United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2013 No. 137

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 5, 2013.

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

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

PRAYER

Reverend Eugene Hemrick, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, paraphrasing the love of St. Francis, may this Congress be an instrument of Your peace. Where there is hatred, let it sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.

O, Divine Master, grant that our Congress may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved as to love. For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; it is in dying that we are born again to eternal life.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BERA of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE THURSDAY INCIDENT AT THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Capitol was in lockdown when Miriam Carey led the police on a frightening high-speed chase that sadly resulted in her death. Initial reports say she may have been delusional, paranoid, and had a prescription for schizophrenia medication.

The incident shows that a person with untreated or undertreated mental illness does not need a firearm to cause harm. It reminds us of an issue that we've been talking about since the tragedy at Newtown, and even before—the problems with our Nation's mental health system.

There were 38,000 suicides in our country recently, 750,000 attempts. The House Energy and Commerce Committee has identified inefficient outpatient and inpatient treatment. State involuntary commitment laws are failing to help those with schizophrenia and paranoid delusions. Community mental health centers are underfunded. Federal privacy laws have problems, and NIMH is woefully underfunded.

I will be introducing legislation soon to deal with these mental health issues. I ask my colleagues to help us deal with serious mental illness in a serious way.

MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS NOT A GAME

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 5 of the government shutdown—day No. 5.

Yesterday you said something that I couldn't agree with more, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday you said, ''This is not a game.''

Last night, my staff gave me a letter from one of my constituents, Sarah from Folsom. Her close friend is battling a rare bone cancer. She has been in chemotherapy and she is fighting for her life. She has a 1-year-old daughter.

She was recently accepted into a clinical trial, a last chance to try to save herself and save her life. Now Congress has shut down that trial and put the trials on hold. Here's what Sarah says:

> Please don't let her daughter grow up without a mother.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with you more. This is not a game. This is real life.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I speak on the House floor for the third straight day to request that President Obama obey the Pay Our Military Act that fully funds, also, defense workers who support the Armed Forces. Since every defense worker, by definition, supports the Armed Forces, furloughs for every defense worker should end.

Printed on recycled paper.

Over 60 Congressmen and I are highlighting this issue in hopes of returning 400,000 furloughed defense workers to their jobs. I am pleased to announce that we're making progress.

Yesterday, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel agreed that ''there's no job in our Department of Defense that doesn't support the military.'' Hence, the Pay Our Military Act's only furlough-ending requirement has been met.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama must end all defense worker furloughs. Why? Because it's the law, and because America's national security is at stake.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this last week must have been quite a civics lesson for the members of the Tea Party who thought that they could shut down the government—and, in fact, shut down the government—and nobody would miss it. But soon they discovered that there were serious problems with that.

Now we see one bill after another: to restore the NIH because they found they stranded cancer patients and other people in need of their health; to restore the WIC program because they found out that the newest born infants in this country would be without nutrition, the veterans programs because they found out our veterans would be stranded, the assistance to go to school would be cut off.

Our national parks, they never thought those communities would be impacted by the national parks. They didn't care about that. They shut them down. But they were here asking for relief.

They found they needed the weather service as the hurricane was approaching our Gulf States. They needed FEMA. They needed someone to organize the evacuation routes in case it became a full-blown hurricane.

The CIA, they discovered they laid off 70 percent of the assets within the CIA. This goes on and on and on and on.

Welcome to America, a big, diverse Nation where we all need one another at one time or another.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETROACTIVE PAY FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have a chance on the floor today to move this body in the right direction—to move us closer to a solution. There is a bipartisan bill today offered by Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, both of Virginia. It's a bill that I've cosponsored and a bill, thankfully, that the President his agreed to sign. It is the Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would allow all Federal employees, regardless of individual furlough status, to receive their pay retroactive from October 1 for the entirety of the budget impasse.

The stalemate we're at now has left 800,000 government employees furloughed and unsure about their next paycheck. There are also those at work now who aren't being paid for it. This includes thousands of Federal law enforcement officers who continue even today to protect this building and those of us in it and around it.

I've been in touch with Federal workers in my district, including law enforcement, and they should know that there is agreement that they will receive their pay when the government reopens.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting in favor of this legislation for all the Federal employees in my district and around the country who deserve some certainty while we wait for this impasse to end.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue to talk, and let's end this impasse.

IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the human consequences of this needless government shutdown, the impact of this shutdown on real people and families back in our home districts. There are so many people out there who are hurt and are worried about what's going on here in Washington, and how can any of us blame them? Let me just give you one example.

I have a woman from the Quad Cities, which is an area I represent, who reached out to our office. She's worked at the Rock Island Arsenal for 15 years, and she told me how much she loved her job, but she was furloughed earlier this year because of sequestration. Now she is out of work indefinitely because of this needless government shutdown. She is worried, like any of us would be, about how she is going to make ends meet, how she is going to support her family, and how frustrated she is with the government.

We need to encourage good people like this woman from the Quad Cities to stay in public service, not drive them away. She is one of more than 25,000 workers at the Rock Island Arsenal who are impacted by this. I say to my colleagues on the left and my colleagues on the right, let's work together and solve this.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN SPENDING PROCESS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, words have meaning, and I find it so interesting as I come to the floor this morning that I continue to hear my colleagues talk about a clean CR. Well, for my colleagues and for my constituents, I want to explain what this means.

They want to say no attachments, no further accountabilities, no spending reductions, just give us the money. And I would remind them the levels that we're spending at are due to sequestration. It's the law. It's the law. That's where it's at. By implication, they are saying, what you all want is unclean or evil or dirty.

What we are for, Mr. Speaker, is an accountable, transparent CR, an accountable, transparent process—transparent and fair to hardworking taxpayers, fair to future generations, like my grandsons, my nieces, great-nieces and nephews, who are going to have to pay the bill.

Let's have an accountable spending process.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, words do have meaning. Instead of working together to do our jobs and resolve these critical issues, Republicans have taken a decidedly different approach, one they seem to have been looking forward to for some time, to make another desperate attempt to stop the Affordable Care Act. The government shutdown could be the most damaging thing to hit our economy since the budget sequestration they imposed on Americans.

I would say to my colleague that I just heard from, the prayer this morning is so appropriate, a prayer of St. Francis: make me a keeper of your peace.

There are people who are hurting and in trouble. Let us look inside to the moral obligations that we have and see what we can do to come together.

Please, let us vote on the continuing resolution passed by the Senate. These are the Republican budget numbers the Democrats have agreed to compromise with. Please, listen to St. Francis. Look inside and see what we can do together.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, how have we ended up here in a government shutdown nobody wanted? The answer is simple: it's because the Senate has refused to even come to the negotiating table on a spending agreement.

The House has passed four measures that would have kept the government open and operating, but they were all ignored by the Senate. First, we voted to keep the government open and to fund the President's health care bill, but they ignored that. Second, we voted to keep the government open and only delay the health care bill for 1 year. They ignored that. Then we voted to keep the government open and simply make the rules for the health care exchanges the same for all Americans. They ignored that. Lastly, we just asked the Senate to talk to us. They ignored that.

The Obama administration has given exceptions to their allies: big businesses and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

The Senate should come to the bargaining table today and end this shutdown today.

□ 0915

OPEN THE ENTIRE GOVERNMENT AND PASS A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the reason we have the shutdown is because of the Republican leadership.

The irony today is that the Republicans keep talking about the other side of the aisle here or the other House, yet they are going to go home at around 12 today, if not sooner, and not come back until Monday after 6:30. So if you really cared about negotiating and doing something, you wouldn't send everyone home for the next 3 days. You are not serious.

The spending levels have already been agreed on. I heard our Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI, on the floor the other day saying she agreed with the spending levels. So the money isn't the issue. And I don't even hear the health care reform being talked about much anymore on the Republican side of the aisle.

I have no idea why the Speaker of the House continues to keep the government shut down, other than maybe they think they can show that they can do it.

This is absurd and it is cruel on the people, the people that are being furloughed. The effect on the economy is just awful at this point with this continued shutdown.

You come here and say you are going to piecemeal approach and we have bills every day to open up a little part of the government. Open the entire government. Pass a clean continuing resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 58

Whereas the Department of Defense has determined that some military chaplains and other personnel, including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain are not able to perform religious services on military installations during a lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination threatens the ability of members of the Armed Services and their families to exercise their First Amendment rights to worship and participate in religious activities; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior has permitted the performance of First Amendment activities in areas controlled by the National Park Service despite the lapse in appropriations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes that the performance of religious services and the provision of ministry are protected activities under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution;

(2) urges and intends that the Secretary of Defense permit the performance of religious services on property owned or maintained by the Department of Defense, during any lapse in appropriations, in the same manner and to the same extent as such religious services are otherwise available; and

(3) urges and intends that the Secretary of Defense permit military chaplains and other personnel, including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain to perform religious services and ministry, during any lapse in appropriations, in the same manner and to the same extent as such chaplains and other personnel are otherwise permitted to perform religious services and ministry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the concurrent resolution offered by my colleague, Representative DOUG COLLINS of Georgia, a dedicated chaplain and Iraq veteran of the United States Air Force Reserve. His resolution goes to the heart of our constitutionally guaranteed ability to worship without interference. I thank him for bringing it to the floor.

The resolution expresses the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse of appropriations. As a grateful dad, with my wife, Roxanne, of four sons currently serving in the military, I know firsthand the importance of chaplains, such as Steve Shugart and Brian Bohlman.

Specifically, it addresses the issue this House became aware of yesterday—that religious services for military personnel are being curtailed, or not offered at all, because Federal civilian employees serving as chaplains, or personnel contracted to perform the duties of military chaplains, have been furloughed.

This is an extremely important issue for all of us to work together. There is no doubt that the furloughing of personnel hired or contracted to perform the duties of military chaplains is having an effect. Just in this region, church services, baptisms, weddings have been curtailed. For example, the Active Duty priest at the Navy Yard canceled mass there. He is needed at Joint Base Anacostia Bolling. It is a larger church and they don't have a priest there this weekend.

At Fort Belvoir, half of the masses have been canceled.

The impact is even more severe overseas, where options for worship are far more limited than in the United States.

What is more disturbing is that General Schedule Federal civilian and contractor chaplains are being told that if they do come to their jobs they will be trespassing. This is just not right.

The performance of religious services and the provision of ministry are protected activities under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. If the Department of the Interior can permit World War II veterans in performance of First Amendment activities to visit the memorial constructed to honor their service, then certainly the Secretary of Defense can permit similar First Amendment activities.

The Secretary can and must allow military chaplains and other personnel,

including contract personnel, hired to perform duties of a military chaplain to perform religious services and ministry in the same manner and to the same extent as such chaplains and other personnel are otherwise permitted to perform religious services and ministry when there is an appropriation. It is that simple.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Secretary of Defense to do the simple thing, the right thing: allow all chaplains of the Armed Forces, be they military, Federal civilian employees or contractors, to minister unhindered to the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I congratulate my colleague, Representative DOUG COLLINS of Georgia, chaplain of the U.S. Air Force Reserve, for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge all Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not oppose this resolution—it sounds sensible going forward—but I do want to raise a couple of process issues.

We found out about this—I found out about this—20 minutes ago. I think it is just emblematic of how much this body has broken down. We have to talk to each other. I don't have an objection to this. I've got staff; the Armed Services Committee has a staff. We work together. We have worked together on the Armed Services Committee better than any other committee in this Congress. I will grant you that that isn't saying much, but we have.

We just simply have to talk to each other. Why would they spring this on us at the last minute and not have a communication about it? It is not something we object to.

Getting past this individual issue, it is emblematic of the entire problem. The Republicans are complaining because the Senate isn't talking to them and the President isn't talking to them about the CR and the debt ceiling. There are reasons for that. But we have reached an epidemic of not talking to each other. On something as small as this we can't even have a communication.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. SMITH, I agree, on the Armed Services Committee—and I want to commend you—we work together in an extraordinary fashion. In fact, the National Defense Authorization Act has passed the House as an indication of your goodwill and good faith.

I believe the reason this has come up so quickly, of course, is because this was only learned late yesterday. The consequence of the thought of chaplains to be declared trespassing is inconceivable and it needs to be addressed.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Right. But again, the communications level has fallen apart. On our side of the aisle, we don't know from one minute to the next what we are going to be voting on. The schedule has been changed at a moment's notice.

I will tell you, even back in the shutdown of 1995, there was greater communication between the majority and the minority about what was going on. In fact, we had a lot of these small little bills that funded little pieces of the government.

But the one thing the majority did is they granted the full House a vote on a—and what a clean resolution means is it only pertains to spending; it doesn't pertain to other policy issues. That vote was granted. The House Republicans voted it down. That was their position. But at least we had a vote. Then we also had a discussion about what we could fund during the shutdown.

The complete and utter breakdown in communication between the majority party, the minority party, the Senate and the House, the White House and us is doing an unbelievable disservice to this country. I don't care if we get in a room and yell at each other for 4 hours. Let's at least have a communication.

I want to really paint the picture here. We all have our talking points, and I heard all of those talking points this morning. I have heard them so much—and I am sure that the American people and I are absolutely sick to death of those talking points. They are poll tested, they are wonderful, they play to the base, they are great, and here we are on day 5 going nowhere.

The basic problem here, number one, on the CR is the health care policy issue, that basically the Republicans—this is no secret—want to get rid of the health care law. The trouble is they don't have the votes to do it, and they are, therefore, willing to hold up the funding of the government in order to advance their policy agenda. That is a very important point because that plays into the larger issue.

I also want to tell you that we are—what is it—12 days now away from defaulting. We are going to default at this point, because what I hear from my Republican colleagues is, oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, we don't want to default. As long as we cut enough spending, as long as we do tax reform we will be fine, which, of course, is what we have been hearing since January of 2011.

I just want to explain briefly to the American people what the difference in the positions are here, and I am going to be as fair and honest as I can be. The Republicans believe strongly that we should severely cut spending, and cutting spending at this point means mandatory programs, entitlements, because we have already cut discretionary spending down to the BCA level, down to the level they agreed to. That is what some of my colleagues are referencing about the CR. The spending level is down there. But they don't want to do that. The deficit is high, so they want to cut spending. The President has on more than one occasion put entitlement cuts on the table.

The difference of opinion is whether or not we should also raise taxes as part of that deal to deal with the deficit. The President, the Senate, and the Democrats in the House—which I realize is irrelevant because we don't have the votes—but unfortunately for you guys they do in the Senate, and the President has the veto. If there is going to be any entitlement cuts, they have to be accompanied by tax increases. The Republicans say, absolutely not, we are not going to do that. So that is the divide.

The problem is the Republicans won 234 seats in the House. Interestingly, they lost the overall vote in Congress by a count of 52 to 48—but redistricting plays out the way it does. They did not win the Presidency and they did not win the Senate. So they are trying to take those 234 votes in the House and jam their broader agenda down everybody's throat. The piece that they have is they are willing to not fund the government and not raise the debt ceiling in order to put us in a bad position to do that.

I will tell you, Democrats cannot vote to cut entitlements if there are not tax increases attached to them. So I hope somebody somewhere wakes up to this reality before we default and stops insisting that somehow miraculously in the next 12 days Democrats are going to magically agree to cut entitlements with no revenue, and maybe do some big complicated tax reform bill that cuts taxes even further. Because if that reality does not set in, we are in for several weeks of great calamity that is going to cause greater damage than what has been caused here.

So with that, I support the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to, again, commend Mr. SMITH. He, indeed, has reached across to try to work together. By referencing the shutdown in 1995, there is a difference, and it begins at the top.

Sadly, the President of the United States 2 weeks ago last night called to announce he was not going to negotiate. In the 1995 shutdown there was communication between the President and the Speaker prior to a shutdown and during the entire shutdown.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. JOHN FLEMING, my friend and colleague.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend Congressman WILSON. I also thank my good friend, DOUG COLLINS, for bringing this measure up today.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment rights of our military do not sunset with the lack of appropriations or even a shutdown. The free exercise of religion is codified in the Constitution of the United States and celebrated by every American, including those of us who have worn, do, or will wear the uniform.

Military chaplains faithfully serve a unique role in the military, bridging the gap between faith and freedom and ensuring that people of all beliefs are able to celebrate mass or participate in a worship service according to the dictates of their faith.

Despite this protective right, the Department of Defense has decided to effectively close the doors of many churches and chapels this weekend by not allowing military chaplains to perform their religious duties on military installations because the Federal Government has not passed the relevant appropriations bill for FY 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the freedom of religion does not follow the Federal Government's fiscal policy. The freedom of religion is a 24/7 constitutional right that should garner unconditional support from this administration and our military leaders.

I stand strong with the brave men and women serving in our Nation's military and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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, I thank my friend for yielding.

The President of the United States has spent weeks of his term negotiating with the Republican Party. What he has been confronted with each time is a demand to either shut the government down or default on the country's debt.

I want to put this in another frame of reference as I rise in support of this bill. On eight occasions when President George W. Bush was President, we had the majority on our side and we agreed to a continuing resolution, a clean continuing resolution. We had our many differences with President Bush over the Iraq war, over issues of health care, over issues of the budget, but on eight occasions President Bush came to the Democratic majority and asked to continue to run the government, and we said yes.

□ 0930

The principle at stake here is whether ''negotiation'' means you have to have everything you want all the time and shut the government down if you don't. That's not the way we do business. That's why three-quarters of the American people agree that shutting the government down over the health care law is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Congresswoman from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, my friend and colleague.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we have all heard, we received the news yesterday that our priests and ministers could end up facing government arrest if they attempt to celebrate mass or to openly practice their faiths on a military base during this government shutdown—a shutdown that we did not want, a shutdown that could have been avoided had the President and Senator REID agreed to negotiate with us.

This is so unfortunate. What we see is no mass, no communion, no confession, no prayer, no faith, no religion. Mr. Speaker, what we have to realize is that religious beliefs predate government. Government should not be able to tell those who are religious whether they can practice their faiths freely regardless of our government-funding situation.

What we are seeking is accountability, transparency, and reducing what the Federal Government spends. Government funding is irrelevant to the religious rights and freedoms that are enshrined in the First Amendment of our Constitution, and some don't get to throw away the Constitution just because they are unwilling to sit down and negotiate and work with us through this process. We are not going to sit here and say, Even if you volunteer to serve the faithful, we are going to deny you.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Will our priests and ministers this weekend—some of them on my post at Fort Campbell in my district—be arrested if they recite a Hail Mary? if they lead in prayer?

I think that it is time for us to pass this legislation to agree that we let our men and women in uniform pray. Let America pray. Government shouldn't arrest anyone because some want to play politics with this situation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, again, I support this resolution. Nobody is getting arrested for praying. I really wish we could keep the debate here in the realm of reality. I believe the issue is that they have been furloughed in some instances so that they are not allowed to carry on the services. I don't want that misimpression left dangling out there that somehow we are arresting people for going to church. We are most certainly not, and I wish the debate would remain a little more accurate. I want to make just one other point.

While it is true that, in 1995, President Clinton talked to Republicans, ultimately, he did not give them any of the policy items that they were asking for. All President Obama is basically saying is, Look, if you want to talk, we can talk; but we can't talk about dismantling my health care law, and we can't talk about adding policy riders to the CR or to the debt ceiling, because we need to keep the government running.

And there is one other difference which I know my Republican colleagues will not address. The Republican majority under Newt Gingrich in 1995 gave this House a vote just like the Senate has given everything you've sent over to them a vote. They voted it down, but they had a vote. This House will not give us a vote on the CR that the Senate has passed. If you feel as strongly about it as you do, do what the Republicans did in 1995—bring it up and vote it down. That's democracy. That's in the Constitution, too, by the way. That would be helpful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. SMITH, again, I appreciate your support of this, but it is important because, sadly, information has been provided that chaplains would be subject to trespassing charges. So this does, obviously, interfere with the ability of freedom of speech and religion and assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. TIM HUELSKAMP, my friend and colleague.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, is it really the policy of this administration to make church services illegal? to threaten Catholic priests with jail if they celebrate mass this weekend?

