to wait for your disability check. That makes no sense. To say it is unfair to a veteran or to his or her family is an understatement.

What about Social Security? People say: Well, the checks are going to go out so people will be just fine in a shutdown.

That is only part of the story. Yes, current recipients will get their checks, but if you reach the age of 65 and you wish to have your application processed, you will not be able to do that or, at a minimum, that will be slowed substantially.

In our State, every month more than 11,600 people are able to start the process for Social Security benefits. Those people will have to wait and wait in the advent of a government shutdown.

What about national parks? We have a great blessing in our State where we have an abundance of national parks and historic sites which are wonderful for the country, wonderful for enrichment, learning, and history, but they also are a big economic driver in different communities.

In southeastern Pennsylvania, when you add it all, one of the numbers I saw was over $200,000 of impact. Those, unlike a lot of others I spoke about, those parts of the government will stop completely. An economic engine in one part of our State that averages about $200,000 of economic impact will stop. Maybe we will lose $10,000 over the course of a shutdown. Maybe Pennsylvania will lose $20,000 or $30,000. We are going to lose for sure and a lot of other States will as well.

The Flight 93 National Memorial is one of those from 9/11 and Gettysburg and Valley Forge/Independence Visitor Center in Philadelphia, there are many examples and many job impacts when it comes to all of those.

The basic point is some people would say: Look, you are in the Senate or the House, and you wish to have a debate about something as significant and consequential to people's lives or to our economy such as health care, you ought to be able to debate that. I would agree with that. There is no question about it. We had big debates in 2009 leading up to a vote in the Senate. Then the debate continued in 2010. The bill was enacted in 2010. There was still debate about it after that. There were votes taken one after another to repeal it. Then the Supreme Court litigated it. That took months until the Supreme Court made a decision.

The Supreme Court, which is dominated—or at least the majority are Republican-appointed Justices—said the Affordable Care Act was constitutional. Then there was a Presidential election, which was another kind of litigation or debate. One candidate said: I am going to keep the Affordable Care Act in place, and we are not going to repeal it. The other side said: We are going to repeal it. The side that said they were going to put it into effect won the election—that of President Obama.

This has been debated and litigated several direct ways in several different branches of our government. That will continue and, frankly, it should continue. Some of the impacts are already in place. We know that.

We know, for example, that since 2010, when the consumer protections went into effect, which had nothing to do initially with those who were uninsured, the tens of millions of uninsured, but we put in place the consumer protections for those with insurance, those who had coverage, were making payments—premium payments—yet their children were still not protected because of a preexisting condition.

Up until 2010, it was the law—or it was the prevailing policy that if an insurance company wanted to say to those who were paying premiums, sorry, I know you are making your payments, but your child has a preexisting condition, and they are not covered, that was permitted when insurance companies had all of the power. I would argue they had all the power, an unfair advantage and bargaining advantage. Since 2010, we have had something on the order of 17 million children who could no longer be denied coverage due to a preexisting condition, solely and completely because of the Affordable Care Act.

We have millions of young people who can stay on their parents' policies from the ages of 19 to 25. They can only stay on those policies solely because of the Affordable Care Act, because it was enacted into law.

We have millions of seniors who are getting payments over time to help them fill the coverage gap of the so-called doughnut hole. They are getting those payments solely because of the Affordable Care Act.

Tomorrow, we are going to see the beginning of the exchanges going up, where people can go into a marketplace and shop for the best possible health care insurance that they can afford. Most people—probably as many as 150 million Americans—already have coverage and their employer provides it, so their status will not change that much, if at all.

These changes are going into effect over time. I would hope the people who wish to keep debating it and making changes to it—and I voted for changes as well—would allow it to be, if not fully implemented, something close to fully over the next couple of months or maybe even over the next couple of years. Then at some point this debate about who is right or who is wrong about the impact will have been determined.

We are all for debate on the budget, health care, and everything else, but we shouldn't bring the country to these cliffs—the cliff meaning this deadline tonight on the budget, where the House has our legislation, which is only about the budget. They could pass it. It will pass if the Speaker puts it on the floor tonight. It would pass, and we would be beyond this crisis. Then we would move to the next deadline, get beyond these deadlines, have a big debate, and have very strong arguments made about how we get a full year's worth of a budget starting in the middle of November. That is the appropriate time and the appropriate place to make arguments about the budget, the economy, jobs, health care or whatever else it is. Now is not the time.

I would hope between now and midnight, the House would put up our bill, which is very simple—it keeps the government operating with no conditions and no add-ons—and pass that legislation. We would be done with this, and we could move on to issues people want us to work on.

I will restate what I said before. People in Pennsylvania, when they say to me what they want me to do, they say work together to create jobs. If you had to put that in a sound bite, that is what it is.

I am hoping between now and then this consensus of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents that prevailed throughout the country will have the appropriate influence on those who are trying to push this to the end and shut down the government. A government shutdown is bad for everybody, no matter what party you are in. We should keep working to make sure it doesn't happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Earlier today the Senate rejected for the second time the House Republican continuing resolution. The approach they have adopted over in the House attempts to and would deprive millions of Americans of health insurance if it were passed here. It is not going to pass here.

I would say to Speaker BOEHNER we have given your proposal a vote. In fact, we have voted on it twice. Now you owe it to the American people to hold a vote, a vote on the bipartisan, clean continuing resolution which would keep the government open. This is the resolution which the Senate sent to you just a few hours ago.

The only thing preventing us from keeping this government open is Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to bring a bipartisan Senate continuing resolution to the House floor. I think most Republicans over there even acknowledge that it would pass if Speaker BOEHNER would allow a vote on it.

The Senate, a short time ago, approved a measure to allow for the pay of our men and women in uniform to continue in the event of a government shutdown. This measure was necessary because requiring our military to go into combat with only an IOU instead of pay would be a travesty. Nobody should be fooled. It is only one travesty that was avoided among many. Even if we restrict our view to the impact of a government shutdown on the military, there are many other terrible impacts of a government shutdown.

Our military Members would be paid so a shutdown would result in at least avoiding that problem. However, there are other unthinkable outcomes to our security with a government shutdown. Family members of military members who die in combat would not receive death benefits during a shutdown. It defies belief that in the pursuit of a narrow ideological goal House Republicans would prevent the payment of benefits for those who died defending our country. That is the result of a government shutdown.

In the event of a shutdown, the Department of Defense would also further reduce already curtailed training and bring routine maintenance to a halt, exacerbating the corrosive effects that sequestration is already having on military readiness. The Department of Defense would be barred from entering most new contracts. That would harm modernization programs.

A shutdown would severely curtail medical services for troops and their families. Commissaries would close, with hundreds of thousands of civilian

employees. Workers vital to our defense would be laid off. Outside of the DOD, a shutdown would disrupt some operations in the Department of Veterans Affairs which is providing benefits to those who have served.

Then there is the extraordinary disruption of having to plan for all of this absurdity. As Under Secretary of Defense Hale said on Friday:

> Even if a lapse never occurs, the planning itself is disruptive. People are worrying right now about whether their paychecks are going to be delayed, rather than focusing fully on their mission. And while I can't quantify the time being spent to plan, it has or will consume a lot of senior management attention, probably thousands of hours in employee time better spent on supporting national security.

Again, that only covers the impact on our military and on our veterans. While Border Patrol agents and FBI agents would continue to work, they would be putting their lives on the line for an IOU instead for a paycheck. Health clinics would stop taking new patients. Lifesaving research would grind to a halt. The far-reaching effects of a shutdown on government services across the country should give us all pause, as should the fact that a shutdown is likely to damage the all-too-fragile economic recovery.

This has gone on for far too long and Speaker BOEHNER can end it now. There is still time for him to bring to the floor of the House of Representatives a clean continuing resolution and avert a government shutdown. For the good of our men and women in uniform and our national security, for the good of our economy, and for the millions of Americans who rely on and who benefit from important Federal programs, I hope the Speaker will allow our bipartisan continuing resolution to be voted on.

I hope that even this late in the game reason is going to prevail. I hold that hope in part because while House Republicans have put tea party ideology ahead of the good of the Nation, many of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate have not. These Members recognize there is a difference between on the one hand debating serious policy preferences and on the other hand threatening government shutdown if you don't get your way.

All of us in the Senate have issues on which we feel every bit as passionately as the opponents of the Affordable Care Act feel about that law. I happen to feel strongly, for instance, that we should have universal background checks for firearms purchases. By the tea party method of proving the strength of my belief, I should threaten a government shutdown if I don't get what I want on that subject. If all of us threaten legislative anarchy in pursuit of our goals, democracy will cease to function.

As appalled as I am that some Members would threaten such damage to our Nation, I am heartened that many of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate have spoken out in opposition to this approach.

When I came to the floor last week to speak on this topic, Senator AYOTTE was speaking. I commended her for saying that the American people expect us to keep the government running even though I disagreed with much of what she said about the Affordable Care Act.

I commend Senator COLLINS for saying a shutdown ''will only further damage our struggling economy'' and that we should resolve our differences ''without resorting to constant brinkmanship and the threat of government shutdown.'' I commend Senator COLLINS, even though I disagree with her on the Affordable Care Act, for taking that position against a shutdown and for seeing the distinction between fighting hard for what you believe in and threatening to bring down government operations overall if you don't get what you want.

I commend Senator PORTMAN for saying that the differences on the Affordable Care Act ''ought to be handled outside the context of a government shutdown.''

I commend Senator CHAMBLISS for saying that while, in his words, he would love to defund ObamaCare, a government shutdown is ''going to do great harm to the American people if we pursue that course.''

I commend Senator KIRK for saying, ''Let's not shut down the government just because you don't get everything you want.''

There are others who have made that critically important distinction between opposing a certain policy and shutting down the government if one doesn't get his or her way.

I welcome spirited debate. I welcome differences of opinion. As my friend Senator MCCAIN said last week, there was plenty of both during the debate on the passage of the Affordable Care Act. But it is deeply distressing to hear Members of Congress argue that the litmus test of whether you are fighting for your beliefs is whether you are willing to shut down the government if you don't achieve a particular goal. That is more than fighting for your position, that is wanton destruction. I hope at least some House Republicans will come to see the difference between fighting for your goals and sowing anarchy in pursuit of them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, moments ago the House of Representatives adopted a rule which clearly indicates that it is set to adopt a resolution containing unrelated conditions that will forestall its approval by this Chamber. That is a tragic result which threatens harm and havoc to countless people who depend on government programs and to our economy. It threatens harm to veterans and children who depend on Head Start, seniors who receive meals, and it threatens jobs and economic growth with a ripple effect that will set all of us back in the continuing fragile and all-to-slow recovery we have seen from the greatest recession in recent memory.

Today's result in the House of Representatives is a tragedy for democracy. Without any overstatement, we have to recognize that this result reflects a dysfunction in democracy. The threatened shutdown of our government is the result of an extreme ideological fringe element in one House and one party that has made the decision that their agenda is a take-it-or-leave-it condition, that it is more important than economic growth, more important than our seniors, our children, our veterans. Key services, our economic growth, and jobs will be impacted very directly by this impending shutdown.

This morning I was at a gathering in Glastonbury, CT, with a group of manufacturers, their employees, and economic experts. One economic expert in particular, Steven Lanza of the University of Connecticut, told us that a shutdown of 3 to 4 weeks alone would cost the State of Connecticut 2,000 jobs.

We know from the predictions of expert economists such as Mark Zandi of Moody's Analytics that the result for the country as a whole could be percentage points of lost growth. In fact, we can ill-afford this self-inflicted, manufactured wound to our Nation and to the trust and confidence people deserve to have in our democracy and our economy.

For some businesses these problems will be more than acute; they will be life-threatening injuries because their existence—not to mention their profits—depends on consumer demand that will be diminished by the ripple effect and the ramifications of the 9,000 Federal employees in Connecticut who will be furloughed, not to mention the hundreds of others whose jobs will be threatened by a shutdown of just days or a week. The fact is that at this point we can't know what the full economic ramifications will be. There are more questions—serious questions—than there are answers.

I will support an amendment and a measure that will be offered I think later this evening or within hours to preserve the benefits and payments that are due to our veterans for their service and sacrifice. That is a provision we need to make. It is our responsibility to keep faith with those veterans and make sure we leave no veteran behind and that the processing of claims goes forward so our veterans receive the benefits they have earned.

At the forum I had this morning, Brian Montanari, the president of Habco, which is in Glastonbury, told us

he relies on contracts with the Federal Government for much of his business, and his employees—to whose ranks he has been adding—will be impacted by this potential shutdown, if only the uncertainty it creates. He is not alone. Businesses all over Connecticut and the country will face a tougher economic climate because of the shutdown. The Small Business Administration will stop processing applications for the business loans it provides to tens of thousands of entrepreneurs, risk takers, and job creators around the country. Perhaps the most galling aspect of this shutdown is the direct economic hardship it will cause to families whose jobs will be threatened and whose livelihoods will be at risk.

There are hours to go before the final hour, but the point is, as the President said so well earlier, keeping the government open is not a bargaining chip, it is our job. President Obama said: ''You don't get to extract a ransom for doing your job.''

Families need to be able to plan for their future, businesses need certainty in order to make investments and hire new workers, and the Nation needs both parties, not just one, to be fully committed to the democratic process.

I hope in the time remaining the House does its job, that these extremist demands are rejected—and certainly by this Chamber they will be. My hope is that we can move forward, keep the government open, provide the services people need, and support the economy, which is all too necessary at this point in our history.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business, with debate only, be extended until 9:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized at 9:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, let me speak for a moment about what we have happening. There is no reason for this happening, and there is absolutely no reason why, first of all, we could not have worked together to put a budget in place. We, months ago, passed a budget in the Senate and have been trying to go to a conference committee with the House so we could work it out and have a long-term budget that continues to bring down the debt. By the way, the deficit is coming down, which is very positive. But we know we need to continue to do more in a balanced way. That could be happening. It is not happening because the same people now who are putting us in a position where in a few hours there may very well be a government shutdown are the same ones who do not want to negotiate to get a budget for our country, which is very difficult to understand in terms of what the strategy is other than to just obstruct.

We are now in a situation where we have agreed to a compromise that would allow the continuation of funding of public services, from safety to health research, to what we do around education, innovation, small business. We have a whole range of things for 6 weeks. So we are talking about 6 weeks.

The compromise is that while we believe we ought to be reinvesting in education, in innovation, we ought to be creating jobs, rebuilding our roads and bridges and water and sewer systems, and doing a number of things that would strengthen our economy and create jobs, for this 6-week period, we agree to continue the funding level at the lower level the Republicans want.

So the continuing resolution we have sent to the House is a compromise by definition because we are willing for 6 weeks—while we negotiate a broader package on a full year's appropriation—to continue funding at the level the Republicans have asked to be the spending level. By definition, certainly for many of us who believe we will not have a middle class—that we cannot grow the economy without doing the right kinds of investments and that we certainly should not be cutting back on cancer research and cutting clinical trials for women with breast cancer or cutting back on other possible cures, and that is happening right now at this lower level—but for 6 weeks we have said we are willing to compromise with the House Republicans in order to continue funding the government while the larger issues are worked out.

Instead of that happening, what we are seeing is a fight that, frankly, has been fought over and over. It was fought in the last election. It was very clear we had a President of the United States who ran on and who made a signature accomplishment of his first-term health care—access to affordable health insurance for all Americans—running against someone who said he would repeal that, and the President of the United States won with a substantial margin.

In the Senate, we had Democrats running against Republicans, with Republicans saying: Elect me and I will repeal ObamaCare; Democrats saying: No. We need health reform. We need to create a better, more competitive way to bring down health insurance rates—like in Massachusetts, the home of our distinguished Presiding Officer. Our candidates—Democrats—won.

So I would suggest that in many places, and certainly across the country, with the President of the United States, the people of America spoke pretty strongly.

Now we are here. We all have seen the intensity of what is a minority opinion. I appreciate that. It is very intense. But it is a minority opinion in this country. So the minority of a minority is trying now to essentially slow down or stop the economy, hurt middle-class families, bring public services to a standstill because—even though they lost in the election, even though theirs is not the majority view—they have decided it does not matter—it does not matter—they are going to shut things down if they do not get their way.

What we are going to see tomorrow when healthcare.gov comes online are more competitive, lower rates for many Americans, young Americans, families, and so on, people who maybe could not get insurance in the past at all, moms-to-be who could not find maternity care—8 million women in this country who have not been able to find insurance companies that will cover them for maternity care because somehow being a woman was a ''preexisting condition''—they are going to have a chance to do that, which means we will have more healthy moms, we will have more healthy babies, and this is good for our country.

We are seeing now in health reform that has already taken effect hundreds of dollars a year more in the pockets of senior citizens that they used to pay out for prescription drugs. But they do not have to do it anymore because we are closing this gap in coverage from the Medicare prescription drug bill.

As a caveat, let me say as somebody at the time 7 years ago who voted no on that Medicare prescription drug bill—because I believed and the majority on our side believed it was written way too much in favor of the drug companies as opposed to the seniors in terms of costs, not allowing Medicare to negotiate group rates and so on—when we lost that fight, we did not shut down the government, we did not try to stop funding the implementation of Medicare prescription drugs, we did not do all of the antics that have been done. We said: OK, we lost that fight, so let's make it work the best we can make it work, and we will fix it later.

We did not stop the funding for the educational efforts for seniors. We did not spend hundreds of millions or—I do not know, maybe it is billions now—trying to scare people, confuse people. We said: Let's try to make it work. Even though in the May before the prescription drug bill took effect 21 percent of the public said they wanted it, they supported it, 7 years later, 90 percent of the public says they support it.

In health reform we were able to fix one of the things that many of us were concerned about then. Rather than

stopping the ability of seniors to get some help—even though it was not structured the way I would like to see it structured—rather than stopping that, we said: Let's make it work the best we can and look for opportunities to make it better.

Under the Affordable Care Act, we have made it better. We have made it better by closing the gap in coverage, which has been dubbed the doughnut hole, so that gradually under health reform this goes away, which will mean literally thousands of dollars in the pockets of many seniors.

I would suggest to our colleagues in the House and the minority of the minority here in the Senate who want to shut things down because they have not gotten their way on health reform that it would be so much better for the American people if they chose the path we did on Medicare prescription drugs, to try to make it work the best we can, and then to look for ways to make it better.

So instead of doing that, what we have is a situation where we are being held hostage—public services are being held hostage to eliminate something that, frankly, a majority of people already voted to say they wanted to put into place. Fix it, yes. If there are problems, yes, fix it. But they certainly do not want to go back to hundreds of dollars a month for a family for a policy that covers almost nothing, which is what has happened all across Michigan and all across the country.

This was a situation where women get discriminated against on the basis of gender, just because we are women or because we cannot find preventive care or we cannot find maternity care as women. We certainly do not want to go back to a situation where a family has a child who gets a serious illness and then suddenly finds, after spending hundreds of dollars a month on a policy that does not cover anything much, that there is a cap on how much care they can get for their child.

So they end up with thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket expenses, maybe going bankrupt, maybe losing their house, because even though they were paying for insurance, it did not cover what they needed. Then there is a limit on the number of treatments they can get. Oh, by the way, now that their child has a serious chronic illness, they cannot get insurance any more because the child has a preexisting condition.

This is the world in which tens of millions of families have been operating for way too long. We do not want to go back to that. I am certainly not going to be a party to going back to that. So we have said no. Negotiate on the budget. Be responsible. Focus on jobs. Move forward, yes. Take us back to a time of bankruptcy for families when there is an illness in the family? No. Take us back to a time when women were charged more than men just because we are women? No. Take us back to a time when seniors are paying more out of pocket for prescription drugs because of this gap in coverage? No.

We could go on and on. When we look at this whole approach, I do have to say given the fact that—we as women gain so much under health reform in terms of protection about unfair rates, getting preventive care without out-of-pocket expenses, access to maternity care, many women for the first time, so many other things.

A majority of those on Medicare are women. There are so many ways in which we benefit. We now see the House over and over sending us something that would delay or end health reform. Then today, on top of everything else, they have decided not only do what they want to stop the next stage of health reform, but they want to repeal what already is the law of the land now on preventive care for women, on family planning services, on mammograms, and all of the other preventive services that we know save lives.

The amendment that all of the Democratic women Senators offered under our leader, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, which made sure that going forward, preventive care would be available and affordable, no out-of-pocket costs, that was repealed in what was sent to us today. It is also interesting that preventive services for men were not repealed. Only preventive services for women, without out-of-pocket expenses.

We find ourselves now in a situation where we are waiting for the House to send back something else again that will chip away at health care and put in jeopardy the ability for the Federal Government in the greatest country in the world to be able to provide services tomorrow, whether it is safety, whether it is health, whether it is education, whether it is the basics, like traveling with your family and needing a passport or visiting one of our national parks or any number of other things that affect us, protecting the air and the water, and what we do to support our farmers and so on.

So that is where we are. We will once again indicate that we are willing to compromise on the budget issues. This is a budget issue. We will support the level of funding that the House says they want, not what we want, because it underfunds critical investments in services and hurts the middle class. But for 6 weeks, as a compromise, we are willing to operate the government at the level that they want. But we will not take the next step which is to take away the ability of millions of Americans to have access to basic health care.

Tomorrow is an important day for so many reasons. But one of them is that for the first time, citizens across the country are going to be able to begin to get the information they need from healthcare.gov about what is available for them and for their families in terms of new health care options.

From what we have seen so far, the rates are not only competitive but lower than was estimated they would be. In fact, for most families and most individuals, they are going to be able to get much more care. They are actually going to get something they are paying for. They are going to be able to receive that at much less cost than they currently can. So tomorrow is an important day, where as they say in Michigan ''the rubber meets the road.''

People will begin to find out for themselves, despite all of the stuff that has gone on for the last 3 years, all of the misinformation, the scare tactics, the millions of dollars in horrible ads that have been run, tomorrow, people will be able to judge for themselves.

We certainly expect it will take a while, just as it did for Medicare prescription drugs, for it to fully take effect. People will have 6 months the first time around to figure out what they want to do to be able to sign up for next year. If we find that there are things that need to be improved on, then we need to come together and do that. We are more than willing to do it. But we are not willing to go back to the day where families could not find any care for themselves or their families or could not afford it.

We, in fact, are the greatest country in the world, and health care is pretty basic for each and every one of us. We need to have a system, which begins tomorrow through private sector insurance and competition, to have a way to be able to lower costs for families while making sure they are actually getting the care that they are paying for. That is starting tomorrow.

I hope tomorrow, in addition to that starting, we are going to see a continuation of critical public services in our country and that we will send a message around the world that America really can get its act together, that this Congress can really work together and be responsible and not see the kind of incredible partisan games that have gone on, not by everyone but by a minority of the minority who are right now holding things hostage in this Congress. We can do better than that. I am looking forward to having the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in fact, to do that.

I am hopeful that the Speaker will just very simply put a continuing resolution on funding the government before the full body of the House of Representatives and let them vote. We have heard from many House colleagues today, Republican colleagues, saying that if they have an opportunity to vote on continuing the operations of government, they will do that, a clean CR, a continuing resolution that would allow the continuing functioning of services that the public depends on, and those who are providing as well are depending on.

The Speaker just simply needs to allow an up-or-down vote. Just allow a vote this evening. I believe if he does

that, he will see a bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives that will be responsible and do the right thing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, while I have a moment—I thought that there were others wishing to speak—since there are not, I wanted to take one more moment to speak about something else that is running out today that I am deeply involved in and deeply concerned about.

That is the 5-year agriculture, nutrition, and conservation policy of this country, the farm bill. We have seen the end today of the extension that was put in place last year because of House inaction. Starting tomorrow, we essentially begin to operate on fumes. We will see a time period in a few weeks when we will see the full impact of having no farm bill.

It is incredibly important that we use this time immediately to negotiate a final farm bill that will not only reduce the deficit, as our bill does by $24 billion, but one that can get a straight bipartisan vote as we did here in the Senate with over two-thirds of the Senate twice voting for a comprehensive reform bill that addresses supporting our farmers and ranchers from a risk management standpoint, while eliminating subsidies that do not make sense from a taxpayer standpoint, strengthening crop insurance, strengthening conservation to protect our land, and air, and water, focusing on regional and local foods, farmers markets, small farmers, to support them as well, new jobs and bioenergy, as well as investing in rural communities all across America through our rural development efforts.

What we call the farm bill really is the rural economic development bill for the country. Some 16 million people work in this country because of agriculture. This is the biggest jobs bill we will pass. Our farmers and all of those impacted have been waiting and waiting and waiting and, frankly, have had enough. They want this to get done.

So I call on our House colleagues again to join with us to be able to finally get this passed into law. This is incredibly important for the economy, for small towns such as the one where I grew up in Clare, MI, all across Michigan, all across the country.

It is incredibly important for our efforts to continue to protect our soil and our forests and our air and our water and to be able to maintain the beautiful outdoors that we do and support for hunters and fishermen and others that we do through efforts in the farm bill. It is incredibly important that this get done. It is long overdue.

So I couldn't let this evening go by without indicating that on the long list of things that have not been done, the September 30 date is incredibly important for rural America, for our farmers and ranchers who need help when they have a loss, for our families who need help when they have a loss, and for our ability to continue to grow jobs.

