United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013 No. 140

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 9, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LEAVING THIS WORLD A LITTLE BETTER THAN YOU FOUND IT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, ''Try and leave this world a little better than you found it.'' Those were the parting words of Robert Baden Powell, a soldier, writer, and founder of the world scouting movement. This was a message to all Scouts that was found among his papers after Powell's passing in 1941.

I am a scouter, Mr. Speaker. It is part of who I am, both as an American and an elected official proudly representing Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Scouter Powell's words today are part of scouting's principles, to always leave the campsite cleaner than when you found it. It is into service, serving others, and making the world a better place. They also ring true in the debate taking place now in Washington.

Today we are saddling future generations with mountains of debt. We have made promises we cannot keep. We are leaving the next generation worse off than our own. We face a Nation with grave challenges, challenges that aren't being addressed. The fact of the matter is that Congress has yet to deal with the real drivers of our debt, a large portion of which is health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care who won the White House or which party holds the majority in Congress. Why? Because not until we actually tackle the tough issues, the tough challenges, can we honestly say that Congress or the White House is doing what is right for the country. Right now we aren't making necessary progress, not on our budget and deficits, not on our long-term debt, not on bringing down the cost of health care. Though we have made some progress on spending, we are nowhere near where we need to be.

We are also leaving the health system worse than where we found it. Here are just two letters from my constituents that my office has received.

Tina, from Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, writes:

> Please do not vote in any way to continue funding the Affordable Care Act. It in no way improves the situation of the average American. Yes, it provides another option for health insurance, but the rates are no more affordable than the private insurances; and therefore, if a person cannot afford the private insurance, there is no way they will be able to afford the government plan. In addition, the act places further strain on the system and will cause the shutdown of more hospitals, cause more physicians to leave the system, and further crowd our Nation's emergency departments.

Catherine from DuBois wrote:

> I am fortunate to have good insurance through my employer. However, I found out from them that they may provide a lesser form of health care due to the no-Cadillac plan. They understandably want to avoid a penalty for providing a good plan. This seems unfair to me, as if we are being penalized for working and having a good employer. If they are willing to provide a good health plan, why should they be penalized and why should they have to lessen our coverage? I am very distraught about many layers of the health care plan that are starting to come to light. I don't know if anything can be done.

I cannot stand idle as Congress acts like it is solving problems when, in fact, it is failing to tackle the tough issues, health being one of them. Let me be clear that a government shutdown is unacceptable. However, each day we stall and fail to deal with these challenges, the worse it gets for the next generation.

The real debate needs to be about how we get our fiscal house in order and set a course of long-term job growth. Not until then will I be satisfied. It should be about addressing the challenges the people elected us to solve. Again, not until then will I be satisfied. It is about trying to ''leave this world a little better than you found it.''

GETTING TO A BIG DEAL

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said that the shutdown should be unacceptable. I agree with that. We could all, within the next half an hour, vote to make the unacceptable not the policy that we are pursuing.

Mr. Speaker, our government has now been shut down for over a week

Printed on recycled paper.

and the American people are looking to Congress for solutions, not spin. Thousands of dedicated Federal employees here, but more profusely around this country, continue to be furloughed without pay, all because a faction of Republicans insist on keeping government closed until we repeal the Affordable Care Act, a demand that has nothing to do with keeping our government open.

Debate about the Affordable Care Act is legitimate. There are people who disagree with it and people who agree with it. But holding ransom the people's government is and should be, as the previous speaker said, unacceptable.

Americans are tired, I am tired, I think most Members are tired of hearing the same rhetoric from politicians over and over. Instead, they want real solutions that can restore fiscal sanity, end the irrational sequester which HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican from Kentucky, says does not work and cannot work, and break the cycle of manufactured crises that do nothing to help our economy and, in fact, are doing it great harm. So the question, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves is: How do we reach a solution? How can this Congress achieve the big, balanced deal that our constituents expect from us?

First and foremost we must end the shutdown. Mr. Speaker, 200 Democrats—we have a vacancy—200 Democrats will vote this very day, this very hour, to open the government. That means, Mr. Speaker, we only need 18 Republicans. The previous speaker said it is unacceptable where we are. We can change it, and we can change it within the hour, with only 18 Republicans joining 200 Democrats to say let the people's government be open; let the people's government be serving them.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, we must end this shutdown and take action to prevent the United States from defaulting on its bills for the first time in history. A solvent nation should not be taken hostage to accomplish an objective. Once these immediate threats are removed, Congress should then vote to go to conference on the differences which are legitimate between our two budgets. Republicans have refused, for the last six months in the House and in the Senate, to go to conference.

The Speaker talks about negotiation. That is where you do it. That is the mechanism that is set up under our democracy to resolve differences. Go to conference. There we can have the opportunity to agree on a comprehensive, balanced plan to put our country on a fiscally sustainable path, not for the next week, the next month, the next 180 days, but for decades to come; and if we do that, our economy will explode, jobs will be created, and Americans will again feel good, not only about their country, but about their Congress.

The shutdown and the threat of default are standing in the way of a real negotiation process for a long-term solution. Democrats, I say, Mr. Speaker, are ready to sit down and talk with our Republican colleagues about a long-term agreement. We know that will require tough decisions, but Republicans should not demand their own policies as ransom required to reopen the government and make sure America pays its bills.

Democrats have already made the difficult choice to accept the Republican's preferred budget level for the short-term funding bill. How do I know it is their preferred funding bill? Because they voted on it and sent it to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate said, We will accept your number, and they sent it back here; and my Republican colleagues will not say ''yes'' to their own number.

A big and balanced agreement on a budget. After we take the Republican number to open up government, go to conference, have discussions, a big and balanced agreement on the budget and on getting our debt under control will require real compromise and difficult decisions. My colleagues, we should have the wisdom and, yes, the courage to make them; and if we do, future generations will thank us.

I continue to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bipartisan majority of Members in this House who are ready to work in good faith towards achieving such an agreement. My observation, however, is, after 33 years in this body, that there is a small faction on the Republican side of the aisle—it may be 50, it may be 60—that is holding captive the 170 of their colleagues who want to make sense and move forward.

I hope that Speaker BOEHNER will take the important steps necessary to enable those negotiations to begin by allowing a vote on the Senate's bill at the House number to reopen government and another one on a clean measure to prevent an unthinkable and economically catastrophic default. Once those occur, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to resume work on achieving real and lasting results for the American people when it comes to our long-term fiscal health.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, would bring the bill to open our government, the people's government, to the floor this day.

THREE CRISES

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this October fiscal crisis is punctuated by three developments that are becoming increasingly obvious and disturbing. The first is the refusal of the Senate and the President to resolve their differences with the House through negotiation and compromise on the bill that would actually fund the government and end this shutdown. In recent days, senior administration officials have said they don't care how long the shutdown lasts because they are winning politically and the President would rather the Nation default than negotiate with the House.

Our form of government cannot operate in such a manner. Congress is a bicameral legislature. That means two Houses that are specifically designed to have a different perspective on issues. The two Houses of Congress were designed to disagree. The only way a bicameral legislature can possibly function is through each House exercising its own best judgment on a given issue and then coming together and meeting to isolate their differences and resolve them through negotiation and compromise.

The conference process of Congress has evolved over centuries. It is very effective at resolving the differences between the two Houses; but it takes two Houses to operate it, and the Senate is refusing to do so. This malfunction is at the very heart of our stalemate.

The second development is the deliberate decision by the administration to amplify the public's suffering and inconvenience during this stalemate. This government has gone through 18 shutdowns now in the past 37 years, but never has a President barricaded open-air venues like national memorials. In fact, he has gone so far as to forbid the use of turnouts on public roads that offer passersby distant views of Mt. Rushmore and Yosemite. He has ordered people out of their own homes and ordered businesses to close just because they lease land from the Federal Government. He has even tried to close the Atlantic Ocean to Florida fishermen.

In the past, Presidents have done everything they could to minimize the impacts of shutdowns. This President is going to ridiculous extremes to maximize the suffering that people must endure. One park ranger told a reporter, ''We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can.'' And then he added, ''It's disgusting.'' And when this House has passed stopgap measures to minimize these impacts, the President and the Senate have summarily rejected them.

The third development is the rapid unraveling of ObamaCare. As it has rolled out, millions of Americans have discovered that their health insurance rates have skyrocketed or they are losing their health plans entirely or that they are having their hours cut back at work. It is very clear that the public isn't buying these new government-brokered policies. One hundred and seventy thousand people visited the Maryland exchange looking for affordable insurance since it opened more than a week ago, but only 326 have actually bought these plans, less than 0.2 percent.

Now, imagine, you have got the biggest store in town. People are required by law to purchase your product. You

open for business, and 99.8 percent of the customers who walk into your store walk out again without buying your product. Do you think you have a problem? We can't pretend this isn't happening. Millions of Americans right now are losing their health plans and not finding affordable replacements. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

This government only exists with the consent of the governed. When it deliberately goes out of its way to maximize the pain and suffering of the American people in this crisis, it jeopardizes that consent. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now. And this government is simply not designed to function with one party refusing to talk to the other, with one House refusing to resolve the differences that divide it from the other. This simple failure is at the heart of our Nation's distress, and it, too, must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

We are now 5 years into this administration. They have not been happy ones for our Nation. But now we have arrived at a crisis—or more precisely, at three crises: one that is costing millions of Americans the health plans they liked and were told they could keep, a second in the relationship of this government to the people, and a third in the basic function of our fundamental institutions.

Happily, the Constitution's Framers gave us all of the tools that are necessary to resolve these crises except for one, and that one is what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Only we can appeal to those angels, and we must do so before more harm befalls our country.

HOUSE GYM REMAINS OPEN FOR MEMBERS DURING SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth day of the Republican shutdown, what started as a tantrum against the Affordable Care Act to defund it, then morphed into a demand to delay it for a year, but now is really an open assault on our system of government.

Unless a fanatic minority holding JOHN BOEHNER and the American people hostage get their way, they will continue to inflict unnecessary pain on hundreds of thousands of our employees and on the American public. Now they are poised to wreck the global economy by threatening that America will not pay its bills. If it works, they will do it all over again.

Make no mistake, this is an assault on our system of government unlike anything we have seen before. We must stop them now, united in the belief that there are some lines we are not going to cross. There will be no weapons on the floor of the House and no willful damage to the American people.

What if these fanatics had their tactics used against them? What if Democrats and Speaker PELOSI demanded that the disastrous war in Iraq stop and, if it didn't, we would wreck the American economy? that our deeply felt concerns about preparing for climate change and global warming were nonnegotiable? What if Senator CHRIS MURPHY, who had 26 innocent children and their teachers massacred in his district, what if he said, Enough. Unless we get background checks for purchasers of guns to make sure that unfit people can't get them, something that 90 percent of the American people agree with, unless I get that, I am going to shut down the government? Can you imagine the howls of outrage?

There is a tremendous disconnect here. One glaring symbol of the disconnect can be found in the subbasement of the Rayburn office building, the House gym. Now, make no mistake, everywhere I have worked I have started fitness programs for our employees. They save money; they improve productivity; they can even save lives. I helped start a fitness program for our employees here on Capitol Hill. If anything, it may be more important for people in Congress who are leading a crazy, unhealthy lifestyle and can seldom get together and interact like human beings. For 17 years, this is where I have tried to start every single day, to exercise, to enjoy bipartisan camaraderie, an island in the storm of Capitol Hill. It is convenient to be able to shower there instead of at home. It is important. It is very important, but it is not essential.

I had somebody argue with me yesterday that it doesn't cost that much because we pay dues. We have an access key that lets us in and there aren't any staff members there now. Well, that is true. It doesn't cost very much, but it costs. The electricity, the hot water, the towels, they are not provided by gym fairies. They are provided by taxpayers. And the same is true for countless facilities across America, closed by the senseless Republican shutdown.

In fact, since we have decided that we are going to pay all the employees when it is over, we are paying them not to work. And it is costly not to collect fees. You can make a better argument for restoring those services than you can for the House gym. Some of the most fanatic about inflicting unnecessary pain on the American public are regulars, enjoying our House gym while the staff gym is closed.

Mr. Speaker, if you and the House Republicans are serious and not cynical about the shutdown, then shut down the House gym until this madness ends.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS PASSING BILLS TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, like myself and many Americans, I am very frustrated over the inaction of Congress to get its work done; but let's look back at what has happened over the last week or so.

The House Republicans, we have sent bills over to the Democratically-controlled Senate to open the government, to run the government, to fund the government. We have sent, starting from delaying ObamaCare, which most Americans have serious problems with, to other bills, and I want to talk about the latter two that we sent.

One was to fund the government completely until December 15, but also with two exceptions. The one exception is that Members of Congress and the President would live by the same rules under ObamaCare that all Americans have to. The other exception is ObamaCare. We need to delay those rules, and let's move on.

The people that talk about the status quo in American history here, the status quo, if you vote for a clean CR, you want the status quo to remain the same. That means unemployment stays where it is, forcing Americans into part-time work. We need structural changes to the underlying problems. We need to address why our debt keeps going up.

The President, yesterday, in his news conference, talked about raising the debt ceiling doesn't increase the debt ceiling, doesn't increase spending. Well, I wish the President would answer to me: When he took office, the debt was $10 trillion; now it is approaching $17 trillion. How does raising the debt ceiling not increase the debt?

The President talks about it is unprecedented, talking about the debt ceiling and having negotiations would be unprecedented if we do that. Well, Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill did it. Bill Clinton did it. President Obama did it in 2011 under the Budget Control Act. It is not unprecedented. And, interestingly, the time the President has been forced to negotiate are times when we have had crises that we have had to address, and the President did that in 2011.

If ObamaCare is so good and it is the President's signature piece of legislation, he ought to be the first one to sign up for it. I believe the First Family ought to be the first in line to sign up for ObamaCare. But, you know what? The President of the United States is exempt from ObamaCare. It doesn't make sense. He ought to have to live by his own bills that he supported and pressed through.

We talk about compromise. I am sure the President doesn't watch FOX News, but I think Bill O'Reilly has a compromise that maybe makes some sense. The individual mandate—that was one of the things we put in there, in one of those bills—we said delay the individual mandate for 1 year. The President delayed the employer mandate for 1 year. It only makes sense, especially when you see so many people having trouble signing up, getting on and all the uncertainty. We are getting reports

now of premiums going through the roof, higher deductibles, higher copays, and we need to delay it.

One of the items we said in the bill was to delay the individual mandate for 1 year. That was rejected by the Senate. Also, we sent a bill over there to say, Okay, if you don't take that, let's just go to conference. Let's sit down and talk. Let's negotiate.

But I think the compromise Bill O'Reilly put out on FOX News the other night makes some sense. Make the individual mandate voluntary, but don't force people to go on this. Delay it for 1 year. Don't force people to go on this and risk their privacy concerns, force them to pay higher insurance premiums for insurance they may not need. Let's see what happens.

As ObamaCare moves through, I think that is a compromise that makes some sense, and the President ought to look at that and talk about that; but in order to do that, he needs to come to the table. He needs to sit down with House Republicans and negotiate and work through the problems. That is how our system of government was set up, and that is how it is supposed to work. The Founders had that right, especially in divided government. So I encourage the President.

Now, this morning there are some reports that the President is inviting the House and Senate Democrats to the White House later today, and supposedly we are going to get an invitation here soon. That is encouraging. I hope he is serious about sitting down and working out the differences, because we have to get back to the work the American people expect us to do.

So I look forward to sitting down with the President and our leadership and working through these problems and getting the government going; but we can't do it without sitting down and talking and making sense and representing the American people, because we were elected to do that.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 1,000 days since I arrived in Congress, and Republican leaders have still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our jobs crisis. Instead, this House has voted 46 times to defund or delay health care for people who desperately need it, wasting precious time.

Wake up, Republicans. ObamaCare is not only the law of the land; it is not only a safeguard to save the millions of people with preexisting conditions; it is an essential tool to give people the economic security and purchasing power they need to revive our economy.

People need ObamaCare. President Obama cares about the American people, and we should, too. Even a Tea Party member of my freshman class of 2010 understood this when he stood and expressed his hopes of being able to receive federally subsidized health coverage immediately upon taking office. He was incensed. He couldn't wait 30 days, but he acts as if he wants his constituents to wait forever.

People all over the world are amazed that we do not have universal health care like they do. We are a world power, and they are saying, You don't have universal health care in America?

Mr. Speaker, people want health care; people deserve health care; and, Mr. Speaker, people want jobs. No one wants to revive the Great Recession by playing dangerous games with our economy. But do you know what? That is precisely what this House is doing.

This is scary. I am nervous. I am stunned by the insensitivity. The whole world economy rests on America's Treasury bonds. Let me repeat: The whole world economy rests on America's Treasury bonds.

Mr. Speaker, when we play with fire on the debt ceiling, you threaten to burn down the buttress on which Americans' 401(k)s, mutual funds, small businesses, and stock portfolios rest. Just consider what happened the last time Republicans simply threatened to breach the debt ceiling in 2011. Government bonds were downgraded, retirement assets plummeted, and homeowners saw big hikes in their monthly payments. That was just for talking about breaching the debt ceiling.

Independent analysts have concluded that a debt default would be as bad as the global financial crisis of 2008. After that crisis, American savers lost decades' worth of wealth in their homes and 401(k)s. We are still living with massive unemployment from that crisis to this date.

While some Members of Congress may like to behave as though we have moved past our unemployment crisis, it is a different story when you look at African Americans—13 percent unemployment; the Hispanic community, 9.3 percent unemployment; and the youngest workers, 22 percent unemployment.

Across America there are nearly 12 million people officially out of work and tens of millions more who are underemployed or who have simply given up looking. America's public sector workers—our teachers, firefighters, construction workers, public health workers, medical researchers, public defenders, bus drivers, social workers, and police—have already suffered so painfully, first under the sequester, and now under the shutdown.