Unfortunately, this policy seems to be another tragic reflection of the complete disregard this administration has for Americans of faith. What is worse is that it's an unprecedented denial of a fundamental constitutional right of our men and women in uniform, like denying access to the World War II or Lincoln Memorials for the first time. This is the first time in 17 previous funding lapses, covering 16 Sundays, that our brave chaplains have been threatened with arrest if they perform their Godly duties.

Secretary Hagel must issue an immediate directive that chaplains should continue to perform their duties and that DOD facilities normally used for religious services should continue to be used.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment is not some empty words on a dusty, archaic document to be viewed somewhere in a museum. I know for men like my uncle, Father Leonard Stegman, who was an Active Duty chaplain for nearly 30 years, the First Amendment is what you do every day as a chaplain, leading men and women of all faiths. It's something real.

For the late Father Emil Kapaun, who was recently awarded the Medal of Honor by President Obama on April 11 of this year, the First Amendment was, again, not some empty words. It's what he did every day, and it's the reason he gave his life for his country. It's the reason he was honored and recognized and how he drew men and women of all faiths.

In honor of Father Kapaun and of all current and former military chaplains and of all members of the Armed Forces, let's strike a blow for religious liberty today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. Let's send a clear message to this administration that the rights of those serving in the Armed Forces cannot be suspended simply to create political and personal pain.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman DOUG COLLINS, who is the sponsor of this resolution and a U.S. Air Force Reserve chaplain.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, whose dedication to our men and women in uniform is among no peer's in this body, and I thank him for his service and for the fight of his family and others as we come along.

I'll tell you today that I rise, Mr. Speaker, really with a troubled heart and also with one that is on behalf of the men and women in the Air Force and the Armed Forces and others who are facing something today that they should not have to face. There is no doubt our Nation is facing many difficulties, and all of us and those across the aisle can understand that. The majority in this body is standing united to fight for the future of our children and grandchildren. Those are legitimate fights, and I respect my colleagues from across the aisle. These are legitimate fights that we are having here. However, today, as I stand, I came to this body also looking for practical things and looking for things that amaze me at times, and this is one that does.

As we do and as we fight for others, we must ensure that the basic rights of all Americans are protected and do not fall victim to the political theater occurring in this body. Military personnel and their families make sacrifices that many of us cannot fathom, and they do so to protect the freedom that we take far too often for granted. Because of their sacrifices, our Nation is a beacon of hope to the dark corners of the world where freedom of speech and religion exist only in fairy tales.

Yet today, military chaplains who have been contracted to come to bases face a closed door. They cannot go on these bases during a lapse of appropriations even if they wanted to volunteer to practice their faiths. Each of us in this body and across the Nation should pause for a moment to consider and think about what I just said. If a contract chaplain wants to minister to a military member stationed abroad who has no access to a church, a mosque or a synagogue, he would be in violation of the law. I am a military chaplain, and this breaks my heart.

Too often, we come to this floor and we talk in abstracts. We talk about concepts and political jargon, arguing about problems that only matter, probably, within less than 3 miles of this building, but today is different. Today, we stand with one resounding voice to tell our servicemembers and the chaplaincy that we will not stand for their First Amendment rights to be violated because the leaders in the other body want to make a point. The laws in this Nation require the Federal Government to ensure that military personnel can express their faiths or non-faith in all corners of the world. That is why the military chaplaincy exists and, when we cannot serve the needs of those, why we contract with others who can provide that basis of one's faith.

General George Washington issued an order on July 9, 1776, providing through the Continental Congress for a chaplain for each regiment, stating:

> The blessing and protection of Heaven are at all times necessary but especially so in times of public distress and danger.

The administration is apparently unsatisfied with denying veterans access to memorials and is unsatisfied with closing off unmanned scenic overlooks to motorists. Now they must go after, in the words of George Washington, the ''blessing and protection of Heaven'' for our military families.

The body has seen its share of political discord and policy disagreements. The government has experienced numerous lapses in appropriations over the decades, but never before in the history of this Nation have the military chaplains and those they contract with to serve our military personnel been prevented from meeting the religious and spiritual needs of our servicemembers.

As a chaplain, I lived and worked alongside men and women in Iraq. Many were religious and many were not, but my purpose was to ensure that they were able to express their First Amendment rights however they wished. Military chaplains and their contract counterparts must be allowed to provide religious service and ministry regardless of our Nation's fiscal state.

If the administration wants to play games and score points through unnecessary theatrics, so be it; but I will not stand by and let these games occur at the expense of the basic rights of our men and women in uniform.

During this lapse in funding, Active Duty chaplains are permitted to continue serving military personnel. However, there is a chronic shortage of Active Duty chaplains, particularly for Catholic and Jewish faiths. For example, roughly 25 percent of the military ascribe to the Catholic faith; yet Catholic priests make up only 8 percent of the Chaplain Corps. That means that approximately 275,000 men and women in uniform and their families are served by only 234 Active Duty priests, thus the need to have contract chaplains.

Due to the shortage of Active Duty chaplains, it is extremely common for the government to employ chaplains via contracts to ensure that the spiritual needs of all of our military members are met. With the government shutdown, contract members of the Chaplain Corps on military bases worldwide are not permitted to work—they are not even permitted to volunteer—even if they are the only chaplains on base.

As my friend from South Carolina and others have mentioned, the restrictions on basic freedoms that are being had around here—and just within this area at Langley, at the Navy Yard and at Fort Belvoir—are all areas that have already been cut back, and that is a shame. I am grateful to my colleagues who have joined me this morning and the House leadership for their commitment to ensuring that military chaplains are able to serve the men and women of our Armed Forces.

If this body does not pass this legislation, the ability of military personnel and their families to worship and participate in religious ceremonies will continue to be at great risk. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in protecting the First Amendment rights of those who give their lives to protect ours.

Before I close, I agree that many times we haven't communicated, and we don't communicate as many would want us to; but I have also heard that timing was a problem here and that we should have seen this coming. Let me just say timing should never be a hindrance to this body's protecting the First Amendment rights of any of our citizens, especially of our military personnel. In fact, it should be our highest calling and the thing we run to this floor to discuss.

Should we have seen it coming?

I'll tell you, what saddens me is I would have never believed that the administration or anyone else would deem protecting a constitutional right as nonessential.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 58.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 0945

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RETROACTIVE PAY FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3223

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 ''Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act''.

SEC. 2. COMPENSATION FOR FURLOUGHED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

Federal employees furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations which begins on or about October 1, 2013, shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation, for the period of such lapse in appropriations, as soon as practicable after such lapse in appropriations ends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3223 and to include extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

The House remains actively engaged in finding a solution to end the current impasse. The House has passed a number of commonsense bills to fund our troops, continue funding for veterans' benefits, and allow the District of Columbia to spend its own funds. The House has also passed legislation to bring defense civilian employees back to work. Unfortunately, the administration appears to be purposefully refusing to use the authority granted by the Pay Our Military Act, meaning roughly 400,000 defense civilian employees remain at home, unable to work.

While we wait on the President and Senate to reach across the aisle, it is important to provide needed certainty to Federal employees who have been furloughed without pay. Each and every one of us has Federal employees in our district, most of whom are guided by a sense of civic duty and take pride in helping make their country a better place.

Civilian defense personnel at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, doctors and nurses at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center, records management professionals at the National Archives, and countless other dedicated men and women throughout my community are employed by Federal agencies and have been subject to furlough.

In the gulf coast region and other disaster-prone areas, NOAA employees help prepare for and monitor major storms. In the aftermath of these natural disasters, FEMA workers are sent into horrible and hazardous conditions to help restore broken communities.

At NASA, employees help us, figuratively and literally, to reach for the stars. They encourage future generations to not be bound by seemingly physical and intellectual barriers.

Our law enforcement agencies work tirelessly to investigate and capture those who seek to do harm to the homeland as well as our allies abroad. The list goes on.

H.R. 3223 ensures the Federal civilian workers will receive retroactive pay for the duration of the Federal Government shutdown regardless of their furlough status. Federal workers who have been furloughed under a shutdown have historically received their pay retroactively. H.R. 3223 provides today's workforce a guarantee that their pay will resume once the President and Senate Democrats agree to meaningful discussions that will ultimately resolve this impasse.

I urge support for this bill as we continue to work on legislation to reopen critical operations of the Federal Government, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This legislation would provide backpay to 800,000 hardworking and dedicated Federal employees furloughed as a result of the government shutdown we are now enduring.

Today is day five of the shutdown created by the Tea Party extremists who are harming our country by holding our government hostage. They're placing our economy and our national security in jeopardy by waging an ideological war to overturn the law of the land and put insurance companies back in charge of health care decisions for tens of millions of our fellow Americans.

Our dedicated public servants ought to be at their duty stations serving the American people right now. They want to be working. They should be working. Instead, they are locked out because the House Republican leadership refuses to allow a vote on a clean bill to fund the government, a bill that would pass today.

Seventeen years ago, Federal workers were given backpay after Newt Gingrich's record 21-day shutdown in 1995 and 1996. It was the fair thing to do then, and it is the fair thing to do now.

Our Federal employees have been under relentless and unfair attack in recent years and have sacrificed much already. They have contributed nearly $100 billion to deficit reduction through the 3-year pay freeze. New employees have seen their retirement benefits slashed. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, many have suffered through sequester-imposed furloughs. And now many families have seen their lives needlessly disrupted by this shutdown. The least we can do for our fellow citizens who work for this great country is to give them the reassurance of knowing that they will receive backpay.

The irresponsible, piecemeal approach to government funding being pursued by our House Republicans omits huge parts of the government in attempts to pick and choose those who will be paid and those who won't. That is not an efficient or effective way to run the government, and the American people are sick of it, and they must be heard.

I give great credit to my colleagues, Mr. MORAN and to Mr. WOLF, a bipartisan group of great Virginians. I applaud them. H.R. 3223 would ensure that all Federal workers will be paid once this manufactured crisis is over and the government is reopened. This is not their fault, and they should not suffer as a result.

It's long past time for Republicans to reopen the government. Instead of disrupting the lives of our fellow citizens and wasting time and taxpayer money, House Republicans should reopen the government today—not yesterday, right now—by simply bringing to the floor a measure that funds the entire government without taking away the health care of our fellow citizens.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join all of us in supporting H.R. 3223, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the author of the bill we're considering today that would retroactively restore pay to Federal workers.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TURNER and Chairman ROGERS and his staff. I also want to thank Leader CANTOR and his staff and Mr. MORAN and Mr. CUMMINGS and the others and all the staff, my staff included, but all the staff who did this very quickly.

This was done during the Reagan administration. It was done during the Clinton administration.

Who are the Federal employees? The Federal employees are the FBI agents that everyone would call if they got a call and found out their loved one was kidnapped. The first person they would call would be an FBI agent, a Federal employee.

I was with Mr. HOYER 2 weeks ago at the Navy Yard. The 12 people who were killed at the Navy Yard and those who were wounded, they were all Federal employees. Mr. HOYER can tell you, when the CNO talked about it, he said they were a part of the fleet.

The Capitol Hill policemen that we all got up the other day and gave a standing ovation, they are Federal employees.

The VA doctors that are working out at Walter Reed, working on young men and women who have lost limbs and served in Afghanistan and Iraq, they are Federal employees.

I remember, I was again with Mr. HOYER when we were down at OPM earlier this year when they had stars on the wall of 27 Federal employees who

have died since 2012, and since that time the number of stars have increased tremendously.

I saw the movie ''Zero Dark Thirty.'' If you looked at that movie, it was about catching bin Laden. The woman who did it, Maya, has she been furloughed? Where is Maya? We don't know where she is. But has she been furloughed? Should she not get paid?

Lastly, I remember being at the memorial service. Seven families walked in; seven individuals died. I saw the young families, the families who were mourning their parents, and they were Federal employees.

There are 12,000 CIA employees who have been furloughed and are gone, maybe missing that one communication from al Shabaab or al Qaeda.

I strongly urge a strong vote for this.

I also want to thank Chairman ISSA, Chairman ROGERS and the leadership, including Congressman ERIC CANTOR—who has quickly scheduled this measure—and their staffs, and mine, for their efforts to prepare this bill.

This bill—which Mr. MORAN and I have introduced with strong bipartisan support—follows in the bipartisan tradition of precedents set during the Reagan and Clinton Administrations: that we ensure that Federal employees, who are out of work and unpaid by no fault of their own, are made whole once the government reopens.

Despite the difficult and unfortunate circumstances that have shut down our government currently, there is bipartisan agreement that signal to the millions of Federal employees that they will be paid for the duration of this shut down.

Who are these Federal employees? They are the Navy Yard employees killed and wounded last month. They are the Secret Service and Capitol Police officers who ran into harm's way earlier this week.

They are the FBI agents, DEA agents, Border Patrol agents, Weather Service meteorologists, Park Rangers, NASA astronauts and engineers, VA doctors and nurses.

I think we can all agree that they deserve the confidence of knowing that they will receive back pay for the time they have worked or have been furloughed.

My hope is that by moving this legislation now we can provide some reassurance to our valuable workforce and their families.

By passing this bill today, Republicans and Democrats can come together to send a powerful message to the Federal workforce.

In April my friend, Congressman STENY HOYER, and I went to the Theodore Roosevelt Federal Building, otherwise known as OPM Headquarters. We were there to recognize the lives of 27 Federal employees who died in the line of duty since January 2012. Twenty-seven.

Two weeks ago I was at the Marine Barracks honoring the 12 people killed at the Navy Yard. The speakers did not talk about military or civilian. They talked about ''one Navy'' serving the fleet.

A hurricane watch was posted on Thursday. Who is monitoring that? Federal employees. What happened after the hurricane watch was posted? Furloughed Federal employees started to be recalled.

Who is working around the clock to protect us from another terrorist attack? Federal employees?

It has been reported that 70 percent of civilians working for our intelligence agencies, including the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency will be furloughed. This could include 12,500 employees at the CIA.

This will impact our ability to protect our nation and disrupt plots by Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups.

In the movie Zero Dark Thirty, there is a scene where seven CIA employees were killed in Khost, Afghanistan.

I went to the memorial service at Langley, which is in my district. I saw the families. I saw the young children mourning the death of their parents.

The first American killed in combat during the Afghanistan invasion? Michael Spann, a CIA employee—from my district.

What about NASA astronauts and scientists? Or DOE lab employees? This legislation will provide piece of mind to their families that, when the government reopens things will be okay. As their board of directors we should do what we can.

If a member of your family was kidnapped, who would you call? The FBI. What about the DEA Agents stopping drug runners and human trafficking. Customs and Border Patrol Agents stopping illegal immigrants. Prison guards working in a dangerous environment who, every day, keep violent felons behind bars.

All Federal employees.

The doctors and nurses at our VA hospitals and clinics helping wounded warriors recover and our veterans live with dignity.

Federal employees.

Who else? The defense civilians repairing sophisticated electronic weaponry systems at Army depots and Air Force. The firefighters you call when a lighting strike sets a national forest on fire and homes and business are in danger.

The park service rangers who help with a rescue in a National Park.

The air traffic controllers and DOT crash investigators.

Let's not forget the NIH researchers working to find a cure for breast cancer, and prostate cancer, and Alzheimer's and Autism.

This bill will provide some piece of mind to the researchers trying to find a cure, and who's work supplements thousands of businesses, large and small.

I know that all my colleagues recognize that Federal employees aren't just nameless faces behind desks, they are real people, out in the field, who work day-in and day-out to make our Nation a better and safer place.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank my colleague, FRANK WOLF. There's no harder advocate or effective advocate for Federal employees than FRANK WOLF. He and I have worked together for over 32 years on behalf of the interest of those people who work for the American people every day to make them safer, healthier, more informed. I want to thank the majority leader; I want to thank the ranking member; I want to thank the gentleman who offers his support of this bill; and I want to thank my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, we're 5 days into a government shutdown caused by—well, I'm not sure what it's caused by. As a result, approximately 800,000 middle class workers who serve the American people are furloughed without pay. All of us talk about working Americans, how we want to make sure they have the jobs that they need to support themselves and their family.

Our Federal employees have already been asked to accept COLA freezes for the past 4 years, and they've endured changes to retirement benefits as well as the furloughs imposed by the irrational policy of sequester. I'm glad to see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor. There's been no more stronger voice on the irrationality of the sequester than my friend from Kentucky.

Only my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can say with certainty, if they can, when our Federal Government will be able to go back to work, but the American people are already noticing their absence, whether safeguarding our national parks, performing groundbreaking medical research at NIH, overseeing disaster relief efforts after a storm or wildfire, making sure nutrition assistance gets to the children and seniors who need it, or enforcing the laws that keep our community safe. Federal employees make a critical contribution to the country and communities and the American people they serve.

We saw their selfless nature and devotion of country on display this Thursday when, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) said, U.S. Capitol Police personnel, Federal employees who are deemed essential for security and are currently on the job without the promise of pay, protected all of us who work in the Capitol complex during a security incident.

I am proud to represent 62,000 hardworking Federal employees in my district, yet most of the Federal employees are not in the Washington metropolitan area. Eighty percent of them are dispersed throughout this country, serving in every area, every community of our great land, many of whom serve in civilian defense roles at critical military institutions like Pax River, Indian Head, and Webster Field in my district. Each one of you could name a facility in your district.

One of them wrote to me to express his frustration of those who are preventing the government from reopening. He writes:

> I'm quite tired of being punished when my only crime is supporting our great Nation with my labor.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1000

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank my Republican colleagues for recognizing that pain and unfairness and bringing this bill to the floor. I hope all of us will support this bill.

Another constituent of mine who works at Pax River said this: ''Please continue to work toward a solution that ends the furloughs for all Federal employees affected by the shutdown, not just a select few,'' as we're doing.

Mr. Speaker, we must reopen our government, and we could do so today, this hour. But until the majority allows a vote on the bill to reopen the government, let us at least provide the dedicated, patriotic Federal employees who want nothing more than to go back to work with the peace of mind that they will still be paid for their service.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). Mr. MORAN, like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), has been an extraordinary leader on behalf of Federal employees, as well as Congressmen GERALD CONNOLLY and STEVE LYNCH who sit here and others on the Republican side who have been aligned on that effort as well. Surely, surely we, the board of directors of the greatest enterprise on Earth, can take care of our employees and give them the confidence that they deserve.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the additional time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and I hope every Member in this House will be happy to support it.

I'm glad to see that, at the very least, the Senate has plans to take up this bill. Stop the presses. The Senate's going to take up a bill, even if they won't consider most of our other bills.

And as we wait for the Senate to come to the negotiating table on shutting the shutdown down, our Federal workforce should not wait to find out whether or not they'll be paid. This bill will provide backpay for those workers who have been furloughed in a fair, full, and timely manner after the shutdown ends. The House has made great strides toward this end. And in fact, as of yesterday, the House has approved 15 different options to fund the government. We have sent them over to the Senate. Sadly, the only response has been a loud snore.

I hope this bill, which I know is a priority for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, will encourage this Congress to find that spirit of bipartisanship that seems to have evaporated over the last few weeks. It will demonstrate that we are able to let level heads prevail and that we can unite in our responsibility to care for the hundreds of thousands of people who serve this Nation day in, day out.

I want to thank the gentlemen from Virginia, Messrs. WOLF and MORAN, two very fine members of our Appropriations Committee, for bringing this bill to the floor, and I salute them. I urge my colleagues to provide our workforce with some certainty for their futures and pass this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished sponsor of the bill from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very close friend from Baltimore, Maryland, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly bipartisan. We have 177 cosponsors, 32 Republicans. It ensures that all Federal employees will be paid for the duration of the Federal Government shutdown.