Our largest area of exports is in agriculture. It is a vibrant, important part of the economy. There is no excuse for this not having already been done. Again, too many games have been played attacking families who need help and choosing not to proceed in a reasonable, balanced way as we did in the Senate.

I am recommitting myself again, as I have day after day—and tomorrow—to making sure I do everything I possibly can. I call on House colleagues and on the Speaker to do everything they can in order to finally get a 5-year comprehensive food, farm, and jobs bill done so that we may continue to grow a very important part of the economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. I know many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are deeply frustrated this evening. Once again, with only a few hours left on the clock, House Republican brinkmanship has us struggling to avoid burdening our families and our economy with more dysfunction and uncertainty. This pattern is simply unacceptable, and some of us, Democrats and Republicans, have been trying for months to break it.

When the Senate budget passed, I was hopeful that we could move to a bipartisan budget conference where Democrats and Republicans from the House and Senate could all come together, sit down, and try to work out our differences. Democrats tried to begin a budget conference 18 times. Many Senate Republicans agreed with us that we should continue negotiations and begin working toward that deal. Each time tea party Republicans and Republican leadership stood and said no. They made it very clear why: They believed they would have more leverage in a crisis—such as the one we are hours away from—than they had a few months ago when we were asking for orderly negotiations.

Instead of working on a bipartisan budget that would strengthen our economy, tea party Republicans began manufacturing this crisis to defund the Affordable Care Act.

This is a law, by the way, that is helping millions of Americans and beginning tomorrow, shutdown or no shutdown, is going to begin helping many more.

Due to Republican refusal to come to the table, we are now scrambling to avoid a shutdown.

I am confident the American people, including many in my home State, are looking at House Republicans and asking the same questions many of us are. They are asking: What are they thinking, and why would they hurt their own constituents simply to make a point?

Even if tea party Republicans don't want to admit it, a government shutdown wouldn't just impact people in Washington, DC, it would be felt across the country. In my home State of Washington, the impacts could be severe. First, Washington State is home to tens of thousands of Federal employees who will be furloughed or stop getting paid. It is also home to one of our Nation's largest veterans communities. The VA has confirmed this week that if the shutdown goes long enough, disability and GI benefits will stop for veterans in places such as Tacoma, Everett, and Spokane due to some tea party Republicans in Washington, DC, who can't have their way.

That is not all. If the tea party forces this government to shut down, our State's gorgeous national parks, such as Olympic National Park and Mount Rainier, will be closed to the public. Students at the University of Washington and Washington State University may not be able to access student loans to pay their tuition bills. Funds for important public health programs, such as WIC, would be cut for women and children who rely on them. Federal support for dozens of Head Start facilities in Seattle and across our State would be at risk.

The good news is that none of this has to happen. We still have time, and the Senate has passed a shutdown-prevention bill that would avoid all of this harm. The Senate's short-term funding bill would keep the government open at current spending levels with no changes in policies while we continue to work on that important long-term budget bill.

The Senate bill by no means is a long-term solution. It is not even close. But as we work to bridge the gap between the parties on budget issues, the absolute bare minimum Congress should be able to do, the very least we owe to our constituents is to not actively hurt them and sabotage the economy.

Playing partisan games with a temporary stopgap continuing resolution is like trying to take away health care from millions of Americans. Tea party Republicans are doing exactly that. Many of their fellow Republicans believe this is an irresponsible and unworkable attitude. Many Republicans have spoken to discourage their own colleagues from waging this pointless, harmful fight over defunding the Affordable Care Act. They have agreed with Democrats that while we might not see eye to eye on everything, we don't have to abandon our basic responsibilities—like keeping the government open—in order to negotiate.

We desperately need this type of commonsense bipartisanship because we have seen repeatedly that families across the political spectrum are sick of governing by crisis and the uncertainty that it creates in their lives. They are sick of gridlock in Washington, DC, that impacts everything from their childcare to their paycheck.

Unfortunately, it seems as if the House Republicans haven't had quite enough yet. They seem to think this is some kind of game, that whoever is left holding the hot potato will be held responsible. Let me be very clear. The American people are a lot smarter than that. They know tea party Republicans have been pushing us toward this crisis for months. They are going to know why a shutdown happened should the tea party refuse to pass the Senate's clean continuing resolution to keep the government open.

Allowing our government to shut down isn't in anyone's best interest—not Republicans, not Democrats, and above all, not the American people. So I would like to call on Speaker BOEHNER to take one simple step. I ask simply that he allow a vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution. I truly believe that given the chance, enough Republicans in the House would join with the Democrats in voting for a clean continuing resolution to keep the government open so we can deal with the bigger issues in front of us.

If Speaker BOEHNER takes that step, we could avoid all the disruption and all of the harm a government shutdown will cause to the families and communities we serve. Then we could move forward and continue our work, which is incredibly important, on a longer term budget deal that ends this crisis and puts our families and our economy first. This is what families across the country expect, and it is what my fellow constituents in the State of Washington expect. That is what I am fighting for, and that is what we should deliver.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise to once again speak about where we are, where we ought to be, and where I hope we will be.

It is now 8:30 in the evening. We are 3½ hours, essentially, until the government begins to shut down. Can we believe this? We are the United States of America. We are a superpower. We are supposed to be a nation governed by rule of law, and we are about to shut down—not shut us down because of a catastrophic event that hit us. It is not as if a meteor has streaked across the sky and hit the United States of America, taking out our power grid and rendering us powerless.

It is not as if we have been hit by a global pandemic that would bring us to our knees. We are in a self-induced act, about to shut down the functioning of the government of the United States of America. I find this shocking.

I have been through this in the mid-1990s. It is deeply disturbing to the people who work for the Federal Government, who get up every day and go to their job trying to perform a service or a function they consider important to the United States, whether it is in transportation, protecting the environment, Federal law enforcement, important financial regulatory agencies, such as our consumer protection agency or our financial services or the Consumer Product Safety Commission in my own State, which protects us and particularly our children against harmful products.

So there are those functions that are going to be shut down. You know what is going to be said to those people—to the men and women who work for the United States of America. Most of you are considered nonessential.

That might be a witty throwaway line for a cable TV show, but I happen to think they are very essential and so does the rest of America.

These people are performing very important functions to protect America.

The House feels it protected America by passing a military pay bill. The Senate passed it by unanimous consent. But guess what. It still means almost 50 percent of the men and women who work at the Department of Defense will be furloughed tomorrow. They are going to be told they are nonessential. Who is essential to defense and who isn't? We certainly know our men and women who wear the uniform and who are in harm's way need to get their pay. They need to get their supplies. They need to get what they need to defend America, but they also need a fully functioning Department of Defense.

I think there are other agencies that protect the United States, one of which is Federal law enforcement—whether it is the FBI, the Marshal Service, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and, yes, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. They put themselves in the line of fire too, along with our Customs and our Border Patrol agents, some of whom have already died. What about our prison guards who are there facing people who are ready to either kill them or break out or break them up at the first chance they can get.

We don't have to pursue this route. Remember, this is self-induced. It is, as our President said, being induced by one faction in one party in one House of our government over one issue—not funding, but should we fund the President's Affordable Care Act. That is the law of the land. It is already in existence, and a good part of it will go into effect on October 1.

When I talk about this, I am speaking from the standpoint of being the chair of the committee called the Appropriations Committee. That is the committee that puts money into the Federal checkbook. That Federal checkbook keeps the entire discretionary funding for the U.S. Government operating—and it is $1 trillion. Wow. What a number. Gasp. You know what. It is a big number, but it is a big country with big responsibilities.

That is not the total funding of the Federal Government because there is mandatory spending. Mandatory spending is our Social Security benefits, our veterans' benefits, earned benefits—earned benefits. All of that is over several other trillion dollars. There is a dispute about how much the spending should be. That is an honest dispute. That is what funding disputes and resolutions should be about. I should be in a room right this very minute with my House counterpart, Congressman HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman, a fine, honorable man from Kentucky, and my Democratic counterpart Congresswoman NITA LOWEY from New York, along with my vice chairman, Senator RICHARD SHELBY, another fine Southern gentleman, a fiscal conservative, and we should be discussing that.

But that is not what we are talking about. We are not talking about what is the House's number, what is the Senate's number, what is the best number to fund our government and do it in a way that is smart, effective, and frugal. Oh no. The big fight is over ObamaCare. That is not what it should be about. We have had something called continuing resolutions before. A continuing resolution should have another word in it—''funding.'' It is the continued funding resolution, and it is to keep government funded while we resolve our disputes.

These resolutions were always, No. 1, short term, and No. 2, they focused on fiscal differences—where did we disagree on fiscal matters. And there is disagreement. The House marked up their bills primarily to $988 billion. That acknowledged that sequester is the new normal. We in the Senate marked up our bill, and the number we used was $1.058 trillion. The number I used came from the Senate-passed budget bill under the chairmanship of Senator PATTY MURRAY. So there is a $70 billion difference between the House and the Senate, and that is an honest dispute.

I am ready to negotiate with Congressman ROGERS, but I am not ready to capitulate. What does capitulate mean? It means we don't even get to a number because we are fighting about ObamaCare. We should be discussing what is the way to do this. I am willing to see a compromise because my goal is that in December we will pass all of the funding bills, that we would have canceled sequester for 2 years, and we would have formed a compromise on a number that does reduce public debt—we acknowledge that—but that also

makes public investments that create jobs and growth in our country. We would do that through transportation, research and development, and things we can also make and sell overseas. These are the kinds of things we want to invest in—the physical infrastructure and human infrastructure, such as education, research and development. We want to have the kind of approach that is progrowth and a pro-American future. I want to get to that debate. I want to get to that discussion. I want to get to that conference. But I cannot get to it because we are fighting over ObamaCare.

Somehow or another that term is supposed to be kind of a sarcastic thing, to call it ''ObamaCare.'' I think we need to respect the President of the United States. I like calling it the Affordable Care Act. But if people want to call it ObamaCare, let them do it. The President does care. He does care that 42 million people don't have health insurance and that we needed to reform our health care system to get more value for our dollar and get rid of the punitive practices of insurance companies denying people health care on the basis of a preexisting condition and, by the way, as a consumer advocate the Chair knows this, charging women much more for insurance than men are charged of comparable age and health status.

So I come to the floor tonight and I ask my House colleagues—I served in the House—please, let's stop the ideological amendments and get on to what appropriations are supposed to be, what a continuing resolution is supposed to be—a short-term approach. That is why I am recommending November 15, to get us to the point where we have compromise on fiscal matters—how can we end the sequester for 2 years, how can we pass all of our funding bills, and how can we come to a sensible compromise on the $70 billion difference between us.

We have tried everything we know. Senator MURRAY worked very hard to pass the budget bill. We passed it in a marathon session, and I was proud of us. We worked hard. We had great debate. It was heartfelt and hard fought. But in the end, we had over 70 votes. Then Senator MURRAY did what the law requires. She said she wanted to go to conference, along with her vice chairman and ranking member Senator SESSIONS. But six Republican Senators objected. So we have yet to be able to even have a conference to get to the overall budget, which is about what our tax policy should be, our approach to mandatory spending, and a target number for me to reach with my appropriations members on both sides of the aisle.

We never got to that. So we marked up our bills in appropriations. We followed the guidelines given to us by the Senate bill at $1.058 trillion. We have been in frequent conversation—frequent conversation—with Congressman ROGERS and Congresswoman LOWEY. That is the way Senator SHELBY and I work. We also have had frequent conversations. But we are talking to ourselves.

So now I am talking to the American people. I think they want an orderly process. The Founders of our country said we would not be a government of personalities and plebiscites and wins and whims. We would be a government of institutions and laws and a process within our parliamentary form of government for resolving disputes.

Let us get back to regular order. Let us pass a simple straightforward continuing resolution to keep the government open until November 15, with the direction that we end sequester, come up with a compromise on the funding, and, at the same time, be able to pass all of our bills. I think we can do it. I think there is the will. I think there is the wallet. We just need to find the way. The way for the House is to give us a plain straightforward bill. Let us pass it over here. Let us keep America open and let us keep America running.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, when defining insanity, Albert Einstein said: It is doing the same thing over and over and thinking you are going to get a different result.

Einstein was a genius, but it doesn't take a genius to figure out the proof is watching the House Republicans because they have lost their minds. They keep trying to do the same thing over and over. They have voted to repeal ObamaCare 45 or 46 times. That is kind of a lot of repetition. Now they are trying to do it again.

They just passed over there another piece of legislation to try and diffuse, defeat, and get rid of ObamaCare. But ObamaCare is the law. We had a couple of Republicans today come and talk about the Obama health care bill. That has long since passed. It is the law. Do I need to remind everyone again that the U.S. Supreme Court has said it is constitutional?

The Speaker, instead of allowing all 435 Members of the House of Representatives to vote to keep the government open for business, is once again pushing for a government shutdown. I think this is what they want. Remember, they don't believe in government. So what is a real good way to hurt government? Shut it down.

The House once again has attached ridiculous policy riders that are dead on arrival over here.

I heard this story before—in fact, just 6 hours ago. Republicans are once again threatening to shut down the government unless Democrats repeal ObamaCare for 1 year. But, once again, we will not relitigate the health care debate or negotiate at the point of a gun. This time the House has attached a poisoned pill that would punish 16,000 congressional staff. The amendment originally offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana would force congressional staff to cover the full cost of their health care.

Think about this for a minute. Others have thought about it. The newspaper Politico said yesterday, perfectly explaining the hypocrisy of this approach:

> Some health care opponents claim the Obama administration is giving members of Congress and their staffs special treatment under the Affordable Care Act. The claim, which . . . is simply false: Although they will be required to enroll in health plans offered within the new health-insurance exchanges under the law, members of Congress and their staffs will not receive extra financial help to pay for their medical care.
>
> In reality, it's the critics—as part of their ongoing assault on the health care law—who are seeking special treatment for Congress, by proposing to make members and their staffs the only workers in the United States whose employer is barred by law from helping to cover their premiums.

I repeat, in reality it is the critics—Politico said—as part of their ongoing assault on the health care law—who are seeking special treatment from Congress, by proposing to make members and their staffs the only workers in the United States whose employer is barred by law from helping to cover their premiums.

Like other Americans who get their health care through their jobs, a portion of the cost of congressional staff health care premiums is currently covered by their employer. Their employer is the Federal Government. There are about 6 million of us. In other words, Members of Congress and congressional staff live by the same rules as other Americans and other Federal employees. As a matter of fact, all Members of Congress will be getting their health care on marketplace exchanges just like tens of millions of other Americans. Six hundred thousand Nevadans are now eligible. They will start signing up tomorrow. But House Republicans want to force our staff, who work so hard, to live by a different set of rules.

Although many of these Republicans have gladly allowed the Federal Government to pay for a portion of their own health insurance, for years—decades, some of them—they now want to force 16,000 congressional employees to cover the full cost of their health insurance.

If Republican Senators believe they should bear the full cost of their own health insurance, they should decline the employer contribution and pay their own way. They should stop being hypocritical. They should practice what they preach. But punishing 16,000 innocent congressional workers is simply mean-spirited.

Speaker BOEHNER knows this new amendment won't last any longer than the last one, once it gets to the Senate; and it should be quick. The Senate will vote it down, and the House Republicans will be in the same pickle they are in right now—but with even less time left before the government shuts down.

But there is still a way for the Speaker to get out of this quagmire, to get out of this ditch, this hole that they have dug for themselves. But I am not sure they want out of this hole, because common sense dictates, if you want to get out of the hole, stop digging deeper. But they do that. They are over there now figuring how glad they are the hole is deeper than it ever was. I believe there is a significant number—if not the majority—of the House Republicans who want the government to close.

So here is what the Speaker should do to get out of this hole that he has dug: Let the House vote, all 435 Members, on the continuing resolution that we passed. We did it on Friday. We affirmed that this afternoon. Stop standing in the way, I say to the Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. Let the House work its will.

If Speaker BOEHNER prevents the Senate bill from coming to the floor before midnight, the responsibility for this government shutdown is clearly a Republican government shutdown and will rest squarely on his shoulders, as all America knows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the majority leader for the statement he just made.

It is hard to believe that we are a little over 3 hours away from shutting down the government of the United States of America. When you hear about this happening in foreign countries, you think: It is a shame they just aren't as stable and strong as our great democracy. Yet here we are, facing that possibility just a few hours from now, and it is through our own fault. It is the failure of leadership.

I will tell you what we have done in the Senate. I think it is the right thing. We passed a clean CR, a clean budget bill. No political strings attached. None. We could have attached the immigration bill, the farm bill, a lot of possibilities there. None. A clean budget bill for America's government for the next 6 weeks, we sent it over to the House and said, just vote for this, and we don't have to shut down the government. They have said ''no'' repeatedly. And they are about to send us the third effort of the House, and it too will be defeated because they are obsessed with ObamaCare—obsessed with the Health Care Reform Act. More than obsessed. They are living in mortal fear of what is going to happen starting tomorrow.

As we will see, across America they are going to announce the insurance exchanges in every State. People who have never had health insurance in their entire lives will have a chance to buy it. Some of it will be affordable for a lot of families. Some of it will be the first chance a family has had to buy health insurance.

There was an article I read over the weekend in one of the Chicago papers about a family raising a child with mental illness. As a consequence, they have been disqualified every time they tried to buy health insurance. Nobody will insure them because their child suffers from mental illness. Guess what. As of tomorrow they will get a list of health insurance plans in their State they can buy. And it is in competition—in a marketplace—and they can choose from many different options. In my State of Illinois, there are 54 different options that we can choose from for our health insurance. It means for that family which has lived without health insurance because of the mental illness of their son, for the first time in their lives they will be able to buy health insurance.

If one has ever lived as a parent with a sick child without health insurance, you will never forget it as long as you live. I know of what I speak. I was there and I remember it, and I will never forget it. When you finally get health insurance, you can breathe again knowing that, if something happens, you will get help in paying those medical bills. For some of these families, for a lifetime they have never had a chance.

That is why the Republicans want to stop ObamaCare. They don't want these exchanges to be announced. They don't want people to see these options. They know what is going to happen: 40 million uninsured Americans are going to take to this because it gives them the first lifeline they have ever seen when it comes to health insurance. That is what it is all about, and that is why they fear it and hate it so much. It is going to work. It is going to give peace of mind to families. And we are never going back.

We will change some of these provisions in this health care reform. Of course, we will. Anything this big is going to be changed, as it should be. Wisdom and experience is going to give us some ideas of how to make it better and stronger and work more fairly. That is why the Republicans are so determined to stop it tonight, before it can go into its first phase of advertising marketplaces tomorrow.

They are going to fail, again. For the third time they are going to fail in just a few days with this House approach with strings attached.

And there is one other element here. I am glad the majority leader raised it. People think that Members of Congress have these gilded health insurance plans, and the honest answer is we do have a pretty good health insurance plan. We go through what is known as the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Eight million Federal employees and their families, including Members of Congress and their staff, buy into it. It has been around for decades. It works well. My wife and I can choose from nine different health insurance plans in Illinois as Federal employees. We choose the big Blue Cross plan, and we pay the highest premium for it. But our employer pays a share of the premium. This is not a radical idea. One hundred fifty million Americans have exactly the same arrangement. They get their health insurance through their work, and their employer pays a portion of the health insurance premium.

Now come the House Republicans and they have come up with a new idea.

First, the requirement that Members of Congress and their staff buy insurance through the marketplace. It is OK with me. I have taken a look at the marketplace plans. They will cover my family just fine, thank you.

Now they add the kicker. But, the Federal Government cannot pay for any of the premiums. Why? Because we know, under the health insurance marketplace small businesses with fewer than 50 employees can provide an employer contribution to their employee buying through that marketplace. It is in the law.

So Members of Congress aren't being treated any differently when our employer—the Federal Government—pays part of our premium in the marketplace. That is all that the law says. They want to stop that. It isn't because of the injustice, because others are getting the same benefit and we are not getting special treatment. It is because they want to find a way to create some pain in the process.

Senator REID talked about 16,000 congressional workers and their family members. I am sure that number included their family members. They want to single them out and say that they get no employer contribution for their health insurance. Shame on them for coming up with this idea.

To deny hard-working people—whether Members of Congress or our staff—the basic protection of health insurance without digging deeper into their pockets, is that their idea of making this a fairer, more just society? I don't think so.

We are going to reject what the House is about to send over, and the clock is ticking. It will be a few hours left before midnight. There is an answer to this, though, an easy one.

Right now, Speaker BOEHNER has in his power the ability to call a bill on the floor that will avoid the government shutdown. It is a bill passed in the Senate, a bill with no political strings attached, a simple extension of the government's budget for 6 weeks. He can do it. He can stop what otherwise will happen tomorrow morning, when agencies all across our Nation give notice to their Federal employees: Go home. We are shut down. It means hundreds of thousands of Federal employees tomorrow will be sent home and not paid for their day's work, and the things they do to make this a stronger country and to keep our government working will just come to a stop.

The greatest Nation on earth shutting down its government on October 1, 2013. It is totally unnecessary. It is a manufactured political crisis by tea party Republicans. We are hoping that

some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle—conservatives, moderate conservatives from all over the Nation—will join us.

Let's spare this embarrassment for America. Let's allow those Federal workers to go to work tomorrow as they should and provide our country the services it needs. Let's get ready for health care reform and the marketplace, and let's let the American people be the judge as to whether it is right or not. I think it will be. But trying to stop it in its tracks is just a fool's errand, as one of the Members of Congress on the Republican side described it.

If the Speaker would call the spending bill that passed the Senate for a vote tonight in the House of Representatives, we can be spared this government shutdown.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Madam President, will my friend withhold for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I was just speaking with my friend from Arizona, and I direct this question to my friend from Illinois.

Nevada is not a heavily populated State as is Illinois, but we have a number of really beautiful systems that are part of our national park treasures.

We have one, Lake Mead, which we all know about. We have about 15,000 people visit there every day. That will close at 12:01 tonight. That is about 550,000 or 600,000 people a year. And Red Rock is a beautiful place. Tourists love it, just like we love Lake Mead. We have 1 million people a year come in.

This is going to happen all over America. I mentioned just a couple of things in Nevada. I will bet my friend knows of national treasures in Illinois that will close. Is that true?

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Nevada that we have 50,000 Federal employees in Illinois, and we expect the majority of them to be sent home tomorrow. They are working in places such as the Rock Island Arsenal. Some of those employees will have to go home tomorrow morning. These are men and women who make the armaments America needs to be safe. The same will happen at Scott Air Force Base and at Great Lakes Naval Training Station. That is the reality.

I might also add to the Senator, because of my responsibilities on the Appropriations Committee I was briefed this afternoon about the impact of a government shutdown on the intelligence agencies of the United States. I am not at liberty to give a number, but it is an amazingly large percentage of those working in intelligence agencies tomorrow who will be told to go home. These men and women are watching out for our safety and security, to guard against terrorism every single day. Because the government shuts down, they will be sent home. Not all of them; the military personnel involved will continue. But the nonmilitary personnel, many of them, thousands of them, will be sent home from work tomorrow. For what purpose? To make a political point about the power of Congress to shut down the government?

It doesn't make us any safer as a nation. It certainly doesn't enhance our reputation. And it is not helping to build our economy. As the Senator from Nevada knows, we are making a recovery. It is slow. We have been told by the Business Roundtable, not necessarily an ally of the Democratic Party, that this tea party Republican strategy will be disastrous in terms of economic growth. I don't know if the word was calamitous or catastrophic or cataclysmic—whatever, it was one of those. They told us to do this will be damaging to this economy. Yet the House Republican leadership is hell-bent on getting this done, shutting down this government tonight.

All they have to do is take what has passed the Senate, our budget proposal that has passed the Senate, and call it for a vote. If they call it for a vote, it will pass and they know it, and Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party Republicans live in fear of that possibility.

I hope they come to their senses. This is about more than a political bragging point, more than tomorrow's headline. We can avoid shutting down this government.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to House Joint Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution H.J. Res. 59, entitled ''Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes,'' and concur with a House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. REID. I move to table the House amendment to the Senate amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 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—46

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	McConnell	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business for debate only until 11 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 11 o'clock I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is some dispute here. I thought I said that there would be 10 minutes for debate only and that at 11 o'clock I would be recognized. I want to make sure I said ''for debate only'' because there is some dispute as to whether I said that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, as you know, we are only 2 hours now from a shutdown. I am sure those who are mesmerized by our behavior saw a group of Senators on the floor who looked like they were smiling and enjoying themselves. Let me tell the Presiding Officer what was going on.

Senators were actually having a conversation. We were talking about is there a possibility of a compromise. What you saw there is what I hope eventually would become a committee of 100, people actually thinking what could get us to a situation where we could begin to focus on the fiscal problems of the United States. There is a difference between the House appropriations bill and the Senate bill. I chair that committee. So there is a difference with us. But what I want people to see is that there are good people on both sides of the aisle who would like to get something done.

The first thing we would like to get done tonight is not to have a government shutdown and to lay the groundwork for a continuing funding resolution that would be short term, that would enable us to come up with a compromise on discretionary spending, where we could reduce our public debt, fund our government at a smart, frugal level, and also do it in the way that promotes growth. This is what I think the mood of many in the Senate is. I think it is the mood on the majority of both sides of the aisle.