But a default would devastate every worker and every retiree. It would hit every 401(k), every mutual fund, every stock portfolio, every mortgage payment, every student loan, and every business loan. It is impossible to be fiscally conservatively or probusiness and simultaneously try to use this financial weapon of mass destruction against American businesses and American taxpayers. It is time for Congress to pass a clean debt ceiling bill.

Mr. Speaker, open the government. Mr. Speaker, raise the debt ceiling. Mr. Speaker, let's begin to address our real crisis: jobs, jobs, jobs.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to both sides in this very important debate: the future of America and where we are going and how we are going to pay for the future of this country. What is amazing to me is that President Karzai of Afghanistan, I don't believe he has furloughed one person.

We are furloughing U.S. Government workers all across this Nation, but Mr. Karzai continues to get his millions and millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, this is unnecessary. I don't know why we in Congress continue to fund a war where we can't even get an accountability from the inspectors. It makes no sense.

I want to read three paragraphs from an article I read this weekend, called, ''The Forgotten War.'' One of the paragraphs:

> But even when the war ''ends'' and Americans have forgotten it altogether, it won't be over in Afghanistan. Obama and Karzai continue negotiating towards a bilateral strategic agreement to allow the United States to keep at least nine of the biggest bases it built and several thousand trainers, and undoubtedly Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan, seemingly forever.

Another of the paragraphs:

> It won't be over in the United States either. For American soldiers who took part in it and returned with catastrophic physical and mental injuries and for their families, the battles are just beginning. For American taxpayers, the war will continue at least until mid-century. Think of all the families of the dead soldiers to be compensated for their losses, all the wounded with their health care bills, all the brain-damaged veterans at the VA hospitals. Think of the outgoing costs of their drugs and prosthetics and benefits. Medical and disability costs alone are projected to reach $754 billion, not to mention the hefty retirement pay of all those generals who issued all those reports of progress as they so ambitiously fought more than one war leading nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, we had five Americans brought back in flag-draped coffins. I doubt sincerely if many people in this country read that report, that five Americans came back in a flag-draped coffin.

I do not understand why this Congress continues to have these difficulties of trying to fix our own problems in this country, but don't worry about the waste, fraud, and abuse—and, more important, the loss of limb and body and heart that our kids have been giving in Afghanistan.

I will close by reading one more paragraph from the article, called, ''The Forgotten War'':

> Will the United States still be meddling in Afghanistan 30 years from now? If history is any guide, the answer is ''yes''; and if history is any guide, three decades from now, most

Americans will have only the haziest idea why.

I can only say to the families of those five patriots who came back in a flag-draped coffin, may we never forget. May we never forget that the war in Afghanistan continues to go on and on and probably will for the next 30 years. Come on, Congress, let's get together. Let's stop spending money in Afghanistan. More important, let's stop sending our young men and women to give their limbs and their life.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless us in the House and Senate, bless the President, and, please, God, three times, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

PROVIDING RELIEF FOR AMERICANS AFFECTED BY SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again speak out about the human consequences and the reckless and irresponsible government shutdown. Today it is day 9 into this needless swirl of frustration and madness.

Yesterday I spent time on the telephone talking with a woman whom I am here to represent. She lives in a small town called Roseville, Illinois. It is in the southern part of my congressional district. Her name is Sherri Leath.

Sherri is a decades-long employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and she serves as a food inspector. She spent the first 4 years of her employment in a slaughterhouse, a beef slaughterhouse. The last 6 years, she is in the inspection area of a poultry and a pork processing plant. This is not a glamorous job, she is the first to admit that, but she works very hard every day, and she takes great pride in the fact that she is making sure that our food is safe and wholesome.

She has four children and six grandchildren, and she says she keeps them in mind and she keeps all the children in mind throughout this country as she is inspecting in these plants and makes sure, again, that this meat goes out safe and wholesome.

So today she will drive. She has a very long commute. She will spend most of that time in a cooler that is at most 45 degrees. And I would call someone like Sherri Leath an unsung hero, because without people like Sherri, who, again, are not receiving their pay right now, our food supply would be in jeopardy.

So she is going into work every day, not taking home a paycheck, and she is worried at a deep level about her family's future. She has a husband named Thomas, who is a school bus driver and brings home $800 a month. This is not enough for Sherri and Thomas Leath to pay their bills.

So they have already discussed what this government shutdown means to their family. Step one for them, if the paycheck doesn't come, is they will tap into their reserves, into their savings. Step two, if it leads to that, they will have to go into further credit card debt. This is not what we should be doing to people like Sherri and Thomas Leath. This is not what we should be doing to the hardworking Federal employees who want nothing more than to do a good job, go to work, and receive fair pay. But this is the way it has been for 9 days now.

We heard Congressman STENY HOYER speak half an hour ago now, talking about that we have an answer to this right now. We have enough Republican votes and we have enough Democratic votes today, within the hour, as he explained it, to get the government up and running again. We could immediately—immediately, today—provide relief for people like Sherri and Thomas Leath by reopening the government right here and right now. We have a bipartisan path to do that.

I would say let's do it. Let's get at it today and put these good, hardworking people back to work and receiving fair pay.

THE INCONVENIENT INCONSISTENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATION—DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the United States Government cannot pay its debts. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.

That was a statement by Senator Barack Obama in 2006.

Driving up our national debt from $5 trillion to $9 trillion is irresponsible. It is unpatriotic.

Once again, Senator Barack Obama in 2008:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices on to the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better. I, therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Senator Barack Obama, 2006.

But that was then; this is now. The President, last week, said, without an increase in the borrowing limit, ''the whole world will have problems.'' In other words, we are all going to die. The sky is going to fall unless the United States raises the debt limit.

He seems to be a little bit inconsistent on positions regarding the debt limit. Of course, now the debt limit is up to $17 trillion, double what he talked about several years ago of not raising.

So we find ourselves in a situation where the President's attitude seems to be: I will not negotiate, except with the Russians, the Syrians, the Iranians about what is going on overseas. But I will not negotiate, I will not talk to the House of Representatives about American issues.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that things that are happening in the United States are really just as important as what is happening in Russia, Syria, and Iran—but maybe not to the administration.

The administration would rather be in shutdown and lockdown for political reasons than to talk, to negotiate, to compromise, to even listen.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they say that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It seems that the administration is in bunker mentality while the United States is in economic turmoil. And where are we? We are in a situation where there is no talking. And it seems to me, the administration says it is our fault. The President won't talk to us. The President has the habit, it seems, to blame others on bad things that happen and takes credit for things that are always good.

But, in any event, I reemphasize the President's own words about why we should not raise the debt limit: it is reckless; it is irresponsible; it is unpatriotic; it hurts us domestically and internationally; it is a failure of leadership, and Americans deserve better.

I agree with that.

So since the President seems to be somewhat inconsistent about his positions, why doesn't he just talk to us? Talk to us about the debt limit, the continuing resolution, about America's issues, America's policies, America's problems, and at least acknowledge that the House of Representatives exists.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when you get to talk to the President—because I don't get to talk to him—and suggest that he come out of the White House and meet with the people's House and quit fiddling around and start talking to us so we can solve this problem together.

And that's just the way it is.

ECONOMIC HARM OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the majority party's latest idea is to create a supercommittee to figure out how to reverse their Republican shutdown of

government. Frankly, Congress doesn't need another committee. It only needs the Speaker to unlock the Tea Party chains put on regular committee order and their function in this House. Let the Appropriations Committee do its job as mandated by our Constitution. It can and will get the job done.

Though it is not my first preference, we can begin by allowing a vote on a clean continuing resolution, that is, allowing the Senate bill which contains the Republican budget mark of $986 billion to move forward. Though the Democrats have expressed deep dismay at that number as it is not what Democrats had sought in discretionary accounts, it speaks loudly to which party is willing to compromise. And then if the majority party does not like the Affordable Care Act, use your real power in the regular committee structure that you control to change it. But closing down the entire government is a sledgehammer when what you need is merely a needle and thread.

Meanwhile, the Republican shutdown is wreaking havoc on our economy. More and more working Americans and businesses are getting singed. How can this be good? The Republican shutdown costs the American people $12.5 million each hour and $300 million a day. As of today, the GOP shutdown has already cost the American taxpayers over $2 billion. Is that responsible government?

The Republican shutdown has caused rising uncertainty about our economy. It has already placed a downdraft on our economic markets and job creation. Yesterday the Dow Jones Industrial Average fell another 160 points. This is part of a recent precipitous slide which has seen the financial market lose nearly 400 points this month alone. Overall, the trend is strongly in the wrong direction—down.

The International Monetary Fund, as a result of the Republican shutdown, cut its growth forecast for our economy by 0.3 percentage points to 2.9 percent for this year and 3.6 percent for next year. This surely will cost the American economy more jobs going forward.

The sapping of U.S. growth will be felt globally, as U.S. economic sluggishness impacts other nations. Global markets continue to fall as well, wondering what will happen to the value of our Treasury bonds. Chaos and uncertainty trigger poor markets. We sure don't need any more of that medicine.

There are over 800,000 Federal workers who have been furloughed as a direct result of the shutdown. They are worrying about whether they can pay their bills, pay their mortgage. NASA, for example, had to furlough 97 percent of its more than 18,000-person workforce due to the closing of the government.

At NASA's Johnson Space Center in Houston, only 100 of 3,150 civil servants have not been furloughed. An additional 10,000 contractors with the Johnson Space Center will face being furloughed.

According to a local FOX affiliate, the NASA Glenn Research Center in Brook Park, Ohio, near Cleveland, which I represent, has essentially furloughed nearly all its 3,000 employees at NASA's key propulsion center. This absolutely punches down the local economy as well as the national.

The Republican shutdown has also caused many more contractors who do detailed work for our government to lose their jobs. Defense contractors like Boeing and Lockheed Martin have had to furlough thousands of employees because the shutdown has halted awards and payments to those companies.

The Republican shutdown hurts government agencies and weakens our national security. There are currently no death benefits given to families of soldiers killed in action; medical treatment for those in the military has been scaled back; and furloughs are creating backlogs for VA disability claims.

Mr. Speaker, just bring the clean continuing resolution that has the Republican budget number in it to a vote. Reopen our government. Use the regular committees to work out any difficulties you have with the Affordable Care Act. And, please, put America's economy back on an even keel.

LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, words are very powerful and words are important. I hear the words from our President and realize that he understands the importance of words, also. In the past, he has talked about debt, borrowing, and spending, but now he talks about obligations, because he understands that ''debt,'' to the American public, is a four-letter word. He doesn't want to be tagged with the fact that he is asking for more debt, so now it is ''obligations.'' That is a word that has cleaned up the concept that we are simply borrowing against our future.

But even the word ''borrowing'' needs to be looked at, because that assumes that we have the credit to borrow with; and the truth is no nation can lend us the kind of deficits that we are running right now, so we are actually printing the money.

But even the word ''printing'' has been changed in Washington. Now it is ''quantitative easing.'' It just sounds so much better. ''Printing'' sounds so crass to the American public who might be worried about what is happening to their savings accounts while Washington is printing money.

The word ''negotiation'' is a word that the President is familiar with. He did it 2 years ago when we reached this exact same point. Both sides came to the table and negotiated, and we wound up with a budget that was not as extremely overdrawn as we had faced before. That is the power of negotiation.

But now the word ''negotiation'' is taken out of the President's vocabulary, and he declares that he is being held hostage. Oh, really? This thing he calls being held hostage is actually the American way. It is what our Founding Fathers wanted. They came here and set up a system with a President and two Houses of Congress and two different parties; and those parties would sometimes have all the power, and sometimes they would share the power.

This President says he is being held hostage by the system. That means he doesn't believe in the balance of powers that the electorate cast in the last election. He declares over and over that the election is done—I was elected. The same people that elected him chose to put Republicans in power in the House of Representatives. I think they did that because they were afraid of this debt, deficit, borrowing, and spending.

We are told that we should have a clean CR. There is nothing clean about sacrificing the future of our children and grandchildren. That is what the President wants: a CR where he can spend what he wants to spend without negotiations on anything. We actually, in the House, submitted four different plans before this shutdown occurred. Those plans were just summarily rejected by the Senate, waved off, not really even considered; and yet we find our friends declaring this to be the Republican shutdown, not that both Houses failed to come to an agreement and the White House failed to sit down and negotiate. They just weren't going to be held hostage. So now, then, we need a clean CR, according to some, and we need to stop this Republican shutdown.

Words are very powerful. No longer do we talk about spending in Washington. We talk about investing. We are investing the American public's money. We are investing it in things like studies of the sexual habits of the fruit fly in Tijuana or wherever. ''Debt'' is, indeed, a four-letter word.

We are finally led to believe that default will occur immediately, that we somehow won't pay our obligations, that the American people need to understand that they are still paying their taxes every day and those taxes come to Washington. That is about $2.5 trillion a year. If we do not extend the debt ceiling any higher, then what Washington is going to have to do is it is going to have to prioritize. It is going to decide which of its expenses to pay.

The Constitution demands that we pay our obligations. It says we can't default on those. Washington would have to do the same thing every American family does: it will have to prioritize its expenses if we do not extend the debt ceiling so chaos will not reign. We simply have to live within our means. That is what every American family has to do.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say good morning to my colleagues and start with a thank-you to President Obama for his invitation to the White House to all Members of Congress in quite a contrast to the representation of the President's lack of involvement.

In fact, over the last 4 or 5 years, this Congress has failed to pass a budget with a Republican majority in the House. That has constantly raised the question of how can we start growth in America.

So I thank the President, first of all, for his negotiating at the beginning of January 2013, in the tax negotiations, along with the acceptance of the very structured and restrictive and non-growth number of 986 for the budgeting of this particular Nation.

We are a growing Nation, we are a thriving Nation, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, and the way to go forward is to invest in America's people. So I thank the President. I thank the President for recognizing, as devastating as the sequester was, that he was willing to cede to a supercommittee that did not fulfill its responsibilities.

So we are here. And this is not about individual Members of Congress. It is about the American people. It is about the 29-year employee in the Dallas-Fort Worth area that spoke eloquently to the fact that, combined with military service, she desired to be at work. She enjoyed working with her young child and being at his school, but she wanted to help Americans. But she is not able to go to work.

It speaks to this question of the willy-nilly structure that the Republicans have constructed. I use the term ''martial law.'' For those who want to understand it better, we were speaking of martial rule. So it is martial law on this floor. But a martial rule we are using means that whatever is thrown down on the floor, what Legos are thrown down on the floor to be picked up, that is how we are running this government.

So the word ''clean bill'' is not a naughty word. It means that we want to fulfill the ability to fund the entire government, not to leave out the SNAP and WIC programs or school food programs that are suffering, not to leave out rural development or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Centers for Disease Control that announced today there is a salmonella epidemic and because we don't have those staff persons, America suffers.

□ 1100

I understand Senator MCCAIN's frustration on the floor of the United States Senate because I went to the floor yesterday in the early morning hours to express my pain for the families who have lost their loved ones in Afghanistan. These are young men and young women; and because of our government shutdown, their memorial services benefits could not be had.

I planned the introduction of a bill, ceded to the bill that is now going to be on the floor, that now we are going to pick to be able to help them. I indicated yesterday in a letter to the Secretary that he should immediately provide them with their funds, that it was eligible under a particular law. We all come together around that issue, and we are pained because of the loss of those loved ones of those family members.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not about us. I continue to say that we are not doing it the right way.

A Vietnam veteran in Houston, Mr. Richard Simon, who came to a veterans center, was turned away yesterday. Homeless veterans in Houston, who need the veterans service centers, were turned away as of Wednesday because all of these veterans centers are being closed down. A farmer in Iowa, John Gilbert, has 770 acres. He is working every day, but he can't get his agricultural resources because the Department of Agriculture has shut down. A family resource center that is dealing with domestic violence is no more because it cannot get its Federal dollars. Then, of course, the U.S. Attorney's Office has seen 4,000 U.S. Attorneys shut down. There have been 3,000 Lockheed employees laid off and 3,000 NASA employees laid off.

So I believe that it is important that we recognize that we are not here for ourselves, rather, that we are here for the families whose loved ones lay down their lives in Afghanistan. Whether we call it a clean bill—however we call it—it needs to be put on the floor of the House because we cannot run the government by playing Legos. We can't throw sticks on the ground. We can't be out on the corner playing those games, throwing things on the ground, and saying, Whatever happens, it will happen.

We have got to help Richard Simon. We have got to help the veterans who are going to these closed centers. We have got to make sure that we understand that a President should be judged for his leadership in this country and not on where he came from or what he looks like. We have to be able to work with all people in America—and all of the people are being harmed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this one question as I go to my seat: Are we going to leave homeless veterans on the street, Mr. Speaker? I hope that we will answer that question and also pay the veterans or their families for the memorial services.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, politics is full of irony, and I believe that that is a vast understatement compared to what is exhibited on this floor almost every day. Sometimes that irony bleeds over into the absurd, and that's what we are facing today when it comes to our President, who absolutely refuses to even sit down and negotiate over the debt ceiling limit or over the implementation of ObamaCare or over the continuing resolution or, frankly, over anything else.

Think about that.

The President of the United States is unwilling to even sit down to have any negotiations—to have even a conversation—with the Speaker of the House.

The President likes to say, I won the election, and he likes to remind us that elections have consequences; but I would remind the President that I won my election as well and so did 233 other House Republicans. I represent more than 700,000 people. Those 233 House Republicans represent more than 150 million people. They expect certain things of us. They expect us to represent them. They expect us to fight for those values that we promised that we would. I can't abandon those values. I owe it to my constituents. I owe it to my family. I owe it to my Nation. I owe it to myself to continue to fight for those values that, I think, help to make this Nation the great Nation that it is.