The issue is fairness. It's just wrong for the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees not to know whether they're going to be able to make their mortgage payment, not to know whether they're going to be able to provide for their families. Many of them live from paycheck to paycheck, and they're absolutely committed to paying their bills when they come due.

I'm sure that this experience has been shared by many of our colleagues. They come to our offices. In fact, just 2 days ago, a woman came in and she started to kind of matter of factually explain the financial situation she had. And she just broke down sobbing. ''I don't know how I can provide for my children if I don't get my paycheck.'' It wasn't through her fault. She didn't do anything wrong. It wasn't through any kind of performance. She's a hard-working employee. She's got commendations.

But we decided, because we haven't been able to fix the budget situation, that we're going to allow this government to shut down. So she's collateral damage. It's wrong—800,000 people are suffering. This would relieve their anxiety. That's why it's a simple matter of fairness, Mr. Speaker.

Now of course on this side of the aisle, we feel strongly that if we could just bring up a simple appropriations bill today, tomorrow, it would pass because there are enough Republicans that want to do that, combined with virtually all of the Democrats. But whether that happens or not, when it happens, this bill does need to happen.

It should be borne in mind, keeping these individuals at home is costing us about $300 million a day in lost productivity. Hundreds of Federal workers have come to our offices, asking us to do this, asking us more importantly to let them go back to their work. They're dedicated to their jobs. So that's the underlying message, let them get back to work.

But in the meantime, let's get this passed. And let's bear in mind that this bill is introduced in a context that over the last 4 years, the Congress has frozen Federal employees' pay. We've cut their pension benefits, and we've furloughed thousands as a result of the sequester. The cumulative impact actually of these punitive measures will cost each Federal employee an average of $50,000 over the budgeted period. I don't think that's fair. It's not right to punish a workforce of civil servants for whom we are the board of directors. We're responsible for this. Let's do the right thing. Let's get a unanimous vote for this bill simply because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last summer, thousands of civilian defense workers were furloughed in violation of the law as the administration decided to spread the pain for political purposes.

In July, the House passed the Defense appropriations bill to fund the military, including those illegally furloughed employees, by 315 votes in an intensely bipartisan effort. And yet since July, the Majority Leader has yet to bring that bill to a vote in the Senate. This week, we passed a law to fund our military, although the administration attorneys are still arguing over what the word ''support'' means. And I commend the Department of Defense in their efforts to overcome this roadblock and get people back to work.

But because of these examples, it is imperative that all Federal employees are guaranteed they will receive the backpay that is due them. This will not cost the government extra. There is precedent. It is logical. Yes, our goal should be to start the government working. But as we are looking, within 2 weeks of this period of time, debt ceiling, the issue of sequestration, entitlement reform, a Senate that continues to demand that we spend an extra $60 billion we don't have and ObamaCare, it is clear that the strategies of the past don't work.

Senator REID's position of ''it's my way or nothing'' has won. We have nothing. And we will continue to have nothing until something new breaks this logjam.

If the Senate were to engage in legitimate talks with real negotiations, that could break this logjam. So it is clear, the Senate's attitude is the key to ending the shutdown. But until that happens, it is significant that all Federal employees know that they will receive their funds, and they will not become innocent victims of the Senate's attitude of belligerence.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of the committee.

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

I also want to thank Mr. MORAN for his leadership and Mr. WOLF, as the lead sponsor of this bill, along with Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. WITTMAN. I know there are a lot of staff as well who have been working hard on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This bipartisan legislation will ensure that our more than 800,000 Federal workers who have been placed on furlough since October 1 will receive full backpay for the duration of the government shutdown. This legislation recognizes that our middle-income

Federal employees are totally committed to serving the American people. And to their great credit, our public servants have remained ready, willing, and able to perform their duties, even in the face of mandatory increases in their retirement costs, sequestration, related furloughs, and as they face the likelihood of their fourth consecutive year of pay freeze imposed by this Congress.

Given that these furloughed employees have already carried a major part of the burden working towards deficit reduction, it would be unjust to expect them to bear the additional cost and uncertainty of a shutdown engineered by one extreme faction within the Republican Party—not all, but one extreme faction within that group—who are intent on destroying government operations for the sake of political brinkmanship.

I would also note that these furloughed Federal employees, nevertheless, perform mission-critical agency functions. Among the employees who have been sent home by the shutdown are Federal aviation safety monitors, Department of Defense military technicians, disease surveillance personnel at the Centers for Disease Control, and also food safety inspectors at the FDA, as well as NIH researchers who are engaged in experimental clinical trials that are life-and-death matters for some.

So it's, therefore, imperative that we also pass a clean continuing resolution so that these Federal workers can immediately return to their post.

Again, I thank Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CUMMINGS for their great work on this important legislation and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3223.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to recognize the gentlemen from Virginia, Mr. WOLF and Mr. MORAN, for their leadership in bringing this forward and for the leadership on both sides of the aisle. This is absolutely necessary.

I rise today in strong support of the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. And I'm proud to be part of a bipartisan group of cosponsors to make sure that this is something that got done and is being done in the best interests of our great Federal workforce.

This bill should really be called the ''Pay Certainty Act'' because that's exactly what it will do, provide certainty for our Federal employees who, through no fault of their own, were told that they were not allowed to come to work effective October 1.

Our Nation's dedicated civil servants have already been asked to shoulder the burden of numerous efforts to reduce government spending. We all know that it is a shared sacrifice. But they don't expect to do it alone. And I've talked to many Federal employees who are willing to do their part. But like everyone else has said, they don't expect to shoulder these cuts alone.

These furloughs have had devastating impacts on people's lives, on the doctors and nurses at veterans hospitals who are responsible for taking care of the men and women who have faithfully served our Nation, on the law enforcement officers running down leads on terrorist threats and protecting our homeland, on the firefighters stationed at military installations around the globe, on our Capitol Police who protect your Congress and Capitol, and on the multitudes of other Federal employees who do a great job serving their Nation day in and day out. The only thing that they want is the ability to serve. And they have all done that in the greatest way possible. And for that, they have my deepest gratitude and sincere thanks, and I know they have the deepest gratitude and sincere thanks from all Members of this body. We deeply appreciate what they do for our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to work together to get the work of the Nation done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of our Government Ops Subcommittee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican manager and the distinguished ranking member, my good friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. Speaker, it's been an Orwellian week in which black is white and white is black. We've got Members who voted for the shutdown who appeared surprised that that led to the closure of national parks, which didn't stop some of them from berating park Federal employees for enforcing the shutdown. We have other Members in this Orwellian week saying that the shutdown is all about respect, and we've got to get something out of this; we just don't know what it is.

So, finally, a moment of decency. Finally, we turn to the men and women who serve our country, the 800,000 Federal employees who are furloughed, and we do something decent for them. We alleviate the angst of whether there will be that paycheck whenever we get around to reopening the government.

This week, one of those dedicated civil servants from my constituency, Dave Lavery, received the prestigious Service to America Medal in recognition of his exemplary leadership of the 6,000-person team that conceived and executed NASA's incredible Curiosity Rover Mission to Mars.

America is unbelievably fortunate to have this kind of talented and passionate Federal worker like Dave Lavery, whose public service should be celebrated, appreciated, and yes, compensated.

On October 1, Dave was one of 17,600 NASA employees deemed ''nonessential'' and was furloughed. The irony was that Dave had to consult the Ethics Office of NASA to see if he could go to his own awards ceremony because of his ''nonessential'' furloughed status. That's what we're reduced to. So today's bill at least redresses one wrong in this otherwise Orwellian exercise called the Federal shutdown.

□ 1015

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen from Virginia, Messrs. MORAN and WOLF, for their effort, but also for personally coming up to me and asking me to be an early advocate of this very important bill.

Like them, I have many constituents who are Federal employees who are furloughed right now, including most of the majority of them being civilian employees at Offutt Air Force Base and STRATCOM. The legislation that we are considering here today will ensure that the 800,000 Federal employees are paid for the time lost or off work during this impasse.

Now, we worked last week in a bipartisan effort to make sure that our military would be paid, and included in that bill called Pay Our Military Act was also very clear language that protected civilian DOD workers who are furloughed. But, unfortunately, in a bizarre ''what's the definition of 'is' discussion'' in the White House and DOD, they furloughed 60–70 percent of the civilian employees where there are critical missions, endangering our country.

So having a bill like this where we come together in a bipartisan way, we can reduce some level of frustration, we can give some level of peace of mind to those employees that they will be reimbursed for their time lost, they will get paid. I want the DOD today to put those civilian DOD employees back to work as it's clearly in the law.

Now, there is historical precedent for this, all of the way back to Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill and their six closedowns when employees were paid and reimbursed for their time off, and so it should be for this effort. This is bipartisan. The President has said he will sign this. I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland.

No one should be made to suffer for actions that are no fault of their own, so I'm very pleased that we're taking up this measure to ensure that dedicated Federal workers who are among the many innocent victims of this government shutdown will be held harmless in the long run. But this important measure simply highlights the sheer folly of keeping the Federal Government shut down for one additional minute. These are public servants who

are paid to do what they love to do—to serve the public. So for goodness sake, let them all get back to work for the public now.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at FEMA. It doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at the national parks. It doesn't say let's just pay the Federal employees at the piecemeal, cherry-picking agencies that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor. It says let's make sure we hold all Federal employees whole. Absolutely. And let's reopen the entire Federal Government and do it now. Mr. Speaker, let us have a vote on that very simple proposition.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill which will make sure that Federal workers who are furloughed because of the shutdown are paid; but I would also point out that the average salary of a Federal worker is $78,500, and so what I don't understand is why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how they can decide which of the funding bills that we have passed during this shutdown are actually worthy of their support, because this week they said ''no'' to opening up our national memorials or opening up our national parks, like Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon, but they're saying ''yes'' to paying Federal workers. They said ''no'' to veterans benefits, but ''yes'' to paying Federal workers; ''no'' to women and babies on food assistance; ''no'' to children with cancer treatments, but ''yes'' to paying Federal workers; ''no'' to the National Guard and Reserve, but ''yes'' to other Federal workers.

Clearly it is time for both sides, Mr. Speaker, to sit down in a conference to negotiate a compromise in a bipartisan manner and to end this shutdown.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would say that we on this side of the aisle say ''yes'' to opening the entire government.

And with that, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. For the last few years, Federal workers have borne the brunt of Congress' failure to deal with its long-term budget issues: going 3 years without a cost-of-living adjustment; facing furloughs from sequestration; and, now, the uncertainty of further reductions in pay because of the shutdown. Enough is enough.

This shutdown is having a big impact not just on DOD workers and park workers and VA workers and others facing furloughs, but on our entire community, folks who won't be able to replace a car or make a home payment or go buy a new TV. That affects our economy. That's why I support this bill, and it's also why I am introducing legislation to provide backpay to workers to compensate them for sequestration-related furloughs as well.

We need to end this partisan bickering, end the gridlock, end the shutdown, and get Congress and government back to work.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

This is an issue of fairness. Five days ago, the President signed my legislation, the Pay Our Military Act. However, hours later, the DOD comptroller sent an email to all DOD civilian employees who were included in the act, which is now law, that there would be furloughs starting immediately despite acknowledgment of the new law.

Last night, media sources reported that the Secretary of Defense had a change of heart—no doubt due to the multitude of letters he had received from me and my colleagues on this subject—and decided to bring these furloughed employees back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a shame if the thousands of DOD civilian employees who were needlessly furloughed were not paid for time they could have spent working had the Secretary given the same level of priority to this issue that he did to college football.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which is important to all the Federal employees in New Mexico. This bill ensures that furloughed employees will be made whole. It is also important for contract employees who work at our national labs. It is clear that Congress intends to insulate those workers who provide vital services to our Nation from the effects of the shutdown.

In the past, DOE has sought to treat lab employees the same as Federal employees. This legislation sets the precedent for how those employees will be treated. We are sending the message that DOE should certify backpay for lab employees as an allowable cost so they will be made whole if they are furloughed. I submit into the RECORD my letter to Secretary Moniz expressing congressional intent to insulate those workers who provide vital services to our Nation from the effects of a shutdown, which includes contract employees at our national labs.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2013.

Dr. ERNEST MONIZ,
Secretary of Energy, Washington, DC.

SECRETARY MONIZ: I write today to call your attention to the many New Mexicans who work at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories who have been adversely affected by the continuing budget impasse in Congress and the resulting shutdown. As you know, these labs are essential to our nation's national security as well as its scientific and research capabilities. Their workforce is comprised of many of the smartest scientists, engineers, and researchers in our country, all of whom have devoted their careers to serving and protecting our nation.

This government shutdown risks betraying these men and women who have made personal sacrifices for our collective security and technological advancement. While lab employees work for the contractors who manage the labs, they are subject to much of the same uncertainty as their colleagues in the federal workforce. While neither of the New Mexico NNSA laboratories have yet announced a need to furlough their workforce, a number of my constituents have written to my office or contacted me directly to share the stress of potentially being furloughed from the labs and missing out on a needed paycheck.

Today, the House of Representatives will pass H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would compensate all federal employees who would not otherwise receive their full salaries due to the shutdown. President Obama has declared that he supports the legislation and his office writes,

''Federal workers keep the Nation safe and secure and provide vital services that support the economic security of American families. The Administration appreciates that the Congress is acting promptly to move this bipartisan legislation and looks forward to the bill's swift passage.''

The overwhelming bipartisan support for this legislation demonstrates the clear Congressional desire that the federal workforce should not be adversely impacted by the shutdown nor should they shoulder the burden of its resulting uncertainty. While the employees of New Mexico's national laboratories are not included within the bill's specific terms, Congress clearly intends that those workers who provide such vital services for our nation should be insulated from the effects of a protracted shutdown.

It is my understanding that the Department of Energy can certify to the labs that it is an ''allowable cost'' for them to use their appropriated dollars to compensate their employees for back pay due to any furloughs caused by.a shutdown. Due to the tremendous economic uncertainty currently faced by the laboratories' workforce, I urge you to certify as soon as possible that back pay will be allowable upon the restoration of government functions. The employees of our nation's national laboratories deserve to know that they will be fully compensated for their service to our nation.

Sincerely,

BEN RAY LUJÁN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that once again this Chamber is moving forward with yet another bill to fund our government. Today, we're ensuring that all Federal employees are paid so their families are not harmed during this time. I know how these families feel because I was a Federal employee for 16 years. I am also proud to represent Scott Air Force Base in the metro east area of Illinois. Whether they are Active Duty, civilian, Reserve, Guard, or retired, we must take care of our military. The House has already acted to ensure that these men and women are paid; but, unfortunately, this administration has chosen needlessly to furlough workers.

Today, I stand with these hardworking men and women, and I also stand against this administration that

always seems to find a way to make situations like this as painful as possible. We have been told to make things difficult for people as much as we can, said a park ranger this week to reporters.

I had a similar experience a few months ago with an airport in my district that was at risk of losing their control tower, even though we told the administration how they could shift the money around. To solve this problem, Mr. Speaker, we had to stand on this floor and pass a bill, and now that tower remains open. Congress had to pass a bill and has to pass a bill now to stop this behavior, and I am offended by the punitive behavior of this White House then and today.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with all military personnel.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan bill, H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. Today is the fifth day of the government shutdown; 87 percent of Americans expressed in a political poll unhappiness with the direction of Washington with this shutdown. Federal employees are dedicated public servants who are just trying to do their jobs, support their families, and contribute to the economy. They did not ask to be furloughed, and they had no time to plan financially for this crisis brought on by the stubbornness of the Republican Party. It seems to me that by supporting this bill, we are not trying to give them a paid vacation. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would bring a clean CR to the floor, they could all be back to work on Monday. These families are victims of the dysfunction of this Congress.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to guarantee our Federal workers are paid. They shouldn't be the innocent pawns in the middle of a debate caused by us unable to work with the Senate. We are ready to talk. We are ready, willing, and able to talk; but we need to ratchet down the rhetoric a little bit, make sure our employees get paid, make sure they get taken care of, and make sure that the men and women who work in places in my district, the district I represent—like the Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, like Padre Island National Seashore, like the Aransas Wildlife Refugee—are secure and safe. We need to get this done.

The Republicans are trying to lessen the impact of this, passing bill after bill. We have passed something to fund the entire government, including most of ObamaCare with the exception of the individual mandate. We are ready, willing, and able to negotiate, and I call on the Senate to come over and talk to us so we can get this done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I remind the gentleman we could get it done today. We want to open up the entire government today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I rise in support of H.R. 3223, and I speak in support of Tracy in Laurel who lives in my district who works at HHS. She helps her mom out every month with her Federal salary; and Christopher and his wife, both of whom work at the Department of Homeland Security, live in Millersville, and they are both on furlough. And Dini, who is a single parent in Oxon Hill, she has already been furloughed this summer and suffers mightily.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the right thing to do; but let's keep in mind that the longer we stay out, meeting the day-to-day needs of our Federal workforce is really tough. Some of these people will really struggle even if they are guaranteed retroactive pay. It's time for us to get the entire government back to work.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

□ 1030

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I rise in strong support of the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

Federal workers from western Pennsylvania have reached out to my office. They are concerned about the impact of this shutdown on their families' budgets. These workers serve their fellow citizens. We recognize and thank them for that service.

This bill will retroactively pay Federal employees furloughed during the government shutdown. Federal workers in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation should not be punished for the Senate's refusal to come to the table and negotiate an end to the shutdown.

I urge my Republican and Democrat colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. CUMMINGS, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was walking on the floor moments ago, and my colleague on the other side said that this failure to pass a CR was punitive behavior of this White House. I cannot allow that to go unanswered. The fact is that there are 260 votes right now in this Chamber to pass a clean CR today.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether the gentleman has additional speakers?

Mr. TURNER. We do not.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that the House pass H.R. 3223 to ensure that our dedicated Federal employees are made whole and receive backpay once this shutdown comes to an end.

Federal employees have been the subject of relentless attacks on their pay and benefits over the last 3 years. This bill is the least we should do. Our hard-working public servants should not become collateral damage in the political games and ideological wars that the Republicans are waging. I would hope that we would have a unanimous vote, because there are so many people that are living from paycheck to paycheck, and they need our vote.

I would suggest that we open up the entire government so that all of our employees can get back to work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle would have us believe that this shutdown is somehow a Republican-engineered shutdown. They would have you believe that the government only shuts down with Republican leadership, and we know that that's not the case.

The government shuts down when there's a failure of the democratic process to work and parties to negotiate in good faith and the deliberative process of democracy to move forward. The President has absolutely shut that down with his refusal to negotiate.

We had a government shutdown when Mr. Reagan was in the White House. Under President Reagan, the Democrat-controlled Congress shut the government down a total of eight times, for 14 days. So a Democrat-controlled Congress actually shut the government down under Reagan for longer than it has been shut down now. Again, under Mr. Clinton, the House also shut the government down.

In each of those instances, there was something different than what's now—and that is that there were negotiations going on. President Reagan was negotiating with the House and Senate. President Clinton was negotiating with the House and Senate. But this President said absolutely no negotiations.

This President will negotiate with Syria. He'll negotiate with Iran. He'll even have secret negotiations with Russia and secret deals. But he will not negotiate with the legislature.

Now, what won't he negotiate over?

He won't negotiate over the debt limit. He wants to take the country from $17 trillion to $19 trillion in debt. No negotiations.

He won't negotiate on his sequestration. In my community, there were 12,000 people that were furloughed. The President will not negotiate on his sequester.

The President will not negotiate on funding the government. We have sent countless bills over to the Senate that would reopen the national parks, that would fund the veterans, that would allow Washington, D.C., to spend its own funds, and HARRY REID heartlessly has said in response to these bills that would provide needed services, Why would we do that?