So what do we need from our friends in the House? We do not need one more politically provocative, veto-bait rider on the funding resolution. The Senate passed a bill that essentially laid out a framework exactly for what I said, a continuing resolution to November 15, and a fiscal level that is their level now. We want to negotiate up. I certainly do.

If they would just take up the Senate bill which is neat, clean, clear, and gets us moving forward, we could be able to do this. So we were not just ha-ha-ha'ing over there. There is nothing here tonight to ha-ha-ha about. But there is a mood on both sides of the aisle to stop the shutdown, stop the shutdown and stop the slamdown. Let's be able to pass something tonight that gets us to a way that we can keep the government open, keep our processors functioning for compromise and negotiation and be able to get the job done.

I think it would be an outstanding achievement. I believe the mood is here. I said it earlier. I think there is the will. I even think there is the wallet. Please, if the House cooperates, we would even have a way forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to follow the comments from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. This has been a tough week. It has been a tough weekend. It has been a tough day. I think as Members of the Senate, as we approach the showdown of a potential shutdown, it is important for us to recognize what is at stake. This is not just me staying here holding the floor late on a Monday evening. I have neighbors here in Washington, DC, who work for the Federal Government. One works for Homeland Security. One works for the Department of Defense. They asked me over the weekend: Am I working on Tuesday? What is happening on Tuesday? Are we shutting the government down?

When we talk about those who are uncertain about what happens this next week with their jobs, I think it is important to recognize it is not just jobs we are talking about; it is the reality that if I am not at work is the childcare facility my kids go to going to be open? What does that mean to me?

If I am the local sandwich shop owner around the corner from where the Fish and Wildlife Service building is and most of the folks who work for Fish and Wildlife are not working next week, what does that mean to me? How many loaves of bread do I make over this next week? I think we need to appreciate and understand, when we are talking about a government shutdown, it does not just mean those who receive a check from the Federal Government. The ripple effect from what we do has consequences.

As we debate, as we ping-pong back and forth between this body and our colleagues on the House side, I think we need to recognize that there are real lives, real families who are lying awake tonight wondering what the rest of the week is going to mean to them. This is a difficult time for us. There are stakes that are very high.

I have not hidden the fact that I am not a supporter of the Affordable Care Act. I have voted against it every time we have had the opportunity to do so. But do I believe we should shut down the Federal Government at this point because we have not been able to shut down the Affordable Care Act? I think we have a responsibility here. We have a responsibility to govern. We are not doing that right now.

Folks back home are talking about a lot of things, talking about the fact that they had a tough fish season in certain parts of the State, talking about the fact that winter is coming on, and our energy costs are still as high as they ever have been. They are worried about what is coming forward for them and their families. What they do not need is to see that their government cannot operate.

So as we deal with these very weighty decisions at this very late hour, we need to remember whom we represent, what we are doing here. It is not just about the next election; it is about making sure those people whom we work for are not stressing and are not anxious about what tomorrow is going to bring for them.

So I am hopeful in the less than 2 hours we have, we will be able to figure out how we keep the government running, how we keep the wheels on the bus, and how we get back together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I wish to thank my colleague from Alaska Ms. MURKOWSKI and also the chair of the Appropriations Committee Senator MIKULSKI for their comments because I think, as Senator MIKULSKI said, the majority of the Members in this body believe it is important for us to keep the government open.

We may disagree about the Affordable Care Act, but one aspect we ought to be able to agree on is that it is in the best interests of this country to keep government open. I believe the same is true in the House; that if the Speaker would bring up the Senate-passed CR, that is clean, that does not have any amendments on it, that extends funding for government through November 15, that accepts the top line numbers for the amount of money we would spend during that period, accept the House numbers, if the Speaker would let that be voted on, on the floor, I think it would pass the House.

It is unfortunate that he has been unwilling to do that. But the reality is, as both Senators MIKULSKI and MURKOWSKI said, a shutdown of the government is not just about what we are doing on the floor tonight or what the House is doing, it will have ramifications way beyond that.

We had a meeting last week with some economists that included former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin. One of the things he said to us was that unlike the last government shutdown in 1995, when there was not a real long-term impact from that shutdown, we are looking at a real long-term impact from a potential shutdown. We have already heard Mark Zandi, an economist, say that if it continues longer than a few days, if it continues for weeks, as it did in 1995, it could affect our growth in the fourth quarter over 1 percent.

At a time when the economy is struggling, we cannot afford to have that kind of a hit to our economy. Families who are seeing their 401(k)s just beginning to recover, pension plans that are beginning to see recovery, cannot afford to have that kind of a hit. We have already seen the stock market reacting. So we know there is going to be an impact.

In New Hampshire we have 4,000 Federal employees who are going to get furloughed starting tomorrow if we are not able to keep the government open. That affects not just them and their family, that is bad enough, but it affects the grocery stores they frequent. It affects the gas station. It affects every business they are shopping in.

We know 1,000 small businesses are not going to be able to go to the SBA and look for loans if the government shuts down. We know people are not going to be able to get their mortgages through the Federal Home Loan Agency because it is not going to be operating.

We know in New Hampshire, as in Alaska, that tourism is going to be hit because visas are not going to get processed. We know that at the Department of Defense, half of their civilian workers are going to be furloughed; in New Hampshire, our Portsmouth Naval Shipyard—in New Hampshire and Maine. I see my colleague from Maine. The shipyard workers are going to get furloughed.

So this is going to have a huge impact on families, on businesses, on the economy. We cannot afford this kind of political gamesmanship. We have to work together. We have to solve these problems, not just for the future of this country here in America but also for our standing in the world, where the rest of the world is looking at us, asking: What is the matter with the Congress that they cannot solve an issue that they ought to be able to come together to address?

I certainly hope in the next couple of hours we can see some progress in the House. I hope the Speaker will bring a clean CR to the floor, will let the Members of the House vote on that so we can keep the government operating for the good of the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we have a number of serious difficulties in our country. The most serious is a lack of jobs and a lack of economic growth. The Affordable Care Act is devastating to that situation, making it much worse.

Our colleagues need to understand, as we talk about the difficulties that would happen if there would be a shutdown—and there will be difficulties, for sure. But the idea that this is not an important matter that needs to be addressed when we confront the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is wrong. We have to address this question.

One thing I would say to all of us, the numbers are in and it is quite clear: 77 percent of the jobs that have been created since January of this year are part time. Every economist has said that is in large part driven by the Affordable Care Act. They have no doubt that this is a major factor and is an exceedingly unusual and dangerous trend that businesses are hiring people part time, not full time—77 percent of those hired this year are for part time work.

When we look at the job numbers that will come in tomorrow and at how many people found jobs, maybe it will be 180,000, maybe it will be 210,000. They will brag about that I'm sure. But has anybody thought about the fact that to an unprecedented degree those jobs will be part time, without health care, without retirement benefits, and less job security? Somebody needs to be thinking about this. The health care law is absolutely a driving factor. Businesses told me that as I traveled my State in August. They say they are trying to keep small businesses below 50 employees too. They are not hiring people only to stay below 50 employees so they don't have to comply with some of these rules.

What have we heard all year? We are not going to talk about fixing the Affordable Care Act. We are not going to bring it up. We are not going to get a single amendment in the Senate.

The House has repeatedly legislated on the Affordable Care Act. The Senate refuses to take up their bills, refuses to allow votes, refuses to have a full debate. We are at the end of the year, and nothing has been done about it. We could expect some tension to build up here.

What I hear the House saying is: Delay this bill for 1 year. It is not working. Delay the individual mandate and give ordinary Americans some relief from this law. The President has already delayed parts of ObamaCare—probably without lawful authority—and delayed it for a year for Big business. But the President and Senator REID have, in effect, said: We will shut down the government before we delay the law for ordinary Americans.

The House has passed a bill to fund the government, but the bill that was just voted down would simply have delayed the individual mandate in the Affordable Care Act for 1 year. Maybe this time we could actually fix some of the problems or change some of the provisions in ObamaCare that are so damaging to America.

One thing I wish everyone to know—and I am the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee and we deal with the numbers—I wrote to the Government Accountability Office. They are an independent group, and I asked them what the long-term costs of the Affordable Care Act would be. The President said, unequivocally, this bill will not add one dime to the debt of the United States. Do you remember him saying that? He said it many times. His aides and Senators said the same thing many times. The President went on to say, however, you may have forgotten: Not now, not ever, period.

Well, is that true? Will the Obama administration health care law not add one dime to the United States debt now or ever?

What did the Government Accountability Office say? This is a chart that reflects what they told the Budget Committee in response to my question.

They said over the 75-year period, it adds $6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. That number is huge, as $1 trillion is a lot of money.

How huge is it? How do we compare it? All of us know that Social Security is in great difficulty and under serious threat. We have to reform it and put it on a sound basis. It is not going to be easy to do that. Why? Well, it has unfunded liabilities. We don't have enough money coming in to pay for the commitments we made to pay out in the future.

Remember, Social Security has a dedicated source of revenue as well. It is on your paycheck every month. It is the FICA we pay. It goes to Social Security and there is a Medicare withholding too. Those funds are dedicated for Social Security or Medicare. But people are living longer, and the benefits are such that we are going to have a shortfall in the future.

How much is that Social Security shortfall we have been wrestling over how to fix? It is $7.7 trillion. In the ObamaCare bill that passed on Christmas Eve, that they rammed through the Senate on Christmas Eve on a party-line vote before Scott Brown could take office and provide the vote for Massachusetts that would have killed the bill. They rammed it through the Senate without any amendments, and it added at least another $6.2 trillion to the long-term debt of the United States of America. It is worse than that, and I can explain why it is even worse. That number does not consider interest on the $6.2 trillion over 75 years. I suspect the interest is going to be many trillions of dollars more and it adds to the debt.

As we borrow the money, we pay interest on the money we borrow. It is not free. We borrow the money on the market or from trust funds. This is a big deal. The American people need to know that the promise this law will not add to the debt is absolutely false.

This is based on, the GAO said, accepted accounting principles and a realistic scenario of what is likely to happen over time should the plan be implemented. One of the things they say is the cuts they made to Medicare providers, hospitals and doctors, that provide health care to seniors are so large they will not be sustainable. If they continue to cut in that fashion over a period of years, hospitals would close and doctors would quit practicing. You cannot do it. We are already dealing with a doc fix now on a bill that cut doctors more than they could reasonably be cut. Every year we have to find up to $20 billion to get the money to fund the doctors because we can't cut below a certain amount. So I would say this GAO number is low.

As we wrestle with the great responsibilities we have been given as Senators, yes, we need to think about what would happen in the next few days if the government does not function. I hope we avoid that. We absolutely should avoid that because it is not good.

We need to be asking ourselves what are we doing to our children, grandchildren, and the financial stability of the United States of America with a new entitlment program that is going to commence now, by January 1, that will add more than $6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. This is a huge amount. I ask our colleagues to consider it.

One more matter that shows how we get in trouble financially is when the numbers get so large nobody can quite follow. The larger the numbers get, the harder it is to follow.

Under the legislation of the Affordable Care Act, the plan was to cut up to $500 billion over the next 10 years from Medicare by cutting providers while promising patients would receive just as good health care as they always did. We are not cutting your benefits, we are only going to cut providers. We have done this before. At some point you can't sustain that.

On December 23, the night before this bill passed, I spoke with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, our own accountant, and told him in a conference call words to this effect: It is absolutely unbelievable to me, Mr. CBO Director, Mr. Elmendorf, that we are about to vote tomorrow morning, we are told, on the largest health care bill since Medicare and we don't know how to count the money. I think they are double-counting the money. This is unbelievable, how many hundred billion dollars we are talking about, it seems to me. I could hear somebody on his end of the conference call say: It is double-counting. I heard someone say it in the background.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent of the Chair for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. Elmendorf, by the next morning, gave us a letter. It laid out and contained this language. He said:

> The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

That is the Medicare trust fund.

> —of $500 billion over 10 years, the savings from the HI trust fund by cutting providers and increase Medicare taxes under PPACA—

That is the Affordable Care Act.

> —would be received by the government only once, so they cannot be set aside to pay for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on other parts of the legislation or on other programs.

You can't simultaneously say you are using this money to support Medicare by making Medicare more sustainable and then spend the money on a new program because then it is not going to be available to strengthen Medicare. That double-counting is not even taken into account in the $6.2 trillion figure derived from the GAO study.

I would conclude by saying the unfunded liabilities in this law are huge. They are a direct threat to the future of the United States financially. At this point in history, we need to be saving Medicare, we need to be saving Social Security, and we need to be saving Medicaid. We don't need to be starting another program without sufficient funds to pay for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I am happy to have an opportunity to speak for a minute, particularly following my good friend, the Senator from Alabama. He and I have worked on so many issues. It shows one day you can work together and agree on something and the next day you can have different points of view.

He and I worked successfully on the RESTORE Act. We worked on the FAIR Act where we can get a portion of our revenues to bring back to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, from offshore oil and gas production. I have to say I have enjoyed working with him many times over the years we have been in the Senate.

Tonight I take issue with some of the things he said. To recapitulate, with much due respect, if everything the Senator said about the Affordable Care Act was actually factual—and it is not—if everything he said about the act was true, this time and method of shutting down the government to prove his point is still wrong.

You should not hold Federal employees, the economy of the United States, the governments of the United States—Federal, State, or local which will be affected by this—hostage because you agree or think that the Affordable Care Act is a bad act. It is the wrong method and it is the wrong time for that debate. That is the issue.

They are on the floor debating whether the Affordable Care Act is good or bad. This is not the debate we are having tonight. The debate we should be having tonight, whether it is good or bad, is, is it worth shutting down the government of the United States tonight? The answer is clearly no.

Secondly, the Senator from Alabama said this bill was passed in the middle of the night. It was passed late one night several years ago. It has been passed by the House and the Senate, signed into law as every bill by the President of the United States. In the case of this law, it was upheld by the Supreme Court and is being implemented by a majority of States in the United States. This bill, law, concept, and approach was debated for 40 years in 20 Congresses. This wasn't debated in 1 night, in 1 week, morning, noon, or midnight, but 40 years across many Presidents, both Republican and Democratic. The question was, How does the richest Nation in the world, the most developed democracy on Earth, a Nation with 1 million-plus workers, provide affordable health care without bankrupting the country and putting too much burden on either individuals or businesses?

There were ideas thrown out for the 40 years this was debated—not 1 night, not just on Christmas Eve. There were hundreds of hearings, thousands of documents, millions of pieces of paper and studies done on the subject, and there were about four options:

One, Medicare for all—lots of opposition to that. It is expensive—popular but expensive.

The second option was a single-payer system similar to Canada's. It was very popular with some, deemed too socialistic by others.

The third option was Medicaid savings accounts, health care savings accounts. Republicans love it. Democrats don't like it, don't think it is fair to the middle class. It would only really help those at the top 2 percent. We said No.

So we compromised on an idea that came not out of the Democratic caucus but out of the Republican caucus, not out of a Democratic think tank but a Republican think tank—the Heritage Foundation—and we passed a private sector, market-based insurance choice for all Americans.

But that debate is over. At least the bill has passed; the debate will go on for a while—but not about shutting the government down. The debate as far as the bill passing, it is done. It is signed into law. And contrary to arguments made on the other side that nobody is interested in amending anything, I don't know if they have read their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is right in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We have already amended the law twice on a vote in the House and the Senate. Remember a year and a half ago we passed the 1099? We repealed that. It was a part of the way we paid for the bill. We reviewed it after we did it and thought that wasn't a very good idea, and we changed it. There has been another change to the law. It is not as if this law will never be changed. But for Republicans—particularly the extremists—every time we come up to a budget debate or the full faith and credit of the United States, to reengage in this debate, it is not fair to the American people, it is not fair to the workers of the United States, and it is not fair to the businesses in the United States. It is just simply not the right way to legislate.

So I would like the chairman from Alabama, as the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I wish he would get on the floor and urge his colleagues to go to conference on the budget he was talking about because I do agree with him. We do have a deficit problem. We do have a debt problem. We do have some entitlements that need to be looked at. We have to get our budget in balance. But the way to do it is not to hold the American people hostage, to take their jobs away from them and shut the government down. That is not

the way to operate. It is to go to conference.

We have tried 18 times to go to conference, and we have been blocked by the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas Mr. CRUZ has objected to going to conference to debate the budget.

Let's debate the budget. Let's debate the appropriations bills. I am an appropriator. I am the chair of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

Tomorrow thousands of people are going to be laid off. People who protect our borders, who help navigate international trade, help keep our hospital industry going, passports, et cetera, are going to be impacted. But instead of the Senator arguing and urging us—as the ranking member of the Budget Committee—to go to the Budget Committee to negotiate, they have objected. We can't go to a conference.

Senator MURRAY passed her budget months ago. We passed a budget. The House has passed a budget. They aren't the same budget, but it is their version and our version. Let's go to conference and work it out. But, no, we have to now threaten the shutdown of the entire government of the United States because the Republicans after 40 years of debate feel that was not enough. Forty years of debate was not enough. Two Presidential elections, which they lost, was not convincing enough. The majority of the Senate fell to the Democrats. That was not convincing enough.

The people who voted that way, their votes, their actions as a democratic nation are being disrespected by our colleagues on the other side. It is not as though this is a dictatorship. We were elected. I was even elected in a State where this is a difficult issue. It is not clear-cut. I have people for it and against it. But after studying and after soul-searching and after looking at all the options and understanding that I have 800,000 people in my State who are uninsured, that I have hundreds of thousands of small businesses that had been dropping their insurance because they couldn't afford it, and that 85 percent of our market is taken up by one company with virtually no competition, I said there has to be a better way. This may not be perfect, but the status quo is worse.

We had that debate, and their side lost. So instead of just trying to fix what they can or suggesting changes or finding a time where we can debate—and we have already changed two things; the President, administratively, has already pushed back one—they want to shut the government down. It is on their shoulders.

So I came to the floor—and I will ask for 5 more minutes—to talk about two things because I have hesitated to speak on this big issue because I have been focused for the last year on a real problem—not that this isn't a problem; it is a problem, but this is a real issue that with a little bit of attention from everyone and a lot less rhetoric, we could fix this, and that is helping to amend a bill that did pass and does need to be amended, and that is the Biggert-Waters bill.

I am not threatening to shut the government down over this; I am simply asking and raising attention to the fact that at some point we would like to have a debate on this floor and in the House on Biggert-Waters. This was a bill that was passed through here—it wasn't debated for 40 years, it was debated for a very short time. At the time the bill passed—Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The bill passed out of the committee on the Senate side. It never did come to the floor at all for debate. It went to the House, was changed pretty dramatically, and then was put in a conference committee. This happens sometimes. It is not usual, but it does happen. I am not complaining about that except that as a result of that, hundreds of thousands of people in Louisiana, Texas, Florida, North Dakota, New York, and New Jersey, tomorrow morning—as I guess if the government is shutting down, they may not be able to go to work, if they have a government job—they will have a big fat bill coming on their flood insurance because Biggert-Waters, the bill in the House, had several very pernicious provisions.

There are about 5 million flood insurance policies in the country. There should be about 17 million, but there are only 5. There will be 17 million, or some such universe as that, but there are 5 million now, and we have many in Louisiana.

When a person goes to put their house on the market and they sell it, the act of selling, according to Biggert-Waters, removes their grandfathered status. They then go from that grandfathered status, which was below market rate—and that was done purposely to help people who live in coastal areas—not necessarily in secondary homes, not in condos, not in million-dollar mansions, but people who work on the rivers, who fish, who live in coastal communities, hard-working individuals and small businesses. This allowed them to live where they have lived, in our case, for 300 years. They didn't just move there in the 1980s. They didn't move down there for sunbathing. They have been there for 300 years, and this was to give them an opportunity to live in their homes with reasonable insurance.

In the Biggert-Waters bill, that trigger—the act of putting up a ''for sale'' sign or selling your house—eliminated the subsidy, virtually rendering a person's house valueless. And it is not just paying 25 percent more, 100 percent more, or 400 percent more. That would be hard enough, but in some cases it literally will render a house valueless because let's say, for instance, you paid $1,200 a year for insurance, but let's say the real rate is actually $15,000. The trigger mechanism means their flood insurance will go from $1,200 to $15,000 overnight. No one will buy a home that has a $15,000 annual premium for insurance. So if they have $400,000 in equity in their home or $500,000 or $150,000 in equity or perhaps they have $1 million in equity, it is gone because their house will not be able to be sold for virtually any price close to what it is worth. And that is not right. That comes close to a taking.

When this bill passed, I put an objection in the record. I said then that we would be back talking about it. There are ways we can fix bills. We need to get Biggert-Waters fixed and changed, and I want to submit that if we don't shut the government down, we can do it. We can negotiate, we can meet in conference and bring amendments to committees, and we can work together.

I want to read for the RECORD for a few minutes. I don't see anyone else on the floor.

> Many in Congress were led to believe that the flood insurance program was unsustainable, that it consistently paid out more in losses than it collected in premiums, and that the only way to balance the ledger was to eliminate subsidies and raise rates. That simply isn't the case.
>
> During 3 of the past 5 years, the program has actually collected more in premium revenue than it paid out in losses. In fact, the program has tabulated an annual surplus 18 times during the 42-year period for which we have data.

Now, there were times, after Florida had that terrible year—2004, I think—when four hurricanes hit and of course after Katrina, where the program took a very strong hit, like when our levees broke and caused so much to drain from the fund. But if we look over time, it was about a $19 million average loss per year—not great but not horrible; not enough to generate the kind of bill that was passed here that is so draconian.

Continuing to quote:

> I also think that most Members of Congress would be surprised to learn that 40 percent of all properties which are required to maintain flood insurance do not have an active policy. This violation of the law costs the program hundreds of millions in lost revenue. Stricter penalties under Biggert-Waters for lenders who fail to enforce mandatory purchase requirements will help to address this, but it is difficult to justify these exorbitant rate increases for people who are participating in the program and playing by the rules when millions of property owners are bucking their legal obligation to pay into the program.
>
> I also think most Members of the Congress and the general public would be shocked to learn that only 44 percent of the money collected by the program is used to cover flood losses in a given year. In fact, the program spends more money paying the insurance companies and agents who administer the program but don't incur any risk and servicing the debt created by the Corps of Engineers than it spends on annual flood losses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete document from which I just quoted.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY

Many in Congress were led to believe that the flood insurance program was unsustainable, that it consistently paid out more in losses than it collected in premiums, and that the only way to balance the ledger was to eliminate subsidies and raise rates. That simply isn't the case.

During 3 of the past 5 years, the program has actually collected more in premium revenue than it paid out in losses. In fact, the program has tabulated an annual surplus 18 times during the 42-year period for which we have data. Over the 26-year period between the time that the federal government took over the program in 1978 and the catastrophic losses in 2004 when Florida was struck by four major hurricanes, the program collected $10.2 billion in premiums and paid out $10.7 billion in claims, resulting in a modest deficit of just $500 million or $19 million per year on average.

I also think that most members of Congress would be surprised to learn that 40% of all properties which are required to maintain flood insurance do not have an active policy. This violation of the law costs the program hundreds of millions in lost revenue. Stricter penalties under Biggert-Waters for lenders who fail to enforce mandatory purchase requirements will help to address this, but it is difficult to justify exorbitant rate increases for people who are participating in the program and playing by the rules when millions of property owners are bucking their legal obligation to pay into the program.

I also think most members of Congress and the general public would be shocked to learn that only 44% of the money collected by the program is used to cover expected flood losses in a given year. In fact, the program spends more money paying the insurance companies and agents who administer the program but don't incur any risk and to servicing the debt created by the Corps of Engineers than it spends on annual flood losses.

The fiscal structure of the flood insurance program is definitely broken, but it isn't because of subsidies. Taken in combination, these facts paint a very different picture of the National Flood Insurance Program than the one that prevailed during the debate last Congress when Biggert-Waters was presented to us.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, these are several reasons why this bill needs to be amended. Again, I am not threatening to shut the government down. That is not appropriate to get amendments to this bill. There are ways to amend a bill, and we can work on that.

Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a quote from Michael Hecht. Michael Hecht is the executive director of GNO, Inc. He is leading a great delegation or a group of people—realtors, bankers, gulf coast residents and many others.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MICHAEL HECHT QUOTE

I would like to read a statement that was made last week by the President of Greater New Orleans Inc., a regional business organization in Louisiana, which I believe conveys the sentiment of thousands of people who I represent that are facing steep rate increases in the midst of so many unanswered questions and misconceptions about this program's underlying problems.

''It is irresponsible to introduce drastic reforms that will potentially devastate hundreds of thousands of American home- and business-owners, before basic questions about forgone revenues and high costs are answered. To proceed otherwise, destroying the wealth of innocent Americans—who have done exactly as the government has told them, maintained insurance and often never flooded—is both economically unwise and morally unjust.''

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, let me read this quote from Michael Hecht. He said:

It is irresponsible to introduce drastic reforms that will potentially devastate hundreds of thousands of American homes and business owners before basic questions about forgone revenues and high costs are answered. To proceed otherwise, destroying the wealth of innocent Americans—who have done exactly as the government has told them, maintained insurance and often never flooded—is both economically unwise and morally unjust.