The President is the President of the United States. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States, and he owes it to the Americans to be willing to sit down and to try to negotiate when we come into a conflict such as we have now.

Yes, we've got great challenges before us, but we can work through these. We always have before. We can find a way to work together. Republicans and Democrats have been working through their differences for generations, but we can only do that if we are willing to sit down and talk with each other. We can only do that if we are willing to be respectful of the deeply held positions that each of us holds. We can only do that if we are willing to work together for the betterment of this Nation, which brings me to the debt limit.

It is like a dark, looming cloud that hangs over us now. We can't ignore it. We can't pretend that it doesn't matter. We can't pretend that it's not important. So, like others, I would like to quote from one who is considered to be a great political leader of this century:

> Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. ''Leadership'' means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, of course I'm not quoting TED CRUZ or MITCH MCCONNELL or the Speaker of the House. I am quoting a young freshman Senator who is now the President of the United

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

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Holding back on a vote prevents the opening of lifesaving clinical trials at the NIH. It prevents the opening of national parks and museums for use by families everywhere. The shutdown is costing taxpayers $12.5 million each and every hour you refuse to vote, and it is costing the American people already $2.5 billion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE DEFINITION OF ''FAIR''

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

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

So what is the real definition of ''fair''?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

She says:

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

Now she talks about her daughter, Riley:

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

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

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

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY'S 100TH-YEAR ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEATH BENEFITS

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

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

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

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

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

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

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

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

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

OBAMA REFUSES TO PAY MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

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

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

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

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

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

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

thousands of defense contractors and their employees.

Never mind that, in doing so, the Obama administration violated the Pay Our Military Act that President Obama, himself, signed—an act that fully funds all defense workers and contractors who ''are providing support to members of the Armed Forces,'' which, by the way, is all of them.

Yesterday, America woke up to yet another political manipulation by the Obama administration. America's Commander in Chief denied death gratuities to the families of four soldiers and a marine who were killed in Afghanistan. Adding insult to injury, America's Commander in Chief refuses to pay the cost of the burial expenses of our men and women in uniform who have given their lives for their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. It must not stand.

The Obama administration claims:

> As a result of the shutdown, we do not have the legal authority to make death gratuity payments at this time.

I respectfully disagree.

The Pay Our Military Act expressly states:

> There are hereby appropriated sums for fiscal year 2014, such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Death benefits and burial expenses are part of our military's compensation package, a part of the ''pay and allowances'' the Pay Our Military Act says the Obama administration must pay. Congress should not have to pass yet another bill today to force the President to do what the law already says he should do.

Instead of punishing America's military by illegally furloughing defense workers and contractors, instead of dishonoring our World War II veterans, our Korean war veterans, our Vietnam veterans by spending taxpayer money to barricade their memorials and by denying them access to their memorials, I yearn for a Commander in Chief who supports our veterans and our men and women in uniform rather than using them as pawns to be sacrificed in partisan, political games. I cannot help but think of the contrast between our current Commander in Chief and our first one.

During the Revolutionary War, George Washington lived with his troops, fought with his troops, and sacrificed for his troops. When the Continental Army was faced with hardship, inadequate food and clothing, George Washington reached into his own pocket and sacrificed his wealth to help the men who fought under his command.

Mr. Speaker, I pray our current Commander in Chief will study and understand the graciousness, the leadership, and the sacrifices of George Washington as he makes decisions on whether to treat our veterans, our troops, and our defense workers with the respect they have earned and deserve.

DENYING MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that will be considered on the floor of the House today, legislation that would address the unacceptable wrong of denying death benefits to the families of fallen soldiers during the budget impasse.

While I, no doubt, expect our Chamber to pass this critical funding bill that the American people have a right to expect—I hope it's passed not just in a bipartisan fashion, but I hope it's passed unanimously in the House—we must consider what has led us to even have to legislatively fix such an obvious injustice.

The Department of Defense, even during the current impasse, is spending sums in the billions of dollars.

How is the debt payment for members of the military not considered essential, Mr. President? What was the decision-making process to deem the death benefits nonessential, Mr. President? Who made the final call in this decision, and why are you not firing that person?

This follows the same pattern that we saw earlier this year when the President cut military tuition assistance. We were able to restore those needless cuts and have introduced a bill to ensure the President does not continue to play games with the tuition assistance as early reports indicate that military tuition is again being held back from families. Simply put, we made promises to our fighting men and women and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the House is ready to keep those promises, but the President is demonstrating, at best, a failure to lead and, at worst, bare knuckle partisanship.

AN ADULT CONVERSATION ABOUT FIXING OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President and his allies claim that the shutdown of government is about one thing—a Republican obsession with ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, they are missing the point completely.

For the past 3 years, the House has been working to improve our economy, to create private sector jobs, and to address barriers that inhibit economic growth. ObamaCare, unfortunately, has emerged as one of the largest challenges standing in the way of job creation: workers are having their hours cut; families and businesses are facing higher premiums; employers aren't expanding because of the uncertainty.

Fixing the health care law would have the quickest impact on the economy; but, in fairness, we can't do that unless the other side sits down and talks to us. Thus far, the Senate and the President have rejected all efforts of the House and refuse to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, this debate should be about caring for the American people, their futures, and the liberties we share in America. We want to reopen the government and help families find jobs, but that requires that the House and the Senate and the President sit down together and have an adult conversation about fixing our economy.

TIME TO PAY THE PIPER

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks, the country gets closer to a time when it will run out of money.

People probably couldn't understand all of the debate leading up to the implementation of ObamaCare just a few days ago, and some of the questions and debate became blurred. That was one of the biggest government programs—largest spending programs—probably in the history of our Nation; but it did have consequences, because you are spending more trillions of dollars, and if we are going to provide health care, we want it right. There are many Americans who don't have health care, and we should assist them in a responsible fashion. The roll-out has been a disaster. We are holding a hearing on that in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

All that being said, it's about time to pay the piper here. I think the American people will understand, and can understand, that the country is close to default. The country is close to default because we have incurred an indebtedness that will soon exceed $17 trillion, an indebtedness which, again, will reach the current limit next week. They are asking for another $1 trillion or $900 billion to get us one more year. We are going to have to pay the piper.

When you spend $1.5 trillion more a year in the first year with the Obama administration and, in each succeeding year, over $1 trillion more than you took in, you acquire an indebtedness. It was $9 trillion when President Bush left office, and it will soon be $18 trillion in some 6 years, the most indebtedness of any nation. We can't become a Greece. This is not that difficult to understand.

When the government can't pay its bills, if folks think there is a temporary shutdown now, think of a permanent shutdown. Think of going to the bank and not being able to withdraw money or, as you've heard, not being able to obtain a mortgage. The full faith and credit of the United States of America will collapse. Just like when an individual spends more than he earns, he must pay the piper.

Hopefully now, everyone can understand we are in that situation and that we must act responsibly.

Republicans are not standing in the way. Republicans are trying to save the day because this is coming due. The bill is due. We must find a way to cut spending, reduce the amount of Federal spending and keep the debt down. It's that simple. If the President of the United States will not negotiate and if the Senate will not negotiate, you cannot achieve what we need to do to be responsible as stewards of the American people. We are one half of one-third of the government, so this isn't all our responsibility.

We are trying to act responsibly, and we are asking people to come together and find a way to reduce spending in a responsible manner. If we have got problems with some programs like ObamaCare, let's fix them. Let's get this spending down. Again, this is the time we are going to have to pay for all of these government programs, for the spending that has gone on unchecked and for the indebtedness the United States has incurred.

Just a final lesson: the Constitution and the Founders put all spending—the appropriations, the funding of programs—and also the responsibility for raising taxes with this body, the House of Representatives. They did so because we are closest to the people. We get elected every 2 years. They chose to have the Republicans in the majority in order to control the spending that went out of control and the government programs that went out of control.

So that is what we are doing, what they sent us here to do; and we must do it in a responsible fashion. We are here. We were here before the shutdown. We have asked to negotiate. We will continue to do that. Our leaders are committed to doing that, to working in a responsible fashion. We have to get this right. We must pay the piper. The piper is calling our bills and our credit due, so let's join together and act responsibly.

THEIR WAY OR THE HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 3 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee sent an earnest letter to Senator HARRY REID, asking him to please put aside the partisanship for a second and to take the opportunity to enact commonsense legislation to help our kids; take up bipartisan House legislation to restore WIC; to open NIH; and to fund Head Start.

Senator REID has done nothing, though, and President Obama said that it's their way or the highway, to give them everything they want or get lost.

In North Carolina, our WIC program doesn't have sufficient funds to issue new vouchers until the Senate acts. It's the Senate's choice. They should do the right thing. At this point, however, the Senate is rejecting common ground.

Senate Democrats are refusing to make government work for the American people because they won't even agree to having a conversation about whether all Americans should be treated equally under ObamaCare. Health care is a matter of security to many Americans; and health care, as we all know, is changing drastically next year. For many in North Carolina, it is becoming more expensive; and for others, their plans are being canceled.

When asked why American families are being denied a 1-year delay of the individual mandate so they can figure out ObamaCare without having the threat of government penalties, the Secretary of Health and Human Services suggested that the way to ''opt out'' of the mandate was to simply allow government to levy a fine against you. That sounds like a fair choice, doesn't it? Individual Americans do what we want or pay an unprecedented tax on your behavior. Mr. Speaker, the refusal even to acknowledge the specter of unfairness in ObamaCare's implementation is shocking.

Consider the great lengths Senate Democrats are going in order to prove a point about not negotiating: Senate Democrats won't call a vote on legislation to fund the National Institutes of Health, to ensure pay for Guardsmen and Reservists, to stop veteran benefit application delays, to fully fund WIC, to restore Head Start, to restore FEMA or FDA funding. Senate Democrats won't call a vote to reopen the national parks.

Throwing all of this common ground by the wayside—common ground that will help people—is inexcusable. The President and the Senate need to start explaining why their way or the highway is more important than doing their jobs and finding a compromise to end this shutdown.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Rod MacIlvaine, Grace Community Church, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, offered the following prayer:

Father, I thank You for the heroic leadership that this House of Representatives has exemplified in the past week during this present crisis. I thank You for their late nights. I thank You for their efforts to seek compromise. And I thank You for the creative solutions they have proposed.

Yet, Lord, at present, there is no solution. So today, Father, we confess our desperate need for You. We joyfully concur that You are the source of wisdom, and all strength resides with You. You are the author of unity even when parties are in conflict. So we ask that You would grant supernatural breakthrough.

Where there is no way forward, we pray that You would forge a way. When negotiations break down, please grant fresh ideas for debate.

We ask this, Lord, for Your glory and for the good of the American people.

We pray this in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. ROD MACILVAINE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our guest chaplain, Dr. Rod MacIlvaine. Rod MacIlvaine is the founding senior pastor of Grace Community Church in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, a community just north of Tulsa.

He also serves as a fellow with the Veritas Center for Faith, Freedom, and Justice at Oklahoma Wesleyan University, and he is an adjunct professor in the doctor of ministry department at Dallas Theological Seminary.

His ministry at Grace Community Church concentrates not only on worshipping the risen Christ, but also on equipping people to serve the city, especially helping people recover from substance abuse and painful pasts.

For the past 10 years, he has also worked through a missions organization he cofounded called ''Grace Missions International.''

He and his wife, Cindy, have been married for 34 years, and they have

four children: Sarah, Kristin, Caleb, and Jared, and six grandchildren, including one adopted from Uganda.

I want to thank Dr. MacIlvaine for serving as our guest chaplain today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when the hallmark of ''Presidential leadership'' becomes the refusal to have a conversation, we all should be concerned.

Our country is facing some very real challenges right now. To name a few:

Government is shut down because the Democrat Senate won't fund operations unless the House allows ObamaCare to be implemented unfairly;

Families in my district will be forced to spend thousands more next year on health insurance because of the President's partisan health care overhaul;

The country is days away from exhausting its $16.7 trillion debt limit.

These challenges are bigger than any one party, and our solutions must be, too.

Not negotiating when such pivotal matters are at stake is wrong. It betrays years of precedent, and it contradicts the bipartisan reality of divided government.

House Republicans want to reopen government as soon as possible, but we can't shape a fair bipartisan solution when we're the only ones willing to sit down, talk to the other side, and negotiate.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican mantra of the day is that the President won't negotiate. Give me and the American people a break.

The President sat down with Republicans many times, and I think he tried harder and longer than he should have to reach bipartisan agreements. The cuts they produced hurt my and many other communities.

A popular definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result.

The Biden task force, the Simpson-Bowles, and the Domenici-Rivlin Commissions were bipartisan and produced nothing. I recall the Speaker walking out on one of the talks.

In the temporary CRs, Budget Control Act and lifting the debt ceiling in the last Congress, Democrats compromised on important programs, and, frankly, there's no place left to cut.

As the President said yesterday, ''I don't know why Democrats right now would agree to a format that takes off the table all the things they care about and is confined only to the things the Republicans care about.''

To go to the table with a gun to our heads in a decidedly one-sided negotiation would really be insanity.

We need to, as Chaplain Black prayed last week, ''stop the madness'' and restore sanity in this House. Mr. Speaker, you can do that today by bringing a clean CR for a vote and lifting the debt ceiling so that the United States can pay its debts.

IRAN SANCTIONS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is simply unacceptable and would pose a grave national security threat to our Nation and our allies.

Sanctions against the Iranian regime are having an effect on their nation's economy and remain a key tool for U.S. policymakers. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is asking to delay new sanctions following all the talk about historic, high-level meetings, and phone calls.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to be fooled by the rhetoric coming out of Tehran, especially as they push harder every day to develop a nuclear bomb. Before we even begin to discuss any deal with Tehran, we need to increase the pressure that has been working. It's time for the Senate to pass the House's new round of sanctions, which recently passed on this very floor with 400 votes.

Each day the Iranian regime is able to further drag out the promise of talks is another day that centrifuges will keep spinning. Once they're done spinning, they won't have any need to talk again.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now in day 9 of the Republican government shutdown.

Let's keep it real. Come on. This could end tonight if Republicans vote ''yes'' on a clean CR. The problem is that the Republicans only want to pass partisan bills with no attempts to reach across the aisle. Instead, Republicans are bringing bills up for votes that claim to fund the VA, feed children, and cure deadly diseases when, in fact, they actually reduce funding for these very important programs. The appeasement of the far right, the Tea Party, is the opposite of good governing and bipartisanship, and it needs to stop today.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I am disheartened by my Republican colleagues' inability to compromise for the benefit of the American people. It's not fair to the constituents that I represent in places like Grand Prairie, people who work at the old Carswell Air Force Base and the Naval Air Station Fort Worth who were recently furloughed as nonessential employees. It's unfair to punish the 62,000 Federal workers in the Dallas-Fort Worth area who have faced uncertain work status as a result of these partisan games.

I urge Republican leadership to stop the parlor tricks. Everything doesn't have to be a partisan battle. It is time for House Republicans to take ''yes'' for an answer and end the government shutdown today.

DEATH BENEFITS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week before the shutdown, this House overwhelmingly passed legislation to provide for our military in case of a government shutdown. We voted to provide them not only pay, but benefits for themselves and their families. Now the President's lawyers at the Department of Defense are blocking death gratuities to the families of those who've made the ultimate sacrifice.

Families of soldiers killed in battle are being victimized by the Department of Defense. It's outrageous. Today, Congress will act again to make our wishes even more clear. The President is the Commander in Chief. He should not be using troops and their families as pawns in this political bickering. He should be doing everything he can to stand up for the men and women of our military. Instead, he is refusing to negotiate until he gets his way. He is violating the trust between himself as Commander in Chief and the troops and destroying their morale.

Divided government is hard, but it's what the people have given us. It requires negotiation and compromise. Let's provide for our troops and their families. Let's sit down and talk, and let's get the whole government reopened.

IN MEMORY OF NICHOLAS ORESKO, MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, the oldest living Medal of Honor recipient and Bayonne, New Jersey, native, who passed away on October 4, 2013, at the age of 96.

In the final stages of World War II, on January 23, 1945, Master Sergeant

Oresko's unit was pinned down by deadly enemy gunfire as the Battle of the Bulge drew to a close.

As platoon leader with Company C, he made a final, solitary attempt to eliminate the German position in nearby bunkers. Master Sergeant Oresko charged the hill, weathering enemy fire, to throw a grenade into the German bunkers.

Refusing to withdraw from the battle, despite being wounded and weak with blood loss, he continued the assault until he was assured the mission was successfully accomplished. His lone assault wiped out two machine gun positions and enabled his unit to take the hill with minimal casualties.

The true impact of his unselfish actions can never be measured as it extends beyond the lives of the men he saved.

Master Sergeant Oresko was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Harry Truman on October 30, 1945, for his quick thinking, courage, and unswerving devotion to his country and fellow soldiers.

I rise today in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, to honor his courage and to ensure that those who will sacrifice their own safety for the benefit of the Nation are never forgotten.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, our message in the House has been pretty clear. We want to reopen our government and provide fairness to all Americans under the President's health care law.

This law had a big rollout last week. It has been called an ''inexcusable mess,'' a ''rolling calamity,'' ''consumers will face dramatically higher rates,'' ''many remain locked out,'' ''surprise, premiums just went up,'' ''instead of making it easier for people to get health insurance, it will be a lot tougher.'' What a train wreck.

How can we tax people for not buying a product from a Web site that doesn't work? How can you give big businesses a tax break and leave hardworking families out in the cold?

This is why we need to sit down and have a conversation about the big challenges that face our country.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Mental Health Awareness Week.

I was raised by a mother who struggled with mental illness her entire adult life. I personally know firsthand how important timely and proper intervention and care are for those who are struggling and how important that care can be.