But we know that the President is playing politics because this House and the Senate passed the Pay Our Military Act. It was signed by the President of the United States. I have sent letters to Secretary Hagel and to the President questioning why he would have furloughed 400,000 DOD workers when he had signed the Pay Our Military Act, and 8,700 workers in my community were furloughed.

How do we know they were playing politics by letting the Department of Defense employees go even though the President had full authority to fund them? Because he's going to be calling them back. He's calling them back without any other passage of any other law or any other law that he signs. So clearly, the President is admitting that he's been playing politics with these furloughs—and it needs to stop.

It also needs to stop so our Federal workers do not have to worry about their pay, they do not have to worry about the impacts on their personal lives. They have child care expenses, house payments to make, kids that are in college. And while the President refuses to negotiate, while he's playing politics, they shouldn't worry about whether or not they can make ends meet.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3223 that would restore the pay to Federal workers and ensure that they have the security that they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

Hon. CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 30, 2013, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Pay Our Military Act to reverse the devastating impacts of a government shutdown on civilian employees. Under the law, you are authorized to ''provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.'' This certainly applies to the civilian men and woman at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base who work diligently in support of the Armed Forces. The law is clear and provides the department as well as the United States Coast Guard with the authority to immediately call its civilian employees back to work.

I am deeply concerned with the impacts to the Department of Defense caused by a government shutdown. The current situation poses a great risk to military readiness and undermines the department's ability to carry out its mission. While our uniformed men and women may be exempt from furlough, I remain deeply concerned with the status of our civilian employees caused by the current shutdown of the federal government. Just like our uniformed service men and women, these civilians play an integral role in ensuring the safety and security of our nation. At Wright-Patterson Air Force Base alone, over 9,000 civilian employees have been furloughed and therefore prohibited from coming to work.

I await an immediate update on the department's implementation of the law and will continue to work with you as we put the government back to work and mitigate the impacts of a government shutdown.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. TURNER,
Member of Congress.

President BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America, The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply disturbed to learn that your Administration has decided not to immediately put the Department of Defense's civilian personnel back to work despite having the legal authority to do so.

On September 30, 2013, Congress passed and you signed into law the Pay Our Military Act to reverse the devastating impacts of a government shutdown on Department of Defense civilian employees. Under the law that you yourself signed, you are authorized to ''provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.'' Failure to fully implement this law not only goes against the will of Congress but puts at risk the safety and security of the United States.

As Commander and Chief, I urge you to restore the department's civilian workforce in its entirety to include the 9,000 furloughed civilian employees currently serving at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in my district. The hardworking civilians at Wright-Patterson are a critical national security asset and certainly ''provide support to members of the Armed Forces.'' Using our defense civilian employees as political bargaining chips is unacceptable and is in direct violation of the United States Constitution.

I urge you to comply with existing law and await an immediate update on the planned implementation of the Pay Our Military Act.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. TURNER,
Member of Congress.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in day five of the Republican shutdown, without an end in sight. Let's be clear that this is a manufactured crisis designed to promote ideology at the expense of needs of our constituents, the American people.

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. I am an original cosponsor of this vital piece of legislation to ensure furloughed federal employees receive back pay for the duration of the government shutdown, regardless of their work status. I would like to thank my Virginia colleagues, Representatives MORAN and WOLF, for their leadership on this issue and I am proud to be a part of the bipartisan Washington-area delegation that drafted and introduced this bill that will provide some certainty to federal workers and their families.

Roughly 800,000 federal workers across the country, who work hard to make our nation a safer and better place to live, will lose their pay because they have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown unless Congress and the President enact legislation to ensure their pay. Under this legislation, federal workers would get retroactive pay, regardless of their furlough status, once the government is funded.

Federal workers should not be held responsible for Congress' inability to pass a budget. Yet, it is the American people, including millions of federal workers, and the U.S. economy who will pay the price.

They are workers like Tracey out in Laurel, Maryland, who has contacted my office. She works at the Department of Health and Human Services and besides meeting her own obligations, she helps her mother pay bills each month. When she called my office, she was crying, she was in tears, because she wants this shutdown to stop so that she can get back to work and to pay her bills.

As Tracey knows all too well, government employees have already shouldered a great deal of the burden of past deficit reduction measures and have lived through the pain of sequestration. Civilian federal employees already have been subjected to a three-year pay freeze, and automatic, across-the-board budget cuts resulted in furloughs for thousands of workers this summer.

They are workers like Dini who lives in Oxon Hill—and I too live in Oxon Hill. She is a single parent who was already furloughed earlier this summer, and now she isn't sure how she is going to pay the bills or take care of her child. In fact, some of these federal workers still have to pay childcare to keep the spot in daycare, even though they are not being paid, they are not working, and may not even have their child at the daycare facility.

Then there are workers like Christopher from Millersville: He and his wife are both employed at the Department of Homeland Security in support of the security of this nation. They were both furloughed earlier this summer, and they find themselves furloughed once again.

That is why this legislation is so critical to ensure our federal workers receive the backpay they deserve. The time is long over-due to provide certainty to our dedicated public servants, who we rely on for public safety, research, and national security. Today's proposal shields family pocketbooks and reaffirms our commitment to our federal workforce—providing these employees with retroactive compensation, as we have historically done in past shutdowns.

Federal workers who stay on the job during a shutdown are paid but not until the government is back up and running. Authorizing back pay is an important step for furloughed federal workers. So with passage of this legislation, all federal employees will be paid and treated the same. However, to be clear this doesn't solve all of their problems. Their paychecks will be delayed depending on how long the shutdown lasts. So, they may not be able to meet their bills on time if the government remains shutdown and they don't receive their paychecks.

This legislation by itself won't address the funding lapse or its consequences. We still must end the shutdown and open the government so federal workers can get back to work and receive that back pay in a timely manner.

I urge the House Republican Leadership to immediately bring up the Senate-passed clean funding compromise, which could go directly to the President and open up the entire government for all of the American people today.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to attend today's session of Congress, as I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have strongly supported passage of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

Federal employees are currently caught in the crossfire, collateral damage in the Republican Party's war against the Affordable Care Act. The Republican Party's refusal to fund our government has resulted in a shutdown that is threatening our economic recovery and severely impacting crucial federal services. It needs to end immediately. This shutdown has caused 800,000 federal employees to be furloughed, with no end in sight. This is personally impacting these dedicated federal employees and their families, who are not receiving a pay check, while many Members of Congress continue to take theirs. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that these furloughed workers will receive back pay when this crisis is resolved.

These employees should not be punished because of Congress's failures. I support this legislation because it will ensure that as soon an as the Republican Party comes to its senses and allows an up or down vote on a clean Continuing Resolution, our government will reopen and these employees will receive their just compensation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3223, the "Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act," which provides for retroactive pay for nearly 800,000 federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown engineered by the Tea Party faction of House Republicans.

I am pleased to co-sponsor and support this bill because it is the right thing to do. The men and women who have been furloughed because of this manufactured crisis are not responsible for the budget impasse.

They did not vote to reject the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate that would have resolved the crisis and made this legislation necessary.

The dedicated men and women of the federal civilian workforce, like those who serve in the Armed Forces, have not spent their professional lives trying to defund the Affordable Care Act or threatening to refuse to raise the debt limit and risking the full faith and credit of the United States.

Instead, these loyal and committed public servants are motivated by their paramount interest in serving the American public without fear or favor and, for the last four days, without any guarantee that they would be compensated for their labor.

And yet, they gladly and willingly serve, some risking their lives to keep us safe. Others stand watch monitoring weather systems and providing information necessary to protect the public from hurricanes and tornadoes and wildfires or conduct research to find cures for disease or that will lead to technological innovations or help us mark and measure the far reaches of space.

Others work to secure the borders and homeland, ensure the safety of our food and water, serve our seniors and children, provide training and support for those looking for work, and protecting our environment and keeping watch over our treasures—our national parks and monuments, including this magnificent Capitol where the people have sent us to do their business.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of the federal workforce do the people's business. They serve everyone equally. They do not single out some persons to serve and ignore others. They do not cherry-pick.

We should follow their example. And the best way to do that is to call up and put to a vote the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate last week.

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. Speaker, holding harmless the federal employees who have been furloughed by this unnecessary government shutdown is a matter of simple justice.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 3223.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the fifth day of the Republican government shutdown, thousands of federal employees and their families must continue to face the uncertainty of how soon they will be able to return to work. The longer that this shutdown continues, the harder it will be for the more than 800,000 workers on furlough to budget and plan for the future.

That is why, in a gesture of basic equality, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. This common sense legislation would provide retroactive compensation to federal employees who have been furloughed due to the House Republican leadership's refusal to pass a clean budget. Hundreds of thousands of federal workers, many of whom belong to the middle class, are still recovering from a three-year pay freeze. Placing the additional burden of unpaid leave of absence on these families is both unnecessary and unjust.

The consequences of the Republican government shutdown extend far beyond federal workers and their paychecks. Federal research activity is already grinding to halt, impacting our longterm competitiveness and capacity to innovate. Consumer protections through the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services, and others have ceased. Further, the U.S. economy is losing millions of dollars in lost economic output each day that the federal government remains closed.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have been determined to cause a government shutdown in order to advance an extreme political agenda. Now, the American people and the U.S. economy are stuck with the consequences. Retroactively paying these federal employees will help mitigate the negative effects of this unexpected furlough. We owe it to the American people to practice good governance and Republicans in Congress have failed at this most basic responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. 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, this 15-minute vote on the question of passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 58.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—407

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
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
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
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)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui

McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Cárdenas
DeGette
Duncan (TN)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Labrador
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pascrell
Pittenger
Rangel
Renacci
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schock
Tipton
Vargas
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1057

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—400

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

NAYS—1

Enyart

NOT VOTING—30

Bass
Cárdenas
DeGette
Duncan (TN)
Hahn
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Labrador
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pascrell
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Rangel
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (TX)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Vargas
Walz
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1113

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

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

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1848. An act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the BBC News, on October 1, 2013 in England, published the following: ''For most of the world, a government shutdown is very bad news—the result of revolution, invasion or disaster. Even in the middle of its ongoing civil war, the Syrian government has continued to pay its bills and workers' wages. That leaders of one of the most powerful nations on earth willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services and decreases economic growth is astonishing to many.'';

Whereas, the state-run Xinhua news service, on October 2, 2013 in China, published the following: ''With no political unity to redress its policy mistake, a dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.'';

Whereas, The News of Mexico, on September 25, 2013 in Mexico, published the following: ''They squabble over the inconsequential accomplishment of a 10-week funding extension. It isn't serious, but it certainly isn't funny.'';

Whereas, the Australian, on October 1, 2013 in Australia, published the following: ''The irresponsible way in which Congress . . . played the politics of partisan petulance and obstruction . . . does them little credit. Neither does it say much for the budgetary processes in the world's largest economy.'';

Whereas, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: ''The main actors in this dispute, which brings together many factors, both ideological and political, took a huge risk and, unhindered, proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core . . . The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.'';

Whereas, the Süddeutsche Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: ''What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it . . . the politicians . . . At the moment, Washington is fighting over the budget and nobody knows if the country will still be solvent in three weeks . . . What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt'';

Whereas, the Washington Post, on September 30, 2013, quoted Justice Malala, a political commentator in South Africa as saying the following: ''They tell us, 'You guys are not being fiscally responsible' . . . And now we see that they are running their country a little like a banana republic . . . there is a lot of sniggering going on.'';

Whereas, the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on October 1, 2013, read: ''House of Turds'', and the bylines stated: ''D.C. cesspols shut down government'' and ''They get paid while nation suffers'';

Whereas, these reports call into question the dignity of the House; and

Whereas, the resulting reduction in the public's perception of the House's dignity has culminated in a 7% Congressional approval rating in the most recent Economist/YouGov poll: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—

that a government shutdown is a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a ''clean'' continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Florida will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when Congress was unable to reach agreement on a funding bill, the House acted immediately on the Pay Our Military Act. The bill passed the House on September 29, the Senate on September 30, and it was signed into law by the President that same day.

The Pay Our Military Act ensures that U.S. military personnel and active military Reservists will be paid and receive their allowances during this government shutdown.

Over the past week, the House put forward legislation to fund critical areas of government. We passed the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act and the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act. Yesterday, we considered and passed the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act; and, today, we passed another bill to fund the government.

These measures should have received the support of every Member in this Chamber. They are bills that should have passed the Senate and made their way to the President's desk. The President and the Senate should back these bills just as they did the Pay Our Military Act. Let's end this stalemate and move forward with the people's business.

PUT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to wish a congratulations to our Republican majority and a thank you for bringing a bill to the floor that would guarantee the pay for the furloughed Federal employees. The essential employees who are already working will be paid from existing law, so now we pass it to the Senate where those furloughed employees will be able to be paid.

My question of the majority Republicans is: now that we're going to pay these furloughed employees, let's bring them back to work. Why would we not bring them back to work if we're paying for them?

I've heard of people being paid not to work, but I've never heard it from the Republican majority before that. I voted for it, and it passed unanimously out of the House, but let's bring those folks back to work. Let's reopen this government, and let's bring back those dedicated Federal employees so they don't have to stand down there and stop our veterans from going to the World War II Memorial.

They're the folks who are working on all of the things that make our country great, so let's bring them back to work. We can do that. We are going to pay them. Let's let them come back and do their jobs.

HAPPIEST BIRTHDAY TO YOU, MARGUERITE FREEMAN

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my precious privilege this morning to express a loving tribute to one Marguerite Freeman.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Freeman was my third and fourth grade teacher, and if I could be with her right now as she is surrounded with family and friends and well-wishers on her 103rd birthday, I would just look into her eyes and say:

Thank you, precious lady, for all that you have done for me in this life. Without your loving encouragement to me as a child, I may never have had the privilege to stand here in this place and speak on the floor of the United States Congress; and I was only one of hundreds of children whose hearts and minds you so deeply touched with your noble message of love and human dignity to the generations to come.

So, beloved Mrs. Freeman, only eternity will discover your magnificent contribution to humanity. Happiest birthday to you, gentle lady, and may God keep you forever.

That's what I would say, Mr. Speaker.

PAYING FEDERAL WORKERS NOT TO WORK

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Federal workers, already under sustained attack from the Republican Shutdown Caucus, certainly deserve to have no further abuse, but the approval of this bill is surely one of the more bizarre moments in a truly bizarre Republican-controlled House.

These great conservative stewards of the taxpayers' dollars refuse to let our Federal workers work; and now, today, they approved legislation to pay them for not working. Getting nothing for your tax dollar. That's the new Republican-Tea Party concept of fiscal responsibility.

Of course, the Federal workers, even though they have paid leave now, are justifiably unhappy because of the uncertainty of not knowing from day to day whether they will be called to work and not knowing whether that paid leave will arrive in time to meet their bills at the end of the month.

Paying Federal workers not to work—a new level, truly, of absurdity in this politically manufactured government shutdown.

TEAR DOWN THAT WALL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. DOGGETT has said as to the absurdity, I'm not sure if this is Joseph Heller or if it's Fellini.

The Tea Party Republicans came here because they were concerned about the debt. The debt, Mr. Speaker, was caused by Reagan and Bush. Look at the records. Reagan and Bush caused the debt. Now they've shut down their government like an arsonist sets a fire, and they're coming around, acting like they're firefighters who are trying to rescue the children who they didn't realize were in the building and who couldn't get help from the NIH for their cancer treatments and the veterans they're going to rescue who couldn't go to the memorials and the Federal workers who aren't getting paid.

It is like a Fellini movie.

There is apparently a wall between the Tea Party Republicans and the mainstream Republicans, who would like to move this country forward.

Mr. Speaker, tear down that wall.

WORDS TO WHICH WE CAN ASPIRE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, what is going on in the House of Representatives right now actually is about the debt. You can look back 17 years when Speaker Gingrich was Speaker of this House.

What was gained by the Republican majority during that time?

If you just look at it from a purely political lens, actually, the Republican majority was reelected for the first time in 68 years after that last government slowdown, the last time being 1928.

This House passed welfare reform and passed welfare reform and passed welfare reform until President Clinton signed the bill. The largest capital gains tax reduction in the history of this country was passed after the last government slowdown, and the first overall reduction in taxes in 17 years occurred after the last government slowdown. Four consecutive balanced budgets came out of that activity. Probably the only balanced budgets in my lifetime occurred after Speaker Gingrich had the courage to do what he did 17 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most telling, in the State of the Union Address that followed the government slowdown the last time, President Clinton stood in this House and announced that the era of Big Government is over.

Those are words we can aspire to.

□ 1130

ALTERNATIVE UNIVERSE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, welcome to the alternative universe in the House of Representatives. We just voted, as we knew we would, to pay the furloughed workers when the shutdown ends, as we knew we would.

What started as a right-wing tantrum to defund ObamaCare, which failed, as it inevitably would, and then it became a demand to pull the rug out for another delay, we're now arguing about something. Negotiations? What?

Since we decided to pay everybody anyway, let's vote on the continuing resolution so we can at least get work in exchange for paying our employees and stop losing tens of millions of dollars every hour.

The Republicans now want to negotiate. I think that's terrific. We've been waiting 6 months for the House Republicans to appoint their conference committee so we can reconcile differences on the budget.

Let's vote on the continuing resolution. Let's appoint conference committees and get back to work.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, we're seeing an interesting dialogue today in the 1-minutes.

Last week, House Republicans brought to the floor a bill before the shutdown to pay our military. Both sides totally supported that, the Senate accepted it, and the President signed the bill. So that's law.

Early this week, after the shutdown occurred, House Republicans brought to the floor to fund the Veterans Administration, to fund National Institutes of Health research, to fund and open our national parks. My friends on the other side of the aisle—most of them, not all—voted ''no'' against that and called it a gimmick.

Today we brought a bill to the floor, the House Republicans, once the shutdown is over, to pay furloughed workers. Again, on that one today, both sides embraced it and said it's a good thing. Now my friends on the Democratic side are getting up and arguing against themselves.

We want to open the government. We want to end this. But we want to keep as much of the government functioning while we do it.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, through the looking glass, ''curiouser and curiouser,'' said Alice. I'm confused. It started out as: We're going to shut down the government until we repeal ObamaCare. Then it was: We'll shut down the government until we delay ObamaCare or the individual mandate or repeal the device tax, or something. Now, I just heard the gentleman from Texas say we're shutting down the government because we're concerned about the deficit. What is it? Which is it?

Come on, you're concerned about the deficit. We have a process. It's called the annual budget process in appropriations. It's a law. We should follow the law, which means temporarily continue the government. We don't shut down the government to deal with our differences in how much money we want to spend each year for what agencies.

This is getting absurd. We're now going to pay Federal employees to not work. Let's just declare them all ''essential,'' make them come back to work, and then we'll pay them later. Maybe in the Republican world that makes sense.

No. Let's just end the shutdown, bring them all back to work, give them their regular pay now, let them have their leave, and move forward with negotiations over the budget.

WHAC-A-MOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, one minor point. We say ''Oregon.'' And since the Ducks are going to win the national championship this year, we want to make sure everybody knows how to say it properly.

I rise today to discuss something that happened earlier in the week. The Republicans are playing Whac-A-Mole. Every time something pops up in the national press that is really embarrassing about this shutdown, they whack and hit it with a phony resolution—they're going to fix the problem—that they know is going nowhere in the Senate and not going to the President.

Earlier this week, after the extraordinary embarrassment of the veterans at the World War II memorial, they were hearing from a lot of small business people outside of Yosemite and other parks saying open the parks. I was just down there for an Honor Flight this morning.

They still don't have bathrooms, by the way.