I know my time is almost to the end. There is no one else on the floor, so I would like to speak until someone else gets here. But this is what we should be working on. We should be working on fixing the flood insurance. Tomorrow morning, October 1, these rates go up. These trigger mechanisms go into effect. It is devastating for people in our States. But the Texas Senators seem to be more concerned about the Affordable Care Act. I understand in their mind it is a problem and in their heart they are sincere. I understand their constituents are complaining. But it is the law, and we should not shut down the government over this.

I wish they would turn their attention to the Biggert-Waters bill, which the House and Senate passed. It needs to be amended. It needs to be fixed, and we need to negotiate a way forward.

No. 2, if people do want to fight about changes to the budget—I am an appropriator. We have been negotiating for years with Republicans about how much to spend, how little to spend, what programs to fund, what not. We do that in a budget conference. We do that in the appropriations bills. In fact, on this measure we are debating tonight the Democrats accepted the House number. Talk about negotiate. We just accepted the number they gave us for the continuing resolution. It was below our number. We want to fund the government in this month a little bit higher, but we even accepted their number. We said, fine, we will take your number.

We usually don't do that. We usually cut it in half or split the difference or say, you want this, we want this. We just took it. We just said yes. They can't even take yes for an answer because they are so committed to using the Federal Government as a hostage, or the full faith and credit of the United States as a hostage to change a bill they had every opportunity to change and didn't change or couldn't change, didn't have the votes to change. Maybe one day they will. But they don't have those votes in this Chamber tonight and they don't have those votes in the House. If they would let the whole House vote, they most certainly would not. They are just allowing the Republicans to vote. But if they would allow the House to vote in its entirety, representing the country, they would support the position of the Senate and they know that.

I end my remarks by saying let us focus on what we can do to fix some bills, the Biggert-Waters flood insurance bill being one of them. Let's not hold the American public and government hostage over a bill that passed, that was signed into law, and upheld by the Supreme Court and is being implemented by a majority of States in America. We can debate it and not shut down the government over it.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to put something else on the RECORD as well that is important for us to think about tonight, besides the underlying debate which I have spoken about and the Biggert-Waters reform which unfortunately is going to go into effect tomorrow. We are going to do a press conference tomorrow on it and try to get as much support as we can for Republicans and Democrats to fix it. But there is another issue I wish to bring up to the body tonight while we are waiting for the leader.

I think with the consent of both Republicans and the Democrats, we could allow the District of Columbia—which is one city that is going to be more impacted than others should the budget of the United States not be able to be negotiated in the next hour or hour and a half. So what I am hoping by raising this issue is that Members will consider that every city in the United States is going to operate tomorrow morning, every State is going to operate tomorrow morning, even if the Federal Government shuts down. They will be impacted, but they will continue to operate with their own money, on their own steam, under their own laws. I would like the same thing for the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia's budget is 75 percent local and 23 percent Federal. So most of their money is local money raised by local taxes, not the taxpayers of the United States. More impressive than that, they have balanced their budget—unlike us—for 18 years. People may be surprised to know this, but the District of Columbia, which is about 650,000 people, does not have a Senator to speak for them. They have a House Member, but the House Member has no vote. So I wish to speak on their behalf for just a few minutes. They have balanced their budget for 18 years and they have well over $1 billion cash in the bank.

So I am raising this to my colleagues to ask for us to consider a unanimous

consent resolution that several of us are putting together now. I would love for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to simply allow the District of Columbia to use their own money—even if the Federal money doesn't come forward, to use their own money raised by their own taxpayers to keep their own government operating, because they are under a special provision to us and have been for many years. People argue whether that is right. That is not the point of this. Whether it is right is of no consequence. It is the law. If we can give them some relief, it would be very helpful to the thousands of people who need a signal from us that just because we can't get our budget straight, just because our budget is in deficit doesn't mean we can't honor the fact that the DC budget is in surplus, $1 billion in the bank. It has been balanced for 18 years, and 75 percent of their budget comes from their own taxpayers. We should allow them to use their money to stay open.

I hope we avoid a shutdown. It doesn't look we are going to. It could be 1 day, it could be 2 days, it could be 3 weeks, it could be 4 months. Who knows how long it is going to be. I hope it doesn't happen, and I hope it is a very short period of time. But whatever it is, there is no reason in the world for the District of Columbia—as Mayor Gray said: We have balanced our budget for 18 consecutive years. We have well over $1 billion in the bank. Yet we cannot spend our own money to provide our residents with services they have paid for unless we get permission from a Congress that can't even agree to pay its own bills.

If we can't agree how to pay our bills, I think it is unfortunate. We should. But this is a big city. It is an important city. It is the Capital of the Nation. They should be able to operate tomorrow morning.

I am hoping in the next hours we can find a way. All it takes is a unanimous consent. I know tensions are running high. We can be angry at each other or frustrated, but we should not be angry with the District. They have done nothing wrong. They have balanced their budget. They need to be able to operate. Many people all over the Nation depend on the District government. So let's not shut them down while we are shutting ourselves down.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period of morning business for debate only until 12 midnight, with Senators permitted to speak until for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 12 midnight I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is a very serious time in the history of the country. It is hard to comprehend, with millions of people being affected tomorrow—in 65 minutes, actually—Republicans are still playing games.

As I indicated, speaking through the Chair to the senior Senator from Illinois a couple of hours ago, just take a couple of examples. We have 15,000 people a day who come to Lake Mead, spending huge amounts of money to help the economy. They come there to boat, to fish, to recreate. Tomorrow morning they can't go.

We have a beautiful recreational area just a short distance out of Las Vegas. When you fly into Las Vegas, you can see the beautiful red hills. It is called Red Rock. Over 1 million people a year come and visit. Not tomorrow. No. The Republicans are shutting down places like that all over America because they don't agree with government. Tomorrow will be a bad day for government and a day of celebration for the Republican-dominated House led by the tea party over there. We hear the next gambit of the House is to request a conference on the CR.

We like to resolve issues. In the Senate Chamber tonight is PATTY MURRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee. She worked so hard to pass a budget in this body. We worked until 5 in the morning to get it passed. We voted on over 100 amendments. We passed a budget. We passed a budget because it was the right thing to do and the Republicans said we should pass a budget—and we did. Senator MURRAY has for more than 6 months requested a conference on the budget 18 times.

So we like to resolve issues. But we will not go to conference with a gun to our head. The first thing the House has to do is pass a clean 6-week CR. They have that before them. They can do it right now. If they do that, then we will agree to work with Republicans on funding for the government for the remainder of the fiscal year.

I propose that the House pass our clean CR, and we will sit down and discuss funding for the balance of the year. That is it. This deal they are pulling out—they have a rule over there that says they want to go to conference on the CR. That closes the government. They want to close the government. This is all a subterfuge to satisfy the tea party-driven Republicans. This very strange agenda is so hurtful to the American people.

So I want everyone to hear what we just said. We will not go to conference until we get a clean CR. If the government closes, what benefit do we have from that? In 2 weeks the government is not only going to close down—we are going to lose the credit rating because they are talking now about not raising the debt ceiling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I sort of feel sorry for Speaker BOEHNER. He has this hard-right tea party group that is adamant about shutting the government down. Many of them talked about shutting the government down in their 2010 campaigns. There are clips where they go to the audience: We will shut the government down if we win back the House. And the audience of tea party faithful cheers.

Here we are. Speaker BOEHNER, who has not been able, not been strong enough, frankly, to stand up to the tea party, realizes he is in a real dilemma. They want to shut the government down and he knows that the American people do not want that. CNN came out with a poll today. What should we do, end ObamaCare or keep the government going? Sixty percent said, keep the government going. Only 30 percent—or 34 percent, I believe it was—said end ObamaCare. The closer we get to this fateful hour—and we are only an hour away from a government shutdown—the more people will understand what the Republicans have done.

There is only one answer, and that is for the House to pass the clean CR bill that we have sent them, that they have. They keep coming up with new diversions. They send us a message that says this. They send us a message that says that. Some of it is related to ObamaCare. Some of it is related to contraception. Now they say we want to go to conference. As the leader said, we want to resolve issues. We would like to get a nice omnibus for a whole year, for the remainder of the fiscal year. We realize we have to do that with both Houses. But not with a gun to everybody's head. Let's go to conference? While they shut down the government and hurt millions of innocent people? Speaker BOEHNER is not going to get away with this subterfuge, as he has not gotten away with the previous ones. People will see through it.

It is a way to take the focus off what they really are doing, shutting the government down and trying to get people to follow the diversion. This time it is let's go to conference. Again, there is nothing wrong with a conference, but not, absolutely not when they are shutting the government down in an hour. All the talking in conference will not help the Federal worker who is not getting a paycheck, the highway construction worker whose job uses Federal

funds to build that highway, the veteran who is waiting for a disability claim. A conference is not going to solve that. There is one way to solve it: Pass the clean CR and then have a conference that talks about the issues for the whole year. Resolving funding makes sense but only after they pass our clean CR bill.

Speaker BOEHNER, no more games. We are in the final hours. Pass the clean CR. Don't send us another one of these little gizmos that is simply meant to take attention off the fact that you do not have the courage to keep the government funded. Pass the clean CR and then we can talk about conference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. The statement made earlier by the majority leader is worthy of note. In less than an hour the government will close. That means agencies all across the United States will start notifying government employees: Go back home. Don't go to work. You may not be paid today. People who are reaching out to those agencies for services—SBA loans, student loans, advice on Social Security, veterans' benefits—they are going to find recordings instead of government workers there to help them. That is not good. It does not speak well for this great Nation that we have reached this point.

What we hear now from the House of Representatives is they want to talk some more. Now they want to sit down with the Senate to talk this over. But only after the government shuts down. That is the difference. They will only talk after the government shuts down. What the majority leader has said is a reasonable compromise. What he said is this: Pass the 6-week budget that we sent over to you, the CR, with no strings attached, no political gimmicks, so that the government continues functioning, so that America is open for business. Do that and during that time we will sit down and talk with you about future funding for the rest of the year.

Party to that conversation should be the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator MURRAY. She worked hard to pass a budget resolution. She tried 18 times on the floor to get to a conference committee with the House. Every time a tea party Senator got up and objected.

We are prepared to sit down again. Chairman MURRAY is prepared to sit down, as is the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Maryland. I have worked with her and for her in our effort to get the appropriations bills ready. The two of them, Senators MURRAY and MIKULSKI, can work together in the conference committee and really charter a way to finish this year in an orderly, thoughtful way.

But shutting down the government should not be the starting point. That is an admission of defeat. Those of us who were sent here to Washington to lead should be ashamed if it reaches that point. What the majority leader has proposed I hope the Speaker of the House of Representatives will take note of. Don't send us the idea of a conference committee after the government shuts down. What the majority leader has said is after we have agreed to keep the government functioning for 6 weeks, then we can sit down and work out the difficult issues that face us.

We have now entertained three different proposals from the House when it comes to funding this government, two today, and we are about to get a third this day. Each one of them has a fatal flaw. It either involves defunding, delaying ObamaCare—to which the President and the Democrats in the Senate would never agree—or in this circumstance they are sending up the idea of a conference committee after the shutdown.

I think what Senator REID has offered now is reasonable, it is constructive, it gives us a chance to do our work. There are differences of opinion, for sure. But it is an orderly process that brings some respect back to Congress as an institution instead of the embarrassment of a shutdown of our important government. I hope the Speaker and staff are listening carefully. I hope they will accept this offer by the majority leader to move forward in a positive and constructive way, to keep the government open, to solve our problems in a bipartisan and constructive fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I find it extremely ironic that we are here right now hearing that the House of Representatives is going to shut down the government and then send us a bill saying they want to talk in a conference committee. Let's remember why we are here right now with the threat of a shutdown where thousands of families and communities are going to be hurt. We passed a budget in the Senate 6 months ago. The House of Representatives passed a budget in the House 6 months ago. The goal was to go together in conference, work out our disagreements, define the funding levels for the coming fiscal year so we would not be sitting tonight, minutes away from a shutdown.

The right thing to have done would have been to go to conference anytime in that last 6 months, as we asked for 18 times, but were told no by the same people who are now sitting on the other side of the aisle and saying: No, they want to shut government down.

Why do they want to do that? They want to create a crisis because they think they are going to get something. We know going to a conference means that we have to compromise. That is what a conference is. But we are not going to do it with a gun to our head that says we are shutting government down. We are going to conference over a short little 6-week CR? We have to deal with the longer term budget. We have asked many times to go to conference on that. We stand ready to go to work on making compromises for our long-term fiscal crisis. But tonight the only question that should be before the House of Representatives and the Senate is keeping our government open without a gun to anyone's head.

The Speaker should pass a clean CR, send it to the President, and tell Americans that we are not going to disrupt their lives in this country for the next 6 weeks while we work out the bigger agreement. That is what we need to be doing.

I urge the Speaker to step away from the precipice and have the government stay open. Don't put everybody's lives and communities in this country at risk and allow us to get to work to solve our next year's fiscal crisis before it is on us again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I chair the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is a great honor. I am the one that would go to conference. Hey, I'm ready. However, a motion to tell us to meet in conference without a continuing funding resolution to keep the government open is a hollow gesture and a cynical gesture and a manipulative gesture. To say ''have a conference,'' that means, myself, my Republican vice chairman, other conferees that would be appointed, we would sit down with the House conferees. By the way, we talk all the time. We started something new under my leadership, with the concurrence of Senator SHELBY, talking with the House. Do we want to meet in a conference? You bet. But to meet in a conference without the continuing funding resolution included in it means that the government shuts down at midnight without a continuing funding resolution to a date certain.

You can tell us to meet all you want, but the government will shut down. My whole point is to agree with my colleagues here that the House should take up what the Senate sent them. The Senate sent, in a gesture of comity and so on, a simple continuing resolution. Keep the government funded until November 15. This would give us opportunities to have that conference. We accepted their funding level, planning to negotiate a higher level. We had been waiting and waiting for Senator MURRAY to be able to go to conference on the budget so that we could arrive at this.

People might say: Senator MIKULSKI, I'm confused. MURRAY is the budget. You are appropriations. Are they not the same thing?

No. Senator MURRAY is the Budget Committee. That is the full revenue. That is the full Federal budget. It includes discretionary spending. I am one part of that. It includes mandatory

spending. That is Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, other mandatory spending. It also includes revenue which means that your books ultimately balance and you have a balance in your economy.

The Budget Committee's job is to arrive at that, working with the House. They then give us, the appropriators, something called a 302(a). It is a section in the Budget Act. That Budget Committee tells us, the appropriators, the cap that we can spend. The appropriators are neither free spenders nor freeloaders. We get a cap, a 302(a).

I have 12 subcommittees. Those 12 subcommittees, we divide them up in terms of what we think are the important investments that the country should make; that is into the 12 committees. Then they work with their Republican members to arrive at the subcommittees, and we bring them to the floor.

I have not had a top line. I have not had my cap, because she cannot go to conference. Remember those conferences everybody likes to have? So, had Senator MURRAY gone to a conference we would have had that number. But in the absence of that, I did something really bold. I took the Senate for its word.

This spring when the Budget Committee passed their 302(a) allocation, it would have been $1.058 trillion. That is how we Senate appropriators, we Democrats, marked up our 12 bills. Some might say that is a lot of money. It sure is a lot of money, and we did a good job with it. We had smart public investments and every one of my subcommittees had the inspector general at their hearings so we could identify duplicative, dated or dysfunctional programs.

We are ready to cut. We know how to cut. We are ready to go, and every one of my subcommittees is ready to go. Am I ready to go to conference? You bet. But to go to conference without that continuing funding resolution is, again, a hollow action that once again wastes time and wastes opportunity.

It is not just those in our country who watch C–SPAN. The world watches C–SPAN. The world is watching us. This is the United States of America. They are watching our parliamentary system, which was once the greatest in the world. We have gone from being the greatest deliberative body to the greatest delaying body, and we delay through hollow gestures back and forth.

I want to do everything I can—working on a bipartisan basis—to maintain the greatness of America, but in order to do that, the greatness of America needs to work tonight. We need to come to our senses, come to an agreement, come to closure, and keep the government open. I am happy to go to the conference, but I would like a date certain. My preference is November 16. Keep the government open. Keep us in not only our job but keep America working.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

IRAQ SPECIAL IMMIGRATION VISA EXTENSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. 1566, the Iraq special immigration visa extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1566) to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the bill.

IRAQ SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss a small, but critical program that represents a test for this body and for this country: The Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program. It is a test of whether we stand behind our commitments abroad. It is a test of whether we help those who help us. And for others out there who might consider assisting the U.S., it is a test to see if we follow through on our promises. If we don't act now, the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa program will expire along with our obligation to thousands of Iraqis who risked their lives to help U.S. troops at war.

The latest version of the Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program was initiated by Congress in the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act. It was originally designed to allow for certain foreign nationals in Iraq who served alongside U.S. forces to receive special visas to come live and work in the United States. The visa program was created to help secure a path out of harm's way for those Iraqis and their families that provided important skills to Americans, like translation services, and are now targeted because of their affiliation with us.

The Iraq visa program is currently set to expire today on September 30, 2013. Without action by the Congress to extend this program, thousands of Iraqi applicants, already under threat due to their faithful assistance and valuable service to the U.S. Government, will see consular work on their cases stopped and their dream of escaping the daily threat of violence will be suspended.

Even if we eventually decide to reauthorize the program at a later date, the stoppage will result in delays of months or even years for these applicants as they completely restart an already long and overly arduous process. Many of these interpreters and assistants who risked their lives for Americans are now in hiding running from place to place to escape retribution attacks against them and their families, any delays could mean their lives.

Now, since I started working on this special immigrant visa issue, I have come across countless stories of bravery demonstrated by Iraqi interpreters who stand shoulder to shoulder fighting with our military men and women. My office has also heard directly from retired military officers who served alongside these Iraqis and are now fighting to get them out of Iraq to the safety of the United States. I would like to just briefly read a few excerpts from these tremendously inspiring stories:

From one retired Marine Corps captain:

I am a retired member of the U.S. Marine Corps, who served proudly in Iraq between 2004–2005. Among our tasks was conducting nightly kill and capture raids in Anbar Province . . . Our interpreter was our lifeline to the local population . . . He became an invaluable member of our team, and our close friend . . . Because of his nearly four years of service to U.S. forces in Iraq, he was left imperiled and at risk of death at the hands of Iraqi militia . . . We came to trust him and treat him as one of our own.

From a Marine Corps infantry officer who did two tours in Iraq:

I owe my life and the lives of my Marines to [my translator] . . . During high intensity combat operations throughout the second Battle of Fallujah, [he] constantly put his life in danger to protect Marines and civilians . . . Over the course of that deployment, [he] not only served heroically alongside Marines, but he also became a second father and a close friend.

From that same marine:

I have had the opportunity to meet many other Iraqi refugees. They represent the best of our Nation. They chose to put themselves in harm's way because they have always believed in what our country is supposed to stand for . . . They are eager to share in the American dream and to contribute in meaningful ways on the home front as they did overseas. They've earned that opportunity.

I could not agree more. But, unfortunately, thousands of Iraqis who have earned the chance to come to the United States might not make it, and simply because we failed to act. That is unacceptable.

Now, a number of Members on both sides of the aisle, including myself, have been working hard for the last 6 months to find a way to extend this critical program. Senators MCCAIN, LEAHY, GRAHAM, LEVIN, DURBIN, and others have been champions of this effort. We have extensions of this program in the comprehensive immigration bill, the current version of the National Defense Authorization Act, and in the annual State Department appropriations bill. Unfortunately, none of these will be signed into law by the deadline.

I was hoping that the House of Representatives would include an extension in their original continuing resolution legislation, but, unfortunately, they did not, leaving the Senate with few procedural opportunities to include it. However, we may have a second chance here in the hours ahead, and I would urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to find a way to extend this program.

Now, there is no doubt that the administration needs to do more to actually process the visa applications. The stories we are hearing about the backlog are entirely inexcusable. Applicants ought to be able to cut through the redtape and bureaucratic nightmare to get their visas processed quickly and more efficiently, while still ensuring proper vetting and background checks. However, we have no hopes of improving the program if we don't extend it.

We have a responsibility to fulfill our obligation to the thousands of civilians who risked their lives to help our country during a time of war. The contributions that Iraqi and Afghan civilians made to our military efforts have been tremendous. Those who served as translators were an invaluable resource and ally to our men and women in uniform. We can't turn our back on them now, particularly as terrorist organizations target these civilians for retribution. We made a promise to Iraqi civilians and now we must honor it.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1566) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1566

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

SECTION 1. SHORT-TERM EXTENSION OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1244(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during the first 3 months of fiscal year 2014 shall be the sum of—

''(I) the number of aliens described in subsection (b) whose application for special immigrant status under this section is pending on September 30, 2013; and

''(II) 2,000.

''(ii) EMPLOYMENT PERIOD.—The 1-year period during which the principal alien is required to have been employed by or on behalf of the United States Government in Iraq under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall begin on or after March 20, 2003, and end on or before September 30, 2013.

''(iii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with subsection (b)(4) not later than December 31, 2013.''.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY FEE INCREASE FOR CERTAIN CONSULAR SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, not later than January 1, 2014, shall increase the fee or surcharge authorized under section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note) by $1 for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas and machine-readable combined border crossing identification cards and nonimmigrant visas.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 140(a)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note), the additional amount collected pursuant the fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—The fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the first date on which such increased fee is collected.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is so important. People who worked with our military in Iraq as interpreters and doing other things that were essential are now targets in the civil war that is going on in Iraq. Some of them have been wanting to leave for 2 years, and this will allow them to do that. I am so glad we are able to extend this.

Every day these people who helped us are subject to arrest, being killed, as are their families. It is so important we did this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wish to say a few words to try to reflect what I think tens of millions of Americans are feeling at 11:25 tonight with the threat of a government shutdown in 35 minutes.

What I want to say is that this discussion is not about ObamaCare at all. What this discussion, debate, and conflict is about is that our Republican friends in the House are trying to annul the elections that took place last November. Some of them were shocked that Obama won and that he won by 5 million votes. They haven't gotten over it. They were shocked they lost two seats in the Senate. They haven't gotten over that. They were shocked they lost some seats in the House.

What they are saying to the American people tonight is: Maybe we lost the Presidential election. Maybe we lost seats in the Senate and in the House. It doesn't matter. We can now bring the government to a shutdown, throw some 800,000 hard-working Americans out on the street, and we are going to get our way no matter what.

I think that is a horrendous precedent to be established for this body. Let's be clear. If we surrendered to that hostage-taking tonight, without a shadow of a doubt these guys would be back 2 weeks from today. At that point they would say to us: Here is our laundry list of demands. If you don't give us what we want, we are going to bring down the financial system of the United States of America, bring down the world financial system, and if it leads to a worldwide recession, well, that is the way it goes. But what is most important is we get our way and we don't care about the repercussions.

Next year I can see these same guys coming to the floor of the House and saying: You know what. We want to abolish Social Security. We think Social Security is a bad idea, and if you don't allow us to do that, we are going to stop the government again. And on and on it goes.

Ultimately, what we are dealing with tonight is an extraordinarily antidemocratic act. Every Member of the Senate has strong feelings. Sometimes we win, sometimes we lose. But when they are in the minority—they do not control the White House, they do not control the Senate—they cannot force the American people to give them what they want.

The irony is that because we have folks in the Republican Party in the House who believe we should abolish Social Security, end Medicare as we know it, privatize the VA, eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency—they do not believe that the function of government is to protect the interests of the vast majority of the people. So these guys are sitting and saying: My God. The government may shut down. What a great idea.

If you don't believe the EPA should protect us from pollution, then isn't it a good idea that we not have an EPA starting tomorrow? If you don't believe in veterans health care, isn't it a good idea that we should slow down the processing of veterans' claims?

So for these guys who do not believe that in a democratic, civilized society we should have a government which represents the people, then from their point of view what is happening is, in fact, quite good.

What particularly angers me, and why the American people have such contempt for what we are doing in Washington is as we speak—everybody knows this—the middle class in this country is disappearing. The Census Bureau study came out last week—if you can believe this—median family income, that family right in the middle of American society, is earning less money today than it earned 24 years ago. All of the increases in technology and productivity doesn't mean anything.

Poverty is at 46.5 million, and that is highest on record. Youth unemployment is 20 percent. Real unemployment is 14 percent. What do the American people want us to be doing? Everybody knows what they want us to do. Every poll gives us the answer.

They want us to start creating the millions of jobs this economy desperately needs. They want us to raise the minimum wage because they know millions of people in this country cannot make it on $8 or $9 an hour. They

want us to improve our crumbling infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, and our wastewater plants. They want us to bring about real tax reform. One out of four major corporations today is not paying a nickel in taxes, and they want us to change that as well.

In my view, for the future of this country, we cannot allow a handful of rightwing extremists to hold this Nation hostage. The American people have to stand tall and tell them that, yes, in a democratic society, people have differences of opinion. Yes, we can make improvements in ObamaCare. But we don't go forward by trying to destroy or bring the U.S. Government to a halt.