I want to the thank the mental health advocates who have contacted me or whom I have met at Iowa events to raise awareness in my district, events such as the walks hosted by the National Alliance on Mental Illness.

Hearing from those at home in Iowa who are personally affected by mental illness on a daily basis has strengthened my resolve to continue to fight to make improving access to mental health care for all Americans a top priority.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this shutdown of government and get back to work on the critical issues that face our Nation, including a mental health system that will work for all those who are struggling, as my mom did for so long.

RESPECTING SERVICEMEMBERS AND MILITARY FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, two Army Rangers, a nurse, and an Army criminal investigator were killed in action while defending our freedoms on Sunday. Because of a devastating decision made by the administration, the grieving families of American heroes Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, PFC Cody Patterson, 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, and Special Agent Joseph Peters are not receiving their loved ones' death gratuities.

Over a dozen more military families are also suffering due to the administration's actions and failure to negotiate. When Congress passed the Pay Our Troops Act last week, it was our intent to pay the pay and benefits our brave men and women have earned and deserve without question.

On Friday, I sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Hagel, demanding answers. Our brave men and women serving in uniform risk their lives to keep American families safe. I appreciate today, as a grateful military dad, that Congress will pass a bill restating benefits to our military families who have earned everlasting respect.

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

□ 1215

HONORING THE FAMILIES OF FALLEN SOLDIERS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Standard and Poor's, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the wealth of American families has grown three times since President Obama has taken office. But here comes the government shutdown, the Republican government shutdown.

Yesterday I rose to the floor of the House to mourn the fact that we lost five brave young men and a young woman over the weekend in Afghanistan doing their duty. I wrote to the Secretary of Defense to direct him and ask him to immediately pay those moneys for the memorial services and other dollars to their families.

We all are concerned, but there comes the government shutdown, a shutdown because of something totally unrelated, the Affordable Care Act. Never during the time of Speaker PELOSI did we have a government shutdown. So, today, we will come together, as Republicans and Democrats, mourning the loss of those soldiers and having H.J. Res. 91.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that every single Member be counted as an original cosponsor of this bill to pay those families that are now mourning and that we never, ever again, never, ever again say ''no'' to our families who have seen their young men and women fall on the battleground.

We don't have to do this but here comes a government shutdown. Let us all join on this bill. Let us be cosponsors. I ask the leaders of this bill to put every single Member on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that unanimous-consent request. Cosponsors may be added by the sponsor in the normal, proper format.

RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to hear the real-world impacts of the implementation and cost of ObamaCare in my congressional district. Just last week, I received an email from CyrusOne, a small business located in my district. Due to ObamaCare, they anticipate paying over $86,000 more for their current level of health insurance for their employees once ObamaCare is implemented.

For a small business, these significant new costs inhibit their ability to hire new workers or to simply keep the workers they have on the payroll. Consumers will begin to see the impact of these costs in the form of higher prices passed on to them.

Higher prices and fewer jobs, this is not the health care reform that Americans want or deserve. We must repeal or at least delay the individual mandate before it does even more damage to our economic recovery.

DAY 9 OF THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the ninth day of the Republican government shutdown. There are only 8 more days until we hit the debt ceiling.

I was back home in Rhode Island this past weekend, and heard from many of my constituents who are disgusted with what they are seeing here in Washington. The American people expect their elected leaders to work together to get things done for our country, but there has been absolutely no cooperation since this shutdown began from our friends on the other side of the aisle who are committed to ending ObamaCare.

If the House voted right now on a clean funding bill, it would pass with support from both parties, and the government would reopen immediately; but instead, we are spending another day trading political rhetoric instead of working on the serious challenges facing our country.

Just yesterday, the U.S. Department of Education released a study of 23 industrialized nations that found Americans fall below international averages in basic problem-solving and reading and math skills. This problem demands a solution, but Congress can't work on this and so many other important issues until the partisan games end.

Let's open the government, raise the debt ceiling, commit to addressing the long-term budget challenges facing our country, and get back to work for the men and women who sent us here.

BLIZZARD OF 2013

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, a storm struck western South Dakota and dumped up to 4 feet of snow throughout the region. This has left thousands without power and devastating livestock losses in the area. Some estimate that hundreds of thousands of livestock have been killed, many of which are still buried in the melting snow.

The weekend's blizzard is expected to cost local governments millions of dollars. Those counties and the Governor are expected to petition the President for disaster status and for FEMA funds so they can clear the fallen trees and help ranchers remove all the cattle that died during that storm.

Some in South Dakota are wondering if this partial government shutdown will affect the timing of potential assistance. It certainly does not have to. There may be disagreement over certain parts of the Federal budget, but not on FEMA.

Last week, the House passed a bill to fund FEMA. It passed with Democrat support because there is bipartisan recognition that we should fund noncontroversial aspects of our government and stop the attempts of some to make this partial shutdown as painful as possible. It does not have to be this way.

I call on our Senate colleagues to act immediately on the funding measures that we have sent them. It's time to negotiate, to work together, so that we can end this shutdown.

WE'VE GOT TO OPEN UP GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 9, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is day No. 9 of the government shutdown.

Enough with the games, the name calling, the finger-pointing. It's time we come together, open the government, pay our bills, and then begin negotiating a real budget. Yes, let's negotiate a real budget that begins to address our debt and the deficit. But first, we've got to open up government.

In my district, in Rancho Cordova, they've shown us what working together looks like. I spoke with Darcy Brewer, the executive director of the California Capital Airshow. They faced some challenges—high winds, bad weather—but they came together, worked into the night, and didn't shut down. They put on a spectacular airshow.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we do as Americans. When times get tough, we pull together, and we show up. We don't shut down.

THE TWILIGHT ZONE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask if we've entered the twilight zone.

Last Friday, a bipartisan coalition in the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 75, which ensures the proper funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, better known as WIC. Senate Democrats have refused to take action on this legislation, choosing to play political games instead of providing nutritional assistance to low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children.

Here's where it gets stranger. President Obama has actually threatened to veto the legislation. The President of the United States is threatening to veto nutritional assistance for little babies and preschoolers?

This isn't a game. Yesterday, North Carolina stopped using WIC benefits because of this unfortunate shutdown.

America elected a divided government, but they expect us to work together. Mr. Speaker, the President needs to convey to the Senate Democrats that they must come to the negotiating table. Senate Democrats must rejoin the normal legislative process. Let's talk.

FURLOUGHED FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a heart-wrenching conversation with a nurse employed at a military installation in my district. She has been furloughed because of the Republican government shutdown. As a Federal contract employee, she is terrified that she won't be able to recover her lost pay, putting her family at financial risk. ''We are the ones suffering,'' she told me. ''We are hard-working Americans working paycheck to paycheck. Something like this can destroy us.''

No piecemeal approach, no temporary fix here or there is going to put an end to this reckless shutdown. Only one bill is guaranteed to reopen all of the government—or even any part of it today—and put this nurse and hundreds of thousands of Americans like her back to work.

It is time for the House to vote on the straightforward, Senate-passed funding bill. Mr. Speaker, let us vote.

PUTTING OUR TROOPS BEFORE POLITICS

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday people across this country were shocked to learn that families of troops who died in combat are being denied death benefits, including a fellow Missourian. Like so many in my district, I was appalled to see news reports showing so little respect or care for the families of troops who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Many issues divide us in this body, but surely Democrats and Republicans can come together to support our troops and to support their families. This issue should rise above any political divide. Troops who lay down their lives in battle should never be forgotten or forsaken by their government.

Today, the House will vote on H.J. Res. 91, Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers. I am hopeful this legislation will then be taken up immediately by the Senate and then quickly signed into law by President Obama. We must correct this wrong.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask every American to join me in prayer for the troops we have lost and for their families who were forgotten by our government.

STOP THE RECKLESSNESS

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER says he doesn't have the votes to pass a clean bill that would keep government open. Yet 198 Democrats would vote for it; another 21 Republicans say they would, too. That's more than the 217 votes needed to pass a bill. That's basic math. The votes are there.

And yet so many people are suffering in this ninth day of the GOP shutdown,

people like Leo Finn, who had been scheduled to start a clinical trial at a cancer institute in Boston to battle his liver cancer, but last week, he was told he couldn't because of the shutdown.

The National Institutes of Health has furloughed 73 percent of its staff. Leo, a father of three, says:

> Everyone talks about national parks, but the shutdown of the NIH is starting to affect people's lives and whether someone will survive a disease.

Now Leo's life is on hold.

It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to stop this recklessness. It is wrong. It is shameful. Bring a clean bill up for a vote.

PLAN FOR PAYING DOWN THE DEBT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people understand the importance of making tough decisions and balancing their budgets.

According to the Federal Reserve, over the past 3 months, Americans have worked to pay down their credit card debts by more than $6 billion; yet the United States Government continues to operate in the red, as it has operated in the red 55 of the last 60 years. Our national debt now stands at $17 trillion. Now the administration is asking Congress to increase our debt by trillions more.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not want to raise the debt ceiling again unless they see a path towards paying down the national debt and balancing the Federal budget. American citizens cannot take out a loan without a plan to pay it back. How can our Nation continue to borrow money without any plan to pay it back?

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the culture of debt and despair in Washington, D.C. Let's put a plan in place to pay down our debt, and let's get our country back on solid financial footing.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EFFECTS ON CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as I awoke this morning and read my local newspaper, I realized that my dear friend Greg Taylor is lying in a medical bed, mostly paralyzed and barely able to breathe, as he copes with ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease.

This past December, Greg lost his business. If this is not bad enough, Greg's long-time partner of 28 years, Albert Sanchez, was just furloughed, a member of the Department of Defense. Although he may now return back to work, this stress is unbearable as they both struggle to make house payments. I failed to mention, they also have a 19-year-old son.

Today is the ninth day of this government shutdown. We still must do something to stop this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, the Democrats have compromised by agreeing to your budget numbers. Now it is time for you to compromise by giving us a clean bill to vote for.

Let's stop this nightmare. I urge us to move forward.

□ 1230

IT'S TIME TO STOP PLAYING GAMES

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 1 week ago, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID shut down the government rather than have an honest conversation about the problems facing this country.

The House has passed not one, not two, not three, but four separate bills that would have kept the government running, while ensuring basic fairness for all Americans under the President's health care law.

And even after the United States Senate rejected every single one of these bills, still House Republicans asked to simply have a conversation, and the Senate said no.

So here we are. House Republicans are working and will continue to work to fund important government functions like medical research and benefits for our veterans. We hope the Senate and the President will join us in these efforts.

It's time for the President and the Senate to stop playing games at the expense of the American people.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN DOLAN

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, often people overlook the treasures in their own backyards; and in Vermont, one of our treasures is the Vermont Institute of Natural Science, an institution that has provided environmental education for young Vermonters since the early 1970s. It has provided help through education, research, avian wildlife, and rehabilitation programs.

Thousands of children in New England have grown up with VINS and taken the lessons they've learned about environmental responsibility and sustainability with them into their adult lives.

Sustaining such a mission over the long term requires persistent work and agile leadership. Dolan has succeeded. He served as VINS president for 8 years and retired on October 1.

John led VINS through a transformation that made it more resilient. He brought renewed focus to the environmental mission of VINS by enhancing the visitors center, expanding the nature camps, and hosting regional events focused on the environment. He created new partnerships, including an expansive research and education program with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dolan's leadership helped VINS sustain its inspiring mission, and he leaves the institute stronger than when he came. On behalf of all who have benefited from VINS and who continue to enjoy it, I offer John my thanks and best wishes for his future.

Vermonters are proud of this backyard treasure and heartened that VINS is here to stay.

LET'S TONE DOWN THE RHETORIC

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans continue to call on Senate Democrats and the President to come to the table and negotiate.

Here's one way to start: let's tone down the rhetoric.

Is it proper to refer to someone you don't agree with as a ''hostage taker'' or as a ''legislative arsonist''?

I don't think so. We may disagree on policy, but this kind of rancor will not solve anything.

Let's work together. It can be done. The House just passed a bill which was not just bipartisan but unanimous that guaranteed back pay for Federal workers, and the bill has the support of the Senate and the President. That's encouraging.

Now the Senate should take up the other bipartisan funding bills we passed here in the House to fund things like medical research and veterans benefits.

Let's negotiate. The American people deserve for us to get this government reopened.

I'm RANDY WEBER and I am proud to be an American.

LET'S MAKE D.C. LISTEN

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, when Senator CRUZ took to the Senate floor for 21 hours to explain to the American public why the Congress had to shut down the government and breach the debt ceiling in order to repeal the Affordable Care Act, I listened carefully. One of the themes was, make D.C. listen. Make D.C. listen.

We know, from polling, that 70 percent of Americans oppose shutting down the government to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

But I went, on Monday, to listen to a couple of my constituents, Tamika Younger and Carla Carey, of Bridgeport. These are two young mothers who

drop their children at Head Start in Bridgeport every single day so that they can go off to their jobs to make the money to give those children some quality of life.

Thanks to the Republican government shutdown, there is no Head Start in Bridgeport now, and they are scrambling and putting their jobs at risk to find something to do with those children they love.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's make D.C. listen to 70 percent of Americans and to Tamika and to Carla, who have very real problems today.

RECOGNIZING NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS PETER HIGGS AND FRANCOIS ENGLERT

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the scientists at Fermilab in my district for their work to find the Higgs particle.

Yesterday, Peter Higgs and Francois Englert were awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for independently proposing a theory for the Higgs boson. That theory, initially rejected in the 1960s, led the high-energy physics community on a decades-long quest to find the particle that gives mass to matter.

While this discovery has been largely credited to CERN in Europe, America has been a leading force in the fundamental science that made identifying the Higgs possible.

Hundreds of scientists from my district are working actively on experiments at CERN. They played a leadership role building the Large Hadron Collider. We should all congratulate these scientists for advancing the basic understanding of our universe necessary for forging ahead into the next great frontier.

America is made great by our leadership in discovery sciences, so let's show them the support necessary to continue and expand our own science ecosystem.

IT IS TIME TO END THIS DESTRUCTIVE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this destructive government shutdown. It just doesn't make any sense, and it's hurting people, and it's hurting the economy.

While Congress is wasting time on the shutdown, we have important work to do. We need to reform our housing finance system.

Right now, the Federal Government backs over 90 percent of all mortgages being made. That's just not sustainable. We have to bring private capital back into the markets, and we have to reduce the government's role, but we have to do it in a smart way.

For generations, owning a home has been part of the American Dream. The 30-year fixed-rate mortgage has made that dream possible for many of us, and so our number one priority in reforming our housing finance system should be preserving the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

But the legislation currently moving through the House doesn't do that. That's why we need to work together on both sides of the aisle to fix that problem.

We need to reform our housing finance system and protect taxpayers, but we also must preserve home ownership for millions of American families.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO ADDRESS OUR DIFFERENCES

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate today to work together to address our differences to fix this government shutdown.

The House has started by unanimously passing a bill that will pay furloughed Federal workers back pay. We've also passed bills that will fund lifesaving research, Head Start, veterans, and many other important parts of the government.

While some people have called this a piecemeal approach, those people ignore the fact that that's how our appropriations process has worked for over 230 years, with multiple appropriations bills every year. That is the real normal.

Mr. Speaker, let's tone down the rhetoric and work together and get our government funded and pay our debts.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN STOPS MILITARY DEATH BENEFIT

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the harsh impacts of the Republican government shutdown is the fact that military families of our fallen heroes will no longer receive survivor benefits. They have been suspended.

Meanwhile, on Sunday, 8,000 miles away in Afghanistan, four Army Rangers were killed and 30 others were wounded by a suicide bomber and an IED. That's why I urge the approval today of legislation on the floor to provide the death benefits to our fallen soldiers.

But I'd also like to salute a Tampa, Florida, foundation, the Special Operations Warrior Foundation, that has stepped forward to fill the void and will provide four very generous grants to the families of our brave soldiers killed in action.

They typically provide scholarships and financial aid and counseling to the families of Special Operations soldiers, and I'd like to thank them: Retired Air Force Major Steve McLeary, Retired General Doug Brown, Retired Vice Admiral Joe Maguire, Melinda Scofield and Dahlia Munoz, and the entire board of directors, and the greater community of the Tampa Bay area that supports Special Operations Command and all of our brave heroes.

STOP EXAGGERATING AND FEARMONGERING

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, while we disagree from time to time, in fact, we agree more often than we probably disagree in this House. I think everybody can agree that one of the things we'd like to try and preserve is the concept of a reasoned debate. We want to have reasoned debate about the issues.

It is impossible to do that if folks start exaggerating and fearmongering, and that is exactly what is happening right now on the discussion of the debt ceiling. We hear that if we don't raise the debt ceiling, the world is going to end.

We've been trying to convince people for the last several weeks that the debt ceiling and the default are not linked in any fashion. Thankfully, just 15 minutes ago, somebody else came and agreed with me on this. It's Moody's, who says:

> We believe the government would continue to pay interest and principal on its debt even in the event that the debt limit is not raised, leaving its creditworthiness intact. The debt limit restricts government expenditures to the amount of its incoming revenues; it does not prohibit the government from servicing its debt.

It goes on to say these two things are not linked. Let's have a reasonable discussion about the debt ceiling and the import of raising it and the import of running the government.

But let's stop trying to scare people and the markets into thinking that if we don't raise the debt ceiling that the Nation will default on its debt.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM IS LONG OVERDUE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform is long overdue. The leadership the President, the Senate, and the Democrats in this body have shown has been tremendous.

Yes, we must provide a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million living in the shadows. Yes, we must provide the promise of the American Dream for the millions of youngsters brought here through no fault of their own; and, yes, we must ensure that this immigration

bill is a comprehensive immigration bill, open and accessible to all.

Diversity visas are one of the few ways and paths that those from Africa and the Caribbean have to become American citizens.