So they took one little tiny slice of the Department of the Interior budget and they funded it, that which is most iconic, that which is most visible in the press. Guess what? They forgot everything else that goes on within the Department of the Interior.

I'll start locally, and we'll build back to the national issue here.

The William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge in the Willamette Valley opened the very popular firearms hunting season for black-tailed deer late last month, in September, but this week they are having to turn away hunters because of the House government shutdown.

The Bandon Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, also in my district, is a great spot for waterfowl hunting. Right now, the only thing it is open to are swarms of mosquitos. My colleague from California will talk in some detail about the Klamath Refuge. It's closed. The beginning of hunting season, closed.

The Fish and Wildlife Service in Oregon recently proposed that three other Oregon refuges—Baskett Slough, Nestucca Bay, and Siletz Bay—be open to hunting. Guess what. They can't continue the process to open those areas of hunting because of the government shutdown.

According to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, nearly 300,000 hunters spend more than $135 million a year. By shutting down the Federal Government, restricting hunting access on public lands, House Republicans have turned their backs on sportsmen and small businesses not just in Oregon, but across the country.

In addition to hunting, the refuges provide for anglers, hikers, kayakers, birdwatchers, and other outdoor enthusiasts, all who spend money in the local communities around these refuges. They're not coming. They're not spending the money in the local businesses all because of the phony shutdown of the government. Well, it's a real shutdown, but a stupid shutdown of the government by our Republican majority.

National wildlife refuges generate $1.7 billion in sales for nearby communities, and many of them are very dependent upon that for their survival. And every day, small businesses across the country that relate to hunting and fishing and other outdoor recreational activities, $4.5 million a day is lost in sales to their small businesses. This has got to end.

There are other very serious issues, which a number of my other colleagues will talk about here this morning, as relates to commercial fishing, commercial crabbing, and a number of other critical activities that are fulfilled by the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior, which were not restored or phonily restored by the Republicans.

I am now happy to yield to my colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank my friend for yielding and also for bringing this issue to the attention of the American people, and, by the way, for the great work that you do as our ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee.

I think Mr. DEFAZIO made a great explanation, a very instructive explanation about this Whac-A-Mole game that we're playing. The veterans memorial is closed, so we do a bill to open that up, a bill that we know isn't going anywhere. An issue comes about because of the lack of cancer treatment that some of our constituents need and must have, so we do a quick bill, Whac-a-Mole, a quick Band-Aid. The Capitol Police demonstrate that they put their life on the line every day, and it became very apparent this week when we had the very unfortunate situation over in the Senate. What do we do? We come out now and we say we're going to pass a bill to pay for Federal employees after this fabricated government shutdown is finished.

Those are all very serious issues, and there are a lot of other serious issues in front of us. What may pale in comparison is the issue of the wildlife refuges. People may say it's just a sport, it's recreation. To some, that is very important.

Just a week ago, ironically, our Nation celebrated National Hunting and Fishing Day, but today sportsmen and sportswomen, who are supposed to be out enjoying the opening day of duck season in many parts of my home State of California, are not because of this reckless, manufactured government shutdown that has shut down hunting opportunities throughout the entire national wildlife refuge system.

This shutdown is having a devastating impact on local economies that depend upon hunters and anglers throughout our entire country. There are 240 congressional districts that are home to national wildlife refuges. That's all the way across the country. This is an issue today and will be until we do away with this shutdown and open the government back up.

Every State has at least one refuge which allows hunting. Today, hunters are supposed to be lined up at places like the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and the Kern National Wildlife Refuge in my State of California. But because of this shutdown, all have been cancelled.

Some duck hunters will be able to pursue their opening day on nonrefuge land. But without hunting pressure on the refuges, their hunting is going to be shut down, closed, or at least truncated to some extent. In addition—and this is a very important issue that I think everyone needs to pay attention to—most of the access for California's disabled waterfowl hunters is found on our State's national wildlife refuge system. With the refuge closed, that means that disabled hunters, including many wounded warriors, will simply have no option for waterfowling. And in 2 weeks, all of the waterfowl hunting areas in California will be open. If we don't end this shutdown, millions of sportsmen and sportswomen will continue to be shut out from their refuges.

It's not just the hunters and the anglers that are affected by the closure of these wildlife refuges. Hunting in California is big business. In 2012 alone, hunters and anglers generated more than $1 billion in retail sales, and they created and they sustained at least 20,000 jobs in California alone.

I've heard from folks who own businesses around these refuges—restaurants, gas stations, a family-owned hotel and motel—that rely on the business generated by hunters. Some local lodges and motels have seen every one of their reservations for this weekend and the following week to be canceled. They were supposed to be fully booked. Next week is supposed to be their busiest week of the year. Now, because of this fabricated shutdown, they'll have empty beds.

At Kirbs Outlet, a sporting goods store in Tule Lake, Don Kirby, the owner, told me that he was expecting to have a big season for sales this year. Instead, he anticipates losing about $6,000 every day that the refuges are closed, and he may have to take out a loan just to keep his small business open.

Hunting guides in the Klamath Basin region are losing $800 to $1,000 every day that the refuge remains closed. Just over the Oregon border, the Wild Goose Motel in Merrill could have booked up all of their hotel rooms several times over because the demand is so high for this weekend and next week. According to Fran Lynn, their manager, out of their 13 rooms and 2 cabins, they have one room that will be occupied. These businesses that rely on the next few weeks of hunting season to keep them in business for the rest of the year are in a hurt, and they can't make up for the loss. This first week is

their big week each year, and it will be lost forever.

California hunters want and need access to our national refuges. It's time for the House majority to put the interests of our Nation ahead of the interests of the Tea Party and end this needless and reckless government shutdown, which is having an impact on millions of sportsmen and sportswomen around our country, along with Federal employees who are being furloughed, folks waiting on veterans benefits, folks waiting for cancer research and treatment, and the closure of our national parks.

This manufactured shutdown is costing us $12 million an hour. Please, bring back the clean CR to the floor for a vote so we can open our government. All it takes is one vote. Put it on the floor, and Democrats and Republicans will provide a strong bipartisan vote to pass it, to open our government, to get people back to work.

□ 1145

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

My colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON, is the two-time chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. And he was recently inducted into the California Waterfowler's Hall of Fame. So he obviously speaks with great authority on these issues and the impact of this unnecessary shutdown on hunters and related businesses in northern California and southern Oregon.

With that, I yield to my colleague from Washington State (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Many of my colleagues today have been highlighting the impacts on sportsmen and -women who are unable to access our National Wildlife Refuges and for other public lands. As they've made clear today, this is a serious problem that's costing our country millions of dollars and is denying access to those who would otherwise be enjoying the great outdoors.

In my home State of Washington, there are 11 wildlife refuges where the public can hunt or fish. All of those refuges are closed because of the shutdown.

But it's not only recreational users that are being impacted. Commercial fishermen in my State will be seriously hurt in the coming weeks if this shutdown does not end. Right now, fishermen from Washington State are in Dutch Harbor, Alaska, getting ready for the Alaska king crab season that's supposed to start in less than a couple weeks. These are the same fishermen and boats that you see on the reality show ''The Deadliest Catch.''

But because of the shutdown, they may not get to start fishing this season. That's because the staff at the National Marine Fisheries Service have largely been furloughed. As a result, no one is available to issue the rules and individual quotas for boats and processors that will permit our commercial fishers to work.

The Bering Sea crab fishery is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to fishermen from Alaska and Washington. And now, because of inaction by Congress, the fishing fleet, the captains, their crews, and the processors stand to lose millions. So instead of a fiscal cliff, right now we're facing a fishing cliff in the Bering Sea unless Congress acts before the season is scheduled to start on October 15.

If the season doesn't start on time, the cost to industry is significant. A delay could mean they'll miss out exporting to the all-important Asian holiday market when demand is at its highest and most lucrative. Missing the Asian market when it's in peak demand means prices significantly decrease by as much as 20 to 30 percent, which means millions of dollars in lost value. This would be a crippling loss to these businesses.

In addition to the potential loss of millions of dollars caused by market disruptions, the effects of the shutdown will be felt in other ways. Fishing boats typically incur costs of roughly $1,000 per day while sitting tied to the docks. Things like moorage fees, fuel, and food to feed the crew all cost the boat owners money.

A delayed crab season means processors will have empty facilities and an idle labor force that still has to be housed and fed. So processors will be contending with costs for housing, fuel, electricity, food for laborers, and more while not bringing in any desperately needed revenue.

Every day this shutdown continues, we're hurting the fishing industry. Without knowing when the season will start, these businesses have no certainty or visibility to plan. If we delay the start of the crabbing season by even a few days, we risk costing the entire industry millions of dollars in lost market value.

This is unacceptable. Our fishermen deserve better than this. Their families deserve better than this. The processors, suppliers, and other businesses that rely on a vibrant Alaskan king crab season all deserve better than this.

It's clear that this shutdown is hurting people, businesses, and our economy. It's time to end it and get to work on passing a long-term budget that will grow our economy, reduce our deficit, and responsibly create jobs.

I urge all of my colleagues to work together and do the job the American people sent us here to do. We must end the brinkmanship and do the responsible thing and reopen the government.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statements and her concern for the Washington crab fleet and others who have been impacted by this manufactured crisis.

I find it particularly bizarre now that this all started with the radical Tea Party minority on the Republican side. And I wonder what their supporters and constituents, who seem to hate all things government, are thinking about the fact that we are now paying Federal employees to stay home and not provide critical services, like opening the crabbing season in the State of Alaska.

I would also note that the west coast groundfish trawl surveys have been suspended. The five ships that were out there doing the survey were called back to port. All of the NOAA employees were sent home, but they will be paid later, some time. But they aren't doing the critical work we need for those commercial fisheries.

With that, I yield to my colleague from the State of California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) very much. And thank you for pointing out the foolishness, the nonsense, and even the hypocrisy of what's going on here.

My colleague MIKE THOMPSON, with whom I share a good portion of northern California, very eloquently pointed out a real problem. When the duck hunters can't hunt, we've got a problem. Opening day, how many days to opening day? Zero. It was supposed to open today. Mr. THOMPSON pointed out that the refuges are closed up in the northern part of the State of California.

How about elk hunters? Elk hunters out there, opening day, today. The refuges are closed, and a good portion of the Federal forests also are unavailable.

Let's see, pronghorn hunting in northern California and southern Oregon was supposed to start today. Not on the refuges. They're closed.

Well, if you are a fisherman and you want to fish in the refuges, don't go today. They're closed. And, of course, the hunters. I think I'll just leave this one up here. These are folks that really get agitated. They have every reason to be agitated. This is nonsense.

I really wanted to take a few moments to explain to the American public what is actually happening here. We came up on this shutdown presumably because we couldn't agree to a budget. The House of Representatives passed a budget in March. The Senate passed one in late March, early April. The Senate asked for a conference committee. They appointed conferees. And Speaker BOEHNER, until 2 days ago, refused to appoint conferees. It was only after the government shut down that he relented and appointed conferees, after the blowup.

And so you want to go to conference? Why didn't you go to conference in April, May, June, July, August, even early September? Why, Mr. Speaker, didn't you appoint conferees when we had the time to negotiate? Why did you wait until after hunters couldn't go to the refuges? I don't understand.

Oh, but you have a solution. The Speaker has a solution. We will open up individual parts of the government based upon what the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) calls ''the whack-a-mole theory of government.'' When something really embarrassing

happens, we'll find a solution, says the Speaker. Wow, how brilliant.

And so what did we do? Oh, we'll open some of the national monuments—not all of them. We're not going to open the fish and wildlife refuges so that the hunters can hunt. But we'll open the World War II Memorial, and maybe we'll open up some of the Smithsonian facilities here in Washington.

Oh, but there's a problem. That's got to go through the Senate. And that's got to have the Presidential signature. And that's not going to happen.

So what's going on here? What's happening? The American public says, What are you guys doing? Well, we're not doing our job. Mr. Speaker, you're not letting us do our job.

We actually have a solution. It's called a continuing resolution, a CR. And that's not a medical procedure. A continuing resolution is actually a process that's been used over 110 times since the first day of President Clinton's—yes, I said that—President Clinton, back in 1993, 110 times we've used continuing resolutions to get passed these unnegotiable periods.

But this time, they added a little deal to it. There will be a continuing resolution when you repeal the Affordable Care Act, when you delay it, when you repeal part of it, when you change it. That hadn't been done in the past. But here we are.

So where are we now with the whack-a-mole theory?

Do you know what these are? Does the American public know what these are? These are 11 of the appropriation bills. Each one is very lengthy. There are more than 500 to 1,000 different items in each one of the appropriation bills, funding individual parts of government, one item at a time.

It's a big government. It's a multi-trillion-dollar government. And it does a lot of good things, like, funds refuges so that people can go hunting, so that people can fish, so that there are national parks, camping grounds. At the national forests all across this Nation, camping grounds are shut down. Nobody's camping there this weekend.

These are the appropriation bills. Probably 5,000 or more individual items. In what has got to be one of the most foolish, nonsensical, and stupid actions, we're going to fund the government one item at a time. Yes. Hello, America. This is the Republican solution to the shutdown. We're going to fund the American Government one item at a time.

Let's see, this is day four of the shutdown. Okay. And to date, we have funded four specific parts of the American Government—oh, excuse me. I'm wrong. The House of Representatives has voted to fund four of the thousands of different parts of the American Government, four of them. Let me see, at this rate, it will probably be 2020 before the American Government is up and operating. How stupid is that when we have a solution available to us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, listen. We have a solution available to us. It's called a continuing resolution. It's passed the Senate. It doesn't have all of the things you may want—like terminating the Affordable Care Act, which is, in effect, modifying it, defunding it, and God knows what else you may want. It's just what is known as a clean continuing resolution that funds all of government—not one item at a time, but all of government. And at what level? At the same level that it has been funded for the last 12 months. Not more funding, not less funding, but a whole lot less funding than what I think is necessary. But nonetheless, it continues the funding of government at the same level as the last 12 months for the next month and a half. And then we go through all this again with another manufactured crisis.

I wonder what the hunters are thinking of us. Mr. Speaker, these men and women want to go hunting. These men and women want to go fishing, camping. They want to go to the national parks. They want to recreate. They want America operating.

Mr. Speaker, please, please end this foolishness. Ronald Reagan went to Berlin, and he said, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.'' Mr. Speaker, open up this government. Open up this government. You have the power. All you need to do is to bring to the floor a continuing resolution to fund the government at the very same level that it's been funded for the last 12 months, continue on for another 6 weeks so that we can establish what apparently you want, a conference committee, and negotiate, as we should do all the time, negotiate a resolution to this manufactured, unnecessary, stupid, dysfunctional crisis.

Mr. Speaker, open up this government.

□ 1200

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman from California. What he pointed out is critical. There is a time sensitivity to this. My other colleague from California pointed that out, too. Many small businesses are dependent on these critical weeks of opening season for their businesses. It is essentially like Christmas for retailers; the opening of hunting season for waterfowl and other species is for people who provide lodging and other services, guiding in those areas, and you are keeping them from working and you're depriving them of their livelihoods.

In Nevada, duck season opens October 12; swan, October 12; deer, October 10; elk, October 10. That's Nevada. That date is pretty soon.

Arizona: turkey, October 4. Well, we're there. Big horn sheep, October 4. On any of these Federal wildlife refuges, hunting will not be allowed.

But the bizarre thing is that some Republicans are saying this is about the deficit. So they are going to pay Federal employees to not work to make a point about the deficit. They are going to cause businesses to lose money on which they won't pay taxes because it is about the deficit; or, well, then there are others of them who say it's about ObamaCare. I wish the Republican majority could make up their mind.

But one thing is plain and clear—and I have been here 27 years—I believe in 27 years—I may be off by one—I believe two times out of 27 years, under both Democrats and Republicans, have we gotten by all of the appropriations bills passed by the beginning of the fiscal year on October 1. Two times in 27 years. But we didn't shut down the government every time that happened. We adopted a very simple continuing resolution. We'd say let's continue to fund government—not send people home and continue to pay them. Let's fund government and have them work, the same cost, and we'll do it for 4 weeks, 6 weeks, to force people to the bargaining table. Sometimes it was done at the prior year's level, sometimes slightly enhanced, sometimes slightly reduced. We have offered to do that. We have brought that up numerous times here. We're not allowed to bring it up explicitly but on votes on rules, and the Republicans won't allow a simple majority vote on temporary funding of government.

They allowed a vote today, which was unanimous, to pay people not to work, but they won't allow a vote on paying people to work over a short period of time.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank my friend for yielding.

One of the previous speakers asked a rhetorical question: How stupid is all this. I would like to kind of quantify that because you can actually put numbers on it.

In my home State of California, I'll tell you how stupid it is. Hunters, who aren't going to be able to hunt this week, they're responsible for about $400,000 in revenue. Retail sales from hunting is $1 billion. Salaries and wages, $760 million. Jobs, $21,000. State and local taxes, about $155 million. Federal taxes, about $175 million. That's how stupid this is.

And if you want more proof, look at the impact on the private sector. For those of you who don't like the government, for those of you who believe that we need to close down the government because everything can be done and should be done by the private sector, you're killing private sector businesses right now.

We talked about the impact on folks who are going to have to take out a loan to keep their sporting goods store open during the busiest time of the year. We talked about folks who have motels and lodges who can't rent a room at a time that would otherwise be the most productive time in their business cycle. Those are private sector business owners, and they employ private sector employees who are going to be sent home.

Unlike the bill that you just brought to the floor that was passed, those private sector employees who were sent home will not be sent home with full pay and benefits; they get paid when they work. The idea, and Mr. DEFAZIO mentioned it a couple of times, that we furlough Federal workers and then pay them for not doing a job, while at the same time we're closing down the facilities that they are employed to keep open and to manage, it is just baffling to me.

And look at the store owners, look at the private sector businesses that are being hammered by this manufactured closure of the Federal Government. Gas station owners, all of the people we have talked about, if they are bird watchers, fishers, hunters, they are driving to refuges, and they put gas in their gas tank. Those gas sales are gone. They buy groceries. They buy groceries to eat in the cabins they would otherwise rent and at the camp sites that they would otherwise inhabit. Those sales are gone.

Sporting goods. They buy all of the stuff that they use to hunt, fish, or bird watch. Not only are those sales gone, but for all of us who depend upon the money that's raised by the Dingell-Johnson provision, the money, the assessment that sportsmen and -women put on their own purchases that go into funding all of the wildlife refuges and all of the places that are near and dear to sportsmen and -women, that money goes away. All of the motels that would otherwise be full, that money goes away. The sales taxes go away. These are, in most parts, rural businesses that run in rural areas. So that's different than the businesses in the city. They don't have other folks coming in and spending in their area.

This is, as the ranking member stated, their Christmas holiday. This is when folks come to their area to spend their money to recreate, to hunt, and to fish. They depend upon this. So we have created a system, it's set up, manufactured, fabricated, it doesn't have to be this way, to penalize these folks who do nothing but work hard and provide opportunities for folks to recreate. In addition to that, you've heard the impact it is having on the fisheries, the commercial fisheries and the sports fisheries.

It is just absolutely outrageous that we are allowing this to happen when with one vote on the compromise bill from the Senate—and I say compromise because not only is it a clean CR that we have been hearing about, but, remember, the compromise was to bring that down to the lower funding level, a funding level that a lot of our folks on our side of the aisle have a real hard time with, and it has been dropped down to that rate. It could be brought to the floor and voted out. These businesses will be able to do business. Employees will be able to come back to work, both the Federal employees as well as the State employees. And let me remind you of the wounded warriors who aren't going to be able to recreate this weekend and this week because of this manufactured close-down of the Federal Government. Let's bring people back to work. Let's get going on this.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. It depends upon the topic. We're talking about locking hunters and fishers out of wildlife refuges and the impact on small communities across America, and the fact that it's essentially the Christmas season for many of these lodges, many of these local businesses that have been shut down. Certainly the Grinch has stole Christmas, and I'm not sure what the gentleman wishes to address. I will yield very briefly, but if we're going to go off topic or get on to something else, then I will have to reclaim my time.