I think it is important for the American people now to stand and demand democracy here in Washington, and tell a handful of rightwing extremists they cannot get their way by holding this government in a hijacked manner.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, do I need to request a specific amount of time in which to speak? Are we under any rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to express my feelings this evening.

Quite frankly, I was one of the optimists in this body. Many of my colleagues have been saying the determination to run our economy over a cliff is so powerful, we are going to end up with a government shutdown. I kept saying, I don't think so. I think in this Senate and across the Capitol in the House there are reasonable folks who know that this type of brinkmanship is doing intense damage to our Nation, and I don't believe we will end up there. So here is my faith in the common sense of a collection of 435 Members of the House and 100 Members of the Senate—my faith in their reasonableness. Apparently, that faith has been misplaced, because we are now just 27 minutes away from a government shutdown. And to what point?

We have just heard from the House leadership they want to have a conference discussion over the budget. Well, certainly, so do we. Six months ago, we passed a budget. The Senate passed a budget. We sought to have a conference committee to resolve those two budgets as a common foundation for a set of spending bills—our appropriations bills—and our Republican colleagues blocked that budget conference committee. They have come to this floor 18 times and blocked the dialogue necessary to take the conversation forward over our budget and spending plan. That is what led us here tonight. The obstruction didn't start a week ago or 2 weeks ago; it started 6 months ago, in not allowing a common conversation.

I am deeply disturbed about the profound dysfunction that now grips this body. I first came to the Senate when I was 19 years old as an intern for Senator Hatfield. When legislation was brought up, it would be debated, there would be a simple majority vote; sometimes we won, sometimes we lost. We then send a bill over to the House. Then we have a conference committee and we get on with things. We make decisions. We test ideas. Sometimes those ideas work well and we keep them and sometimes they don't work so well, and we either amend them or throw them out or the public says, the bums who brought us those ideas that didn't work, we will throw them out. We had a completion of the democratic circle.

We don't have that completion now because we can't have a simple majority vote. Our colleagues have so abused the filibuster process; the courtesy of letting everyone have their say is to never let us get to a final up-or-down vote. So instead of 12 appropriations bills being passed year after year after year, we have zero this year. We only had one in 2011–2012, only one.

Citizens across the country are seeing this and saying, what is wrong with the Senate and what is wrong with the House? The House has its own form of supermajority: the Hastert rule. They are saying, We are not going to put on the floor things we know will pass unless they belong to the ideology of the far right, because we know that right now, if the Speaker of the House wants to put on the floor of the House the bill passed by the Senate—a clean, simple extension of a continuing resolution—it would be adopted. The leadership does not believe in allowing a vote in that Chamber, just as a minority of colleagues here in this Chamber have blocked us from having a simple majority vote time and time and time again.

We need to have a more substantial conversation about how to make both Chambers work better. But in the near term we have to find a path in which we stop careening from crisis to crisis.

Let's say, in the final 23 minutes now before midnight, that we were able to find an answer to pass a continuing resolution. Let's say we were able to do that. Is there no harm done? Well, I wish that were the case, because there has been a lot of harm done; because what businesses know across America is that this process of brinkmanship, of hostage-taking, of threatening to throw the economy over the cliff is happening time and time and time again. Already, Members on the House side are saying, Well, let's not only make these arguments tonight, let's make them in a couple of weeks over the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling—the decision on whether to pay the bills we have already incurred; the decision on whether to honor the good faith and credit of the United States of America.

President Reagan spoke on this multiple times, telling folks, We don't mess with the good faith and credit of the United States. His team undoubtedly recognized that when we do so, we raise the interest rates, we endanger the dollar as a reserve currency, we weaken our purchasing power around the world, and we do deep damage. But that reasonableness, that common sense that we don't take hostages and we don't threaten to destroy the economy that is going to hurt the middle class is gone.

I live in a working class community. Folks don't have a lot of savings. They have been hit hard. They lost a lot of their savings in the 2008 meltdown, a meltdown that came from deregulatory actions, that allowed predatory mortgages and securities based on predatory mortgages. They know that governance matters. They know we could create a lot of jobs if we could pass those bills for low-interest loans, for energy saving renovations that would put a huge amount of the construction industry back to work. That bill passed here in the Senate, but the House hasn't taken it up. They haven't passed it.

They know we would have a lot more jobs if we invested in infrastructure. China is spending 10 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. Europe is spending 5 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. And what are we spending here in America? We are spending 2 percent—not enough to repair the infrastructure that is wearing out across America, that needs replacing, let alone establishing infrastructure for the next generation. In a 10-year period, 2 trips to China, I saw Beijing go from bicycles to a bullet train. That is what happens when a society spends 10 percent of GDP on infrastructure. We build the economy of tomorrow for the generation of tomorrow that is going to thrive in that city.

When we underinvest, we imperil the future. When we underinvest in education, we imperil the future of our kids, and we are certainly underinvesting in education. But for each of these policy issues we have to be taking on, we can't succeed if a small number in the Senate and in the House can paralyze this process, can go to extraordinary lengths to basically hold hostage and damage the United States of America.

This process must end. The Senator from Vermont who spoke a few moments ago said, If we yield to this hostage-taking now, we will see it time and time and time again in the future. We will see the threat to end Social Security, et cetera. Well, we are not going to go in that direction.

The House has said they want a conference. Great. Let's not do so at the same time we are taking down the economy. So put the Senate resolution on the floor of the House right now, with 20 minutes left, give it an up-or-down vote, pass that bill so that we have just these few short weeks, from now until November 15, to hold that conference and to work out a deal without taking the American economy down with ObamaCare.

We wait for common sense and reasonableness to return to a dialogue so

that we can have a legislative process the American people can believe in, because we are tackling the big problems facing America. But as of tonight, with now 18 minutes to go, we do not have that process, and that must change.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator just made a reference to the fact that the Speaker of the House has refused to put the Senate resolution up for a vote in the House of Representatives. It seems to me this has not been adequately illuminated to the public. It is not just that we insist that there be a clean CR—which we do, because we don't want every other issue that people feel passionate about to be insisted upon as the price of keeping the government going. Each one of us has issues we feel very passionately about. But I don't know any of us—at least on this side—who have said that unless we pass, for instance, an infrastructure bill—unless we pass a bill that includes background checks for people before they can buy an assault weapon—I feel very passionately about that. But the idea that we or any of us on this side of the aisle would say the government is going to close unless we get our way on a particular issue that we feel passionate about is absolutely anathema to us. Nonetheless, there are a few folks who are willing to do that.

But when we say we insist we have a clean CR—in other words, that it not be linked to some issue that some faction is insisting upon—what we are really saying is something even deeper than that, more basic. We simply want them to vote on a clean CR. We are very confident it will pass if there is a vote, because it will have bipartisan support.

For some reason over in the House, bipartisan support for a bill is now anathema. Apparently, it is called the Hastert rule. The Republican leaders over there say they are not going to pass any bill that relies upon any Democratic votes, which is the exact opposite of what bipartisanship should be. Over here, we rely on votes from both sides of the aisle for just about everything we pass. But over there they have this policy now, which is the most partisan kind of policy one could imagine. If someone could design a partisan policy, it would be, We will not have any reliance on the other party for votes; only our party can be relied upon for votes. We are not going to pass anything which depends upon the other party. That, to me, reeks of partisanship. Whenever I hear the Speaker or any of the Republicans in the House talk about bipartisanship, the first thing they ought to do is get rid of the Hastert rule, because the Hastert rule guarantees partisanship. It bakes partisanship into the process over there.

But back to the narrow point I wish to ask the Senator about: Tonight, as in previous nights, all we are saying is not just we insist upon a clean CR, which is not linked to some faction's passion, which in this case is getting rid of ObamaCare; what we are saying is vote on the Senate CR. Just put it up for a vote. We are confident it will pass. But does the Senator agree it is even something less than saying it must be a clean CR that we are insisting upon? What we are saying is, vote on a clean CR. We are very confident it will pass, but put it up for a vote. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MERKLEY. Absolutely. I appreciate the point the Senator is accentuating. When the Senator says this has not gotten enough attention, he is absolutely right. The House has refused to have a budget resolution pursued—a continuing resolution that does not have extraneous policy attached to it. They have absolutely said they will not take the Senate version, which did not put on the things the Senator and I might wish to attach, and did not put on the things my colleagues from across the aisle might wish to attach. It said: Let's keep the government open. Let's keep it operating, using, by the way, the budget number proposed by our colleagues in the House.

So if our colleagues in the House say, wouldn't it be great if the Senate would compromise with us, well, we went farther than a compromise. We did not say: Let's split the difference between the Senate number and the House number. We will take their number. And let's get rid of these extraneous policy issues and then put it up for a vote. I think it is a simple request to make.

Doesn't it make sense to give a bipartisan group the opportunity now, with just 14 minutes left, to actually end this process of driving our economy over a cliff?

Mr. LEVIN. At least vote as to whether to do it.

Mr. MERKLEY. At least have that vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Is it also not true that we have voted twice on the House continuing resolution? We have rejected it, but we voted on it.

Mr. MERKLEY. My colleague is exactly right. They sent it to us and we voted on it.

Mr. LEVIN. All right. They have not voted once on what we have sent to them.

Mr. MERKLEY. The Senator is right.

Mr. LEVIN. That is not something you have to go to conference about. That is something which is sort of kind of fundamental. We have voted twice on your proposal. We have rejected it. You refused to vote on a Senate proposal. Why? Because you are afraid it will pass with some Democratic votes. That is anathema to the House of Representatives Republican leadership now to pass legislation that depends upon Democratic votes. And at the same time they talk about bipartisanship, they have that fixed, rigid rule that they will not depend on Democratic votes to get something passed in the House of Representatives. The first step toward bipartisanship in the House would be to end that approach.

But I thank my friend from Oregon. It is amazing to me that the refusal of the House of Representatives to even vote on the Senate proposal which we sent to them has had such little play in the media because I think if the public understood that, they would then—without any doubt—instead of it being 60 to 30 that it is the Republicans who are bringing this government to the brink of closing down, it would be 80 to 10, when the public understands that it is the refusal of the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to allow a vote on the Senate proposal.

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend.

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. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, we are at the verge of the midnight hour here, and what is playing out is a challenge to the very essence of our government, and it is a challenge both at home and abroad. I will speak to that in a moment.

I was in the other body, in the House of Representatives, 17 years ago when we had the last government shutdown, led at that time by the Republican majority in the House of Representatives. I had thought they learned the consequences to the Nation and to their party as a result of such a shutdown. But it seems those memories have faded.

Now we are on the verge of a consequence that is consequential to the lives of American families, consequential to the economy of the country, consequential to the message we send across the globe.

What I cannot understand is the fixation that our Republican colleagues have on the question of the Affordable Care Act, which they derisively call ObamaCare. It is something that was passed by the Congress, signed by the President, reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, which is the final voice of what is the law of the land, and then reaffirmed by the American people in their reelection of the President with a significant majority.

There were two candidates in that election. One was President Obama, who said: I intend to fully implement the Affordable Care Act and create millions of opportunities for those who have no insurance—to control costs; to end preexisting conditions as a limitation; to ultimately ensure that children could stay on their parents' insurance to the age of 26; to be able to provide millions of dollars of relief across the landscape of the country; to help senior citizens who often chose between putting food on the table, keeping their home, or having access to

lifesaving, life-enhancing drugs, by getting a doughnut hole—that gap in coverage for seniors—to be ultimately eliminated. It has provided tremendous relief for the seniors in our country not to have to make those dynamic choices.

So what they could not achieve at the ballot box they are trying to achieve by shutting down the Federal Government.

And then, at this late hour, after having tried a series of times to undermine the Affordable Care Act—and believe me, when they talk about a 1-year delay, which they seem to try to show that it is benign, it is not benign. There is a purpose to their strategy. The reason that a 1-year delay—in addition to the fact that the law should be able to move forward for millions who have no insurance to be able to finally have insurance—is because if you delay the mandate, that means 11 million people will go uninsured who otherwise would get coverage. It means, as the Congressional Budget Office estimated—the nonpartisan entity of the Congress that scores everything we do: Is this going to cost money; is this going to save money—they estimated that repealing that individual mandate will increase premiums anywhere between 15 to 20 percent because fewer healthy people will enroll to balance out those with higher medical needs. Insurance is about spreading the risk across the spectrum.

In my home State of New Jersey, we tried to have insurance reform that limited preexisting condition exclusions and different premium band ratings without an individual requirement for coverage. The result was skyrocketing premiums. So, in essence, delaying the mandate for a year—which is the essence of what the House Republicans have sent here various times as a condition of keeping the government open—is a Trojan horse because Republicans know that, in doing such a delay, the mandate will create higher premiums. And in creating those higher premiums, they, in essence, create rate shock and they fulfill that which they would like to see, which is the failure of the Affordable Care Act.

They have a very particular strategy. It is not benign by any stretch of the imagination. They are not concerned that the Affordable Care Act will fail. They are concerned it will actually succeed. So what they seek to do is to introduce poison pills to make it fail.

It is amazing to me that I keep hearing: Well, we will replace it. With what? We have not heard with what. When we challenge our colleagues, they say: Oh, yes, preexisting conditions, we are for that, making sure that does not exist anymore. We are for the seniors getting the rebates on prescription drugs. We are for making sure there are no more lifetime caps on anybody's insurance, so if they have a catastrophic illness, they will not come up against that cap. We are for all of those things. The only problem is, to have all of those benefits which Americans overwhelmingly want, it costs money. And the only way to do that is, of course, to have everybody ultimately insured in the country.

This is not a fight between Democrats and Republicans. This is a battle for the very soul of the Republican Party. Unfortunately, they are playing it out in a way that affects the Nation. This is a designed strategy.

Jonathan Chait of New York magazine wrote a tremendous piece. I recommend it to all of my colleagues. He basically described a meeting that took place in January of this year. I am going to read from his article for a moment: ''In January, demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. Conservatives were angry that their leaders had been unable to stop a whole series of things, including the Bush tax cuts on high incomes, and they wanted to make sure their leaders would no longer have any further compromises. Not only did they decide they would not have any further compromises, but, in fact, they developed a legislative strategy.

Before I go into that, I am happy to yield to the majority leader who I understand has an announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, through you to my dear friend from New Jersey, who does such a wonderful job in everything he does, especially running the Foreign Relations Committee, I thank him for yielding to me.

This is a very sad day for our country. The President has told the head of the Office of Management and Budget, Sylvia Mathews Burwell, to issue a shutdown statement, and she has done that. Here it is: ''MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.''

This memorandum follows the September 17 memo and provides an update on the potential lapse of appropriations.

No more potential. It is after midnight.

Appropriations provided under the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act expire at 11:59 pm tonight. Unfortunately, we do not have a clear indication that Congress will act in time for the President to sign the continuing resolution before the end of the day tomorrow, October, 2013. Therefore, agencies should now execute plans for shutdown due to the absence of appropriations.

That is what she said. So the agencies of government are in the process of closing down. It now appears that the House is not going to do anything to keep the government from shutting down. They have some jerry-rigged thing about going to conference. It is embarrassing that these people who are elected to represent the country are representing the tea party, the anarchists of the country, and a majority of the Republicans in the House are following every step of the way.

This is an unnecessary blow to America, to the economy, the middle class, everyone. The House has within their power the ability to avoid a shutdown. They should simply pass the 6-week CR we sent them.

We are going to come in in the morning and see what they have done sometime tonight. But I would hope they would understand that, within their power, at any time, all they have to do is accept what we already passed. All this stuff they keep sending over here—they are so fixated on embarrassing our President, the President of the United States. They think an election is coming this November. It happened last November. He was elected by 5 million votes over what Romney got—5 million votes. It was not close. So it is really too bad.

I am going to ask this unanimous consent. We are going to go out tonight and come back at 9:30 in the morning. So the unanimous consent is that we are going to recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning. I want the Senators who are here on the floor to be able to talk for 5 minutes each.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 Tuesday, October 1, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in day; that at that time, I be recognized; that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 tomorrow to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

I ask, before this is implemented, that everyone understand that when we receive that message from the House—I hope we will have it in the morning when we come in—I will make a motion to table it as we have done the two other measures in the last few hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that following the statements of Senators MENENDEZ, DURBIN, MURRAY, and SCHUMER, the Senate adjourn under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just ask the leader, the government is shut down. There is nothing we can do to keep it open. The only way to keep the government open would be for the House to pass the resolution we have already sent them; is that correct?

Mr. REID. That is right. It keeps the government funded. They have had that for days now. They could do it,

with the way they vote, in a matter of 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. But nothing we can do?

Mr. REID. Nothing we can do. They are over there now negotiating with themselves, I guess.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is it not true that until they vote for that resolution, the government will remain shut? They could send us 100 different little doodads, gizmos, and other things, but the ball is in their court, and we hope and wish that they would pass our resolution and that we keep the government open.

Mr. REID. It is in their court and has been in their court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I had hoped we would not get to this point. I believe that where I was headed is to embody why we have come to this moment today. It just did not happen. I was referring to this article by Jonathan Chait of New York Magazine that in January the House Republicans met, retreated to Williamsburg, VA, and came up with a strategy.

What is that strategy? He goes on to say:

> The first element of that strategy is a kind of legislative strike. House Republicans initially decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama, and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate—

Which only goes to prove why, despite having passed a budget 6 months ago or over 6 months ago, each of the 18 times that Senator MURRAY, the budget chair, has asked to go to a conference—which is a meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate to work out their differences in their budget—there have been objections.

So when I read this article and see that House Republicans decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate—we are seeing the consequences of that strategy here today.

This kind of refusal—he says in his article that ''to even enter negotiations is highly unusual.'' The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

It is pretty interesting. You know, for those who said: Well, both sides, the reality is that there is no moral equivalency to shutting down the government. If you are willing to use the tools of shutting down the government in order to elicit what you could not achieve by winning at the ballot box—i.e. getting a Republican President elected, both Houses of the Congress—then you could ultimately repeal a law with which you disagreed. But since you could not do it that way, to have a policy that ultimately says: No, we are willing to shut down the government in order to achieve what we could not do at the ballot box with the will of the American people, there is no moral equivalency. So it cannot be accepted that both sides are to blame when clearly only one side is willing to pursue their political goals by closing down the government and the consequences that flow from that.

It is an interesting article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that all of my colleagues might be able to read it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Jonathan writes for NY Magazine.)

In January, demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. Conservatives were angry that their leaders had been unable to stop the expiration of the Bush tax cuts on high incomes, and sought assurances from their leaders that no further compromises would be forthcoming. The agreement that followed, which Republicans called ''The Williamsburg Accord,'' received obsessive coverage in the conservative media but scant attention in the mainstream press. (The phrase ''Williamsburg Accord'' has appeared once in the Washington Post and not at all in the New York Times.)

But the decision House Republicans made in January has set the party on the course it has followed since. If you want to grasp why Republicans are careening toward a potential federal government shutdown, and possibly toward provoking a sovereign debt crisis after that, you need to understand that this is the inevitable product of a conscious party strategy. Just as Republicans responded to their 2008 defeat by moving farther right, they responded to the 2012 defeat by moving right yet again. Since they had begun from a position of total opposition to the entire Obama agenda, the newer rightward lurch took the form of trying to wrest concessions from Obama by provoking a series of crises.

The first element of the strategy is a kind of legislative strike. Initially, House Republicans decided to boycott all direct negotiations with President Obama, and then subsequently extended that boycott to negotiations with the Democratic Senate. (Senate Democrats have spent months pleading with House Republicans to negotiate with them, to no avail.) This kind of refusal to even enter negotiations is highly unusual. The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda, without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

Republicans have thrashed this way and that throughout the year. Republicans have fallen out, often sharply, over which hostages to ransom, with the most conservative ones favoring a government shutdown threat and the more pragmatic wing, oddly, endorsing a debt default threat. They have also struggled to define the terms of their ransom. The Williamsburg Accord initially envisioned forcing Obama to sign spending cuts, or some form of the Paul Ryan budget. During the summer, Republicans flirted with making Obama lock in lower marginal tax rates. Recently, Republicans settled on pressuring him to kill his health-care law. But the general contours of the legislative strike, and the plan of obtaining policy victories without offering any policy concessions, has enjoyed general agreement within the party.

The history is important because much of the news coverage and centrist commentary has leaned heavily on the idea that the crises in Washington have come about because of some nebulous failure of bipartisanship. The Washington Post editorial page implores both sides to compromise, without explaining why only one party should have to offer policy concessions to keep the government running. Mark Halperin neatly implies that the two sides share the blame in equal measure.

The analytic error here is the assumption by professional pox-on-both-housers that they can take an advocacy position on the government shutdown without siding with one of the parties. If you want to land on the conclusion that both sides are to blame, you need to equivocate on the underlying moral question of whether a shutdown is really a bad thing. If, on the other hand, you want to take a stance against crisis governance, you need to be honest about the fact that one party is pursuing this as a conscious strategy.

Mr. MENENDEZ. This is a battle within the Republican party itself about where they are headed. It is a battle that is totally unnecessary because I think there is a simple message to the Speaker: Allow the House of Representatives to have an up-or-down vote on what the Senate has sent it, which is basically a clean continuation of the government without any gimmicks, without any poison pills.

If that vote were allowed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the floor of the House of Representatives, I believe it would pass and the government would stay open. Instead, a few within the Republican Party who hatched this concoction in January of this year when they lost the elections and retreated to figure out what was going to be their legislative strategy are bringing the Nation to its knees.

That is simply unacceptable.

I said at the beginning of these comments that it is not only consequential here at home—and it will be consequential—to many families, to those who are Federal employees, and their families, to those who seek the assistance of the Federal Government, whether that is a small business loan, whether it is somebody for the first time enrolling for Social Security payments or a veteran's disability or a whole host of other things; they will not be able to do it if the government is going to be shut down tomorrow—it is also a consequence in the world. I say that as chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What message do we send to the world when, in fact, we cannot get our own budget done and one party is willing to hold the Nation hostage in order to get their political views pursued?

We are trying to convince Iran not to pursue nuclear weapons. We tell Iran if you disarm totally and stop your nuclear weapons program, then sanctions to you can be lifted. I believe the Iranians are looking and saying is it possible that such an agreement could

ever be delivered by the Congress of the United States, if we do actually disarm, if we end all of our nuclear weapons program, if we do everything that the Security Council has asked of us. Would the United States lift the series of sanctions that they have ultimately passed upon us?

This Congress cannot agree with the President. When I say this Congress, I speak of the Republican Congress and the House of Representatives.

It is a dangerous message in the world. We tell other nations that we believe they have to abide by certain disciplines, and yet we cannot ultimately keep our own budget open and the Nation and this government functioning.

I think this is the ultimate extortion. I believe that since this is by design, not by chance, it is going to have real consequences for our Nation. There is no doubt that if there is a prolonged shutdown, it will be consequential to our economy. It will be consequential to the gross domestic product.

We saw that 17 years ago. It will be consequential to not only Wall Street but to Main Street in terms of their confidence as to how to move forward. This economy is in recovery. The last thing it needs is a body blow by its own government as it tries to continue to grow an economy in which more people can be employed.

The consequence of Republicans doing this is more than a government shutdown, it is increasingly an economic shutdown. This is simply something that we should not accept.

Finally, to send us a resolution after 6 months of trying to go to a conference, 18 different petitions and motions on this floor to go to a conference, to go to that simple meeting that might have reconciled these differences that were objected to by certain Republicans within this chairman—and now to say you are going to send us a motion to go to conference when you have shut down the government and, therefore, have a gun at our head in order to be able to try to negotiate the critical issues that might be negotiated—is simply unacceptable. They already have a legislative victory.

We have accepted an amount in the temporary budget that is less than what we devised in the Senate budget, $80 billion less. Yet that is not satisfactory to them.

This is not about the economics. This is about their drive to kill the Affordable Care Act in a way that undermines the health and quality of opportunity for millions of Americans who finally don't have to worry about preexisting conditions. They don't have to worry about lifetime caps, can keep their children on their insurance until the age of 26, and can get millions of dollars across the landscape of the country for seniors to reduce prescription drug costs, that finally controls costs in this Nation. Their fear is not that it won't work. Their fear is that it will succeed and in doing so will undermine the very essence of what they have been against all along.

That is a hard way to pursue a political tactic as a consequence of the Nation's laws. This is what is going on here today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. We are in, as has been said by Leader REID and my good friend from New Jersey, an unfortunate moment. There are millions of people who are innocent. They wake up in the morning, work hard, and hope to get a paycheck to help feed and clothe their families. They will not be getting a paycheck tomorrow morning.

They might be Federal Government workers. I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side demonize the Federal Government. When I think of the Federal Government, I think of individual people who are working hard, who show up at work in the rain and the snow, who work hard, as do people in the private sector, people who work for State governments or such as the people who work for us. Why should they be punished?

Then there are so many others, such as the veteran who needs a change in his or her disability formula and can't get it; the construction worker who is working on a federally funded highway, or somebody who works in a defense plant, as a civilian, all of these people now have been put at real risk.

There is an answer, as I mentioned in my colloquy with the leader. The answer is for the House to pass the bill that passed here—the key vote had a majority of Democrats and Republicans, 25 Republicans—and keep the government running.

They are busy working late at night on another little subterfuge, a little scheme. Have a conference.