In many African countries, whole cities gather to hear the results of the diversity visa lottery. What's more, immigrants from Africa and the Caribbean typically are more educated, with the ability to contribute to our economy right away.

If we are going to have true comprehensive immigration reform, then we must keep the diversity visa lottery intact at its current levels because our diversity is what makes this Nation great.

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 the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 91

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided for fiscal year 2013 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113–6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for ''Operation and Maintenance'' and ''Military Personnel'' accounts for continuing the following projects and activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39), and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013:

(1) The payment of a death gratuity under sections 1475–1477 and 1489 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The payment or reimbursement for funeral and burial expenses authorized under sections 1481 and 1482 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The payment or reimbursement of authorized funeral travel and travel related to the dignified transfer of remains and unit memorial services under section 481f of title 37, United States Code.

(4) The temporary continuation of a basic allowance of housing for dependents of members dying on active duty, as authorized by section 403(1) of title 37, United States Code.

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

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

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act.

Our government has no greater responsibility, Mr. Speaker, than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This bipartisan legislation provides continuing appropriations to ensure that, if troops are killed serving our country, our government will honor its obligations to them and their families without delay.

Specifically, the bill would provide for the payment of death gratuities and other benefits, such as military housing allowances, to the families of our fallen soldiers. It would provide for authorized funeral and burial services for servicemembers and their families.

This measure would also pay for families to travel to meet the remains of their loved ones returning home. This bill provides appropriations to pay benefits upon the deaths of military servicemembers.

My colleagues, while this bill is written as a ''continuing appropriations act,'' I want to be very clear. The intent of this legislation is to fully fund the specific benefits for all authorized recipients.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solemn duty to take care of our troops and their families, especially as we remain a Nation at war.

Our men and women serving in uniform, serving in dangerous places all over the globe, deserve the peace of mind of knowing that during the worst of times their families will receive the benefits they deserve immediately. This bill removes any ambiguity on this point.

This is a bipartisan bill with Democratic and Republican cosponsors that, I believe, should pass with overwhelming support.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for legislation upon which we can reach consensus. I am hopeful this bill will bring us together, and I urge support for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for bringing this legislation to the floor. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the subcommittee members for their work, and I certainly support the gentleman's legislation.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense had to report that since October 1 of this year, 17 servicemembers have perished whose survivors would be entitled to a death gratuity payment. So the gentleman's legislation is correct in that it is timely, and it should pass.

The only other observation I would make at the beginning of the debate is the House passed the Pay Our Troops Act, H.R. 3210. I would hope that none of our colleagues are under the misimpression that we have solved all of our problems relative to our national defense because, in a comprehensive fashion, essentially, it deals with about 40 percent of the Department's budget.

The problem that Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN is attempting to address today is but a slice of that 60 percent that, unfortunately, the Government of the United States has not dealt with since the beginning of the fiscal year. But, again, I strongly support and thank the gentleman for his efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. This bill, as has been said, will ensure that the families of U.S. military members who have given the ultimate sacrifice will receive the benefits they were promised in spite of this unfortunate government shutdown.

The House has voted to take care of our warfighters by ensuring that they will be paid during the fiscal crisis, but our responsibility to our soldiers doesn't end there by any means.

As they put their lives on the line on behalf of this Nation, our brave soldiers shouldn't be concerned about who will take care of their families. That's part of our Nation's agreement with our men and women in uniform: You take care of the United States, and we will take care of you and your beloved family.

To this end, the bill allows continued funding to guarantee that the government honors its commitments to our military families without delay. It allows funding to provide a death gratuity to families of fallen soldiers. This is a lump payment to assist them in one of their greatest times of need.

The bill also allows for the customary financial assistance for funeral costs, family travel and housing, back salary payments, and living expenses. It's certainly the least we can do for those who make the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The reality is we are a Nation at war. Wars don't stop just because our government is not functioning properly, nor do our obligations to our soldiers get put on pause while we work to clean things up.

To the families who have lost a son, a daughter, a sister, a brother, a husband, or a wife to war, this bill is our commitment to you that you should not have to suffer even more heartache after such a significant loss.

This legislation is the right thing to do. It should be passed without delay. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VISCLOSKY for taking up this critical legislation and for moving it so quickly to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, our Nation lost five patriots in Afghanistan. We need to remember who they were:

First Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, U.S. Army;

Sergeant Joseph Peters, U.S. Army;

Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, U.S. Army;

Private First Class Cody Patterson, U.S. Army;

Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins, U.S. Marine Corps.

Thirty-six hours after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay death benefits because of the government shutdown.

When I heard about this yesterday morning, I simply could not believe it was true. I asked my staff to look into the matter and find out if it could possibly be true. Unfortunately, they confirmed that indeed we had denied these benefits. We took immediate action, and along with a bipartisan group of Members representing the districts where these fallen heroes lived, we moved forward and introduced this legislation.

As has been said, the bill will provide funding to pay survivor benefits and cover the funeral costs for these military families and all servicemembers who may give the ultimate sacrifice during this shutdown of our government services.

God forbid that any other family should be put in this situation again. It is absolutely abhorrent that we would leave our military families without assistance when they are at their most vulnerable time of trying to deal with their loss and grief.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 91, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey in all matters related to national security, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana.

I also appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's bringing this measure to the floor. It's rather unfortunate and somewhat amazing to me, actually, that he has to.

The Pay Our Military Act passed the House on September 29, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President the next day. It says clearly that there are hereby appropriated such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Who would have ever thought that some lawyer in the Pentagon would say that the death and other benefits we are talking about today would not be included in that? Rather than spend more time in squabbles with lawyers, I think the gentleman from New Jersey wisely has brought this measure to the floor just to make it clear so everybody understands that all of these allowances should be paid.

I think it's also, Mr. Speaker, very important for all of us to say that our hearts grieve with the families for whom this benefit is immediately relevant. Money alone, of course, cannot express our gratitude for the sacrifice and the service that their loved ones have given to this country. But it is important, even in these times when we have differences on fiscal and other issues, that the House come together and everybody unites, regardless of our opinions about other targeted funding issues, to say that we will stand with those families who have given so much to our Nation.

So, again, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this, and I hope that all of my colleagues will vote in support of this measure.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans made a purely political choice to shut down our government to advance their agenda.

Unbelievably, House Republicans decided to shut down our government with thousands of American servicemen and -women on the battlefields in Afghanistan. We are here today because brave Americans who gave their lives on the battlefield were being denied funeral benefits because of this shutdown. Their families were being denied payments of survivor benefits.

This is a disgrace and a shameful consequence of the irresponsible Republican majority. This is an outrage.

The fact that we are here today to pass this bill is a clear admission that America's fallen heroes have been abandoned in this shameless political game being played.

Passing this bill is absolutely needed, but this bill requires us to recognize the willful failure of the Republican leadership in this House to fund our Federal Government and to provide our servicemen and -women all that they need.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and all of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee who are bringing this up so quickly and for fast-tracking it.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Marine Corps. I did three tours: two in Iraq, one in Afghanistan. I served with these men and women. I have met their wives, their husbands, their kids, their families. I sat down with them. I've had dinner with them. I want to say from the bottom of my heart, I apologize for the shameful act of the administration's lawyers in determining that

what we passed last month does not count for paying this death benefit.

When the lawyers in the administration made the decision to not count the death benefit, they broke a sacred trust with our U.S. military men and women and those on the front lines. It is up to us in this Congress to restore that trust for the American people and for our military that we have sent to war for whom we have a responsibility.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say the denial of this benefit is absolutely outrageous, and it is a disgrace. We've broken our fundamental promise to fallen heroes, and we must fix it. This bill will do just that.

We must also ensure that it never happens again. That's why, later today, I will be introducing a bill that makes sure we never forsake our fallen servicemembers or any member of our uniformed services ever again under these circumstances.

I am very pleased that we came together today in a bipartisan fashion. I thank my colleagues for coming together and for putting their differences aside in order to honor these commitments to those who have fallen and in order to take care of their families in this time of need. I hope we will see a unanimous vote in approving this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN. I am very grateful that my oldest son's in-laws are ably served in New Jersey by Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my shock at the administration's absolutely disgusting failure to keep faith with those who paid the ultimate price in the service of our country.

Today, four of our fallen have arrived at Dover Air Force Base, and the families in attendance will have had to pay their own way to be there for the arrival of their loved ones. This is a disgrace and an intentional policy to cause pain by this administration, whose actions are disrespectful of those who have made our freedoms possible.

Soon, we will vote to restate the critical death gratuities that we owe in no uncertain terms to the families of our fallen servicemembers to correct the injustice that has been thrust upon them.

I am particularly disappointed in the administration, as the son of a veteran, as a 31-year veteran myself, and as a grateful father of four sons currently serving in the military.

This Congress, in a bipartisan way, passed the Pay Our Military Act. It was signed into law for the express purpose of making sure that those who served in our Armed Forces in the defense of our freedom are paid all that they are owed. The administration already has the authority to pay this gratuity.

Every effort should be made to respect our servicemembers and military families. The administration is playing politics on the backs of the families of our fallen. This is unconscionable.

Today's vote will give us an opportunity to do our duty to take care of the families of our fallen servicemembers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 1300

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I rise in enthusiastic support of H.J. Res. 91, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for recognizing that all Members—all Members—had a pain in their heart regarding those mothers and fathers who are now suffering the loss of their children, four young men and one young woman, to my recollection, names that we should never forget because we are a Nation at war. For that reason, I believe that this was of great concern to the administration and Secretary Hagel. They're in a dilemma, a conflict, if you will, on the present shutdown of the government.

But I would say to the chairman and ranking member, this is what Congress is all about, fixing the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will place into the RECORD my letter to Secretary Hagel asking for relief for these families. Now we have it.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If I might just inquire, a question of the Chair on H.J. Res. 91: Would you accept a unanimous consent request to ask that every Member of the House be considered an original sponsor or cosponsor of this legislation, H.J. Res. 91?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request cannot be entertained. There is a proper procedure for adding cosponsors.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I make that request now.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

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

DEAR SECRETARY HAGEL: Let me express my appreciation for your service to our nation and for the sacrifices being made by men and women in uniform serving far from home to keep America safe.

As you may be aware, this past weekend five members of the Armed Forces fell in battle while serving in Afghanistan. All Americans mourn their loss and extend our condolences to their families.

I am particularly disturbed to learn that death benefits have been withheld from the families of the fallen due to the government shutdown.

I am therefore requesting that you review H.R. 3210, the ''Pay Our Military Act,'' which the President signed into law as Pub. L. 113–039 on September 30, 2013, and direct that death benefits be paid to the families immediately so that they can travel to Dover Air Force Base and defray the cost of funeral expenses for these fallen heroes.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know how important the work done by our men and women in uniform serving abroad is to the mission of keeping the homeland secure. I know also that your commitment to our men and women in uniform is unparalleled.

Thank you for your reconsideration. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Very Truly Yours,
SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, four brave United States servicemembers died in service to our Nation. Like too many before, Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, Sergeant Hawkins, Sergeant Joseph Peters, and Private First Class Cody Patterson were killed—far from home—by an improvised explosive device in the remote Kandahar province of Afghanistan.

Now, due to the government shutdown, their families have not been disbursed the standard survivor benefits from the United States military that they are rightfully owed. These benefits include reimbursement to the family for funeral expenses, payment of survivor housing, reimbursement for funeral travel, travel associated with dignified transfer of the remains, and other expenses.

This is, beyond a doubt, an outrage. Two of the fallen, Sergeant Hawkins and Private Patterson, were based in my district at Fort Benning, Georgia. Both soldiers were members of the Army's prestigious 75th Ranger Regiment. Sergeant Hawkins was serving his fourth deployment to Afghanistan and Private Patterson his second.

Imagine the pain these families are going through in coping with the death of a loved one. Now imagine being greeted with the cold shoulder of a shuttered government, their country turning on them all because of an unnecessary shutdown.

How dare we not provide these grieving families with the necessary support in their time of need. I am truly embarrassed that these shutdown shenanigans have impacted these brave soldiers' families in this way.

To those people who say the government shutdown is only of minimal impact, remember these families. This is not minimal. These are our sons and daughters we have sent to combat in faraway lands, and they should never have to question our Nation's resolve in taking care of their families. We

must reopen our government so that such inconveniences do not continue to plague our Nation.

In the meantime, let's pass this bill, H.J. Res. 91, for our Nation's military families.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, without question, every Member of the House should support providing a death gratuity for family members following the death of service personnel.

The majority is once again proposing an approach that addresses today's problem but leaves the overarching crisis before us unresolved. Major gaps in capabilities remain with neither a fully functioning national defense nor a fully functioning Federal Government.

The Republican shutdown and piecemeal plan is damaging to the Department of Defense: it hurts our credibility with our allies; reports from the Asian-Pacific Economic Forum suggest that the shutdown raises questions about U.S. political stability and plays into Chinese and Russian foreign policy objectives; and the Army Chief of Staff has said the shutdown is harming readiness.

Even if Republicans' irresponsible piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government is fully up and running.

We could end the shutdown today if Republican leadership would allow a vote. Democrats have negotiated. We didn't just meet in the middle; in fact, we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stopgap bill.

How many more times will the majority discover an unintended consequence before they come to their senses and allow a vote to end the reckless Republican shutdown?

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If I could ask my friend how many more speakers he has on his side.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We anticipate, through the Chair, several more speakers; but I assume we are both waiting, perhaps, for some additional.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is what both of us are doing, and we can continue talking to each other.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to.

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

Let me say to the gentleman that I want to salute you and Chairman YOUNG for sponsoring this legislation, which is truly bipartisan, for bringing it to the floor and for giving Members of both parties an opportunity to join together. At a time when there is a lot of disjointment around here and lack of consensus, on this there is no argument at all; and I am highly appreciative of all that you have done to assist in this process?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I appreciate the gentleman's remark about our chairman, Mr. YOUNG, who has announced his retirement at the end of this Congress. You could find no finer person in the world—a kinder heart or wanting to leave the world better—than our chairman.

I would use this time while we are waiting to simply follow on Chairman ROGERS' remark in reminding all of our colleagues that we do continue to be a Nation at war, and while we have lost 17 individuals since October 1, in fact, this Nation has lost 117 people since the beginning of this year.

I do hope, as we proceed with the United States Congress and the administration, people understand that we ought to fully fund not just the Department of Defense for their important job, but the other agencies of this government, and certainly through the regular appropriations process.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our government has no greater responsibility than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This legislation will ensure, as we've said earlier in this discussion, without question and any ambiguity, that the Department of Defense should provide payment of death gratuities and other benefits to families of our fallen men and women in uniform.

I urge support for this bipartisan legislation, and I thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership in making sure this bill gets to the President as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 91. Yesterday the Department of Defense issued a press release saying the Pentagon does not have the authority to pay death gratuities for the survivors of service members killed in action. This is beyond unacceptable.

Prior to the end of the fiscal year this body passed the Pay Our Military Act, giving the Secretary of Defense plenty of latitude on prioritizing military pay and allowances to Service Members.

This act was understood to provide for death benefits to families of fallen troops during the government shutdown.

I add my voice to the cacophony of frustrated colleagues in disbelief. We are flabbergasted that the Death Gratuity, which provides surviving family members $100,000 in death benefits, was not brought to our attention sooner.

Our office received a phone call from a constituent yesterday who was enraged that military families were no longer receiving these benefits.

Having deployed as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserves, I have been in those life altering situations where the loss of life uproots a family's sense of normalcy.

The immediate days after learning of a service member's death are critical for a bereaving family. Knowing the cost of burial and other after life care is provided for makes the situation a little more bearable.

I plead with this Congress to not turn this issue into one of our normal political footballs where we punt the issue from one body to the next. Let us decide now to take care of our citizens who have offered up their sons and daughters, husbands and wives to the defense of our Nation.

Today this body will choose the moral imperative and tell the families who have lost it all, your cries are being heard and your broken hearts have moved our Chamber into action.

I implore the House with the strongest conviction I possess to move on this legislation and return military families back to focus on rebuilding their lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.J. Res. 91 the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution for 2014.

The Federal Government functions as a cohesive unit, not as dismembered parts. The Federal Departments, sub agencies, independent agencies, commissions, and offices interact with each other much like a military unit serving in the field.

They have relationships that are not apparent until they are revealed most often when a critical need for the Federal Government function is not present when another agency or most important when someone needs that service.

I along with fellow members of the United States House of Representatives stand together to honor and recognize the sacrifice of Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah who lost their lives in defense of this nation and pray for their families that they find solace, grace and mercy.

We made a promise to them and to their families to support them when deployed, and take care of their families at home so they can serve without fear or concern for the wellbeing of their loved ones.

We also promised all of our men and women in the armed services that should the unthinkable happen and their lives are lost in the service of this nation we will step in and be there for their families.

This promise is one that the House and the President take very seriously, but the business of politics is intervening in our discharge of the most basic function of Congress to fund the entire Federal Government.

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah did not forget their duty nor ignore the obligations to keep the oath they took to protect this nation from all enemies both foreign and domestic.

The majority has to put the nation's interest ahead of their political interest—the ideological, social or cultural values that you embrace cannot supersede the needs of our nation. Congress' insistence on funding some parts of the Federal government, while intentionally not funding others is causing confusion and doubt about what can and cannot be funded.

This is understandable since the Federal funding process has never occurred in this way.

Members of the House of Representatives know how serious Congress takes Federal employees coloring outside of the lines when it comes to Congressional legislative intent when they carry out their work. We do not ask Federal employees to be creative with the purse strings of the government, but the mini-CR process is creating confusion and uncertainty on how Federal employees working with a mini-CR, reduced staff and under Sequestration determine how to proceed within the law.

Appropriations bills can be hundreds of pages long depending on the size of the agency. When the House of Representatives insisted on closing the entire Federal government, then decides to engage in this absurd process of mini-continuing resolution, they knew we were moving Federal employees into uncharted waters.