I have known the gentleman for years, and so I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARTON. Well, I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I am not going to be demagogic. I certainly respect the comments of the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman of California. I was actually going to pay the gentleman from California a compliment.

I just wanted the country to know these are serious issues and there are differences of opinion based on philosophy, but there are not personality conflicts. The gentleman from California was gracious enough several weeks ago to invite me into his home for a meal. He makes a delicious grilled chicken and is quite the chef, and I just wanted to thank him. And at the appropriate time after the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from California have made their points, if they would like to enter into a little bit of just an honest policy debate, I would be happy to do that. But I know it is the gentleman from Oregon's time, and I don't want to take away from that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for those very tempered remarks and the kind remarks about the gentleman from California.

I would like to talk about a couple of other impacts. Some are in the Interior budget; some are in another budget we haven't touched yet. MIKE was talking very eloquently about the fact that these impacts are falling most on rural residents and on rural small businesses, areas that are for the most part pretty darned depressed in this country. A lot of my rural areas are well into double-digit unemployment.

I was talking to the chief of the Forest Service—granted, a different budget, one that hasn't gotten on the Republican radar screen yet, although I was talking to a Republican leader this morning who said they may yet do whack-a-mole on this one to try and fix it, and that is that the chief of the Forest Service has an obligation when timber is sold to a private party to have Forest Service employees monitor those sales. He has not found a way to declare those employees as essential and, as of Monday, is going to end somewhere between 400 and 500 active timber sales, bumping up against the winter season where many people won't be able to operate, depending on where the sale is, and incurring obviously penalties on the Federal Government because he does not have the staff to go out and monitor those sales.

I don't yet know about the Bureau of Land Management timber sales. They are a fairly unique thing. They happen on the statutorily unique lands of the Oregon and California lands. In Oregon, we have been in touch with the BLM, and we don't yet have an answer about how they're going to handle it.

Much of the restoration work from recent fires cannot be considered emergency; some of it can, but most can't. That work is not ongoing. Certainly any responsible timber salvage that might happen is not even being considered, and we're losing critical time there where those activities might be conducted.

And this morning, we did get the World War II Memorial reopened, only for honor flight and World War II veterans, and maybe other veterans. I'm not sure exactly the categories that were established. There were two rangers there this morning, and I encountered a problem. I was there to greet a large contingent from Oregon, wonderful people who put their lives on the line, but we are looking at a group here who are fairly elderly, and the adjacent bathrooms are not open. I went and asked the rangers if they could give me the key and they said, we don't have the key; that's maintenance. So we placed a call to the Park Service looking for whoever is the highest ranking person not being paid to stay home, and we got a fellow in charge of at least the World War II Memorial and some other grounds, and he said, I'm prohibited from doing that. I don't have that authority.

I've now called the White House to ask them. I mean, come on, restrooms for very elderly men and women who put their lives on the line, saved the world from the horrors of World War II, and we can't open bathroom facilities. I will go down and volunteer to refill the toilet paper rolls and clean up at night, you know, if we do that. I think other people I know would also do that.

So we've just got to end this. I mean, it became so bizarre today that Congress voted unanimously to pay a majority of the Federal workforce to stay home and not provide public services, to make what point. Let's just go ahead with a continuing resolution that doesn't change anything. We can adopt the lower levels that the Republicans have advocated for. Why can't we do that for 4 or 6 weeks? Open up the refuges so business can flow again to these areas because these hunting seasons are ephemeral, as are these timber sales.

There's another impact, and that is the Student Conservation Association

of the Interior Department has been shut down. So, again, hundreds of interns were sent home who were providing public services.

And then also in the other budget, agriculture, the job corps has been shut down. Thousands of young, at-risk people have been sent home. I don't know how many of my colleagues have ever gone to a job corps. It is the most inspiring thing. These kids are learning skills. These kids are high at risk. Many of these kids, young people, have been in trouble.

□ 1215

They're getting skills and they're getting jobs. They want to be there. They're working hard. They have been sent home. Some of them don't have a home to go to.

With that, I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank my friend from Texas for the compliment. You're always welcome in my home. I would suggest if we did more of that, we might get a little bit more cooperation on things that are important to the country.

Mr. DEFAZIO, I just wanted to comment on the issue you raised in regard to the World War II Memorial and the veterans who come out to get a glimpse of that, many of whom have never seen it before, some of whom have never been to Washington before, but they did in fact serve our country admirably, bravely, and heroically. They won World War II. As a combat veteran myself, I can tell you that I still get goose bumps when I hear about, and sometimes even talk about, what has become the Greatest Generation.

I think it's important for all of us to note that they're referred to as the Greatest Generation for a couple of reasons. One, and most obviously, they did a heroic job when they won World War II. There's no question about that. It was just an unbelievable feat. And the sacrifices they made were horrendous and something that we will all appreciate forever. And they won that war.

But they're also referred to as the Greatest Generation because, after winning that war, they came home to the greatest Nation in the world. They built this great Nation. And they built this great Nation for everyone, not for just the ones that they liked or just the programs that they liked.

We can stipulate that there are programs in the Federal Government that all of us may not think are the number one programs. There are programs in the Federal Government we all would like to see changes to. But the fact of the matter is, as our colleague from California pointed out, if you start passing them program by program, we've seen what's happened. Day five of the shut down and we've passed four programs—and only partially. It is absolutely ludicrous to think that we can do this.

We need to remember and honor that Greatest Generation, and we need to bring this budget that funds all of government—a government for all Americans, not just the Americans who are affected by the headlines today, not just the Americans who want to visit a memorial that's closed and we hear about it in the paper, not just an America who needs a medical procedure but that entity is closed so we're going to fund that one in the eleventh hour.

We need to fund government. We need to open government and get it back to work so we can be the greatest Nation. And we should do that. We should do it quickly.

I've said this a couple of times. This is a manufactured crisis. And nobody we represent at home or in anybody's district believes that we should operate in chaos, and that's exactly what we're doing right now. Talk to any of your business owners back home. They don't want to operate in chaos. Go to your universities, go to your small businesses, big businesses, schools. Nobody wants to operate in chaos.

We want to minimize chaos. The trains need to leave the station on time, as they say. The way to do that is to bring this continuing resolution to the floor for one vote, we open up government, and then we can get down to negotiating any changes that we might have.

You were successful in your plan. Eighty Members on the other side of the aisle signed a letter to my friend, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, to shut down the government. You were successful. Now let's open it back up. Let's bring these Federal employees back to work. And I'll repeat what the ranking member said. Federal employees that have been furloughed, they're home. They're not working. They're not keeping the World War II Memorial open. They're not keeping the wildlife refuges open. They're not at their job, yet we are paying them, according to the bill that the majority just brought to the floor and that was passed.

It's silly. It's ridiculous. This whole thing has gone on too long. Bring the CR to the floor. Let's get it voted on. It'll get strong bipartisan support. And let's open the government and then get down to the work that we were sent here to do.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would like to correct one thing the gentleman said. As I understand it, we are not paying them. We will pay them. For working today, they will get a hamburger on Tuesday, sometime, maybe, perhaps.

For a lot of people, that's a hardship. A lot of Federal workers are of modest means. I would point to our Capitol Hill police here. I've had conversations with a number of them. Leaves are canceled. Some of them have had plans for a very long period of time. They can't get sick. They are not being paid. They will be paid. They'll get a hamburger on Tuesday, maybe, sometime, depending on how long this whole thing drags on.

This has risen to the point of absurdity. It started out to stop ObamaCare from going into effect on October 1, and it went into effect. It then became chipping away at ObamaCare in ways they knew the President would never sign a bill to do.

But I heard just earlier today from a gentleman from Texas saying this is all about the debt and deficit. If it's all about the debt and deficit, this is pretty easy. Let's bring up the continuing resolution that would actually reduce spending from current levels, continue government for 6 weeks while we sit down and negotiate how we're going to deal with longer-term structural problems in our economy, dealing meaningfully with our debt and deficit. That seems pretty darn simple to me. It seems we're pretty close to agreement there. But, unfortunately, I think there's 30 or 40 Republicans whose agenda is still to stop or repeal ObamaCare.

So I believe the gentleman who spoke today was probably speaking out of school and not speaking for them. But what he said, and I believe a majority of Republicans want to do, could get Democrats to agree to in a minute. Bring up the continuing resolution. We're not very happy with the further reduction in spending levels across the board—it's a dumb way to cut—but we'll accept it for 6 weeks while we work out a longer-term deal.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE REST OF THE STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, for the last hour, the minority in the House, the Democrat Party, has had the right to speak to the American people in their leadership Special Hour. I think the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from California did a good job of presenting the side of the story as they viewed it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the late Paul Harvey had a radio program for many, many years that many of us listened to, and in that radio program he would tell us ''The Rest of the Story.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, for the next hour, those of us on the majority side, the Republican side—most of us from Texas, although we're going to have some friends from Michigan and perhaps from Florida, too—are going to tell you the other side of the story, the rest of the story. And let's start by discussing this continuing mantra from the minority side that we ought to just bring up the clean continuing resolution, or CR, from the other body, the Senate, and life would be perfect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one tiny, small problem with that. And that is,

Mr. Speaker, that that continuing resolution funds the discretionary part of something that is legally called the Affordable Care Act, but most people in the United States are now calling it ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a huge new entitlement. It's not just another Federal program. It changes, fundamentally, the way we practice medicine in the United States of America. It changes, fundamentally, the rights of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare mandates—forces—every American to have health insurance, whether they want it or whether they need it. It's a huge new right taken away, a freedom. Heretofore, we've said that people had the right to choose whether they wanted health insurance or not. And now we're going to tell them, at the Federal level, they to have it. That is not a trivial right to take away from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, mandates that every employer that has at least 50 employees must provide health insurance. Heretofore, health insurance had been considered a fringe benefit. Some employers provided it, some employers did not. Now, according to the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, you have to provide health insurance.

What that's done, Mr. Speaker, is caused many small businesses to reduce their workforce, to change their work hours. Many employees that were full-time, 40-hour employees, have become 20- or less than 30-hour part-time employees. Again, a huge change in the way Americans have conducted their business.

Mr. Speaker, there are many mandates in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, that relate to how you practice medicine. Many health care practitioners have told me in my district that they're not going to practice. They're going to retire. They're not going to put up with all the mandates. They're not going to put up with all of the paperwork. Again, something that is fundamentally changing the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, there are all kinds of mandates on what has to be included in insurance, how the insurance companies have to provide it, what premiums they can charge. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, many insurance companies have raised their premiums. Many insurance companies have changed their policies. Again, a fundamental change.

So, Mr. Speaker, when our friends in the minority on the other side say, Just bring up a clean CR and we'll vote for it, they don't point out that that clean CR includes funding for ObamaCare. It is, again, a fundamental change, Mr. Speaker. Most of us on the Republican side, the majority side, don't want that. We want the freedom to choose.

I would ask my friends on the minority side, if ObamaCare is so great, why does it have to be mandatory? Let's make it voluntary.

Republicans happen to support many of the things in it. We support coverage for preexisting conditions. We support allowing young adults to stay on their parents' life insurance until they reach the age of 26. We support the concept of the public exchanges. In the Republican alternative, when ObamaCare was passed, we had something called ''co-ops.'' Not exactly like these health exchanges, but certainly similar.

So, again, if this act is so good and so great and everybody loves it, let's make it voluntary. How about making it voluntary for a year and just let the people choose? If these health exchanges are great, people are going to flock to them. If all of these mandates are really worthwhile, make them voluntary based on free choice and the market, and most of those will be accepted and implemented. So that might be an alternative at some point in time to consider. Take all the mandates away, leave the structure of the law, and let the American people choose whether they wish to participate.

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this story. In the next 50 or 55 minutes, the Texas delegation on the Republican side, with some help from friends in other States, are going to tell you the other side of the story.

With that, I would like to yield to Congressman WEBER from Friendswood, Texas.

□ 1230

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

You know, it's interesting. We see that in 2010, the other side of the aisle—the Ds—had no problem passing this humongous takeover of health care. Funny, they had no problem that the Republicans were against it; they had no problem that the majority of Americans were against it; and, Mr. Speaker, they had no problem that the majority of the business community was against it. They had no problem that there wasn't any bipartisanship involved, and now they have no problem blaming others, as a result of this government shutdown, of this failed legislation, this not-ready-for-prime-time hostile takeover of almost a sixth of the economy.

In short, the other side has no problem. I guess that's right. Now the Affordable Care Act is the American people's problem, and yet they continue to blame us. They continue to demagogue and say it's all about us.

We have a President who will not negotiate. He will negotiate with terrorists; he will get his foreign policy from the Russian President, Putin; but he will not come to the House of Representatives and negotiate.

The majority leader in the Senate and the Executive in the White House want this House of Representatives, the Republicans, to unconditionally surrender and roll over and forget that it is the American public that has the problem—this huge entitlement that the gentleman from Texas was just alluding to. This is our method of getting negotiations going about fixing that problem.

Interestingly enough, today we heard in speeches on the floor of the House the analogy of the Republicans' attempt to go ahead and fund those crucial parts of the government while they play their games. They bring up a game analogy called Whac-A-Mole. They say that our policy is akin to Whac-A-Mole. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I recall in recorded history that someone has actually made a molehill out of a mountain—a Whac-A-Mole analogy.

I would submit that the ''Unaffordable Care Act,'' as I like to call it, is a lot larger than the 900-pound gorilla in the room. Our colleagues on the other side are ignoring the 900-pound gorilla and paying attention to moles, that proverbial molehill. That's so interesting.

In some of their comments today they have been decrying the fact that hunters in their own States may not get to hunt. Well, that seems really peculiar to me. The party who is in favor of gun control, who seems to be anti-Second Amendment rights in my opinion, all of a sudden are interested in hunters' rights. As Mr. Rogers from the old TV show used to say: Can you spell hypocrisy? Sure you can.

It's very interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, at this juncture in the game, that all of a sudden they're interested in those rights that heretofore they had no interest in and somehow it's the Republicans' fault.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as the American people, that of the last 17 shutdowns in the last 30 years, 15 of those shutdowns occurred when a Democratic majority was in control of this House of Representatives. You never heard the terms ''terrorists,'' ''holding a gun to the head,'' ''refusing to negotiate.'' You never heard that back then.

But because of this Affordable Care Act, as the gentleman from Texas has already eloquently stated is a huge mandate, because this seems to be their signature legislation—to make Americans have health insurance—now we're hearing that all of a sudden they're in favor of these other things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since March 23, 2010, when President Obama signed that hostile takeover of health care into law, we have seen key promise after key promise made to the American people broken.

The President said, ''The Affordable Care Act is designed to make it easier for younger Americans to obtain and maintain health insurance.'' Well, I'm from Texas. We believe in being truthful with people. In Texas, you get in trouble for making those kinds of false statements. We still believe in truth, justice, and the American way even though we're from Texas.

In reality, if ObamaCare is implemented in Texas, health insurance premiums on the individual market will see an increase of 53 percent for young males and an increase of 11 percent for young females. That doesn't sound like such an affordable deal. To top that off, those who live in Texas could see premiums increase up to 43 percent in the individual market and 23 percent in the small group market.

Promise number two, broken, the President said, ''If you like your current health care plan, you'll be able to keep it.'' Promise number two, broken.

The fact is, ObamaCare incentivizes, as the gentleman from Texas stated, employers to drop coverage to avert taxes and fees that would be imposed on those small businesses and large businesses if they were to continue to provide their employees coverage. Home Depot, UPS, to name a few, have dropped tens of thousands of covered employees from their plans just at the outset of this. According to the CBO, 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored coverage, nearly double the previous estimate of 4 million.

In 2012, the Texas State Comptroller, Susan Combs, and her office surveyed Texas members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses and received replies from over 900 Texas businesses, large and small. In that report, only 3.4 percent of those business owners believe that the President's health care would be good for their business. In fact, fines and penalties paid by those same Texas businesses with more than 50 employees for fiscal year 2010 through 2019, those fines were estimated at $9.3 billion.

Not only have there been broken promises, there have been major delays of the law. It is simply not ready for prime time; and the truth of the matter is, folks, it will probably never be. As more and more Americans get that, they understand how imperative it is that we make changes in that law. In fact, since the law has been in place, there have been 22 actions to defund, revise, or repeal parts of that overburdensome law.

To the other side, I would say this. Let's use the President's words: Knock it off and move on. Fifty-nine percent of the American people want this law defunded. Why does the President and the majority leader keep ignoring the American taxpayers?

In my district, I have constituents sharing their heart-wrenching stories about the negative impact ObamaCare has already had on their family. There's been hundreds of responses. Take Susan Gay from Beaumont. She said:

> My husband and his coworkers lost their overtime 2 years ago from the vote for ObamaCare. We are now still frightened he may lose his job, as he works for a small business man locally in Beaumont.

Susan, I hear you. The Republicans hear you. We're fighting for you, fighting for your husband and his coworkers and millions of others that have already been negatively impacted by the President's hostile takeover of the health care system.

Folks, your House Republicans are making every effort to get rid of this law. We have introduced replacement bills that will empower the individual and make affordable health care more accessible for everyone.

Folks, there is a better way. It is high time that the President and the Senate get on board with us in the House if they truly want to help and listen to the American people.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and I'm proud to be a Texan.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you, Congressman WEBER.

Before I yield to my friend from far north Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, of the First District of Michigan, I want to read into the RECORD a comment that I received on my Facebook page. Now, most of these comments are from Texans, some of them are not. I'm not sure of the location of this gentleman, Mr. Dave Guss, Jr. This is a Facebook page comment received yesterday or this morning:

> Just got a letter from my provider that my policy will end and I need to purchase a new one. When I called and asked why, I was told that my current policy does not meet the required coverage for ObamaCare because it has no prenatal coverage. I am a male. The new policy will cost me $500 a month, the old one I had was $200 a month.

We have a number of these stories, Mr. Speaker, that I will be putting into the RECORD as this Special Order continues. But now I would like to yield to the gentleman from the First District of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I want to thank my colleague from Texas. I feel a great affinity for my Texas colleagues, and I'm an avid fan of western swing, especially Bob Wills.

I didn't know how we would end up in a shutdown. I never really wanted to have a shutdown in the government. I wanted to reach a compromise with the Senate and have business go on. The problem is that, in the House, we've passed four different pieces of legislation that would have prevented a shutdown. I mean, I can see, for example, the first thing that we sent to the Senate was a plan to fund the government and defund ObamaCare. Okay. I can understand that the Senate isn't going to maybe significantly budge on that, but maybe we would get out of the Senate some votes. Maybe some Democrat Senators would vote for it. We would see what kind of support we would have on the Democrat side in the Senate.

So then we sent to the Senate a piece of legislation which simply delayed the President's health care law for a year. The President had already delayed components of his law for some people or for some time. So let's try this. Maybe we would get Democrat votes in the Senate to support that. Well, those two propositions, they weren't even voted on. They were tabled in the Senate. They voted to table them and not have any debate about the merits of those two proposals.

So then we sent to the Senate a proposal not to defund the President's health care law but to continue to fund the President's health care law, but to change the law so that it affected all Americans the same. The President, by executive order, changed his own law. Contrary to the law, he wrote an executive order to change the nature of the law so that employers were exempted from their mandate. In other words, the law mandates that employers provide insurance for their employees or suffer a fine. The law also demands that individuals buy insurance or suffer a fine. Well, the President saw fit to change the law so that major employers don't have to pay a fine, delayed the enforcement of that part of the law for a year, despite the fact that the law doesn't go for that.