As the leader said, conferences are fine with us. We tried to do a budget conference 18 times. Don't do a conference as a charade while you are shutting the government down. That is what the other side is asking us to do.

Let's modify what they are doing. Let them pass the bill that is now in the House that will keep the government running until November 15, and then we will have a conference on how to fund the government for another year.

Make no mistake about it. Tomorrow morning their next gambit will be defeated in the Senate and then we will be back where we were, where we are now.

There is a bill, a ready bill, in the House of Representatives that can keep the government funded and prevent these millions of innocent people and our national economy from being hurt and hurt significantly.

This is a final plea, at 12:15 a.m., 15 minutes after the government has been officially closed. House Members, Speaker BOEHNER, let the bill come up for a vote. It will pass. It will save such trouble, and, even worse. For millions of innocent Americans it will save our economy from great risk. Then we can go back to debating the many issues that you and we wish to debate.

With that, with a bit of a heavy heart because it didn't have to happen, that we have a small group of people who are so sure that they are right that they can hurt millions to pursue that righteousness, that self-righteousness, is a bad thing. I hope it doesn't happen again.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

SYRIA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Friday I was reading the press reports about the remarkable progress that has taken place at the United Nations in obtaining a legally binding resolution, with the support of Russia and the other members of the Security Council, to eliminate Syria's chemical weapons. I could not help but compare it to what has been happening here in the Congress over the past week and a half.

While Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov have worked diligently to reach a historic agreement to destroy one of the world's largest arsenals of poison gas, the Congress has been consumed by political theater, debating an utterly pointless, politically motivated, doomed attempt to defund the Affordable Care Act. In doing so we are now perilously close to a shutdown of the Federal government that will cause untold damage to innumerable programs on which States, municipalities, and every community and family in this country depend and cost the taxpayers far more than if the government stays open.

Ironically, while just 2 weeks ago Congress was on the verge of authorizing a military attack against Syria, some of the most vocal advocates of an attack are the same Members who are toying with a government shutdown that could make it harder for the United States to help implement the U.N. resolution to destroy Syria's chemical weapons. If the government stops functioning, it will no longer be able to pay the salaries of our diplomats, nor to provide the funds to help pay for the weapons inspectors and the removal and destruction of the weapons.

I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and our new U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power for their extraordinary efforts. We should also recognize the indispensable cooperation of Minister Lavrov and his government. While it will be many months before we know if this agreement will be faithfully implemented and achieve its goals in Syria, it is a dramatic step forward.

I also commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their efforts to

seize on the positive overtures by the new President of Iran. Again, it is too soon to say where this may lead, but if there is a chance of resolving diplomatically and verifiably the issue of Iran's nuclear program, it would be a monumental achievement.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Power's remarks at the U.N. last Thursday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR SAMANTHA POWER, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE SECURITY COUNCIL STAKEOUT FOLLOWING CONSULTATIONS ON SYRIA, SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

''Just two weeks ago, tonight's outcome seemed utterly unimaginable. Two weeks ago the Syrian regime had not even acknowledged the existence of its chemical weapons stockpiles. But tonight we have a shared draft resolution that is the outcome of intense diplomacy and negotiations over the past two weeks.

Our overarching goal was and remains the rapid and total elimination of Syria's chemical weapons program. This is a class of weapons that the world has already judged must be banned because their use is simply too horrific. This is a fundamental belief shared by the United States, all members of the Security Council and 98% of the world.

Tonight, the Council discussed a draft resolution that will uphold this international norm by imposing legally binding obligations on Syria—on the government—to eliminate this chemical weapons program.

This resolution will require the destruction of a category of weapons that the Syrian government has used ruthlessly and repeatedly against its own people. And this resolution will make clear that there are going to be consequences for noncompliance.

This is very significant. This is the first time since the Syria conflict began 2½ years ago that the Security Council has imposed binding obligations on Syria—binding obligations of any kind. The first time. The resolution also establishes what President Obama has been emphasizing for many months: that the use of chemical weapons anywhere constitutes a threat to international peace and security. By establishing this, the Security Council is establishing a new international norm.

As you know, we went into these negotiations with a fundamental red line, which is that we would get in this resolution a reference to Chapter VII in the event of noncompliance, that we would get the Council committing to impose measures under Chapter VII if the Syrians did not comply with their binding, legal obligations.

If implemented fully, this resolution will eliminate one of the largest previously undeclared chemical weapons programs in the world, and this is a chemical weapons program—I don't have to tell you—that has sat precariously in one of the most volatile countries and in one of the most horrific civil wars the world has seen in a very long time.

In the span of a few weeks, the curtain that hid this secret chemical weapons program has been lifted and the world is on the verge of requiring that these terrible weapons to be destroyed.

This resolution breaks new ground in another critical respect. For the first time, the Security Council is on the verge of coming together to endorse the Geneva Communique, calling for the establishment of a transitional governing body with full executive powers. If adopted, we will have achieved what we were unable to do before—unable to do for the last 2½ years—which is to fully endorse the Communiqu and call for the convening, as soon as possible, of an international conference on its implementation.

As Ambassador Churkin, with whom we've worked very productively, has just stated, we are hoping for a vote tomorrow in the OPCW Executive Council on the OPCW Executive Council decision. And then in the wake of that vote—and we hope in the immediate wake of that vote—we would have Security Council adoption of this text, which we are optimistic is going to be received very warmly. We're optimistic for an overwhelming vote.

Before closing, just let me—bear in mind, or note that we should bear in mind, even as we express appreciation for the cooperation that brought us to this moment but let us bear in mind the sobering catalyst for all of this: the use on August 21st of chemical weapons against people who were just sleeping in their beds, against children who will never get to share their dreams.

The precipitant for this effort was as ghastly as anything we have ever seen. And I think the Council members are well aware of that. A number of the Council members referred to the events of August 21 and the importance of keeping the victims of that attack and other chemical weapons attacks in their minds as we seek to move forward.

The second sobering note, of course, goes beyond chemical weapons, which is that every day Syrians are dying by artillery, by air power, by Scuds. This monstrous conflict has to come to an end. And we are hopeful that the spirit of cooperation that we carried from Secretary Kerry and Foreign Minister Lavrov's negotiations in Geneva back to New York, that that spirit of cooperation will carry over now on humanitarian issues and, fundamentally, on the political solution we all know is needed to this horrific conflict.

TRIBUTE TO DARREL THOMPSON

Mr. REID. Madam President, behind each Senator is a team of hard-working and dedicated staffers who ensure our constituents have the best possible representation in Congress.

For almost 9 years, Darrel Thompson, my deputy chief of staff for intergovernmental and external affairs, has been a lynchpin of my Washington staff.

Darrel grew up in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, but he fights for my constituents as if he is a native Nevadan.

Darrel works with Federal and State officials and business leaders to foster economic opportunities in Nevada.

And Nevada employers and workers alike have been fortunate to have Darrel watching out for their interests.

Sadly for us, today is Darrel's last day with my office.

Darrel has lived on Capitol Hill for two decades, and he is leaving to realize his dream of running for the District of Columbia City Council seat for Ward 6.

I know Darrel's talent will shine in this new endeavor, as it has in my office.

Darrel has been a trusted advisor on international labor and employment issues, labor negotiations, and job growth.

He has also been an advocate for social justice, and for both the faith and African-American communities.

And he has always been a strong voice for the District of Columbia in the U.S. Senate.

Darrel's prior experience has been also an asset to our team.

Before he joined my staff, he was chief of staff for the Barack Obama for Senate campaign and finance chief of staff for Congressman Gephardt's 2004 presidential campaign.

He also received his master's in public administration from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

I am so sorry to see Darrel go, but I know my loss will be the District's gain.

I congratulate him on his 9 years of dedicated service to the U.S. Senate.

I wish Darrel success in his race for city council as well as a lifetime of happiness.

STOPPING THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the recent tragic shooting at the Navy Yard has by now moved off the front pages, but for the victims and their loved ones and for the Washington, DC community, the effects of that horrific day will linger much longer. We may never fully understand what demons compelled the perpetrator to commit this heinous act, but at least one thing is clear: We should not consider this incident in a vacuum, not after 6 dead in Tuscon, not after 12 dead in Aurora, not after 6 dead in Oak Creek and 2 dead in Clackamas and 27 dead in Newtown, 20 of them children, not while mass shootings are occurring all around our Nation, every day, in places like Albuquerque, Minneapolis, Newton Falls, Seattle, Chicago, and many more. In the words of MedStar Washington Hospital Center chief medical officer Dr. Janis Orlowski, ''There's something wrong here when we have these multiple shootings, these multiple injuries, there's something wrong.''

Dr. Orlowski is right. Our Nation is torn by gun violence. Facts are facts: The American Journal of Medicine recently released clinical research showing that the United States has a rate of 10.2 gun-related deaths per 100,000 people. This rate is far higher than almost all of the 27 other countries the study examined—higher than the rates of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Japan, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Turkey, Germany, and Canada combined. The Washington Post has put similar findings in sobering perspective by noting that an American is ''20 times as likely to be killed by a gun than is someone from another developed country.''

Congress can take important steps to stop this violence. There is legislation in the Senate right now that, if enacted, would take important steps toward reducing gun violence in this

country. Among other things, these bills would close the 'gun show loophole' that allows 40 percent of gun purchases in this Nation to go forward without any sort of background check on the buyer. This loophole allows criminals, the mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists to obtain deadly weapons to turn on our communities.

The American people agree that taking this step would just be common sense. Study after study has shown that around 90 percent of Americans support comprehensive background checks for all gun sales. Another study conducted by the UC Davis Violence Prevention Research Program found that 55.4 percent of gun dealers and pawnbrokers in the United States support comprehensive background checks.

Public safety is not a partisan issue. Dr. Orlowski said it well: ''Mass murders people—walking through schools, people walking through movie theaters, people walking through work places—unfortunately is common, or more common than what it should be . . . we've got to work together to stop this.'' The American people overwhelmingly support commonsense gun safety measures. Our law enforcement communities, our medical communities, even our licensed gun sellers overwhelmingly support commonsense gun safety measures. We should listen to them, and act.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WHITEMAN LUMBER COMPANY

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, sustaining the longevity of American small businesses should be a primary focus of today's lawmakers. When we find a company that has managed to endure through difficult economic times, we should honor their commitments to the American dream and learn from them so that others can follow in their footsteps. The Whiteman Lumber Company, from the Silver Valley in northern Idaho, is a prime example of this. It is a small family business that has survived recessions and fires but continues to thrive and enhance the lumber industry.

In 1928, Harry H. Whiteman started what has now become the oldest continuously operating sawmill in all of Idaho. When the neighboring Sunshine Mining Company needed a constant supply of mining timbers to operate, Mr. Whiteman saw an opportunity and financed his lumber company by becoming the mine's primary and reliable lumber source. Whiteman Lumber then expanded distribution to other surrounding mines until arduous environmental regulations caused the decline of the mineral markets in the area.

Brad and Mary Corkill bought Whiteman Lumber in 1988 and maintained the strong relationship with the Sunshine Mining Company until its closure in 2001. Since then, Mr. Corkill has grown the business by focusing on both the national and local markets, selling materials to individuals, timber framers, contractors, and wholesalers, in addition to the remaining regional silver mines. Whiteman Lumber also supports the Silver Valley community by sustaining a supply of almost exclusively large logs from local mills, which are no longer capable of milling bigger trees. Moreover, they add a distinctive rustic look to their product by using circular saw technology and offer customized kiln drying to achieve specific levels of lumber moisture content for their clients.

Whiteman Lumber Company continues to be an essential part of the Silver Valley thanks to fortitude and their longstanding relationships with buyers. In 2009, the middle of the recession, a fire burned down the lumber mill, but Mr. Corkill quickly rebuilt into a more efficient layout and had their employees back to work within the year, several of whom are still related to Harry Whiteman.

The family-run business of the Whiteman Lumber Company is perfect representation of resiliency. They survived a devastating fire and the collapse of the mining industry by giving their clients desirable products while also giving back to their community. Mr. Corkill's business model is a vital tool that can be used by small businesses across the country striving to support the local and national economy while maintaining their own permanency.•

RECOGNIZING THE STODDARD FAMILY

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Stoddard family of Sandown, NH. In May of 2010, Cole Stoddard was diagnosed with neuroblastoma, a form of childhood cancer. Cole was 4 years old at the time of his diagnosis, and he passed away nearly a year and a half later on January 20, 2012, at the age of 5. Since Cole's passing, his parents, Tony and Michelle Stoddard, and their children, Tara and Troy, have made it their mission to raise awareness about childhood cancer and encourage people throughout the country to learn more about the disease that annually takes the lives of nearly 1,500 children in the United States.

The Stoddard family has worked tirelessly over the past year in their efforts to designate the month of September 2013 as ''Childhood Cancer Awareness Month,'' and 41 States have already signed on and made this designation. Tony has also encouraged people to wear the color gold in September to further raise awareness about this devastating disease. Tony's advocacy has brought the Stoddard family to the famed Fenway Park in Boston, MA to raise awareness about childhood cancer, and Boston's Prudential Center was lit gold to acknowledge the cause. Landmarks in places as far as Australia, Ireland, and Switzerland have been colored gold to recognize Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

In the United States, approximately 11,500 children under the age of 15 will be or have been diagnosed with childhood cancer this year. It is the leading cause of death by disease in children in our country, and its causes are largely unknown. While medical research has led to better treatment and a significant increase in 5-year survival rates over the last 30 years, more needs to be done.

I would like to thank and recognize the Stoddard family for their tireless work toward raising awareness about childhood cancer. Their noble efforts have already made a positive impact on thousands of young lives, and I know that I join all of New Hampshire this September in wishing them the best of luck as they continue their mission in Cole's honor and memory.•

CONNECTICUT LAKES HEADWATER PROJECT

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 10th anniversary of the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Project.

In 2001, as Governor of New Hampshire, I partnered with my friend and our former colleague, Senator Judd Gregg, to form the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Partnership Task Force. This broad coalition joined forces to protect the largest remaining undeveloped block of New Hampshire land from future commercial and industrial development. We developed a bipartisan plan for conserving the land for traditional recreational use and forestry.

Ten years ago marked the completion of the final phase of the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Project, which in total protects 171,000 acres in Pittsburg, Clarksville, and Stewartstown. This wonderful project enjoyed the support of the thousands of community members who live and work in New Hampshire's North Country. This land includes pristine undeveloped lakes, crystal-clear streams, and healthy forests of balsam fir, maples, and birches.

These treasured lands are integral to our State's economy and environmental heritage. It is a working forest where value for man is managed in concert with value for wildlife. They are home to some of New Hampshire's most scenic areas and notable, rare species, such as the loon and bald eagle. Each year, tourists and Granite Staters alike travel to the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters to enjoy the spectacular scenery and diverse recreational activities the area has to offer, including hunting, fishing, canoeing, and snowmobiling. Between its tourism and timber-related jobs, this land contributes vitality to the North Country's economy.

Today, the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters are a cherished part of New

Hampshire's identity, and the people of New Hampshire are committed to preserving this inspiring landscape for future generations.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 29, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:28 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2251. An act 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''.

H.R. 2848. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3204. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3210. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. GALLEGO of Texas.

At 3:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:08 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. 3210. An act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN).

At 9:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2251. An act 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''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2848. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Methyl Parathion; Removal of Expired Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9401–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''FD and C Blue No. 1; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9396–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''FD and C Yellow No. 5; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9400–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3176. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Litchi Fruit from Australia'' ((RIN0579–AD56) (Docket No. APHIS–2009–0084)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3177. A communication from the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3178. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3179. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3180. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Grain-Shipment and Grain-Shipment Assist Vessels'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3181. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Delaware River; Wilmington, DE'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0827)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3182. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; America's Cup Aerobatic Box, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0741)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3183. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; 2013 Annual Islamorada Swim for Alligator Lighthouse, Atlantic Ocean, Islamorada, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0663)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3184. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Pro Hydro-X Tour, Atlantic Ocean, Islamorada, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0762)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3185. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Catawba Island Club Wedding Event, Catawba Island Club, Catawba Island, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0840)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3186. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area—Tappan Zee Bridge Construction Project, Hudson River; South Nyack and Tarrytown, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0705)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3187. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Frogtown Race Regatta; Maumee River, Toledo, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0839)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3188. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Dayton-Springfield Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9901–09 Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3189. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; PM10; Redesignation of Sacramento to Attainment; Approval of PM10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Sacramento'' (FRL No. 9901–29–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3190. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for Salt Lake County and Davis County'' (FRL No. 9786–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3191. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California'' (FRL No. 9831–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3192. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Emergency Orders'' (FRL No. 9901–30 Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3193. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 9833–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3194. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; States of Michigan and Minnesota; Regional Haze'' (FRL No. 9901–31–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3195. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference'' (FRL No. 9900–05–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3196. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Redesignation of Connecticut Portion of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut Nonattainment Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-hour Standards for Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9901–11–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3197. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Miscellaneous Metal and Plastic Parts which Includes Pleasure Craft Coating Operations'' (FRL No. 9901–20–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3198. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL No. 9832–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3199. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9900–74–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3200. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9900–96–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3201. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM 2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM 2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; Colorado'' (FRL No. 9901–04–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3202. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Stage II Requirements for Enterprise Holdings, Inc. at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport in Boone County'' (FRL No. 9901–23–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3203. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a) (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9901–22–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3204. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Louisiana: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program'' (FRL No. 9819–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3205. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule for the Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions

Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area'' (FRL No. 9901–21–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3206. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality: Revision to Definition to Volatile Organic Compounds—Exclusion of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene'' (FRL No. 9900–53–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3207. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation Request for the Wheeling, WV–OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9901–41–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3208. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Thurston County Second 10-Year PM 10 Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9901–34–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3209. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Secretary of the Army's report relative to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3210. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application of Windsor Decision and Rev. Rul. 2013–17 to Employment Taxes and Special Administrative Procedures for Employers to Make Adjustments or Claims for Refund or Credit'' (Notice 2013–61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3211. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clarification of Notice 2013–29'' (Notice 2013–60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3212. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—October 2013'' (Rev. Rul. 2013–21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3213. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–098); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3214. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) Medical Malpractice Program Regulations: Clarification of FTCA Coverage for Services Provided to Non-Health Center Patients'' (RIN0906–AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3215. A communication from the Director of the Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Implementing the Byrd Amendments to the Black Lung Benefits Act: Determining Coal Miners' and Survivors' Entitlement to Benefits'' (RIN1240–AA04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3216. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's budget submission for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3217. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA–3363-EM in the State of Texas having exceeded the $5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3218. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–148, ''Private Contractor and Subcontractor Prompt Payment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3219. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–149, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 77, S.O. 12–6036, Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3220. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–152, ''Marriage Officiant Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3221. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–153, ''JaParker Deoni Jones Birth Certificate Equality Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3222. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–154, ''Criminal Record Sealing Temporary Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3223. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–155, ''Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Board of Directors Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3224. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–156, ''Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Clarification and Title Insurance Clarification and Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3225. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9396–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3226. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9399–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3227. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9397–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3228. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kathleen M. Gainey, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3229. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kurt A. Cichowski, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3230. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Edward A. Rice, Jr., United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3231. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Claude R. Kehler, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3232. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Richard W. Hunt, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3233. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Approval of Lending Institutions and Mortgagees: Streamlined Reporting Requirements for Small Supervised Lenders and Mortgagees'' (RIN2502–AJ00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3234. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3235. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3236. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, the July 2013 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3237. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened'' (RIN1018–AY76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3238. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened'' (RIN1018–AY15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3239. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Neosho Mucket and Threatened Status for the Rabbitsfoot'' (RIN1018–AX73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3240. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Threatened Status for the Streaked Horned Lark'' (RIN1018–AY18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3241. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark'' (RIN1018–AZ36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3242. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Echinomastus erectocentrus var. acunensis (Acuna Cactus) and Pediocactus peeblesianus var. fickeiseniae (Fickeisen Plains Cactus) Throughout Their Ranges'' (RIN1018–AY51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3243. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard Program'' (FRL No. 9900–89–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3244. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; Removal of Obsolete Regulations and Updates to Citations to State Regulations Due to Recodification; Correction'' (FRL No. 9901–40–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3245. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards and State Board Requirements'' (FRL No. 9901–35–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3246. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana'' (FRL No. 9901–53–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3247. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Dayton-Springfield, Steubenville-Weirton, Toledo, and Parkersburg-Marietta; 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 9901–61–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3248. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Canton-Massillon Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9901–63–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3249. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Illinois; Redesignation of the Chicago Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard'' (FRL No. 9901–44–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3250. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Review of Experiments for Research Reactors'' (Regulatory Guide 2.4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3251. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to continuing disability reviews (CDR) completed in fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3252. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to Syria (OSS 2013–1594); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3253. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–078); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3254. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–130); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3255. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3256. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–100); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3257. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–147); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3258. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–142); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3259. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3260. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Turtles Intrastate and Interstate Requirements'' (Docket No. FDA–2013–N–0639) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 2, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3261. A communication from the Director of the Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation Division, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to Domestic Service'' (RIN1235–AA05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3262. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Fiscal Year 2014–2018 Strategic Plan for

the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3263. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Certification Process for State Capital Counsel System'' (RIN1121–AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3264. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned and Veteran-Owned Small Business Status Protest'' (RIN2900–AM92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3265. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XC817) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3266. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XC836) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3267. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC850) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3268. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area'' (RIN0648–XC856) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3269. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Queen Conch Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Regulatory Amendment 2'' (RIN0648–BD15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3270. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restriction'' (RIN0648–BD57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3271. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BD39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3272. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2012 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title and with an amended preamble:

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.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 227. A resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Nominee: Caroline B. Kennedy.

Post: Japan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: $2,500, 03/26/2009, Jennifer Brunner Committee; $1,000.00, 09/30/2009, Friends Of Patrick J. Kennedy Inc.; $1,000.00, 09/30/2009, Bill White For Texas; $250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $250.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $500.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $500.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $1,000.00, 02/10/2012, Obama for America; $1,000.00, 03/28/2012, John Lewis For Congress; $2,250.00, 05/5/2012, Obama for America; $1,500.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; $2,500.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; $1,000.00, 06/26/21012, Elizabeth For Ma Inc.; $250.00, 06/30/2012, Elizabeth For Ma Inc.

Joint Fundraising Contributions: $500.00, 06/30/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $500.00, 09/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $500.00, 09/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012.

Recipient of Joint Fundraising Contributions: $500.00, 06/25/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; $500.00, 09/14/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; $500.00, 09/14/2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee; $2,000.00 07/8/2004, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee.

2. Spouse: Edwin A. Schlossberg: $1000.00, 07/12/2009, Friends of Chris Dodd; $500.00, 09/13/2010, Tommy Sowers For Congress; $1,000.00, 02/28/2012, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; $1,000.00, 06/26/2012, John Lewis For Congress; $2,000.00 09/28/2012, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; $1,000.00, 02/22/2013, Elizabeth Colbert Busch For Congress

Joint Fundraising Contributions: $5,000.00, 09/12/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $5,000.00, 09/25/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012.

Recipient of Joint Fundraising Contributions: $416.00, 09/12/2012, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; $333.00, 09/12/2012; Democratic Party of Wisconsin; $277.00, 09/12/2012, Iowa Democratic Party; $277.00, 09/12/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; $2,500.00, 09/12/2012, Obama for America; $666.00, 09/12/2012, Ohio Democratic Party; $388.00, 09/25/2012, Colorado Democratic Party; $833.00, 09/25/2012, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; $666.00, 09/25/2012, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; $555.00, 09/25/2012, Iowa Democratic Party; $555.00, 09/25/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; $133.00, 09/25/2012, Ohio Democratic Party; $250.00, 10/17/2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; $500.00, 10/26/2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; $555.00, 11/26/2012, Nevada State Democratic Party.

3. Children and Spouses: Rose Kennedy Schlossberg (single): $250.00, 12/06/2009, Citizens for Alan Khazei; $200.00, 02/12/2008, Obama for America; $250.00, 09/23/2011, Obama for America. Tatiana Celia Kennedy Scholssberg (single): $150.00, 09/27/2008, Obama for America. John Bouvier Kennedy Schlossberg (single): None.

4. Parents; John Fitzgerald Kennedy—deceased; Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy Onassis—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr.—deceased; Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy—deceased; John Vernou Bouvier, III—deceased; Janet Norton Lee—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Brother: John F. Kennedy, Jr.—deceased; Brother's Spouse: Carolyn Bessette—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses—None.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2014.

*Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 29, 2017.

*Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2015.

*Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

*Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1560. A bill to allow certain emergency relief amounts to be made available to the Federal Highway Administration to use for disasters occurring in calendar year 2013; considered and passed.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1561. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1562. A bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1563. A bill to provide for the expansion of the biofuels market; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1564. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1565. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1566. A bill to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas; considered and passed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 55, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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. 644

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 644, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 893, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) 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. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) 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 names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors 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. RES. 261

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 261, a resolution designating the week beginning September 23, 2013, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week.''