There will be other surprises regarding what agency is needed to provide a service to a group or another part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the House majority has this Nation stumbling around a dark room looking for a way out, but we know how to escape this drama. The flashlight that can lead us out of this darkness is the passage of the Senate's clean CR.

I pay tribute to these American heroes:

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, 25, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, Georgia. In 2010, he enlisted into the Army following his high school graduation.

He has been posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal and Purple Heart. Sergeant Hawkins has been awarded the Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with two Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Presidential Unit Citation.

Sergeant Hawkins was described by fellow service persons as "a brave and incredibly talented Ranger." It is reported that he was killed while going to the aid of a fallen fellow soldier. The Ranger Creed: I will never leave a fallen comrade, is part of the values held by soldiers—they put others before themselves and in doing so assure success of their missions.

First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, 25, of San Diego, California, assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington. First Lieutenant Moreno volunteered to be a member of a cultural support team that joined efforts with a special operations task force serving in Afghanistan.

She grew up in Logan Heights with her mother, two sisters and a brother who is also in the Army.

Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, 24, of Springfield, Missouri, assigned to the 5th Military Police Battalion, Vicenza, Italy. It is reported that the Army's Criminal Investigation Command (CID) said that Sergeant Joseph M. Peters was assigned to one of their Special Operations units. Sergeant Peters investigated felony level crimes involving the Army. Peters was the first special agent for CID to be killed in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, 24, of Philomath, Oregon, assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, at Fort Benning, Georgia. This was his second deployment to Afghanistan. He was described as:

. . . courageous and dedicated and lost his life while fighting tenaciously against our nation's enemies alongside his fellow Rangers. Our thoughts and prayers are with the Patterson family.

Lance Corporal Jeremiah, 19, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, assigned to Combat Logistics Regiment 2, 2nd Marine Logistics Group, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

We offer our heartfelt sympathy to the families and fellow soldiers of those who died.

Mr. Speaker I ask that my Colleagues work together to end this impasse so that we can have a whole and completely functioning Federal government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 91.

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. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 90

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113–6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading ''Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration''.

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

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

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the ''Flight Safety Act''.

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

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 Appropriations.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 90, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I present H.J. Res. 90, a bill providing the FAA with critical funding to ensure safe air travel for the American public and providing critical support for the aviation industry, our Nation's leading exporter.

This bill funds the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester level through December 15 or until enactment of a full-year appropriation for the Transportation-HUD bill, whichever comes first.

The bill would bring back over 6,000 aviation safety inspectors who are currently not working due to the shutdown. These safety inspectors perform critical aircraft certifications that support American jobs by certifying new aircraft for sale in the U.S. and abroad.

The FAA's aviation safety workforce is also essential to ensuring safety in the national airspace by reinspecting and recertifying the operation aircraft fleets that transport millions of Americans every day.

The bill would also reopen the aircraft registry service, assuring that American-made aircraft can move off the production lines and onto the markets in the U.S. and around the world.

The bill would reopen the FAA Academy to resume the training of new air traffic controllers and ensure that our air traffic controller workforce is fully staffed.

The bill will ensure that air traffic control modernization investments resume, ensuring that our NextGen development and deployment continues on schedule.

This is not a comprehensive FY 2014 bill but, rather, a CR to continue funding the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester levels. This brings the FAA back to work to ensure the safety of the flying public until we can come to an overall resolution on the FY 2014 funding levels.

I urge the quick passage of this important legislation so that we can send it on to the Senate. Let's get the FAA back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1315

Here we go again. This week, the House has considered bill after bill to fund pieces of the Federal Government. We can open the entire government if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate nearly 2 weeks ago. Instead, we are considering a bill to fund the Federal Aviation Administration, but we are leaving many other agencies within the Department of Transportation in shutdown status.

I strongly support the mission of the FAA. The controllers, technicians, and safety inspectors are highly skilled and dedicated public servants. However, I cannot support this piecemeal approach to funding our transportation system.

For example, 94 percent of the Federal Transit Administration's employees are furloughed. More than 1,300 transit agencies across the country are not receiving grants for capital and operating assistance. No funds are provided for the Capital Investment Grant Program, which helps create construction jobs and relieves congestion in our major cities.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's vehicle safety program is shut down. Defects in cars and trucks are not being investigated. Crash tests and safety rulemakings have been suspended.

What about assistance for Amtrak? Operating and capital assistance is discontinued at a time when more than 30 million passengers rely on Amtrak to get to destinations all over this country.

The Maritime Security Program gets no relief in this piecemeal approach. This program provides vital support by helping move the cargo that is necessary to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, the National Transportation Safety Board has furloughed most of its employees. Investigations into last week's tragic bus crash in Tennessee will go undone. Today, we reported a gas explosion in Oklahoma, which would be the responsibility of this agency to investigate. Will it be investigated? Probably not—only because of the shutdown.

The reckless and irresponsible shutdown that has been masterminded by a small faction of the House is disruptive for our Nation's transportation system and for the programs that support our most vulnerable citizens.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for opposition to this piecemeal approach to this piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the other side of the aisle on all of these bills that attempt to reopen many aspects of the Federal Government. We hear them say, well, I am in favor of that program, but I want to vote against it until they bring the entire government funding bill before us.

I would love to do that. I would love to bring the entire budget here. In fact, we did, and we can't get the Senate to act on it. But in the meantime, the other side is saying, I will vote against this because I want to save and vote for the entire Federal Government.

That may work in some of the agencies, but this is safety. This is the safety of people flying the skies of this country and the world. You don't want to delay safety until you can vote on a bigger bill. I think it is irresponsible not to support the safety of our people in the skies.

This bill provides funding to resume operations within FAA that are critical to the safety of our skies and our aircraft fleet. It would bring back 7,000 aviation safety inspectors currently not working, restart aircraft certification activities, resume training for air traffic controllers, reopen the aircraft registry service, and continue air traffic control modernization.

Mr. Speaker, you don't want to mess around with the safety of our people. This bill cures that problem. I can't imagine anyone wanting to oppose this bill.

The sum total of these efforts will help guarantee safe, efficient, and reliable air travel for the American public.

This funding is provided at an annual rate of $12 billion and will last until December 15, or until the Congress enacts and the President signs full-year appropriations bills.

The language in this bill is yet again nearly identical to what was included in the CR I offered back in September—nearly a month ago.

Once again, we are calling on the Senate to consider and pass this bill. Our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol continue to call for a clean CR; yet they continue to act on these ''clean'' mini-CRs.

The House has put forward a plethora of options to fund the Federal Government: first, the four annual appropriations bills to fund the government in regular order; then three different continuing resolutions prior to September 30; and now the short-term CRs to reopen parts of the Federal Government—in fact, more than a third of it so far.

But the Senate is committed to inaction. They didn't pass any regular appropriations bills; they will not pass our clean, short-term funding bills; and they so far have refused to join us at the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, that completely puzzles me. It goes against the grain of what has gone on in this country since we have been a country. When the two bodies differ, the Founding Fathers said, if you can't agree, appoint conference members from either body—both bodies—and let them go out and recommend a solution to the problem. It has always worked, except now the Senate refuses to do their duty.

I hope they will consider this bill as a steppingstone toward ending the shutdown. We need to come together in a productive way with open ears and open minds to find a way to clean up this mess.

I urge my colleagues to preserve the safety of American skies. Vote for this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting in that I believe many months ago the Senate, which no one thought would pass a budget, we persuaded them through our votes here in the House to pass a budget, and the House leadership refused to have a conference to appoint conferees so that we could have had regular order, had done

the appropriations bills—and I know the chairman of Appropriations wanted to do that—and today here we are talking about safety when most of the air traffic controllers are already on the job.

I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this reckless Republican shutdown.

As if we need any more proof of a broken Republican government funding strategy, today we are considering a fix to a sequester Band-Aid. This is déjà vu, Mr. Speaker, and further admission that the Republican budget strategy just is not working. While this bill puts furloughed FAA workers back on the job, it does nothing for the rest of our transportation system. This shutdown affects our transit, vehicle safety, railroad, pipeline and hazardous materials, and maritime programs, too.

For example, at the Federal Transit Administration, 94 percent of the employees have been furloughed. No grants are being issued to more than 1,300 transit agencies around the country. Additionally, at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, vehicle safety activities, like consumer testing of new vehicles and investigations to identify defects in automobiles, have been suspended.

Now, all of these points aren't to say that Democrats have no desire to avoid flight delays and cancellations because of furloughed controllers. Earlier this year, despite our opposition to the broader FY '14 T–HUD bill, we supported the inclusion of language to prevent controller furloughs. Unfortunately, that effort never advanced because the allocation for the T–HUD bill under the Republican budget forced cuts so deep to very important popular initiatives like the Community Development Block Grant and Amtrak programs that not even Republicans could support the broader bill, and it was Republicans that pulled the bill from the House floor.

We could end FAA furloughs and all other furloughs if the Speaker allowed a vote on the clean CR to end the shutdown. Democrats have negotiated. Let's remember that. We didn't just meet in the middle; we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stopgap bill. Look no further than a recent headline from the National Journal yesterday: ''Nineteen times Democrats tried to negotiate with Republicans. The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last week.''

I want to make one other point. I woke up this morning listening to the voice of a furloughed worker with two kids in college who was talking about how in the world he is going to pay his expenses and put food on the table without the dollars that he and his wife count on in their accounts.

Let's look at the facts. Let's listen to these stories in our districts. It is fine to be so cavalier here in Washington and shut down the government, talking about getting rid of our important obligation to pay our debts, but let's look at the impact of this. Let's look at what is happening back home in our districts and think of how critical these workers are, these programs are.

Let's get the bill on the floor that would fund the entire government. This piecemeal effort may sound good. I don't know if it sounds good to your constituents. I don't know if you can fool them that way, but let's put the entire bill on the floor that was at your level that passed the Senate and let's move forward.

Vote ''no'' on this irresponsible bill, and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. LATHAM. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bill to fully fund the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration. It is so absolutely critical, both to our economy as well as to our security in the airways, not only on commercial flights but general aviation as well.

Mr. Speaker, during this shutdown, we keep hearing a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has no strings attached. It just funds the FAA.

I know that many of our colleagues on the other side will say, well, they can't vote for this unless they have an entire clean CR funding the entire government, because they want exactly what they want, and nothing else will do. Yet, they call Republicans ''absolutists.''

Fortunately, many on the other side will support this bill. In fact, I think it is of note that with all the various CRs, clean CRs, that we have been passing since this shutdown began, all with no strings attached, all that have nothing to do with ObamaCare, we actually now have funded a large part—if not more than half—of the entire discretionary Federal budget.

Unfortunately, the President and the Senate Majority Leader keep saying that they will not negotiate; they won't consider any of these things.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important funding bill.

□ 1330

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I know how important it is to end the shutdown of the FAA, but I do have to ask the question, if safety were so important, why wasn't this the first bill brought to the floor in this piecemeal approach that the Republican side has taken?

Now, look. A safe and efficient aviation system isn't just good for travelers; it's the lifeblood of the economy where I come from. In our State, 131,000 people across over 1,200 companies work in the aerospace industry, but these folks don't just depend on the FAA. Is it safety to say that police departments that need Federal grants to put cops on the beat should have to wait? Is it safety to say that our functioning transit systems have to wait for grants to make the transit systems more safe? Is it safety to say that the EPA can't issue grants in my district or around the country to make sure that we have safe and clean drinking water? This bill funds none of these priorities.

We should not be opening just parts of the government to serve just some of the people. We should open the entire government for all Americans. The Republican solution to the Republican shutdown, this piecemeal approach picking winners and picking losers, is no solution at all.

It's great that this House wants to make sure that air travel is safe, but why should we stop there? What about safety on our highways?

In the last 10 days, there have been three major, fatal transportation accidents across this country. A plane crashed in Santa Monica, California, killing four; a bus crashed in Tennessee, killing eight and injuring another 14; and less than a mile from this building, one person died and two others were injured during a Metro repair accident this week. But the National Transportation Safety Board can't investigate because this Congress sent the investigators home on furlough.

Let's end this piecemeal approach and move on to a vote on a Senate bill that opens all of the government for all Americans. If it's about safety, let's do it that way. This continued unwillingness to allow one vote—just one vote—to open the government for all Americans and not just some needs to stop. One bill, one vote for all Americans.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it troubles me that the administration is once again going out of its way to cause pain for the American people and at great risk to America's safety. We see this up close and personal in my district with this incomprehensible closure of the FAA registry office. That is the office that allows air flights to be transferred, to be sold and bought and purchased and entered into service. In previous shutdowns, this office was deemed essential. It was kept open and for good reason. It is the equivalent of DMV for

aircraft; you have to keep this pipeline moving. It is important for safety and for workers. It is affecting thousands of families all across the country who build these airplanes—engineers and workers and manufacturers and sheet metal benders—especially in the Fourth District, the air capital of the world.

There are thousands of families, many of them hardworking union families folks across the aisle tell me they care deeply about, and I know that I do, too. I would urge these folks on the other side of the aisle to recognize the importance to our labor force, to keep America safe, to get the aircraft registry back open, and to pass this legislation on the floor today.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act. This commonsense bill will restore critical funding to the FAA and help protect airports in northern Michigan and throughout our Nation.

Like so many people in our country, I am deeply frustrated by this government shutdown. I don't want to see air travelers in northern Michigan hurt because the Senate and the President refuse to negotiate on a spending plan. All that needs to be done is for both sides to come to the negotiating table, but the Senate refuses to talk to us. It's ridiculous.

We've already seen this mess in Washington impact airports in my district, like the Cherry Capital Airport in Traverse City. Just this past weekend, dozens of flights were canceled because of this government shutdown. Families shouldn't be stranded at the airport for hours just because Washington can't get its act together. But it doesn't have to be this way. We could fix this problem at our airports right now with this simple piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Flight Safety Act today. I also urge our colleagues in the Senate to take action and pass this measure as soon as possible.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague that we could fund the entire government if my colleague could persuade his leadership to bring H.J. Res. 59 to the floor. We could have a straight up-or-down vote. It would probably pass in a bipartisan manner, and we could stop the shutdown, and people could go back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that we've talked about bringing our employees back from the shutdown. We were told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that this is very important because here we are dealing with safety, and the reality is that probably the majority of the air traffic controllers and safety personnel, as required by FAA, are working. I can't imagine that the administrator, Mr. Huerta, would put the American public in any kind of danger.

Again, if we would have had a budget conference several months ago, we could have done the appropriations process and probably funded the entire government using regular order, but I keep hearing that if this vote were to come to the floor that it would pass in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take H.J. Res. 59 from the table and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Well, Mr. Speaker, next time I bring it up, I will try to clear it since there is such enthusiasm to bring the Federal Government back to work.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.J. Res. 90, the so-called "Flight Safety Act," which provides limited and insufficient funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, and is test gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

I am a senior member of the Homeland Security. I chaired the Transportation Security Subcommittee in the 111th Congress and was its Ranking Member in the last Congress. I represent Houston, which is home to one of the nation's busiest and most important airports. So I know the importance of the air transit industry to our economy. And I know that the health of the air transit industry depends upon security of air travel. I support robust funding for the FAA. I support robust funding for TSA. I support and worked to secure increased funding to modernize airport runways, reduce noise, increase the number of air marshals, and to develop NextGen.

NextGen is the name given to the new airspace system to be phased in between 2012 and 2025. NextGen will transform America's air traffic control system from an aging ground-based system to a satellite-based system that shortened routes, save time and fuel, reduce traffic delays, increase capacity, and permit controllers to monitor and manage aircraft with greater safety margins. So while I take a back seat to no one in my support for a modern and secure air transportation system, the bill before us is the wrong way for this House to deal with the pressing budgetary priorities of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our Republican colleagues to abandon their current strategy of wasting valuable floor time bring miniCRs to the floor. They know the Senate will not accept them and the President will veto them. This strategy will not reopen the government they voted to shut down.

There are the votes in this House to pass the clean CR from the Senate and send it to the President today. That will reopen the government today. And that is what we should do. Every day we delay passing a clean CR is another day of unneccessary pain and hardship and burden inflicted on the American people.

People like Ramon Encarnacion of Texas, whose 11-year-old son doesn't understand why his father, an FAA aviation safety inspector, was able to greet him when he got home from school this week. "When he came home and saw me here and not working, Mr. Encarnacion said 'But you're always at work.'" Mr. Encarnacion worked for 25 years at American Airlines without ever being furloughed and he never thought he would be out of work when he took a job at the Federal Aviation Administration as a safety inspector last year. But with the government shutdown, Mr. Encarnacion and hundreds of other Texas employees who work for the FAA are getting an unplanned and unpaid leave of absence.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to the nation's transportation system and infrastructure than the small portion of FAA safety inspectors funded by this piece-meal mini-CR.

The shutdown of the government has crippled many of the safety enforcement and grant-making functions of the Federal Transit Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board.

This mini-CR does not end the adverse effects that the government shutdown has had on other transportation safety and infrastructure investments. As long as House Republicans abandon their shutdown strategy: The Federal Transit Administration cannot process or award operating and capital grants to roughly 1,300 transit agencies.

The FTA cannot fund or review major transit capital projects which create construction jobs and relieve congested areas. And FTA cannot implement its authorized safety oversight responsibilities provided in MAP–21. FTA cannot perform these critical functions because more than 9 in 10 (94 percent) of its employees have been furloughed.

There are no funds in this mini-CR for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration so the agency has had to: Suspend investigations into safety defects in vehicles; halt all vehicle safety enforcement, research, data analysis, and consumer testing programs; Delay compliance testing of vehicles and equipment; and Defer safety research on crash avoidance technologies, occupant protection and alcohol detection.