And when is the President allowed to change a law by edict, by his signature? We change laws in this country by statute. Should we allow a President to change the law at his whim?

Another aspect where the President changed the law is he changed the law to give special privileges to Members of Congress, that the Members of Congress who have to go to the exchange would be afforded a subsidy—unlike anyone else who has to go to the exchange. So how is the President changing the law to give special privileges to Congress something that the American people should be for?

□ 1245

I think that the American people want the law to apply to everyone the same.

The third thing that we asked for from the Senate was simply change the law so that the law applies to the Congress, to the President, and to the Vice President, the same as it does to every other American, and to afford individuals the same delay in the law that the President granted to his big manufacturers, some of his favorite unions—not all unions got it. Why not all Americans?

So that is what we asked for in the Senate. Not even to defund the President's health care law, but simply to make the law abide with all Americans.

How is it that we have become a country where the law applies only to certain people—that the President by a written statement can exempt certain people from the law? Is that what this country is becoming? Is that the United States of America that we grew up in? I don't think so.

I think what we asked for, which funded ObamaCare and simply changed the law to apply to everyone, was certainly a reasonable compromise from our initial piece of legislation. And they tabled that.

Our fourth effort to keep the government open was simply to ask the Senate to come talk to us. So if you won't agree to make the law the same for everyone, will you at least come to us

and talk about what you will accept? That is why we are in this impasse we are today.

We have taken steps to reopen the government. We have passed targeted pieces of legislation that will fund critical portions of our government—FEMA, national parks, WIC, Veterans Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the National Guard. We even passed legislation that furloughed employees will be paid once the shutdown ends.

The Senate and the administration have given exceptions to their allies, big businesses, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

We have heard a lot about a clean CR. I don't know, I don't see how it is so clean when it allows the President to change a law by edict. I don't see that as a clean piece of legislation. I think that is a piece of legislation that allows unfairness in the law to continue. To me, it is rather unclean.

I am willing to talk to the Senate to come to some sort of agreement, but it just strikes me as really, really disingenuous to call what they are calling a clean CR ''clean'' when in reality it is allowing the President to change the law at his whim. I think that the administration and the Senate certainly should come to the bargaining table and talk to the House. The ''power of the purse.'' We have the power of the purse. Shouldn't our consideration be taken into account? Shouldn't we have conversations to make sure that the country stays open?

I just wanted to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those listening, how I feel and why we are here. I would ask your support in that.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Florida, I want to read two more comments into the record from my Facebook page.

The first one is from Kevin Hussey, H-U-S-S-E-Y. Kevin says:

> It's doubled my premiums. Simply put, how is that ''affordable?''

And Laren Engel Schmude comments:

> My mom is facing having her hours cut, or being laid off all together, not to mention that her company is dropping health insurance for part-time employees all together.

Again, these are comments from folks on my Facebook page.

I would also like to point out that my wife, Terri Barton, is the marketing director for Ennis Regional Medical Center in our hometown of Ennis, Texas, and it is her job to help the hospital get ready to implement ObamaCare. I have texted her this morning and asked her how that is going, and she has replied that the counselors are all trained and they are ready to help if people call in wanting to sign up. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a certified application center, but so far very few people have called and tried to sign up.

That is on the front lines. Ennis Regional Medical Center is a hospital approximately, I think, 60 or 70 beds, in a town of approximately 18,000 people, in the suburbs of Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas. It is on the front lines of ObamaCare as we implement it, if we do implement it.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I appreciate you wearing our stripes on your tie today. That is apropos.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address all of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, but more importantly, the American people, for they are the ones that we all need to listen to. They are the ones that will hold us accountable. We were sent here to represent the people. I represent approximately 700,000 citizens in north Florida's congressional district and had approximately 65 percent plus support of that district.

One of the things I ran on was preventing the Affordable Care Act from being implemented, and I have voted to do all in my power to prevent this ill-conceived legislative malpractice of a bill from being a burden to the American citizens I represent.

I also ran on the rule of law and the adherence to the Constitution. So when I hear my colleagues on the left—I mean, excuse me, to this side of the Chamber—say the Republicans want to shut down the government, I find it somewhat disingenuous.

I am voting the way the majority of the people I represent have instructed me to do, as have my colleagues.

Since we are the House, the people's House, we are the voice of the people. So when my Democratic colleagues say the Republicans want to shut down the government, keep in mind that it is the voice of the people that we represent whose voice you are hearing. That is the way a representative Republic works.

Another issue that belittles this body and lowers our approval rating—I read the other day—with the American people, equal to or less than a root canal or a colonoscopy, is the drama, the theatrics, and the name-calling. Understand, no one on this side, as is true for your side, wants children, veterans, old people, or widows to starve or to be deprived of health care. We, as you, will take care of the needy, the truly needy.

The name-calling, I have to admit, seems to emanate from one side more than the other side. I have heard childish, angry words like ''jihadist,'' ''terrorist,'' ''anarchist.'' Today, I heard ''Whack-a-moles,'' ''teabaggers'' and ''Tea Party radicals.''

Now, it is interesting, the word ''Tea Party'' reminds me of a time in our history. In fact, it was a pivotal point in this country in gaining its independence from a tyrannical government under the rule of law by the King of England. I am so thankful that the colonists at that time rose up—rose up—in opposition to a minimal tax placed upon all the tea sold into America. That led to the Boston Tea Party.

So isn't it ironic that after 237 years, we have created a government that not only says you must pay the tax, but you also must buy our tea? Can you say the ''Affordable Care Act?'' Is it any wonder that today there is a new Tea Party in America with a mindset of limited government, fiscal responsibility, free enterprise, personal responsibility, and the Constitution?

The Tea Party is a movement. It was a spontaneous movement that happened throughout this country. There is no national leader, there is no national headquarters. The American people said they were tired of Washington and the gridlock and politics as usual, and that led us to where we are at today. They said, like I did: ''I had enough.''

Now, as far as shutting down the government, nobody I know wants to shut down the government, because in the shutdown who pays? The American people pay. Therefore, it would behoove us to negotiate a settlement to keep the government up and running for the benefit of these people and for this great country.

The Republicans have offered at four different times CR legislation that represented the voice of our constituents to keep the government open. Two of those offers were outright rejected by the President himself and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID.

We worked through last Saturday up here until 2 in the morning and passed more legislation to resolve this issue and compromised. We did not hear back from either side—the President or Mr. REID. Many of us in the Republican party were on the Senate steps of the Capitol on Sunday afternoon asking for a chance to sit at the table just to negotiate in conference to stop this gridlock and get America back to work again. Again, silence from the President and Mr. REID. We did not hear from the President or Mr. REID until Monday afternoon. Their answer was ''no negotiation,'' which translates to ''our way or the highway.''

On one other point, to clarify, is for the House and Senate to go to conference over the budget. Yet the Senate didn't offer a budget for over 4 years, the last 4 years. But now all of a sudden it is a problem if we don't go to conference.

Again, one side is being disingenuous to the American people, because a budget does not fund our government. A budget is a wish list of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and the President. Appropriations are what funds this government, and the House has passed four appropriations bills, and the Senate has failed to bring those up for approval by the Senate and then send over to the President to sign. So again, America, you are being fed misinformation.

That is why this government is shut down. The American people need to

hear the other side of the story. They need to hear that we amended our bills, the CR bills, four times from the House to negotiate with the Senate. They need to know that we requested to go to conference to resolve our differences, the way a Republic is supposed to work, the way differences have been resolved in this esteemed body since its inception.

Mr. Speaker. Let's add an air of dignity to this damaged body, let's end the name-calling, let's end the bickering, let's go to conference on a continuing resolution, hash out our differences and get this government up and running again, and let's focus on the ensuing tsunami that is coming called our debt ceiling.

This is a time for us not to be Republicans or Democrats; this is a time for us to be Americans. It is what the American people expect, it is what the American people deserve, and it is what I came to Washington to do.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a couple of more comments from my Facebook page that have come in in the last days.

This is from a gentleman named Richard Lay:

> Since ObamaCare my insurance rates have gone through the roof. Every teacher I know has seen their monthly insurance rates increase by more than $200 to $300 per month. One teacher's went up by $400.

Mr. Anthony Rhodes from Arlington, Texas writes:

> My rates have increased over 15 percent a year for the last 3 years. Last year and 3 years ago, my deductibles also went up 20 and 50 percent respectively. There has been nothing affordable about my health care for the last 3 years. I have less coverage and it costs me more, and even if I wanted to cancel it, I am better off paying the high prices because I get hit with a penalty tax if I cancel. I get fighting mad just thinking about the mess of legislation that was passed so that we could ''find out what's in it.''

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the 11th District of Texas, Mr. MIKE CONAWAY, from Midland, Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague from Ennis, Texas. I appreciate his hosting this hour.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, or as most of the folks in District 11 want to refer to it, the ''Unaffordable Care Act,'' was passed in this House by the slimmest of margins in March of 2010 and then passed without, frankly, one Republican vote. It was also passed in the Senate by parliamentary tricks that were used to avoid the 60-vote issue that they lost. Once they lost the Ted Kennedy seat to Scott Brown, it eliminated their ability to cram it through there. They had to resort to some parliamentary issues. Again, with not one Republican vote to make that happen.

While our colleagues on the other side may say that this is currently the law of the land, that was 3½ years ago. Today, poll after poll is showing that the American people are expressing themselves that they do not want this bill and the underlying requirements and costs associated with it crammed down their throat. Much like those now infamous words of Speaker PELOSI when she said that we were going to have to pass this bill before we would know what is in it, the American people are going to have to suffer through this flawed rollout in order to understand what is in it that they do not like as part of the implementation of this deal.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we've had to resort to a government shutdown, quite frankly, to try to get this President's attention and HARRY REID's in order to force them to come to the table. It is almost unconscionable to hold the American people through their government hostage like that, but that is exactly what this President and HARRY REID have wanted to do.

We have time and time again, as has been recounted already on this floor today, to find common ground with this President and the majority leader in the Senate and to come to agreement on those parts of funding the government that are unrelated to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, areas in which we thought we could agree.

One of the first ones was the bill that passed unanimously in the House to fund the Department of Defense and the related contractors while this shutdown is going on so that they would not be impacted by it. We then sent a series of bills across this House floor for which we've gotten good bipartisan support.

We've had 25 Democrats agree with us on continuing the funding of pediatric research. We've had 23 Democrats agree with us that we should reopen our parks and memorials. We've had 35 Democrats agree that veterans benefits should not be impacted by this. We've had 36 Democrats agree with us that the National Guard and Army Reserve should be paid for their monthly training. We've had 23 Democrats join us on disaster relief. Then, just today, we had 189 Democrats—100 percent of those voting—agree with us to pay furloughed Federal employees once this conflict with the White House and the Senate is over; and 184 of them agreed with us that the Federal Government should continue to provide religious services to our Armed Forces while this is going on.

In addition to these efforts, the House passed by voice vote a bill that would allow the District of Columbia to continue to operate using its own resources, not Federal general revenues. It was UC'd, as that phrase is used in the Senate, and it was passed by the President.

So this President and HARRY REID have had a very checkered pattern of supporting some issues that we thought we had common ground on, but not supporting others, including HARRY REID's now callous comment with reference to children with cancer as to why would we want to continue that funding during this time frame.

Mr. Speaker, analogies are always dangerous, but this one, I think, fits. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union built a wall in Berlin, separating East Germany from West Germany. I would argue that we are in another cold war today with this President and with HARRY REID in the Senate. This is a cold war that they are also building a wall of, but their flat-out refusal to negotiate with House Republicans—except, of course, when it benefits a constituency that they believe is important to them on these issues—is their building of a wall of obstinance, a wall of hardheadedness and a wall of stiff-neckedness, if that is, in fact, a word. It's a little hard for somebody in west Texas to get his tongue around that one. Nevertheless, that is a wall in that they are refusing to listen to the American people.

To paraphrase those wonderful words of Ronald Reagan's when he was speaking to Gorbachev, I will try to use those same comments to this President and to HARRY REID, the majority leader of the Senate:

Mr. President, tear down this wall of obstinance. Tear down this wall of stiff-neckedness. Tear down this wall of not negotiating with House Republicans. Listen to the American people, and tear down that wall so that we can get this government back to operating and so that we can deal with a bill—and now a law—that the majority of Americans do not want.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield to the Congressman from the Fourth District of Texas (Mr. HALL), let me read a few more comments into the RECORD from my Facebook page.

This is from Kevin Jones:

> It hasn't hurt me yet, but it will. I don't have medical insurance; don't want medical insurance; don't need medical insurance. I pay my own way. Because I am self-pay, I am able to negotiate some nice discounts on my medical bills. ObamaCare will just be another tax on me.

This is from a lady named Theresa Stone:

> I had a job that I did well in, but because I was expensive and getting old—I'm turning 54 in January—to save money, I was let go in February for absolutely bogus reasons. I am collecting unemployment, but that ends in January. I lost my insurance when I lost my job. I can't afford my bills—house, food and insurance—so I am uncovered. I will never sign up for ObamaCare—ever.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Rockwall, Texas, the Fourth District of Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, a decorated World War II veteran and, in my opinion, the absolutely nicest man in this Congress.

Mr. HALL. I thank you for those compliments. You read them out just exactly like I wrote them for you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, too, and I thank you for being here when most everyone else has gone.

ObamaCare was forced through the Congress without a single Republican vote. Just think about that for a second—not one Republican vote. I don't know if that has ever been done. I think Charles Krauthammer says it best in an article from yesterday's Washington Post.

He said:

From Social Security, to civil rights, to Medicaid, to Medicare, never in the modern history of the country has major social legislation been enacted on a straight party-line vote—never. In every case, there was significant reaching across the aisle, enhancing the law's legitimacy and endurance. Yet ObamaCare, which revolutionizes one-sixth of the economy, regulates every aspect of medical practice and intimately affects just about every citizen, passed without a single GOP vote.

Mr. Krauthammer is not alone in being concerned about this country. We are concerned about, not the Members of this House or of the Senate, but of everyone who has children or who cares about children.

Let's talk about jobs. There are no jobs now whether you are educated or not educated. They don't look to a job. By the time this President exits, they're not going to find any employers. That's how serious it is. This is a real problem, Mr. Speaker, and I'm afraid it's going to bankrupt the families and bankrupt the businesses in the Fourth Congressional District, which was the third largest user of manufacturers in the entire United States Congress—House or Senate—in 2011. I have not seen the words for 2012.

We are forcing people to buy insurance that they can't afford; and if they opt out, we fine them. Then they can't even afford the fine. What a train wreck. Go ahead and go to the Web site and sign up. There are reports from all over the country of glitches and of the confusion and frustration from those who have tried. Now we're hearing that the Federal Government will be shutting down the Web site for repairs. You would think, after 3 years of planning, it would at least be able to sign people up. This is clearly not the case, and they are clearly not ready for prime time. I think this is a sign of things to come under ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

I am also concerned about data security in this system. Given the government's track record, I am worried that people's personal information could get out. All of us have good and honest relationships with our doctors. We trust each other. We do not need the government to get in the middle of that relationship. The push for ObamaCare was to cover all Americans; and now, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 30 million people will still not be covered in the year 2022. So what's going on here? This is just one giant tax on the American people. If you don't sign up, you get taxed. If you do sign up, your rates will go up, and some reports are saying it will be by as much as 400 percent.

In closing, I'll just say another push for ObamaCare was to bring down the cost of health care. According to the American Action Forum, health insurance rates for people between the ages of 18 and 35 will go up substantially. Premiums for this group before ObamaCare averaged about $62 a month, and now the premiums for these youngsters will be on the average of $187 a month. That's triple the cost. How is this helping? My constituents are opposed to this bad health care law. My mail is 100 to 1 against it, and I am opposed to it.

The folks on the other side of the aisle should listen to the majority of Americans and repeal, defund, or delay ObamaCare. The Senate had four chances to prevent this shutdown. They selected none of them, and we shut down.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from the Fourth District.

I would point out to the Speaker that, yesterday, Congressman HALL was one of the Texas Congressmen who went to the World War II Memorial to make sure that our veterans on their honor flight were allowed in to see it.

I want to read one more email into the RECORD before I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, Dr. BURGESS. This has come in as we've been doing this Special Order, Mr. Speaker.

Katie Hoffman of Minneapolis, Minnesota, says:

Hi, Joe. Keep up the good battle today. I am tuned in to C–SPAN with a close eye. I received notice last week under the Affordable Health Care Act that my insurance will be doubling almost from $113 a month to $207 a month. I am a 35, nonsmoking, healthy female. Who am I paying for? I've had enough. I'm working hard to cover the non-working society—frustrated. Keep up the fight.

Then one more from a gentleman named Tim Ruschi:

Dear Representative Barton, I just want to express my support for your efforts. I am watching you right now on C–SPAN. My wife and I received a certified letter recently from our insurance provider, Cigna, informing us that our health insurance plan is being dissolved, effective January 1, 2014. I believe the President knew he was lying when he boldly proclaimed many times that, if people liked their insurance coverage, they could keep it—period. He knew or should have known full well that the Affordable Care Act would cause many insurance plans to shut down, and now this has become the sad reality. I cannot trust anything the President or this administration says anymore.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Flower Mound, Texas, in Denton County, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President.

Mr. BARTON. If I may let the Speaker know, this was an email sent to me from an American citizen. I was just reading something an American citizen wrote. These are not my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President, including by reading into debate matter that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank Mr. BARTON for bringing this hour to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that this is the Texas hour. People look to Texas for leadership. Certainly, from an economic standpoint, Texas enjoys a AAA rating. The United States, unfortunately, does not.

If you look at Texas between the years 2009 and 2011, it gained nearly a million new residents. Other times when there have been vast expansions of populations in a State, the rate of uninsurance has also increased, except in Texas. During that time period from 2009 to 2011, the rate of uninsurance went down.

Why is that?

It's because people were moving to Texas because they could find a job, and accompanying that job typically was employer-sponsored insurance. The reason for that is, of course, that Texas has a long history of utilizing the energy resources inherent in that State. In fact, it's Texas that has gone a long way towards redefining our national energy policy and making us an exporter of energy rather than an importer.

But our purpose today, here, is to talk about the Affordable Care Act. It has already been referenced that the other body passed this late on a Christmas Eve in order to get out of town right before a snowstorm. Now, the chairman of the Finance Committee in the other body when talking to the Secretary of Health and Human Services earlier this year said, Madam Secretary, I am worried that we are seeing a train wreck.

I wanted to provide for Members of the House of Representatives what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Ladies and gentlemen, the House and my colleagues, this is where we were last Monday night—the two locomotives bearing down on each other with smoke trailing out of each of their smokestacks. This is a train wreck right before it happens, and that's where we were on Monday night. A train wreck was fixing to happen, and we were trying to do everything possible to prevent it. We had passed four bills and had sent them over to the Senate to allow funding for the government. Each one had been rejected. In fact, with the last one, in the spirit of compromise, we said let's just sit down and talk; and the Senate rejected that as well.

When you stop and think about the history of this thing, you say, Why has it been so hard to implement this? The reason it has been hard to implement this is that this was never intended to become law.

The House of Representatives never had a single hearing on what at the time was known as H.R. 3590. It was passed in the Senate without a single Republican vote at the midnight hour

on Christmas Eve, and every Senator thought, We'll get a chance to go to conference and fix it. We know there are problems, but we'll get a chance to fix this. They didn't because they lost their 60th vote in Massachusetts, and the Senate majority leader told the Speaker of the House at the time, There is nothing else I can do. I've put everything into it. I can't pass this again in the Senate. It's because he lacked one vote.