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor 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.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, October 2, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark up S. _____, Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization act of 2013; S. _____, CHIMP Act Amendments of 2013; H.R. 2094, School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act; S. _____, Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2013; the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, to serve as Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education; James Cole Jr., to serve as General Counsel, Department of Education; and Chai Feldblum, to serve as Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224–5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 30, 2013 at 6:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013, AT 9:30 A.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:18 a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

DANA J. HYDE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION, VICE DANIEL W. YOHANNES.

INTER–AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

MARK E. LOPES, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTER–AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE GUSTAVO ARNAVAT, RESIGNED.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTER–AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

LANHEE J. CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2018, VICE MARK J. WARSHAWSKY, TERM EXPIRED.

ALAN L. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2016, VICE DANA K. BILYEU, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China, which commemorates the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising on October 10, 1911, and led to the establishment of the Republic of China—more commonly known as Taiwan.

For decades, Taiwan has been a significant partner to the United States in regards to its security, economic, and political interests. Taiwan has acted as a model democracy in the Pacific region where the people of Taiwan enjoy self-governance with democratic elections. In addition to Taiwan's political contributions to the region, it is also a vital economy in the Pacific. Because of this, I believe Taiwan should be allowed to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership sooner rather than later.

Taiwan, however, is not only an economic player in the Pacific, it also plays and important role in the U.S. economy. In 2012, Taiwan was the 11th largest U.S. trading partner and it's the 7th largest market for U.S. agricultural products. In light of this, I encourage the Administration to solidify a bilateral investment agreement with Taiwan, as it would boost both trade and investments for both parties.

As we go forward with this mutually beneficial partnership, it is important that we continue diplomatic visits to Taiwan; and, in return, we should invite Taiwan officials to the United States. By doing this we will see better understanding and respect between our countries.

HONORING CRISTIANI EXCAVATING

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, individuals and families benefit when businesses, big and small, are able to help communities maximize their economic potential. In Southern Indiana, Dan Cristiani is one outstanding example of a small business owner who harnesses the talent and work ethic of his employees to improve their community.

At just fifteen years old, Mr. Cristiani started his first business by cutting down timber and selling it as firewood. Today his company—Dan Cristiani Excavating—is a full service business that sells and rents heavy equipment, distributes topsoil and mulch, and offers waste disposal services for individuals and companies.

In addition to owning a thriving business, Mr. Cristiani has become a recognized community philanthropist. He is particularly involved with Clark County 4–H, saying, ''My dad was involved in Floyd County 4–H, and I guess I'm kind of a chip off the old block.'' In 2002, he started a consignment auction to help raise money for the organization. The annual event provides an opportunity for individuals and businesses to sell farm equipment that is no longer needed, typically generating between $15,000 and $20,000 for 4–H. Additionally, he donates money for 4–H project animals. There is no doubt that 4–H plays an essential role in educating children about the benefits of agriculture throughout Indiana's 9th District, and I appreciate that he is helping give children access to this wonderful organization.

Beyond his contributions to 4–H, Mr. Cristiani and his excavating company help provide many other services to Clark County, such as funds and equipment for a new baseball park. But perhaps his greatest impact is felt when the community is most in need. For example, in 2004 a tornado struck the north edge of Borden, Indiana, and he immediately sent his excavating equipment and crew to the affected area to begin cleanup. He did so under no pretense of being paid, and there was no guarantee of reimbursement for equipment use or staff salaries. Despite that, his team stayed in the area for weeks providing assistance to Hoosiers when they most needed it. As a result, Borden was back on its feet much more quickly than other towns impacted by the storm.

Dan Cristiani and Dan Cristiani Excavating are representative of the small businesses in which Hoosiers in Indiana's 9th District take pride. Their commitment and generosity prove that, whether big or small, businesses of any size can make a positive contribution to their community. I am proud to represent such sturdy Americans, and I am pleased to highlight their good works in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today in this installment of Indiana's 9th District Small Business Spotlight.

RICHARD LUTHCKE RETIREMENT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Richard Luthcke on his retirement from the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department.

Mr. Luthcke served with the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department for 23 years, retiring in February 2013. For 10 of those years, he was a detective in the homicide department, helping to find justice for murder victims and answers for their families and friends. Before working for the department, Mr. Luthcke served in the United States Navy for four years. Presently, he works for the Stroud Area Regional Police Department as a homicide detective on cold case murders in Monroe County.

Mr. Speaker, for 23 years Mr. Luthcke served to protect the Pocono Mountain community from danger and find justice for victims of homicide. Therefore, I commend Richard Luthcke on his retirement from the Pocono Mountain Regional Police Department and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING DENISE WEAR FOR EXEMPLARY COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the enduring efforts of Mrs. Denise Wear on the occasion of the Chinese Newcomers Service Center Benefit on September 27, 2013 in San Francisco, California. For over 25 years, Denise Wear has devoted substantial time, talent, and resources to help raise funds and support for various community groups and she has coordinated many regional events for children and families.

Mrs. Wear has dedicated herself to many causes and organizations seeking to improve our communities including Friends of China Camp State Park, Bay Area Discovery Museum, and Asian Scholarship Fund. Through her efforts she has been instrumental in promoting the history of the early Chinese immigrants and appreciation of Chinese language and culture.

Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Mrs. Denise Wear for her long and impressive record of service to the Asian community in Marin County and to our entire Bay Area Community.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDMUND REGALIA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank Edmund L. Regalia for his many years of service as Founding Director of the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund.

Established in 1968 in memory of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert F. Kennedy the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund provides financial aid to graduating community college students from minority groups under-represented at California's four-year colleges and universities. Many award winning students have excelled academically but are faced with financial hardships.

Since its creation forty-five years ago, the Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund has raised well over $3.5 million to help send more than 600 community college students from Contra Costa to four-year universities. None of this would be possible without Ed Regalia's

dynamic leadership in the community and his unwavering commitment to students.

Recently Ed was named a ''Hometown Hero'' by our own Bay Area News Group-East Bay in partnership with Comcast Corporation specifically recognizing his work with Kennedy-King Memorial Scholarship Fund. For those of us who have known and worked with Ed these many years, the term Hometown Hero is certainly fitting. He and his wife, Gwen, have made a decided difference not only in the lives of the deserving students but through their community service and philanthropic work. Truly, they have touched the lives of all of us in Contra Costa County.

Please join me in congratulating Ed and Gwen Regalia for their dedication to our students and our community, and I commend my colleagues to read the following article recognizing their work:

[From the Contra Costa Times, Sept. 3, 2013]

HOMETOWN HERO: WALNUT CREEK ATTORNEY'S 40 YEARS OF HANDING OUT MINORITY COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS

(By Matthias Gafni)

Shortly after Robert Kennedy was assassinated in June 1968 and months after Martin Luther King Jr. had been killed, a young Ed Regalia met with his Democratic Club in a friend's Walnut Creek backyard.

The idealistic young attorney, along with wife Gwen and others, thought of how they could honor the two men's contributions to society. They decided to create a scholarship fund for low-income, minority students in Contra Costa County. They consulted a black professor at Diablo Valley College, Regalia said.

''He set up a program that he recommended, and we followed his rules,'' Regalia said in a recent interview from his Walnut Creek home.

More than four decades later, the Kennedy-King Memorial College Scholarship Fund has helped send more than 600 Contra Costa community college students to four-year universities, raising more than $3.5 million.

''We're very grateful,'' said Regalia, now 82, retired and recovering from a stroke five years ago.

The well-known attorney, whose wife served as Walnut Creek's mayor for many years, still sits on the fund's board. His work with minority students began even earlier, when he was a 16-year-old El Cerrito High student leading the Del Mar Hi-Y club. A district official wrote a letter to the teenage Regalia in 1948 about a recital, saying, ''The spirit of your organization in being willing to agree to sponsor a colored boy before the public was, to me, far more important.'' It was a year after Jackie Robinson had broken the color barrier in baseball, his wife pointed out.

Regalia was born in El Cerrito; his father laid bricks for a living. Regalia attended nearby UC Berkeley while earning a scholarship from the Navy. He served three years during the latter part of the Korean War, leaving the military as a lieutenant before returning to Cal and graduating from Boalt Law School.

By 1964, Regalia joined Boalt classmates Harry Miller and Marvin Starr to form the Miller Starr Regalia law firm. Dealing almost exclusively in civil litigation, Regalia led the firm in real estate and business issues, representing title companies, banks, savings and loans, and other companies.

The father of four was involved in many major cases, litigating once for a woman whose house was damaged from a landslide. That case wound its way to the state Supreme Court and led to requirements to provide disclosures for homebuyers.

His work with the scholarship fund raised some eyebrows, with most thinking it would quickly fizzle out.

At the inaugural dinner, held June 14, 1969, in Concord, Regalia's group awarded $2,000 scholarships each to the first two recipients. The organization spent months personally collecting pledges from various politicians and Contra Costa movers and shakers. U.S. Rep. George Miller's father, then a state senator, pulled a $100 bill from his money clip when the couple approached him, Gwen Regalia said. The younger George Miller continues to raise $8,000 each year to fund a scholarship, she added.

The fund has always reached across the political aisle. At the first dinner, the speakers included former Democratic U.S. Reps. Pete Stark and Jerome Waldie, and Republican State Sen. John Nejedly.

Over the years, more and more of the fundraising came from corporations, enabling more students to get help. The fund requires low-income minority students to have spent two years at one of Contra Costa's three community colleges, and the scholarships help pay for their junior and senior years at four-year universities. Graduate school scholarships also are available.

Alameda County deputy district attorney Mark Jackson, who is black, received an undergraduate scholarship in 1988 as a Contra Costa College undergraduate, and it allowed him to finish his degree at San Francisco State. He won the scholarship again in 1991 as he tackled his law degree at Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco.

As a college student, Jackson struggled to earn enough money to attend college.

''The scholarship was very helpful in enabling me, in conjunction with working two jobs and with my family's help, in graduating college without any student loan debt,'' Jackson said. ''These students need every dollar they can get from this program.''

Jackson, now 45, has since served on the scholarship's board and started a pre-law program at Contra Costa College.

''Whenever they finished and got a job, they were expected to devote their time in the community,'' said Gwen Regalia, who has served on the scholarship fund board, as well as 21 years on the Walnut Creek City Council and nine years on the Walnut Creek school district board.

In May, Ed Regalia's organization awarded scholarships to another 20 students who will attend undergraduate and graduate schools, including San Francisco State, UC Berkeley, Mills College, University of Alaska, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Cal State East Bay, Holy Names University and Samuel Merritt University.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 491, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

RECOGNIZING THE WEDDING OF ASHLEY SHILLINGSBURG AND MICHAEL ALDERFER

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the upcoming wedding of Ashley Shillingsburg and Michael Alderfer. Having worked in my D.C. office for the last five years, Ashley is someone I have come to greatly respect and rely on. She is tirelessly committed to her job and commands a wide range of policy expertise. Ashley is an invaluable asset and a cornerstone of my D.C. operation.

This is why I am happy to stand here today in recognition of her upcoming wedding to Michael Alderfer on October 5, 2013 at Willow Creek Winery in our neighboring West Cape May, NJ. Michael Alderfer, while not a Philadelphian, is an accomplished young man with a bright future and, as of equal importance, an avid Eagles fan. Being married to an incredibly bright woman, one who challenges me every day in the best of ways for over 16 years, I am confident that Michael and Ashley will treat each other with the love, dignity, and respect that guarantee a long-lasting marriage.

It is a privilege to recognize a person who has become such an integral part of my office. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Ashley and Michael on their upcoming nuptials and wishing them a bright and happy future together.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Saturday, September 28, 2013. I was traveling back to DC from family obligations in La Crosse, and my flight was delayed due to fog in Detroit. Had I been present, I would have voted against H. Res. 361 (Roll No. 493).

RECOGNIZING 110 YEARS OF WORSHIP AT CALVIN UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to congratulate Calvin United Church of Christ in Toledo, Ohio as it celebrates 110 years of worship in the historic Birmingham neighborhood of Toledo's East Side. Worshipers will come together in a special celebration on Sunday, September 29, 2013.

Toledo's Birmingham neighborhood was established and grew when Hungarian workers were relocated from Cleveland to Toledo to work in foundries. More and more Hungarian workers came to Toledo and the neighborhood

quickly established itself. In 1891, these immigrants founded the Magyar Reformed Church. The building was designed by local architect T. W. Matz and was completed in 1901. Echoing features of Hungarian village churches, its design is that of Hungarian Neo-Baroque church, with a tower, four round arched windows and round-shaped clocks pointing to each cardinal direction. The Hungarian coat-of-arms can be found on the bottom of each of the stained glass windows. The church stands still at its original location at the corner of Bogar and Bakewell Streets in Toledo.

The church was incorporated by the State of Ohio as the Hungarian Church of Toledo on June 16, 1903. The name was changed to Calvin United Church of Christ in 1962.

Since its beginning, Calvin United Church of Christ has been an anchor of Toledo's East Side and its Birmingham neighborhood. Its members are community leaders and the church is a good neighbor. Following the Scriptures call in 1 Chronicles 16:9 to "Sing to Him, sing praises to Him; meditate on and talk of all His wondrous works and devoutly praise them!" Calvin United Church of Christ's faithful have lived Christ's Word across three centuries and continue a proud tradition in its neighborhood. We are pleased to congratulate the congregation as it approaches its 110th anniversary, and look forward to its efforts in Christ's service for years to come.

HIGHLIGHTING SEPTEMBER AS SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to promote awareness of the fact that September is "Suicide Prevention Month," and to specifically highlight the vulnerabilities of our nation's veteran community.

Tragically, the Department of Veterans Affairs reports that, on average, 22 United States military members and veterans commit suicide every day. Not all battle wounds are visible from the outside.

Please stand with me to help emphasize, not only to our hurting veterans but every American in need of help that people matter—relationships matter—and their lives remain full of hope and meaning.

When a loved one is in crisis, even the smallest act can make a lifesaving difference. I ask that we all take time to learn to recognize signs of isolation, withdrawal and suicidal behavior. And further, I ask that when we grow concerned for an individual, we become proactive and reach out to appropriately address the situation.

To all those who are hurting—no matter what problems you are dealing with, you can find a reason to keep living. If you are a veteran in need of help, please call 1–800–273–8255 or for non-veterans please call 1–800–273–TALK.

It's time to act, because "It Matters."

HONORING MR. HERMAN J. "PETE" MATTHEWS

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. Herman J. "Pete" Matthews, Jr. Mr. Matthews will be receiving the Labor Man of the Year Award at this year's Friend of Labor Committee of Laborers' Local 332 Annual Black Tie Charity Dinner.

Mr. Matthews has served as President of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) for District Council 33 since 1996 and has brought true union democracy to its membership. Before this position, Mr. Matthews served as the Business Agent of Local 394 for thirteen years. Building upon his education from Temple University, Mr. Matthews completed the Harvard University Trade Union Leaders Institute and regularly attends continuing education courses on labor and health care at Harvard University. Mr. Matthews is an active member of many boards, including the Executive Board of the Philadelphia AFL–CIO and the AFSCME International Judicial Panel. He is committed to his position as President of District Council 33 and is a force for stability and positive change in all communities of the City of Philadelphia.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to community has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Matthews for his lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 490 I was unable to be present for the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Thursday, September 26, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of approving H.R. 3095 (roll No. 486), in favor of approving H.R. 2600 (roll No. 487), in favor of approving the Journal (roll No. 488), in favor of the Grijalva amendment to H.R. 687 (roll 489), and in favor of the Napolitano amendment to H.R. 687 (roll 490).

ALCOA INC. 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Alcoa Inc., which is celebrating 125 years in the aluminum industry this year.

Alcoa was originally founded as the Pittsburgh Reduction Company in 1888 by Charles Martin Hall. Mr. Hall discovered a way to produce aluminum through electrolysis, sparking the modern aluminum industry both here and abroad. Starting with their creation of the first prototype aluminum tea kettle, they have been behind major milestones in fields ranging from aerospace to consumer electronics.

Today, Alcoa remains one of the most admired metals companies in the world, employing approximately 61,000 people in 30 countries. They are the leading global producer of primary aluminum and fabricated aluminum, as well as the largest miner of bauxite and refiner of alumina. The company's innovations have led to the creation of products such as the world's lightest planes and most fuel efficient cars.

Mr. Speaker, for 125 years Alcoa Inc. has served to create innovative and sustainable solutions in the aluminum field. Therefore, I commend all the personnel who have worked at this industry leader.

GOV'T SHUTDOWN FAIRNESS ACT

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again remind my colleagues here in the House, and in the Senate, that we are employees of the American people. Employees charged with operating a federal government that works for those people—our constituents.

For lawmakers, a shutdown of the federal government is the ultimate admission of failure to do your job. Simply put, if we can't find a way to fund the government, than we shouldn't accept a paycheck. It's that simple.

That's why I support the Government Shutdown Fairness Act which codifies just that.

It is the primary responsibility of governing bodies, no matter how big or small: to pass a budget and appropriate tax dollars so the government can function. As a government shutdown is unacceptable to me, it's important to let the American people know that should it happen, Members of Congress won't continue cashing in while Americans pay the price.

Americans know that getting paid should be tied to getting the job done. This legislation, like 'No Budget, No Pay' says it's time lawmakers be held accountable. It is my hope this legislation will never have to take affect because no one should have to deal with a government shutdown.

HONORING MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY—WEST PLAINS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Missouri State University—West Plains on 50 years of service to South Central Missouri. September 16, 2013 marked the exact date 50 years ago the university began offering classes at the West Plains campus. Since the campus opened its doors, MSU—West Plains has provided area residents with access to affordable and quality education. I applaud hard work of the university staff and the continued support of the surrounding community that has helped the West Plains campus thrive since 1963.

The university has expanded significantly since its founding, with an average enrollment of 2,200 students. This institution has also been recognized as one of the top two-year schools in the nation and as a military friendly school. Transforming the landscape of education in the region, MSU—West Plains has had a significant impact on the lives of many local Missourians. Over 700 community members attended the 50th anniversary celebration, during which a time capsule was created to be opened 50 years from now.

I offer the highest congratulations to Missouri State University—West Plains Chancellor Drew Bennett and Missouri State University System President Clif Smart on this accomplishment. I look forward to another 50 years of success for Missouri State University—West Plains.

HONORING MR. W. CODY ANDERSON

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Mr. W. Cody Anderson. Mr. Anderson will be receiving the Outstanding Community Leader Award at this year's Friend of Labor Committee of Laborers' Local 332 Annual Black Tie Charity Dinner.

Mr. Anderson has committed himself to the field of broadcast radio for more than 35 years, beginning in the Sales Department of WDAS Radio and working his way to become the President and General Manager of the station. He is widely considered a leading communicator to African-American and urban-based communities and has long-standing relationships with leaders and organizations throughout the region. His expertise in community and grassroots based marketing has allowed him to build one of Philadelphia's most influential talk radio stations, 900AM WURD. He is consistently listed as one of Philadelphia's Top Ten Influential African-Americans and remains concerned with and accessible to community members and the issues they face. Throughout his very busy and successful career he has served as a member and advisor for several community organizations such as Action AIDS and the African-American Interdenominational Ministries, Inc., and is an Ambassador in the Team Pennsylvania Outreach Program.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to community has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Anderson for his lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 489, I was unable to be present for the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. ___, THE FREE MARKET ROYALTY ACT

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R.___, the Free Market Royalty Act (FMRA), which creates a "performance right" that will obligate AM/FM radio stations to compensate performers for the use of their music just as cable, satellite, and Internet radio are obligated to do. Currently, cable, satellite, and Internet radio compensate writers, publishers and performers for the use of their music. However, when a song is played on AM/FM radio, the songwriter and publisher receive compensation, but the performer does not. The failure of terrestrial broadcasters to compensate the vocalists, musicians, and background performers sets the U.S. apart from most industrialized nations where performers are compensated for their performances. As a result of this lack of reciprocity, royalties collected internationally for over-the-air performances are not available to American sound recording artists.

As part of the revision process that culminated in the Copyright Act of 1976, the Register of Copyrights was directed to examine whether the performance right should be extended to sound recordings. The Register's study considered whether a law should be enacted providing a performance right for sound recordings and also evaluated copyright systems developed in foreign countries. The exhaustive study transmitted to Congress in 1978 found that "[s]ound recordings fully warrant a right of public performance" that would address a major gap in the copyright laws. However, AM/FM broadcasters have fought against this equitable change for the last 35 years contending that AM/FM stations provide unique and valuable promotion to performers.

In 1995, the Clinton Administration noted that "[t]he copyright owners of sound recordings should be able to decide for themselves, as do all other copyright owners, if 'free advertising' is sufficient compensation of their works. If the users' arguments regarding the benefit copyright owners derive from the public performance of their sound recordings are correct, the users should be able to negotiate a very low rate for a license to do so."

In 2009, I joined a broad, bipartisan majority of the House Judiciary Committee in favorably reporting the "Performance Rights Act" to the full House. The Senate judiciary Committee reported similar legislation to the full Senate. These bills would have established in law a performance right for sound recordings.

Airtime on AM/FM radio is no different from exposure on other mediums. Cable, satellite, and Internet radio also promote artists to new audiences, yet all these services pay performance royalties because clearly the value in these relationships runs both ways. AM/FM stations profit from advertising revenue. Why do advertisers pay? Because people listen. Why do people listen? To hear the songs. For many stations, take away the music and you take away the audience.

I was happy to hear Bob Pittman, the CEO and president of Clear Channel, the nation's largest broadcaster, say "[t]here are plenty of people in radio who think we already give the record labels so much by giving them free promotion to break their artists, and they say that ought to be enough. But clearly that is not enough, or there wouldn't be a decades-long battle over it." I agree that promotion is not adequate compensation.

I was less happy to hear the National Association of Broadcasters' claim that certain direct licensing deals that Mr. Pittman has reached with a handful of record labels illustrate that performance rights legislation is not needed. In fact, those deals expose the unfairness and inadequacy of the current system and they strongly point out the need for a legislative solution that will apply market wide. Indeed, Scott Borchetta, the president and CEO of Big Machine Records and one of the architects of the first private deal with Clear Channel that has become the template for others, wrote Congress in November that "the absolute need for legislation cannot be emphasized enough."

What these deals really highlight is the uneven patchwork of rights that infects any effort to negotiate in the market as it stands today. AM/FM broadcasters get songs for AM/FM airplay without paying a single cent to the performers. That gives them a source of revenue they can leverage in negotiations, for example to obtain lower royalty rates for digital radio play. But digital-only services don't have this unfair advantage. Meanwhile, only some labels and artists and only some broadcasters are in a position to undertake the costly negotiations that these deals require.

At the same time, Internet broadcasters have come to the Judiciary Committee to complain of the separate unfairness in the market under which they pay performance royalties at a different rate than satellite radio (which has its own illogical grandfathered exception) while AM/FM doesn't pay at all. In some respects, I agree. The Obama Administration recently echoed some of these concerns noting that "in the context of the growing digital audio market . . . there is still no public performance right when sound recordings are used by over-the-air FCC-licensed broadcasters. As a result, over-the-air broadcasters enjoy a competitive advantage over emerging digital services." The solution to all these problems is for everyone to pay and for all royalties to be set under

the same fair-market standard. That is essentially what the 2009 bill did.

Unfortunately, however, we've reached a legislative stalemate in which a reasonable compromise that virtually everyone agrees makes sense has become stuck. And the parties have all become locked into their positions and unwilling to make a move.

The FMRA seeks to end that stalemate by putting a new idea on the table that respects the equities and responds to the arguments of all. This bill creates an AM/FM performance right, to match the digital right that already exists in law. This would jumpstart meaningful private negotiations for all.

The FMRA's solution for royalty setting is the one the broadcasters have called for: let the market decide. But it also provides equal rights and bargaining power to both sides by allowing recording artists to reject offers they find unacceptable—something they currently cannot do under the copyright laws because the compulsory license requires them to make their music available. To implement this free market approach, the bill would repeal the existing compulsory license.

Internet radio says it pays too much, that the current "willing buyer, willing seller" standard results in rates that are too high. Under this bill, they may negotiate any rates they can. While Congress will establish a right, it will get out of the business of essentially establishing a price for that right. The value of music will be determined by the market.

There are of course many useful features of the current system that we should retain. Radio services have been able to use the compulsory licensing as one-stop licensing, allowing them to get access to any music they wish to use at an established price. To preserve that convenience to radio, the bill empowers broadcasters, and rights holders with SoundExchange as their agent, to collectively negotiate a one-stop licensing rate that will be available to all. Broadcasters and music creators are also free to negotiate separately alternative arrangements on top of those backstop terms.

Current law also contains critical protections for artists requiring that they receive a statutorily mandated fair share of performance royalties and that those royalties be paid directly to them through SoundExchange. The bill retains those requirements.

In 2009, we hoped all stakeholders could reach an agreement that would end the years of waiting for fair pay for airplay. This proposal makes it in everyone's interest to reach such an agreement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,433,470,635.61. We've added $6,111,556,421,722.53 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 492, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may be aware, September 2013 is National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month. This month gives us a valuable opportunity to call attention to this issue and what we can do to support people living with spinal cord injuries.

There are approximately 270,000 people living with spinal cord injuries in the United States. In particular, an estimated 100,000 of those people are veterans who sustained a spinal cord injury while serving as members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Approximately 12,000 new spinal cord injuries occur in the U.S. each year. In fact, every 48 seconds in our country, a person becomes paralyzed. A majority of these injuries occur from work-related accidents, motor vehicle accidents, sports injuries and falls.