Since there are no funds for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in this bill, the agency lacks funds to conduct pipeline and hazardous materials safety inspections or to award pipeline safety grants to state and local governments.

The National Transportation Safety Board has had to furlough 95 percent of employees and suspend investigations into new crashes and incidents.

The same is true for the Federal Railroad Administration, which has no funds for FRA safety inspectors and has furloughed more than half of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of funding for the Maritime Administration has resulted in the shutdown of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and a suspension of the Maritime Security Program, which ships cargo to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this mini-CR claims funds portions of the Transportation Security Administration but it provides no funds for commercial aviation screening or Federal Flight Deck Officer Training or Federal Air Marshals travel and training.

Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

Mr. Speaker, people are hurting. Our economy is suffering. The shutdown has cost our economy $8.5 billion in lost productivity already and that number increases by $1.5 billion everyday.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the madness. Let the House vote today on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate and reopen our government and put our people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. ESTY. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 90 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth day of the unnecessary government shutdown and the 12th time we've made a motion to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—12 times to allow this House to vote on a measure that has passed the Senate, 12 times to allow the House to vote on a budget figure that the Republicans asked for and that has already passed this House—a measure that, based on public statements by Members of this body, would pass and reopen the government immediately.

Across my district and across the country, workers have been furloughed, and veterans and seniors are seeing their earned benefits delayed. People in Connecticut and across America are suffering the consequences of this reckless, unnecessary shutdown in very real ways.

For months, groups in Connecticut that partner with NIH to conduct research that we need to find breakthrough treatments for children and adults with cancer have been asking that we end the budget sequester. Last week, university hospitals and researchers like those in my State came together to oppose the piecemeal approach, and they asked this House to end the government shutdown.

The shutdown means that loans for small businesses to help them grow and create jobs are being delayed. In fact, the average loans for small businesses approved per day in my district are $188,000, and those businesses put those loans to work in creating jobs, ordering new equipment, exporting their goods, but they can't when the SBA is shut down.

Business travelers need the entire Federal budget reopened, not a gimmick piecemeal bill limited to parts of the FAA. Piecemeal gimmicks are not a solution for families and children who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that Head Start classrooms aren't closed. Piecemeal gimmicks are not a solution for our veterans who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that they don't face even more unnecessary, harmful delays for the benefits they have earned.

Tax-paying Americans are right to expect their hard-earned tax dollars are used responsibly. What sense does it make for taxpayers to be footing the bill for furloughed workers who are prohibited from working when we can vote today for this motion which would lead to the entire Federal Government's reopening?

Yesterday, I received a report that 801 unemployment claims have been filed in Connecticut from furloughed workers. Taxpayers will be paying unemployment instead of paying people to work. One vote is all it would take, and this motion could be that vote.

It's time to end the shutdown. It's time to send a short-term funding bill to the President. It's time to reopen the entire Federal Government. It is time to be responsible. This is what I hear from folks across my district: Reopen the entire government. A manufacturer in my district let me know that the shutdown is causing uncertainty in its business and its customers' businesses. The shutdown has put a chilling effect on its customers and is harming confidence.

Piecemeal gimmicks are not the solution to this problem, and this disingenuous, piecemeal approach is not acceptable to the Chamber of Commerce or to a coalition of over 250 associations representing multiple private sector job-creating industries. They sent a letter to us even before the shutdown, urging this body to promptly pass a continuing resolution to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling. We need to reopen the Federal Government for all of the American people.

Make no mistake: I want the FAA reopened. I have contract towers in my district. I want the FAA reopened. I want the VA reopened. I want the entire Federal Government reopened. I ask my colleagues to be reasonable and to vote to pass this motion to reopen the entire Federal Government.

I will remind my colleagues who claim that we won't meet part way, we have. Mr. Speaker, the budget figure in this temporary spending bill is your proposal. The Republican budget number is much, much lower, frankly, than what Democrats prefer, but we want to end the shutdown and stop the pain for all of the American people. So we come before this House with the Republicans' own budget figure and ask all House Members to do the right thing. Join us. Join us in reopening the Federal Government. I urge all House Members to vote ''aye'' on this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Connecticut wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open all of the Federal Government instead of just one portion of the government?

We have voted to pay workers furloughed during a shutdown—I supported that bill—but what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not able to do their jobs? What kind of a strange House is this that would force that situation on our workers and taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not be opening the entire Federal Government today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't open the entire Federal Government today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Aviation Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, October 7, and October 8, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such a motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of Rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommittal, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 91.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—194

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

NOT VOTING—9

Ellmers
Gabbard
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Rush
Young (FL)

□ 1412

Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. SINEMA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 536, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 172, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

AYES—252

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)

Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—172

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

NOT VOTING—7

Gabbard
Garamendi
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1419

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—425

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
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.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall

Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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.
Sanchez, Loretta
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 (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
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
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler
Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Turner
Young (FL)

□ 1433

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 538, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SHUTDOWN ISSUES

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, most people are surprised and actually stunned and amazed to discover that the Senate and the House have agreed—at least for the next 5 weeks—on a level of funding.

This is not an argument about money. This shutdown is not about money. There are only two issues stopping the shutdown from coming to an end right this second. The President was on television yesterday, for over an hour, and never mentioned those two issues.

We've agreed on the money. Here are the issues:

Make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everybody else in the United States of America.

The President gave Big Business and special interests a 1-year break from being a part of ObamaCare.

We want America's workers and families who work hard and play by the rules to have the same advantage. That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district say they want.

To give special benefits only to Big Business and special interests is not fair, it's not right, and it's not good for the United States of America.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of my Arizona district to once again make a simple request: allow a vote on a clean funding bill to reopen the government.

In the past week, House GOP leaders only allowed piecemeal votes on bills that went nowhere. Yesterday, they did it again. This time, they did it with Head Start funding, which is important for the 12 Native American tribes in my district. Schools on tribal lands have already taken a massive hit with sequestration cuts.

The shutdown is continuing this pain, not just with cuts to Head Start and impact aid, but with furloughs from the Indian Health Service and with cuts in funding for programs that protect women from violence.

These piecemeal games are a dead end. They only prolong the shutdown. If House leadership were genuinely concerned about programs like Head Start or Impact Aid, they would allow a vote to reopen the government.

Congress should stop picking winners and losers. This is not a game. We demand a vote on the budget.

LET'S GET OUR ACT TOGETHER

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate again that the bodies have agreed on the general numbers that we have to look at to deal with our budget. We need to do it. We need to get it done, and we need to get people back to work here in the United States of America.

The one thing that shocked me, Mr. Speaker, is last Saturday, I went with my colleague STEVE KING to The Mall because we wanted to open up the World War II Memorial, the Korean Memorial, and the Vietnam Memorial so that our veterans and the American people could visit them.

We were absolutely shocked to find the level of intimidation that was going on. Police dogs were held by park rangers, and mounted police were in front of the barriers in front of these monuments. That's shameful.

What was even more shameful is that there were 90-year-old people in 90-degree weather, and the park system had shut down not only the water fountain but also the bathrooms. We had 10 Honor Flights coming in to visit the World War II Memorial, and in one of the most undignified acts I've ever seen, the Greatest Generation was denied access to a public bathroom in the national park.

That's terrible. We wouldn't do that to anyone. That's why we need to get our act together and get this taken care of.

SHUTDOWN CONSEQUENCES FOR NEVADA

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to give credit where credit is due and to commend a Republican who understands the negative consequences of this shutdown, and he is the Governor from my home State of Nevada, Governor Brian Sandoval.

Yesterday, he told the Las Vegas Sun that Nevada is struggling because of this ongoing shutdown. He said that Nevadans are going to ''see some catastrophic issues going on for the State'' if the shutdown continues.

The Sun reported that 362,000 food stamp recipients will see benefits end on November 1 as State employees who administer the program face potential furloughs. In addition, 425,000 women, infants, and children would be cut from food assistance rolls. Rape crisis call centers may be closed. Unemployment claims will not be processed.

Republicans in Congress need to recognize what's happening in their States. Listen to your constituents. Listen to your State legislators and Governors.

This shutdown needs to end, and it needs to end now.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, October 8, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DEAN HELLER,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOE HECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DINA TITUS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MARK AMODEI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN: Your service to our state is vitally important, and I want to thank you for your work and dedication. I know we all put Nevada first and understand how special and unique our great state is. We have all worked together to move our state forward, and I will always be grateful for your willingness to put partisanship aside when it comes to Nevada.

I feel compelled to write all of you to express my deep concern with the shutdown of the federal government and its potential impacts on our state. This shutdown impacts how the state operates, the services we are

able to provide, and has the potential to set our state back when it comes to economic recovery. In the most basic of terms, this is about ensuring people are fed, houses are kept, and jobs are available.

As you are aware, Nevada was the last state to emerge from the great recession. While we have made much progress since the height of the recession, our unemployment rate still remains above the national average, and our housing market has not fully recovered. And while Nevada's economy is once again expanding, a prolonged federal shutdown undermines consumer confidence and threatens economic growth nationally. Either of these outcomes endangers the tourism industry that is so important to our state.

Job creation and getting Nevadans working again has been my greatest priority since coming to office, and I know, as members of the federal delegation, it has been a priority of yours as well However, I am concerned that we may be forced to take steps backwards as the impacts of this shutdown unfold on the economy. While we do not know the extent of the impact, we know even in the best of times the economic impact of a government shutdown is felt.

I am also deeply concerned about the possibility of a disruption in services to our state's neediest. Whether it is child nutrition programs, SNAP benefits, unemployment insurance, or dozens of other programs, this disruption in service undermines the economic and nutritional security of Nevadans. Those who are struggling may go hungry or be unable to pay their rent or mortgage. These services are designed to help those who have fallen on the hardest of times. A disruption to these services will be devastating for some.

The state has the ability to cover the cost of some federally funded programs during the shutdown by temporarily allocating money that has been set aside for other purposes. However, we have no assurances that the federal government will reimburse Nevada for any costs that it assumes during the shutdown. It is difficult to make informed choices on how to proceed absent swift action from the federal government to provide clear directions regarding which programs will be made whole and which will not. At a very minimum, the federal government needs to address this uncertainty so the state can plan financially and manage its affairs responsibly.

The State of Nevada cannot be expected to assume the costs of federal programs. We built our budget in good faith with reasonable assurances regarding federal funding levels. To that end, I have included a summary of the shutdown's impact on the people of Nevada. I implore each of you to work together to resolve the issues in Washington and to honor the federal commitment to Nevada.

Thank you for your attention to this most important matter. As always, I am available to each of you should the need arise to discuss this further.

Sincere regards,

BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor.

RESPECT FOR OUR FALLEN HEROES

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 days since the government shut down. The postal service is still running. Social Security and unemployment checks are being processed. Citizens can get passports and food stamps, and certain groups that have the right ideology are even given permits to protest on our National Mall; but for some reason, our military families, including those at Fort Bragg in North Carolina, cannot receive emergency death benefits.

This is worse than excusable. It's shameful.

Last week, Congress unanimously passed the Pay Our Military Act, with the intent that all military pay and allowances will be disbursed during the government shutdown. Unfortunately, this administration has been playing political theater with the families of our war heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

To make our intent crystal clear, today the House passed the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. Certain things should transcend politics, and it is up to the Senate and the administration. In fact, they have a moral obligation to join the efforts of the House to fix this problem and to express our deepest gratitude to the families of our heroes.

CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of increasing relevance to our national affairs and to constitutional government properly understood—and that is the requirement that the President faithfully enforce the laws of the land and the failure of the current incumbent to satisfy that obligation.

The Constitution sets out a simple yet effective structure: the major powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—are divided into three separate branches of government. The legislative branch—the Congress—passes laws, makes law; the executive branch—the President—enforces law; and the judicial branch—the Supreme Court and inferior courts—interprets laws.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution imposes upon the President the duty to ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'' This duty has roots in Anglo American law dating back to the Glorious Revolution of 17th century Britain. In fact, the English Bill of Rights of 1689 provided that:

> The pretended power of suspending laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, without the consent of parliament, is illegal.

For his part, the Founder of our country, George Washington, saw the faithful execution of the law to be one of the President's core responsibilities. In a letter to Alexander Hamilton, then-President Washington explained that the Constitution's ''take care'' clause meant:

> It is my duty to see the laws executed: to permit them to be trampled with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

The duty of the President to ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed'' is a central component not simply of the executive branch of government, but to the entire constitutional system.

□ 1445

Yet the conduct of the current incumbent has evinced a disregard for this core constitutional duty. By picking and choosing which laws to enforce, the President has undermined the constitutional order and has failed to keep faith with the basic idea that ours is a government of laws, not of men.

Now the most conspicuous vehicle for the President's disregard of the Take Care duty has been the implementation of the law that bears his name—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, aka ObamaCare.

Now, it is interesting that of all the arguments that have been put forward to counter those who seek to defund, delay, or repeal this law, the one that ObamaCare supporters have embraced most frequently as of late goes like this: ObamaCare is the law of the land and has been upheld by the Supreme Court; therefore, it cannot be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Now, this is a nonsensical argument on its face. Congress has the authority to legislate, per article I of the Constitution, and can amend, supercede, or repeal ordinary legislation as it sees fit. But this argument is particularly rich regarding ObamaCare. Because if this law is somehow sacrosanct, then why is the President not enforcing it as written? It is untenable to assert that Congress cannot change the law through legislation but that the President can delay or waive provisions of the law by executive fiat. Exhibit A for this, as it relates to ObamaCare, is the President's unilateral decision for 1 year to delay the enforcement of the so-called employer mandate, a central provision of ObamaCare requiring most businesses to provide government-sanctioned insurance to their employees.

Now, section 1513(d) of that law states that the employer mandate ''shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.'' Note the statutory command of ''shall.'' This is not discretionary, and there is no provision of the law permitting the Executive to delay it.

Incredibly, the President has not offered any coherent rationale for his actions. He was asked in an interview with The New York Times whether his critics were justified in asserting that he lacked authority to delay the mandate. He responded by saying:

> If Congress thinks that what I've done is inappropriate or wrong in some fashion, they're free to make that case. But there's not an action that I take that you don't have some folks in Congress who say that I'm usurping my authority. Some of those folks think I usurped my authority by having the gall to win the Presidency. And I don't think

that's a secret. But ultimately, I'm not concerned about their opinions—very few of them, by the way, are lawyers, much less constitutional lawyers.

In other words, the President doesn't care what Congress thinks, as elected Representatives of the people, and feels no need to justify his official conduct.

Now, a couple weeks later he was asked again about this decision to unilaterally delay the mandate, and he said, look, he ''didn't simply choose to delay this on my own'' because the decision was made ''in consultation with businesses all across the country.''

Now, I have searched the Constitution in vain for the provision allowing the President to suspend article II, section 3 of the Constitution so long as he consults with business, but I have not found it.

What is even worse, though is that the President further justified his conduct by stating:

In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker and say, you know what, this is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law. Let's make a technical change of the law. That would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we're not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare.

That's the end of the President's quote.

Now, this is absurd. The Constitution doesn't relieve the President of his duty to faithfully enforce the law simply because the political environment is difficult. Second, the President didn't, in fact, need to call the Speaker, because a couple weeks before his comment, this House voted 264–161—with 35 Members of the other party voting ''yes''—to delay the mandate by law for 1 year. Most of us in the House actually think that, as a matter of policy, the employer mandate is bad for the economy. The President responded to our request to delay the employer mandate by threatening to veto the bill.

Now, with respect to the employer mandate, the emperor truly has no clothes. The unilateral delay of this mandate is not consistent with the Constitution's Take Care clause and is an abridgement of Congress' constitutional duty to make the law. The separation of powers is designed to ensure a government of laws, not of men. This President is content to be a law unto himself.

Now, the employer mandate delay is not an exception that proves the rule, unfortunately. Far from it. The entire enterprise of ObamaCare implementation has been an exercise in the administration picking and choosing which provisions to enforce and which provisions to delay or waive. Rather than implement the law as written, the President is rewriting the law as he goes along.

The following list represents a pretty impressive display of this lawlessness:

ObamaCare contains a statutory cap on out-of-pocket health costs, yet the President suspended this provision, most likely because he feared it would lead to health insurance premiums rising even more than they already are.

Second, the law requires the State-based ObamaCare health insurance exchanges to verify whether applicants for exchange subsidies qualify for subsidies based on their income level. Yet the President suspended this requirement, thereby allowing taxpayer money to be handed out based on the ''honor system''; and we know that it's going to hit the taxpayer more than if you actually enforce the regulations.

The plain text of ObamaCare also provides that subsidies can only flow through State-based exchanges, yet the President's IRS is disregarding this requirement and is allowing subsidies to flow to Federal exchanges.

So this is creating, I think, a patently unjust scenario: The law imposes substantial burdens on society as a whole, but those with political connections—employers, insurance companies, what have you—are granted delays and/or waivers from the law's burdens. This is precisely contrary to James Madison's admonition in the Federalist No. 57 that there should be ''no law which will not have its full operation on the political class and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society.''

The most egregious example, though, of political favoritism via executive branch lawlessness has got to be the illicit bailout for Members of Congress with respect to congressional health plans. Now, when the bill was being debated several years ago, the American people were told we have to pass the bill to find out what is in the bill. And sure enough, the law contained all sorts of surprises, including an interesting provision regarding health care for Members of Congress.

Now there is broad agreement among analysts who have looked at the effects of ObamaCare that the law's structures and incentives will cause millions of Americans to lose their employer-provided coverage and get pushed into these health care exchanges. The only dispute really is how many millions of Americans will suffer this fate. The Congressional Budget Office said 7 million. Other analysts have said it's going to be tens of millions of Americans.