I will just ask people in this body on both sides of the aisle to think back. Lyndon Johnson was a Member of this body. Lyndon Johnson was the majority leader of the Senate. Lyndon Johnson was President. Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing the Civil Rights Act because he lacked one vote? Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson not passing Medicare because he lacked one vote? No. He would have exercised Senate leadership or Presidential leadership, and he would have gotten that vote, and he would have made it happen.

□ 1315

Both of those, by the way, passed with bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate. So don't fault the House of Representatives because of how bad this thing is. Don't fault the Representatives because the people of the United States do not like this thing. Don't fault the United States House of Representatives because they couldn't even get their informatics piece correct with 3½ years and billions and billions of dollars.

Why did the site crash in the first couple of days? They knew it was coming. They knew there would be great interest in this. Amazon is able to do that. Amazon handles how many millions of hits a day? Facebook—certainly a nonessential site on the Internet—how many transactions does it handle a day? How could they not be ready? This is, after all, the President's signature piece of legislation.

I get criticized because they say Republicans haven't tried to fix it. Republicans have tried to fix it. We have passed seven pieces of legislation that have modified the Affordable Care Act, and the President has signed them. The President himself has laid portions of this law down not to be enforced for whatever period of time he says.

Certainly, people can't sign up for preexisting condition coverage now. They have to wait until the first of the year. That window has been closed since February 1 of this year. The employer mandate went away right before the Fourth of July weekend. Reporting requirements were also suspended right after the Fourth of July weekend. The President has put more pieces of this law on hold than any Member of this House could ever do.

I appreciate so much the gentleman from Texas holding this hour. I'm privileged to have been a part of it. I did want to remind people what a train wreck looks like right before it happens.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in this Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to Mr. STOCKMAN, I want to apologize to the House for reading into the RECORD comments from citizens of the United States exercising their First Amendment rights. One of those citizens made a disparaging remark about the President of the United States, and we understand that Members, ourselves, cannot personalize these issues. Some of our citizens that are commenting don't understand the rules, but I do, and I want to apologize to the House because I do understand the rules.

I now yield to Congressman STOCKMAN.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the fact that we're talking here today about things that impact our Nation, and I want to talk about our Speaker who, as you know, or many of you know, I voted against and didn't want to be the Speaker. Today, our Speaker has been vilified after offering opportunity after opportunity to negotiate. The President, on the other hand, said he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

The Speaker grew up in Ohio in a working-class community, and has negotiated many times with the President. It's most puzzling to me why now the stance of no negotiation. Every time we had a shutdown—I was here in the last shutdown—we negotiated. The President at that time, President Clinton, negotiated. In all the shutdowns, we always had negotiations. That's the way this body works is that we work on compromise.

The President wrote a letter to this individual who is the head of Iran. He's negotiating with the head of Iran, who wants to eliminate Israel. He's willing to negotiate with him for nuclear weapons.

The President also wants to negotiate with the head of Syria. This individual gassed his own people, tortured his own people, and killed his own people. I don't understand why he's willing to negotiate with him, but he is. Again, he's not willing to negotiate with our Speaker.

Next, the President is also willing to negotiate with the Taliban. The President ordered the release of several prisoners prior to even negotiations to get ''the negotiating to start.'' Again, let me remind the body that the Speaker is not to be negotiated with, but the Taliban is. Now the President says, I'm willing to negotiate if you give up your position. That's not negotiation.

I would like to show you, Mr. Speaker, some of the words that have been used against our Speaker and the Republican body. We've been called by this administration: terrorists, anarchists, suicide bombers, blackmailers, fringe, extortionists, ideologists, gangsters, extremists, bombs strapped to their chest, guns held to their heads.

We're not talking about the terrorists who the President is negotiating with, but we're talking about the working-class gentleman from Ohio.

I call on the President to tone down the rhetoric. I call on the President to respect this body and to negotiate in good faith. It's time to end the government shutdown, and let's do it in a positive manner.

I would like to point out, too, while these names were hurled in insult to the Speaker, never once has the Speaker ever used that kind of terminology against our President.

I would like to see this body turn down the rhetoric and get back to the business of negotiating and making compromise. It's the fair thing to do, it's the proper thing to do, and I just appeal to the Nation to stop using this kind of rhetoric against people in this body. We deserve better.

I praise the gentleman from Ennis, Texas, for allowing me this time to speak to unifying the body and negotiating in fairness. We ask the President just to sit down.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we've appointed conferees to negotiate. To this date, they've never shown up on the other side. We can't negotiate unless there's someone else. Anybody in a family knows that it takes a husband, a wife, a spouse, or a partner to make a deal. It takes two people. You can't do it unilaterally.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, to my friends in the body, this is a serious issue. ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, as I said at the start, is a huge new entitlement. At a minimum, we would have a real debate about it. As has been pointed out, it barely passed the House on a partisan vote. No Republicans voted for it, and some Democrats, I think, voted against it. I think it passed by one or two votes. It passed the Senate only because they were able to get around the 60-vote requirement to end debate. It is the law of the land, but it was passed with all Democratic votes and no Republican votes.

Before it is fully implemented, I think it is worthy of a debate and it is worthy of the type of situation that's going on now. As I said at the top of this Special Order, if the Affordable Care Act is such a great thing, let's make it voluntary for the next year and let the American people choose whether they want to implement it as it is currently structured. If they don't, let's work together, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Speaker, to change it.

No one wants the Federal Government to shut down. That's obvious. The Republicans in the House are bringing bills to the floor on a daily basis to try

to open up as much of the Federal Government as is possible. Our friends on the Democrat side some days are with us on that and some days are not. They were with us today on paying furloughed Federal workers when they come back to work. Hopefully, next week, they will be with us on paying the veterans, opening the VA, the national parks, funding cancer research, and some of the things that earlier this week they were against.

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

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, in information that came out after close of business yesterday, there was a report from CNBC about the 99 percent of ObamaCare applications that hit a wall. This report said:

> As few as 1 in 100 applications on the Federal exchange contains enough information to enroll the applicant in a plan, several insurance industry sources told CNBC on Friday. Some of the problems involve how the exchange's software collects and verifies an applicant's data.
>
> ''It is extraordinary that these systems weren't ready,'' said Sumit Nijhawan, CEO of Infogix, which handles data integrity issues for many major insurers including WellPoint and Cigna, as well as, multiple Blue Cross/Blue Shield affiliates.
>
> Experts said that if Healthcare.gov's success rate doesn't improve within the next month or so, Federal officials could face a situation in January in which relatively large numbers of people believe they have coverage starting that month, but whose enrollment applications have not been processed.
>
> ''It could be public relations nightmare,'' said Nijhawan. Insurers have told his company that just 1 in 100 enrollment applicants being sent from the Federal marketplace have provided sufficient verified information.

The article goes on:

> One insurer reported a better, but still stunningly low, rate of enrollment applications containing enough data to process for coverage. ''It's about half of what we've received,'' a source at that insurer said.
>
> ''We're getting incomplete data—about half of the applications we haven't been able to process,'' said the source, who used the term ''corrupted'' to describe the batch of applications received.

The article goes on to point out what a huge problem, after 3½ years to get ready for ObamaCare to be the law of the land, after repeated refusals to negotiate whatsoever on delaying anything except for what the President has signed in the way of exemptions and waivers, hundreds of times himself, as he and Chief Justice Roberts completely rewrote the original ObamaCare bill. There has been a refusal to allow everyone in America to stand on the same fair, level playing field as the friends or supporters of the President have gotten through their waivers and exemptions, including people in Congress, which many of us here in this body have refused to accept if Americans don't get them as well.

□ 1330

One person in the article said he blamed the exchanges' software, which is allowing too many people to finish the process online without making sure they provide answers needed by the insurers processing the applications. But the article also mentions there are going to have to be people who go back and try to get information from these individuals that did not complete the application process—it sounds like through no fault of their own, just for the impropriety of the software programs, themselves.

And it's not difficult to see what a nightmare that will be, as it opens wide the door for identity thieves to start making calls or sending emails telling people they did not adequately complete the process, and they need this information or that information. It's going to be tough for people to know, Am I sending information to the government, or am I sending it to a proper contractor, or am I sending my information to an identity thief?

The process was not ready for prime time, and it's just going to get worse as we move toward January in the problems that are occurring.

Here is an article from Dr. Susan Barry. This was dated October 3, talking about Secretary Sebelius:

> The woman who is behind the controls of ObamaCare was unable to convince even one person from Kansas, the State she used to govern, to sign up for it.
>
> Though HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius is the former Governor of Kansas, Representative Tim Huelskamp was informed by an insurance provider in his home State that none of the 365,000 uninsured people living there successfully signed up for insurance on the ObamaCare exchange on the first day.

Now in the midst of all the chaos, all of the broken promises where people have lost their insurance, they have lost the coverage they had, even when they keep their insurance, insurance prices have spiked for the vast majority of Americans in this country.

They did not get the $2,500 cheaper insurance the President promised. They either lost their insurance altogether or it has spiked dramatically. They didn't get to keep their doctor. We're hearing from those people constantly. And at the same time, when here in the House, we have sent compromise after compromise before the shutdown occurred down to the Senate, which normally, in a functioning Senate, would have the Senate—if they didn't like what we proposed—send back an alternative. And at that point, after an alternative is passed in the Senate, then the Speaker can appoint negotiators called conferees. The head of the majority in the Senate, HARRY REID, could appoint negotiators, and then come together, and they work out an agreement. And then that comes to the House and Senate for an up-or-down vote, non-amendable, straight up-or-down vote in each House.

But the Senate was playing games. It is now clear that there was no intention of having any agreement, that the conventional wisdom in this town for the last 3 years say that, Gee, if there is a shutdown, then Republicans will likely lose the majority in the next election. So whatever it takes to shut down the government, go ahead.

That was borne out by the fact that the first 21 mainstream stories completely faulted the Republicans, failing to point out the compromises that were sent down the hall and the Democrats' refusal to even entertain them. And then on the fourth, the ultimate capitulation said, All right, all right. Basically, we're appointing conferees; just appoint people to sit down and talk about it. We can probably have this worked out by morning. But it was clear they wanted damage from a government shutdown.

We've learned that as these telltale signs emerged—and one park ranger was quoted as saying that it was disgusting. But as park rangers, they had been instructed to make life as difficult as possible for people.

We're getting stories in from around the country about how this abusive Federal Government that wants to tell you what health care you can have, what surgery you can have, who wants to supervise everything about your private life, they want every page of every medical record about you they can get their grimy hands on so that bureaucrats can decide if you're doing something they don't like, how to jerk you around, as the IRS has been caught doing now, as we've gotten reports of other agencies—whether EPA, FEC, others—being abusive. And we find case after case now, since the shutdown, of this government funding park rangers to go out and create as much chaos for Americans as possible.

We have this administration, where the buck stops with the Commander in Chief, that has now made clear to Catholic chaplains of the military that are independent contractors that you are not to show up and conduct mass on Sunday. And if you do, you may be arrested or subjected to disciplinary action.

There was a time in this country when we believed in volunteerism, where no matter what happened, Americans would step up and make sure things that needed to happen actually got done. Now we have an abusive administration so intent on, as the park ranger said, making life as difficult as possible for people in such a mean-spirited way that it would go shut down facilities that don't take a dime of Federal money just to hurt as many people as possible.

And those same people that are calling those shots want to decide what you can have in the way of health care, Mr. Speaker. No, thank you. I am opting out. I will pay the penalty. I am not going to have the government telling me what I can or cannot have. I

will pay the penalty. I'm waiving the subsidies. If Americans can't have it, why should we, in Congress?

That same spirit of entrepreneurialism prevailed in 1995 when the Grand Canyon was actually shut down. It's amazing this administration hasn't tried to pay for some kind of screen to put over the top of the Grand Canyon so commercial airliners can't fly over and look down and see God's creation.

But in '95, there was an agreement between the State, local government, and the Federal Government to make sure that after it was initially closed, it reopened. And State and local government people were able to allow Americans who had scheduled their vacations, their travel time, to allow them to enjoy that.

Not this administration, oh no. They are so intent on refusing to allow even a delay across the board to be given to everyone as they've given to Big Business, to their cronies that they are not going to allow any local government, private business, States to reopen parks and things that have no business being shut.

The stories are coming in of all kinds of places that there was no need to close. There was no need to spend money to barricade but just to make life tough for Americans, because this is how Big Government has grown. This is how abusive government has become.

And I can't help but draw the conclusion that since Lois Lerner was never actually punished for the abuses and the obvious lies that have now come to light, that others in the Federal Government have said, Well, they didn't do anything to Lois Lerner. She got caught red-handed. So we can be as abusive to people as we want.

So a story from October 4 which talks about how Arizona Governor Brewer, local businesses, local governments are trying to get permission to fund the reopening of at least part of the Grand Canyon, but this Federal Government, like the park ranger said, wants to make life difficult and wants to create as much misery as possible.

I'll say this about the Carter administration. I was in the United States Army at Fort Benning for over half of the Carter administration, and we had a lot of misery as a result of the calls by the Commander in Chief then. And there came something that was called the misery index, to measure how miserable Americans were under President Carter. Because we were having inflation, which is now coming under this administration because of the massive creation of money. You can't keep creating money and not end up causing inflation. That's coming. Interest rates that keep being teased, that they're about to go higher. We'll see. And the unemployment rate was massively high back in those days.

But I'll say this about the Carter administration: they didn't mean to cause that much misery. They really did not mean to cause that much misery. There was massive misery across the country back then. But at least that administration did not intend to make people that miserable.

But reports continue to come in of the misery this administration is inflicting because they can, because they want everyone to succumb to what has been classified as Chicago-style thuggery, that having more to do with tactics of organized crime. If you didn't go along with what they wanted, they made you suffer. And we're seeing that.

I mean, for goodness sake, we passed a law before the shutdown. I've been pushing for a military pay bill for over 2½ years. And I'm very grateful the Speaker finally brought that to the floor. I'm grateful to the gentleman from Colorado, MICHAEL COFFMAN, for shepherding that. And then the Department of Defense gets it.

We were going to mitigate as much as we could. To the Senate's credit, they passed that before the shutdown. But then the Department of Defense, this administration chose to interpret it so much more narrowly than the law itself, and said that they furloughed lots of people, just like the park ranger said, trying to make life as difficult as possible. And they said, Well, we're going to take some time to read the legislation and let people suffer for a while. And eventually we'll get around to deciding whether or not we think Congress meant to do what they said they meant to do, and that is, protect our country, provide for the common defense, make sure our military continued to get paid, along with every private contractor that supported them in any way, along with every civilian employee that supported them in their role. They just, apparently, wanted to make life miserable.

There are enough problems being created by ObamaCare and by the overspending of this administration without creating things unnecessarily.

Here's a story from Stephanie Condon from CBS news about ''Obamacare marketplaces raise data security concerns.'' That is continuing to be a concern. It seems to be borne out that this was a train wreck, it is a nightmare, and that it will continue to just get worse.

□ 1345

And the L.A. Times, Chad Terhune, had a story:

> California exchange overstated its Web traffic for ObamaCare launch.

That would be consistent with so many of the mainstream that grabbed ahold of a young man who said he had signed up successfully, so he was hailed. He was interviewed by different media, and then come to find out, actually, he is a paid computer hack who gets paid by Organizing for America, President Obama's lobbying group that he funds. The guy is paid, as he admitted. He's paid to go online and just say things politically supportive of the President. It turns out he had not actually successfully signed up for ObamaCare.

There was a story from Andrew Johnson, National Review:

> Zero enroll in the new Louisiana plan on ObamaCare's first day.

One from the Weekly Standard, October 3, the White House on a number of enrollees in ObamaCare:

> We don't have that data.

AP reports that pressure continues to mount to fix the health insurance exchanges. Those continue to be a nightmare.

And in the midst of all this, where you had had Franklin Roosevelt say the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, we have John Harwood in a CNBC interview this week saying to the President, ''Wall Street has been pretty calm about this,'' and the President said, ''This time I think Wall Street should be concerned.'' So we have to fear the President making people fear.

There was an interesting online entry this week indicating at the World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington where veterans have been staging protests to keep it open, Washington Examiner reports that at least seven officials were dispatched to Wednesday morning to set up a ring of barricades to block tourists from the memorial. That's two more security officers than the State Department had in Benghazi one year ago on the night of the terrorist attack that killed four, including the U.S. Ambassador.

Well, as I keep going out to the memorial each day to ensure veterans are getting in, I've noted there are more Park Service people out there than I have ever seen at the World War II Memorial. I have been there all times day and night—I don't sleep that much when I'm in Washington—although come to find out, our park rangers don't know the law. They don't know the parking law properly. There are a lot of things they don't know. We find out they have been instructed to make life as difficult as they can for people. As the ranger said, that was disgusting. Thank God there are some people I have met and spoken with with the Park Service that care about the veterans. We have veterans that serve in the Park Service who just want people to enjoy their parks, not to make things difficult. But I'm seeing more Park Service personnel around the Mall than you ever see out there around the World War II Memorial.

The last few days I've been out there, each time you see mounted Park Service people on horseback watching over things keeping their eye on the veterans. You know, those guys in wheelchairs from World War II, they may make a run. They may try to go down the sidewalk where they are not allowed.

It is outrageous what this administration is doing. The Obama administration has decided to block access to public memorials on the National Mall as a result of the government shutdown, like its decision to end White

House tours when the sequester cuts took effect. There is no rational reason for this. The Park Service normally in charge of monitoring these spaces isn't even affected by the shutdown, and they are shutting off access to these sites. It is gratuitous and petulant.

Another article about the ObamaCare privacy nightmare.

Shutting down the cemetery at Normandy for people that have spent so much, saved so much, trying to get a family member there to see the graves they never saw of people who fell while serving with them at Normandy is about as outrageous as it gets.

For heaven's sake, make life miserable for Members of Congress; but for Pete's sake, leave our veterans alone. Let them enjoy their memorials. Let them have their times of silence and meditation at their memorials, at their cemeteries. There are private entities, there are local governments, there are State governments wanting to keep these things open. But I can tell you, any administration that is so callous that it would allow and encourage difficulty for its citizens when it has a tantrum and doesn't get what it wants is not somebody you want in charge of your health care. Every American ought to be seeing this and ought to be saying loud and clear, let's hold up for at least a year on ObamaCare. You've done enough damage already. We don't want you controlling our health care. At least give us that break.

We are here this weekend. It would have been nice to have been back in east Texas and to be at the events that I was scheduled to be in different places this weekend, but we're here. I have no regrets. I just hope that the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and the administration will decide that negotiating means more than calling a press conference and announcing that we're willing to work things out, because when the President announces we're going to work things out, we're willing and he calls the leaders of Congress up to the White House so he can announce to them in person that we're not negotiating, I just wanted to make that clear, you give us everything I want, you abdicate, forget the Constitution, forget your requirements that you appropriate the money, you go through, you have oversight, you make sure that we're not wasting money, forget your obligations under that, give me all the money I had last year, don't put anything on it. Just give it to me like I want it or we're not negotiating. That is not an administration you want in control of your health care.

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

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. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 7, 2013, at noon 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:

3236. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Litchi Fruit From Australia [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0084] (RIN: 0579-AD56) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3237. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — 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 [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0061; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY51) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3238. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2013-0009; 4500030114] (RIN: 1081-AZ36) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3239. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Columbia Trade Promotion Agreement [USCBP-2012-0017] (RIN: 1515-AD88) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3240. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement [USCBP-2013-0040] (RIN: 1515-AD93) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3247. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3248. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3249. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3250. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3251. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3252. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3253. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3254. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3255. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3256. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3257. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3258. A bill making continuing appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3259. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3260. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3261. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3262. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3263. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3264. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3265. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3266. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3267. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3268. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3269. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3270. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. considered and agreed to.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1263: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1830: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1904: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2703: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3239: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3241: Mr. SALMON, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CONAWAY.