The impact of spinal cord injuries is felt throughout our society. The estimated lifetime medical cost of a spinal cord injury can range from $1 million to $5 million, depending on the level of injury, and the ripple effects can be felt throughout other sectors, such as housing, job training and transportation.

Increased education and investment in research are key factors in improving outcomes for individuals with spinal cord injuries. Better treatments, therapies and access to the right equipment and services can go far toward both improving their quality of life and ultimately finding a cure for these injuries.

Throughout this month, awareness efforts have been taking place across the country to highlight the need to expand and build support for programs and initiatives that help people with spinal cord injuries.

I thank everyone who has participated in this month's activities, and I applaud the dedication of local, regional and national organizations, as well as the researchers, physicians, volunteers and people across the United States who are working to improve the quality of life of individuals and their families living with spinal cord injuries.

My hope is that we not only continue to make progress in this field, but that we also take every opportunity to elevate this issue and work toward finding solutions to help these thousands of people. I hope my colleagues will all join me in recognizing National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month.

HONORING MRS. BERTHA N. GODFREY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Bertha N. Godfrey. Mrs. Godfrey retired from her position as senior vice president of the Philadelphia Tribune on July 31st after working for the paper for 67 years.

With 129 years of service, the Philadelphia Tribune is the Nation's oldest continuously published African American newspaper and has employed Mrs. Godfrey for over half of its existence. Throughout her nearly seven decades of employment with the newspaper, Mrs. Godfrey rarely missed a day of work, totaling up to approximately 17,500 plus days. Mrs. Godfrey has been described as an anchor and a historian for the newspaper, serving four different presidents of the paper from 1946 until 1980. At 92 years of age she continues to be a vibrant and dedicated character in the lives of those around her and will be sorely missed at the Philadelphia Tribune.

I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mrs. Godfrey for her lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District and the Philadelphia Tribune. May we all learn from her legacy of hard work, commitment, and passion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 487, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ON THE PASSING OF MR. KENNETH EDWARD BENTSEN

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the legacy of the father of a dear friend. Our colleague, the former Member of Congress who represented large parts of the district I have the honor of representing today, Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr. lost his beloved father this past week. Ken's father was also the brother of the late former Senator, and Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen, Jr.

Kenneth Edward Bentsen died Tuesday morning, September 24, 2013 in Houston, Texas. Mr. Bentsen was a prominent architect in Houston spanning over four decades. He was married to the former Mary Dorsey Bates for 60 years, who survives him.

He attended the School of Architecture at the University of Texas, where he was a member of the Sigma Nu Fraternity. In his sophomore year, he enlisted in the Naval Air Corps.

Following the completion of his military service, he entered the new College of Architecture at the University of Houston. He graduated in 1952 with bachelor degrees in Science and Architecture. He had the good fortune to be a student of both Donald Barthelme and Howard Bamstone. The University of Houston hosts the Kenneth E. Bentsen Architectural Papers in the UH Library's Special Collections.

His first practical experience was with the firm Mackie and Kamrath. In 1958, he opened Kenneth Bentsen Associates Architects where he practiced until 1991. He chose to sell the firm following the completion of one of his most interesting projects, the 1,038,000 square foot Texas Children's Hospital Complex in the Texas Medical Center. It was the largest children's hospital in the United States at that time.

One of his favorite commissions was the City of Houston Summit Sports Arena, the original home of the Houston Rockets, which is now Lakewood Church. Another favorite was the Southwest Tower of the Bank of the Southwest. Perhaps the most rewarding of all of his projects was the opportunity to design 18 structures at Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas, now the University of Texas—Pan Am.

He also designed the State Bar Center in Austin; the Graduate School of Business at the University of Texas, Austin; the William Levin Learning Center and the Allied Health and Nursing School at University of Texas, Galveston; Agnes Arnold Hall and Phillip Guthrie Hoffman Hall at the University of Houston. For the Agnes Arnold Hall, he received the Award of Merit for Achievement of Excellence from the U.S. Office of Education, the American Institute of Architects and the Distinguished Alumnus Award for Architectural Excellence from the University of Houston.

The firm's design excellence was recognized with more than 100 architectural design awards. In 1971, Kenneth was inducted into the American Institute of Architecture College of Fellows (F.A.I.A.) in the Excellence of Design category. He was the first graduate of the University of Houston to be honored in this category.

He served on the National American Institute of Architects Committee on Design, The Houston and Texas Chapters of the American Institute of Architects, the Texas Commission on the Arts, as well as the boards of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, the Sarah Campbell Blaffer Gallery at the University of Houston and Texas Children's Hospital.

Kenneth was born in Mission, Texas on the 21st of November 1926 to Edna Colbath Bentsen and Lloyd M. Bentsen, Sr., who preceded him in death. In addition to his wife, he is survived by children: Molly Bates Bentsen, Betty Bentsen Newton and husband Stephen, Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr. and wife Tamra, William Lloyd Bentsen; grandchildren: Emmie Bentsen Zimmerman and husband Zachary, Elizabeth Newton, Louise Bentsen, Camille Newton and Meredith Bentsen; and great grandchildren: Chloe Zimmerman and Bentsen Zimmerman. He is also survived by his sister, Betty Bentsen Winn of McAllen; and sister-in-law, B.A. Bentsen of Houston; and many beloved cousins, nieces, and nephews. He was preceded in death by his brothers Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr. and Donald L. Bentsen.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, September 25, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1961 (Roll No. 484) and in favor of H. Res. 354 (Roll No. 485).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 486, I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING UPS FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO SERVING THE COMMUNITY AND RECOGNIZING THE EXCELLENCE OF 20 NORTHBROOK CIRCLE OF HONOR DRIVERS

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Northbrook UPS for its outstanding commitment to community service, to recognize the incredible safety records of 20 Circle of Honor drivers and to congratulate UPS on 106 years of business excellence.

What started as a small–time messenger service has grown into one of the world's most recognizable companies. Over the years, UPS has revolutionized the way we all do business and connected every corner of the world in ways we never thought possible. After 106 years of excellence, I look forward to what will come next.

At the local level, UPS has demonstrated a strong commitment to improving the community. In Illinois, UPS employees have logged more than 26,000 volunteer hours, and 1,800 of those were performed by employees from my district, Mr. Speaker. Beyond this dedication to community service, UPS employees are also committed to keeping our community safe.

With drivers on the road and pilots in the air every day, UPS has made safety paramount. In Northbrook, 20 drivers have qualified for the Circle of Honor, meaning 25 accident–free years on the road. This is an exemplary record, and I would like to honor the following drivers for achieving this mark:

John Hayes; Donald Babo; Brian Behm; Douglas Caldwell; Phillip Guido; Henry Sielck; Randall Kaufman; Steve Makowski; Will Woodfork JR.; Joseph Nowik; Steven Kass SR.; Douglas Soriano; Stephen Mann; James Twarowski; John Hill; Timothy Schwellenbach; John Truska; Richard Forney; Neil McGreevy; Robert Janiak.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate these drivers and thank UPS for its outstanding community service and leadership.

IN HONOR OF THE BIG SUR LAND TRUST

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Big Sur Land Trust on the occasion of its thirty-fifth anniversary. I have a deep personal history with and love for Big Sur's land and people. So it is a true personal honor to share the tribute with the House.

In 1978, seven families came together to ensure that Big Sur, California's beauty and quality of life would be preserved for later generations. Around kitchen tables and over potluck dinners, they decided that a land trust would enable their vision, and so was born the Big Sur Land Trust. These visionaries included Zad and Laela Leavy, Sherna and Kipp Stewart, Roger and Beverly Newell, Nancy Hopkins, Lloyd and Pat Addleman, Martin and Suzanne Forster, and Peter Harding. The Land Trust's first president was Nancy Hopkins, and Zad Leavy later served as its first executive director, devoting 25 years to the cause of conservation.

They thought big from the start. The Trust's first acquisition encompassed over 3,000 acres now known as the Circle M Ranch on the southern Big Sur Coast. It was a pioneering example of how to connect a conservation buyer, in this case David Packard, with the principles of stewardship and community collaboration in order to protect natural resources. This transaction even attracted national attention.

For the last thirty-five years, the Big Sur Land Trust has continued in this tradition by working with private landowners and conservation partners to ensure the conservation of more than 40,000 acres in Monterey County. Thanks to many generous donors and members, an interconnected network of parks, natural landscapes, trails, ranch- and farmlands, wildlife corridors, and coastal rivers and streams has been set aside for community benefit. Some of the most notable of these projects include 9,980 acres of the Palo Corona Ranch, 1,312 acres of the Point Lobos Ranch, 89 acres at the Odello Fields, and the 316 acres Whisler-Wilson Ranch. The Land Trust has also supported several conservation projects in the Salinas Valley as part of its effort to expand its conservation mission county wide. Some of these projects include conservation easements the Violini Ranch, the Dorrance Ranch, and the Arroyo Seco Ranch.

In an effort to broaden its impact and be in greater service to communities across Monterey County and the Salinas Valley, in 2007 the Land Trust acquired the 816-acre Marks Ranch near Salinas where the Land Trust partners with ranchers, artists, biologists, youth groups, and others to give urban youth the opportunity to experience the natural world. It is also using Glen Deven above the Big Sur Coast for more sustained and intimate wilderness experiences.

The Land Trust's journey over the past thirty-five years built accomplishments and inspired dreams that its founders could not have imagined: more than 40,000 acres conserved; a membership of 1,200 active community leaders, and a permanent home in an historic Monterey adobe. Its new strategic plan lays

out the Land Trust's vision: To inspire love of the land and conservation of our treasured landscapes.

Mr. Speaker, Big Sur is truly one of our national treasures and the Big Sur Land Trust has played an instrumental role in keeping it safe. I know I speak for the whole House in celebrating the Big Sur Land Trust's many achievements and wish it many more years of success.

GOV'T SHUTDOWN

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, let's cut through the static and stop throwing around terms like CR, shutdown and numbers like 988 and 1058.

Let's get to the crux of what's happening here tonight.

Congress has two basic jobs: Passing a budget; and Paying its bills.

The Republican Congress, right now, is refusing to do either. They're refusing to do our most basic duties and putting the American economy at risk in the process.

Here's what failure to keep the government running means for average Americans.

Tomorrow, Americans will continue to pay their taxes—same rates, same costs.

But tomorrow, Americans will get far less in return.

Tomorrow, the backlog at the VA will get worse; as Veterans Administration claims workers are furloughed.

Tomorrow, our troops will have to keep fighting on the frontlines in Afghanistan, but they will no longer get paid for their service.

Tomorrow, loans to American small businesses will stop.

Yes, Americans will pay their taxes tomorrow. They will do the right thing.

Yet we won't honor the taxpayers who sent us here by doing the most basic jobs we were entrusted to do.

If Americans still have to pay their taxes, we should still do our jobs.

The Republican House is holding hostage: benefits for our veterans, pay for our military, aid for American small businesses—all in the name of denying access to health insurance for hardworking Americans.

Let's do the right thing for those hardworking Americans—let's do our jobs and keep government running.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 28, I missed the following votes:

H. Res. 361—Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform of agricultural programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018.

On agreeing to the resolution had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 493.

H. Res. 366—Providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown

On ordering the previous question had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 494.

H. Res. 366—Providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 . . .

On agreeing to the resolution had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 495.

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."

On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 496.

H.J. Res. 59—Making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1 (permanently repeal medical device tax) had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 497.

H.J. Res. 59—Making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #2 (delay implementation of the ACA by one year) had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 498.

H.R. 3210—Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

On passage had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 499.

H.R. 2848—Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014.

On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 500.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, I was not present to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall vote 500—H.R. 2848: Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization, FY2014; "aye" on rollcall vote 499—H.R. 3210: Making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a government shutdown; "no" on rollcall vote 498—H.J. Res. 59: On concurring to the in the Senate amendment with amendment #2; "no" on rollcall vote 497, H.J. Res. 59: On concurring in the Senate amendment with amendment #1; "aye" on rollcall vote 496, H.R. 2251: On motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended; "no" on rollcall vote 495, H.Res. 366: Agreeing to the Resolution—Providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3210) making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; and "no" on rollcall vote 494, H.Res. 366: Ordering the Previous Question, Providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59), making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill.

CELEBRATING WHITE MEMORIAL MEDICAL CENTER'S CENTENNIAL

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate White Memorial Medical Center on its centennial celebration marking one hundred years of healing and caring for the people of Boyle Heights and the surrounding communities.

White Memorial Medical Center was founded in 1913 to improve the quality of life of the residents of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles by giving care to the whole person—body, mind and spirit. As a non-profit, faith-based, teaching hospital which provides our community with inpatient, outpatient, emergency and diagnostic services, White Memorial Medical Center embodies a unique sense of family, loyalty, trust and commitment.

White Memorial Medical Center plays an important role in training the next generation of physicians, nurses and other medical professionals. Its physicians are some of the finest in Los Angeles. White Memorial Hospital is known for quality outcomes and patient satisfaction. It is one of the top hospitals in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

White Memorial Medical Center employees, physicians and volunteers extend their mission of healing and caring by supporting community projects and organizations such as Dolores Mission, the Homeless Outreach Project and the House of Ruth. They also participate in medical missions around the world including Africa, Mexico, Haiti, Peru and the Philippines.

Through its ongoing operations, capital improvements and physician activities, each year White Memorial Medical Center generates approximately $1 billion in economic activity and supports more than 6,000 jobs in the Southern California region.

White Memorial Medical Center is a strong community anchor which provides quality health services that improve the health and well-being of all Angelenos.

I extend my sincere congratulations to White Memorial Medical Center on its centennial celebration, and I sincerely thank its outstanding staff and volunteers for their quality service to the Los Angeles community and for the significant impact they make in health care, medical education and charitable contributions.

May their outstanding service continue for another hundred years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIE MAE KIRK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary person, Mrs. Willie Mae Kirk.

Mrs. Kirk attended what now is known as Huston-Tillotson University, where she met her husband Lee Kirk. Lee and Willie Mae Kirk became the proud parents of four children. Mrs. Kirk served as a teacher for 32 years, where she championed equal opportunities for her students in East Austin and also helped lead protests against segregation at Austin businesses, schools and Barton Springs Pool. As a teacher, she lived a committed life ensuring the future of young Americans was a bright one.

Mrs. Kirk was a leader in her community and played an important role in Austin politics for over five decades. In her younger years she worked to repeal the poll tax and register African Americans to vote. Even late in life, she continued to speak out about how minorities were treated in Austin, particularly in the wake of police shootings. Last year, the city of Austin named the Willie Mae Kirk Branch library in her honor.

It is with great respect and admiration that I ask this esteemed body to keep her son, former Mayor of Dallas and former United States Trade Representative Ron Kirk and the rest of the Kirk family in our hearts and prayers. May we all rejoice in having known such a great woman and cherish both her memory and her legacy.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2013

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, October 10th will mark the 102nd Anniversary of the Wuchang uprising, which led to the establishment of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on January 1, 1912. The people of Taiwan pay tribute to this anniversary, known as the National Day of the Republic of China, through celebrations, parades, and fireworks, befitting its importance as a national holiday. Due to our cooperative and warm relationship over these many decades, it is also a special occasion worthy of tribute by this Congress as well.

This important anniversary also provides an opportunity for Congress to contemplate the current state of our bilateral relationship with Taiwan and to take proactive steps to enhance it.

In this rapidly evolving global economy, and with Taiwan's economic importance only growing, I believe now is the time for our two nations to further enhance economic and trade relations, such as the US considering a Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan. Taiwan is already the 10th largest trading partner with the US and I urge the Administration to conclude this bilateral agreement as soon as possible.

Concurrently, the US Trade Representative recently wrapped up the 19th round of negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I believe it's vitally important that this Agreement between the United States and Asian Pacific nations include Taiwan. My hope is for Taiwan to join the agreement expeditiously.

Finally, I look forward to continue to work toward a deepened relationship with Taiwan to achieve greater prosperity for both nations, and hope that such work can be undertaken through official diplomatic visits to the U.S. from Taiwan officials without obstruction.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 1, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 2

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine continued oversight of the ''Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act''.

SD–226

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.

SD–106

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding American manufacturing.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the ''America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act'' (America COMPETES), focusing on scientific research and the United States economy.

SR–253

OCTOBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine advanced biofuels, focusing on creating jobs and lower prices at the pump.

SR–328A

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Syria.

SVC–217

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine reversing Iran's nuclear program.

SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 42, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, S. 822, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and the nominations of Robert Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

SD–226

11 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director for Environment and Energy, and Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director for Science, both of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.
SR–253

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, all of the Department of State.
SD–419

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

OCTOBER 7

3 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Social Security disability benefits.
SD–342

OCTOBER 8

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SD–G50

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Subcommittee on Jobs, Rural Economic Growth and Energy Innovation
To hold hearings to examine investing in small town America, focusing on the importance of a comprehensive farm bill.
SR–328A

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.
SD–G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the draft regional recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.
SD–366

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.
SD–562

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 2

10 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine natural resource adaptation, focusing on protecting ecosystems and economies.
SD–406

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7011–S7064

Measures Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1560–1566. **Page S7063**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 213, expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 227, to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people. **Page S7062**

Measures Passed:

Emergency Relief for Disasters Occurring in 2013: Senate passed S. 1560, to allow certain emergency relief amounts to be made available to the Federal Highway Administration to use for disasters occurring in calendar year 2013. **Page S7014**

Military Pay Appropriations: Senate passed H.R. 3210, making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown. **Page S7018**

U.S. Government Employees in Iraq: Senate passed S. 1566, to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas. **Pages S7049–50**

House Messages:

Continuing Appropriations Resolution: Senate resumed consideration of the House Message to accompany H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, taking action on the following motions proposed thereto: **Page S7011**

Rejected:

The amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 210), Senate tabled the House amendments to the Senate amendment.) **Page S7011**

The amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 211), Senate tabled the House amendment to the Senate amendment.) **Page S7041**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Dana J. Hyde, of Maryland, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Mark E. Lopes, of Arizona, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of three years.

Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.

Lanhee J. Chen, of California, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2018.

Alan L. Cohen, of Virginia, to be Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2016. **Page S7064**

Messages from the House: **Page S7058**

Measures Referred: **Page S7058**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7058–62**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7062**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7063–64**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7057–58**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S7064**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7064**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—211) **Pages S7011, S7041**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 2013 and adjourned at 12:18 a.m. on Tuesday, October 1, 2013, until 9:30 a.m. on the same day. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7053.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EPA INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee received a briefing to examine the Office of the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency's investigation of career employee John Beale from Arthur Elkins, Inspector General, and Patrick Sullivan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1545, to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs, with amendments;

S. Res. 213, expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 227, to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people; and

The nomination of Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador to Japan, Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported 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, Federal Labor Relations Authority.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3219–3224; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 67–69; and H. Res. 369, were introduced.

Pages H6051–52

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6052**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 2374, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–228, Pt. 2);

H. Res. 367, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 113–239); and H. Res. 368, relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–240). **Page H6051**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H6013, H6049**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013: H.R. 3174, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for emergency relief projects arising from damage caused by severe weather events in 2013 and **Pages H6016–19**

Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2013: S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 387 yeas to 35 nays, Roll No. 503.

Pages H6019–20, H6030–31

Recess: The House recessed at 10:58 a.m. and reconvened at 5:19 p.m. **Page H6020**

Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House agreed to the Rogers (KY) motion that the House recede from its amendments to the amendment of the Senate, and concur therein with the amendment printed in H. Rept. 113–239, by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 504.

Pages H6031–40

H. Res. 367, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote

of 225 yeas to 204 nays, Roll No. 502, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 501. **Pages H6021–30**

Recess: The House recessed at 8:41 p.m. and reconvened at 11:35 p.m. **Page H6040**

Relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014: The House agreed to H. Res. 368, relating to consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 199 nays, Roll No. 505. **Pages H6041–49**

Pursuant to H. Res. 368, the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59 and requested a conference with the Senate thereon. **Page H6049**

The Chair appointed the following conferees on H.J. Res. 59: From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Rogers (KY), Frelinghuysen, Crenshaw, and Carter. **Page H6049**

For consideration of the Senate amendment and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Cantor, Camp, Ryan (WI), and Graves (GA). **Page H6049**

Additional conferees may be appointed on the recommendation of the Minority Leader. **Page H6049**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H6020–21, H6040–41, and H6049.

Senate Referral: S. 1560 and S. 1566 were held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6029–30, H6030, H6030–31, H6040, and H6048–49. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 1:25 a.m. on Tuesday, October 1st.

Committee Meetings

THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS: FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled ''The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs: Federal Regulations and Regulatory Reform''. Testimony was heard from Howard Shelanski, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget; and public witnesses.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; AND SAME-DAY CONSIDERATION

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule, which provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House recede from its amendments and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule provides 40 minutes of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion. In Section 2, the rule waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against any resolution reported from the Rules Committee through the legislative day of October 7, 2013.

CONFERENCE REQUEST—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Committee on Rules: Full Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule, which provides that the House insists on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, and requests a conference with the Senate thereon. In Section 2, the rule provides that any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.J. Res. 59 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on fundamentals of a functioning private label mortgage backed securities market, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Challenges and Opportunities in the 5GHz Spectrum Band'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Human Rights Abuses in Egypt'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3190, the ''United States Parole Commission Extension Act of 2013''; and H.R. 1447, the ''Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security, hearing entitled ''Implementation of an Entry-Exit System: Still Waiting After All These Years'', 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Secret Agent Man? Oversight of EPA's IG Investigation of John Beale'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''Reauthorization of the National Integrated Drought Information System'', 10:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation, hearing entitled ''Perspectives from Users of the Nation's Freight System'', 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 1 through October 4, 2013

Senate Chamber

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: October 3, to hold hearings to examine advanced biofuels, focusing on creating jobs and lower prices at the pump, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Armed Services: October 3, to receive a closed briefing on the situation in Syria, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: October 1, to hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on fundamentals of a functioning private label mortgage backed securities market, 10 a.m., SD–538.

October 2, Subcommittee on Economic Policy, to hold hearings to examine rebuilding American manufacturing, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: October 2, to hold hearings to examine the ''America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act'' (America COMPETES), focusing on scientific research and the United States economy, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

October 3, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nominations of Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director for Environment and Energy, and Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director for Science, both of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, 11 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: October 1, to hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: October 3, to hold hearings to examine reversing Iran's nuclear program, 10 a.m., SD–419.

October 3, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: October 2, business meeting to consider S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole,

Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: October 2, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–342.

October 3, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: October 2, to hold hearings to examine continued oversight of the ''Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act'', 10 a.m., SD–226.

October 3, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 42, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, S. 822, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and the nominations of Robert Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: October 1, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

October 3, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, October 2, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing entitled ''The Future of the CFTC: Perspectives on Customer Protections'', 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, October 2, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''Resetting the Force for the Future: Risks of Sequestration'', 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, October 2, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''The North American Energy Infrastructure'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

October 3, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Reviewing FDA's Implementation of FDASIA'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 2, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3212, the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013''; and H.R. 1768, the ''Accountability Review Board Reform Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

October 3, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Al-Shabaab: How Great a Threat?'', 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, October 2, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1095, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes; H.R. 1204, the ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013''; H.R. 1791, the ''Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act''; H.R. 2719, the ''Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act''; H.R. 2952, the ''Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013''; and H.R. 3107, ''Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, October 2, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The President's Constitutional Duty to Faithfully Execute the Laws'', 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

October 2, Subcommittee on the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled ''Dodd Frank's Impact on Competition in the Financial Industry'', 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, October 3, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations, hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 3188, to expedite the planning and implementation of salvage timber sales as part of Forest Service and Department of the Interior restoration and rehabilitation activities for lands within the Stanislaus National Forest and Yosemite National park and Bureau of Land management lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California; H.R. 298, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; H.R. 712, to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024; H.R. 1167, the ''Restoring Storey County Act''; H.R. 1259, the ''Coltsville National Historical Park Act''; H.R. 1633, the ''Small Lands Tracts Conveyance Act''; H.R. 1846, the ''Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site Amendments Act''; H.R. 2015, the ''Las Vegas Valley Public Land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Act of 2013''; H.R. 2259, the ''North Fork Watershed Protection Act of 2013''; H.R. 2657, the ''Disposal of Excess Federal Lands Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2954, to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa

Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, October 2, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Wind Energy Production Tax Credit'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, October 2, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Challenge of Retirement Savings for Small Employers'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: October 2, to hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: The Majority Leader will be recognized.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, October 1

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1401, E1403
Barr, Andy, Ky., E1403
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1402, E1403, E1404, E1405
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1405
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1405, E1407
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1407
Farenthold, Blake, Tex., E1401
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1406
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1403
Green, Al, Tex., E1405
Holt, Rush, N.J., E1407
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1401
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1408
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1402
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1402, E1403, E1406
Miller, George, Calif., E1401
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1407
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E1406
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E1402, E1403, E1404, E1405, E1405, E1406
Shimkus, John, Ill., E1408
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E1404
Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E1404
Young, Todd C., Ind., E1401

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.