Perhaps recognizing this possibility, one section of ObamaCare makes Congress eat its own cooking. The idea behind the provision is that, because ObamaCare will upend the health care arrangements of other Americans, Members of Congress and other political insiders should be placed in exactly the same position as their fellow citizens whom they have burdened, and thus Members of Congress must go and get insurance through these ObamaCare exchanges. No more gold-plated plans for Washington, given Washington is having a negative effect on other Americans.

Now, one can search the health care law in vain for any provision providing Members of Congress taxpayer-financed subsidies for use on these ObamaCare exchanges. It's just not there. In fact, as Politico reported, the Office of Personnel Management initially said that lawmakers and staffers couldn't receive subsidies once they went into the exchange because there was no authority to give them subsidies. This is probably also because any other American who loses their health coverage and goes into the exchanges is prohibited from getting a tax-excludable employer contribution.

This state of play didn't sit well with a lot of Members of Congress. So after being lobbied by Members of both the House and Senate, the President pledged to ''fix the issue.'' He ordered OPM to reverse course and grant unique taxpayer subsidies to Members of Congress and other Washington insiders—again, without having a statutory authority to do so.

So this is a lawlessness in service of liberating Members of Congress from having to live under the terms of the laws that they impose on others, And this is creating all sorts of problems of fairness and equity.

I think the Founding Fathers had it right when they said that the President did have a duty to take care that the laws would be faithfully executed. And that word ''faithfulness'' means something. Yes, you have discretion as an executive to enforce laws to a certain degree or not, depending on the situation. That is a natural aspect of prosecutorial discretion. But the idea that you can just supercede or delay laws by executive fiat is something that's foreign to our constitutional tradition.

I'm going to yield in a second to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but think about this: Had Mitt Romney won the 2012 election and he came in and started delaying or waiving parts of ObamaCare with impunity and with no congressional authorization, can you imagine the uproar that we would be hearing from the press and from our friends on the other side of the aisle? I think it would be very loud in here if that were the case.

At this time, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for coming, and I yield to him.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Well, I really appreciate it.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), who has been such a great leader on constitutional issues in this body. And I'd like to say that, here you have a gentleman who went to Yale undergraduate and he played baseball. He got a law degree from Harvard, and then he decided to join the United States Navy. He has served bravely in the United States Navy as a JAG officer, and now he's serving in the United States Congress. So if there is anybody in this body who has the credibility to discuss these constitutional issues, it is my good friend from Florida, RON DESANTIS. And I appreciate your leadership on these issues.

When you think about the constitutional process, Mr. Speaker, there is one particular issue that is near and dear to me, that is near and dear to my constituents, that we have seen this body go through earlier this year, and that is the issue of gun control. I think it was back in April. The President had an agenda and HARRY REID had an agenda, and their agenda was to outlaw certain types of guns. These guns didn't operate any differently than other types of guns; they just looked scary, so they wanted to ban them.

Interestingly, that effort died in the Senate and it never came to the House of Representatives. So then they started another effort, and that effort was for what would eventually be a national gun registry. They called it ''universal background checks,'' but ultimately it would be a national gun registry, and that effort died in the Senate.

Now, the constitutional process, if the President wants his agenda enacted, he needs to go to the United States Senate or the House of Representatives and pass a law, in a bicameral process, and eventually it needs to go to his White House for signing. Ultimately, this bill did not have the will of the American people. This bill did not have the desire of the Members in this body to pass that bill. So what the President did recently—which I believe is egregious—is he decided to enter the United States of America into an international treaty to accomplish the very objectives that the House of Representatives and the Senate had rejected, and that's the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Under this treaty, anybody who purchases a gun internationally—if a gun comes from another country, maybe a Glock from Austria—well, then you have to enter into an international database. You have to enter your name and your address and your phone number. There will be an international database of anybody who buys a gun that was ultimately produced in a country other than the United States.

And let me be clear about this, because I've talked to a lot of gun manufacturers. Many parts of many guns are not made in the United States. You could have a handle that's made in China. You could have a trigger that's made in Mexico. If you look at most of the guns that are made in the United States, major parts of them are made elsewhere, which means that we are going to have a national gun registry that will have an international body overseeing our national gun registry per the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Now, for the President of the United States to have an agenda item that doesn't get through the Senate, that doesn't get through the House of Representatives, that never comes to his desk for signing, that he is ideologically committed to this—which is a violation of the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution—for him to then enter into a treaty, an international treaty where there will be an international body responsible for overseeing this treaty, to me, is an egregious lack of leadership and certainly violates the intention of the Constitution. The President knows full well that the Senate will never ratify this treaty.

And this is another important point, I think. The President has had other agenda items. He wanted to sign us up for other treaties—the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Children, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Women, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of the Disabled. There are all these conventions, and they're all seemingly very good conventions; but what I would say is this: The United States of America has laws, and those laws are far more stringent than these treaties.

□ 1500

For what purpose would we sign on to a treaty when our laws themselves are stronger at adhering to the principles that these treaties are trying to promote? Why would we sign on? Why would we turn over our sovereignty to an international body? I personally don't understand it.

The United States is a leader in the world. We can lead the world by example, but signing over our sovereignty so that there will be an international body that comes in and inspects our country because the President has an ideology that he couldn't get through the House, that he couldn't get through the Senate, that ultimately these treaties were not going to be ratified by the Senate, I think it is egregious.

Certainly the Second Amendment of the United States is, quite frankly, not up to debate by foreigners, and it is not up to debate by foreign bodies. Foreign governments cannot come into the United States and force us to overturn our own constitutional amendment—the Second Amendment.

That is, I think, another example of where this President has overreached beyond his constitutional authority in certainly passing laws—not actually passing laws, but creating treaties because he can't get his laws passed—that would violate our Constitution.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Thank you for those comments, and thank you for the service that you have given to the country, here in the Congress, but particularly as a naval aviator flying more than one platform—the E–2D Hawkeye and then also the F–18 Super Hornet.

You have been deployed in harm's way numerous times, and you speak with a great deal of authority, not only on these issues, but on issues related to national security. I think it has been great that the gentleman and I have had a mutual pact to be supporting our blue-water Navy because there is no other weapon in the world like it when you can move a carrier 90 miles off somebody's coast and project power.

With that, I would like to recognize another one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SALMON), a guy who has been here before, he has walked the walk, and one of the few guys who will tell you what his principles are and will come here and will actually put those principles into action. He did it in the '90s and he is doing it again.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you very much.

First of all, I want to say what an honor it is to be sharing the dais with two such distinguished gentlemen who have given up their careers and sacrificed countless hours with their families to come to this body and not, as has been done before, be willing to ''kick the can down the road''; coming to make real change; coming to try to get our arms around the real problems that are confronting our society and us as a Nation.

I would like to say that it is just a debt crisis, that it is just funding for our government. But I think we all know it is much more than that. It is about the freedoms that we hold. It is about everything that we hold dear—everything that every military person for the last 240 years has fought to defend—and that is the freedoms that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they started this great experiment. We don't want to let that experiment die.

I am so honored to be able to serve with two gentlemen that take this seriously and are willing to do more than be politicians and risk those political careers to actually do what is right. What a novel idea for Washington, D.C.

I would like to talk just a little bit about the genesis of the President's health care law when we talk about the constitutionality. They cooked this thing up at a time when they knew that time was running short. A new Senator had just been elected from Massachusetts, so they had to act very, very quickly, or they wouldn't be able to get by the cloture vote. That is why NANCY PELOSI ended up saying, we have to pass it before we know what is in it and then we can read it afterwards, because virtually none of those Senators actually read it.

That is why I understand Wolf Blitzer just came on today and said: Mr. President, why don't you postpone ObamaCare for a year?

Why? Because we have seen over the last week it is a failure. Its roll-out has been catastrophic. We want to stop the hemorrhage and help the American people.

How did the bill eventually become a law? It happened because they did a ''strike all'' on a bill that was originated in the House. But they did a ''strike all'' with language that had nothing to do with the original language.

Why is that important? Because in the Constitution there is a provision called the origination clause. That stipulates that any revenue bill has to originate in the House of Representatives. It has to. That is a requirement

for the Constitution, but this bill actually started in the Senate—ObamaCare started in the Senate. So constitutionally from day one it started out on shaky footing. They violated the Constitution right out of the shoot.

Now, let's fast-forward to where we are today. Congressman DESANTIS, you have done a marvelous job describing some of the inconsistencies and the breaches of the Constitution that this President has done in actually changing his own law. We say it is his own law—it is Congress' law. It is a law that a President can't enact in and of itself and he can't change in and of himself. We don't have a line-item veto anywhere. The President can only change the law if it goes through Congress first. So like you said, Congressman DESANTIS, he arbitrarily changed the date in the law from one year to the next, and you can't do that.

I have heard from the Democratic Party time and time again—the folks on the other side—that they can't support this pathway that we have been going through in the last week of putting bills up on funding various aspects of government, like funding for NIH and kids with cancer or funding our veterans or funding our national parks. They say that that is a process of creating winners and losers, and they can't have any part of that.

Well, what is President Obama doing when he is giving breaks to Big Business and to Congress, but he is not giving them to every other American when it comes to ObamaCare? Isn't that creating winners and losers? I think it is a tad hypocritical of them to even raise that specter.

But I want to talk for a little bit about what has happened in the last week and a half. Because while the President is very willing to exceed his constitutional authority to do certain things, when he does have the constitutional authority to do something, he doesn't do it.

What am I talking about? I am talking about what has happened over the last few days with the bill that we passed last Saturday before the shutdown funding our military, the Pay Our Military Act. It was clear in that bill, that very succinct bill, that they had the power to pay all of our military folks, including all of our civilians, and that they could go ahead and take care of the death benefits for these widows who have lost their loved ones in war. That was very, very clear. They had that ability all along.

So what does the President do? He wants to use this for political leverage and make this as painful as he possibly can. So what do they do? They furlough several hundred thousand civilian workers within the military, just so they could ratchet up the pain and make it a little bit tougher on the Republicans.

Then what happens? About a week later Chuck Hagel, the Secretary of Defense, comes out and says, Oops, my bad. I guess we had the power all along.

Wasn't that what we have been telling them all along? You have the power to go ahead and keep these people at work and not disrupt, but they did that for political gain so that he could make it as painful as possible.

One other example: in my own State, in Arizona, we have one of the greatest national parks, the Grand Canyon. It is not only a wonder for the entire world, but it is also a wonder for our economy. We have folks that are doing river raft trips, folks that do excursions and hikes down through the Grand Canyon; but they run into a closed park.

Well, let me tell you something: I was here during 1995 when we had that last government shutdown. And guess what? We had a Democratic President. His name was Bill Clinton. We had a Republican Governor, just like we do in Arizona right now. His name was Fife Symington. What happened with the government shutdown? President Clinton worked with our Republican Governor, Fife Symington, to allow them to use private and State resources to keep the park open.

So our Governor, Governor Brewer, writes a letter to President Obama thinking that he might be somewhat similar in nature to President Clinton as far as being willing to negotiate. I mean, these are people's lives on the line. What did they get? A big fat zero—no way, you can't open it.

We have seen that time and time again. We have seen it on the National Mall that when certain groups of people want to come and take a look at the monuments or go into the National Mall that, no, the government is shut down, you can't come in, everything is shut.

But yesterday, what happened in the National Mall? Fifteen thousand people came for a protest on immigration reform, and they opened up the National Mall.

It is a disturbing pattern. If you agree with the President and his policies, we are going to do everything within our power to use government to help you get where you need to be. If you disagree with me, we are going to use our government to bludgeon you and use it as a tool to further our political agenda.

That has happened with the IRS when it comes to the nonprofit status of various organizations. It happened with our Capital Mall and our Capital monuments.

All I am saying is that I find it so incredulous that the President is willing to overstep his boundaries and unconstitutionally do things through executive order, and yet when he has the power and we have given him the power he is not willing to do it. I find those inconsistencies extremely disturbing and a little bit Machiavellian.

I would hope that the President would look at what we are trying to do through this process. We have a responsibility to the people that elected us to make the laws as good as we possibly can.

The last proposal that we put on the table was that we would delay the individual mandate so that every American—as you said, Mr. DESANTIS—every American could get the same deal that Big Business with their great lobbyists here in Washington, D.C., got and that Members of Congress got. They would get the same consideration.

The other part was that we would make sure that Congress lived under the same laws everybody else has to. A pretty commonsense approach, so much so that multiple Democrats agreed with us and voted with us to pass that and send it to the President. But what did HARRY REID do? He shoved it in his draw at the behest of President Obama.

It is time to stop these reckless games. Mr. President, you have already shown that you are very willing to use your executive powers far beyond your scope of authority given you in the Constitution. Is it unreasonable for us to ask you to use your powers when you are given them to do the right thing?

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for those great comments.

I think he brings up a great point about the funding bill that was sent the day before the fiscal year ended was not demanding that the President fully repeal the health care law; it basically had two very reasonable policy asks:

One, that Members of Congress live under the exact terms of the law that they passed and not get any type of special unauthorized treatment; and then

Two, that individuals be given the same courtesy that the President gave to Big Business.

That was very reasonable. The press hasn't really reported that. That is not really the way they framed it. I am not surprised at that. But that is a vote—by standing beside the Senate majority leader, all those Senators who did that—that is going to be a vote that is going to reverberate into the future.

I think it is interesting because when we are talking about the proper constitutional authority of the President, our primary means to check the President is the power of the purse. That is basically what we are doing in terms of we are sending the funding bill, but we are saying, look, we cannot afford to continue going with this disparate treatment throughout society. You have got to treat everybody the same.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DESANTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to ask you a quick question, which is, when you consider the fact that the media reporting is very different from what I have perceived in this body as a Member of Congress, I am more astonished every day at how the media reports the story. But the very last ask that we made before the government

shutdown was about 1 o'clock in the morning, so I guess technically the government had been shut down for about an hour. That very last ask was simply a meeting. It was simply a conference so that people on their side and people on our side could come together and discuss ObamaCare and some of the problems that we have with it.

Now, when you talk about the Constitution and the constitutional process that we have and you have divided government—I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida—is that not a perfectly reasonable adult way of handling disputes?

□ 1515

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman for the question. That is not only an adult way, that is exactly the way that the Founding Fathers envisioned it. James Madison, when he wrote about the different branches of separation of power, checks and balances, he said:

> Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

So you have an executive that gets beyond their scope, he expected the legislature to check that. So in this instance, we are saying, Wait a minute, you can't unilaterally delay the law for business, but then leave the rest of the American people holding the bag. You can't let Congress, the people who are imposing this law upon others, get out from under the exact text of the law. So in that sense, that's exactly the way the system is supposed to work.

Now he has a different view of, basically, the Congress needs to do what he decrees, and then he will grant Congress the courtesy of actually discussing issues with them. That would probably not have gone over very well with the Founding Fathers.

I want to just make another point because the gentleman from Arizona brought up how ObamaCare was passed and kind of the genesis of it. Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle that say, How can you guys be talking about this, it's the law, move on, not giving any credence to the 50 to 55 percent of Americans who are being negatively affected by it. But if you compare how that law was passed compared to any other major piece of legislation, I pulled some interesting numbers. Social Security in 1935, in the House of Representatives, 96 percent of the Democrats voted for it, 81 percent of the Republicans voted for it. The interstate highway system under Eisenhower, 93 percent in this body voted for it, 98 percent of the Republicans in this body voted for it. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, maybe the most important piece of legislation in the 20th century, 61 percent of the Democrats in the House voted for that piece of legislation, 80 percent of the Republicans in the House voted for that piece of legislation.

Even 1981, the Reagan economic program, in the Senate, 78 percent of the Democrats voted for Reaganomics, and 98 percent of Republicans voted for Reaganomics. When the gentleman from Arizona was here when they did welfare reform, you had a unified Republican Party joining with a number of Democrats and a Democratic President. So when you have this bill that never received any support from the other party and that rests on all these broken promises about your health care is going to decline by $2,500 a family, you can keep your plan, keep your doctor, we know none of that is going to be true.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, yield to him because he and I had been discussing the idea of the President's responsibility to enforce border security and enforce laws related to immigration. I yield so you can discuss that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I appreciate that, and it is perfectly appropriate that we have the gentleman from Arizona here as well. The gentleman from Arizona, and when you serve in this body, you get to meet a lot of very interesting people that have done amazing things in their lives. The gentleman from Arizona who we heard from earlier had an opportunity to serve in this body back in the 1990s, and then he left. He had a term limit pledge. He honored his term limit pledge. And then he came back recently as a newly elected freshman with the rest of us, and it is an honor to serve with him. But in that hiatus when he was back in Arizona, he ran for the governorship of Arizona, and he darn near won. Interestingly, he ran against the person who won, who was Janet Napolitano, who became the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the Obama administration.

I would like to discuss some things about why it is so important for me personally. I am a Navy pilot, as the gentleman from Florida said, and I have flown combat. But interestingly, I have also flown counterdrug missions in Central and South America. And I can tell you without a doubt that the drug cartels that we fight down in Central and South America, they don't try to get the drugs into the United States of America anymore. Their only objective is to get the drugs to northern Mexico, where they are vertically integrated with gangs and other cartels who bring the drugs across the border without a hitch. Now, because we have these drug wars in northern Mexico—and, by the way, there are over 100,000 people who have been killed in the last 7 years in these drug wars in northern Mexico, but that exists because we have an open border policy on the south side of the United States.

So if you were to hand a 16-year-old kid a backpack with $1 million worth of cocaine and you say to him, Hey, go across this border and get to that point, you're going to be very well rewarded. A 16-year-old kid will do that in many cases in these impoverished areas in northern Mexico. Interestingly, another 16-year-old kid will see that backpack and want it for himself, and the next thing you know, you've got one killing the other, and then you get a third killing the second. And then you have these gangs form, and this is how you get to a point where you have cartels and gangs that are killing not only each other, 100,000 people, but they are also killing judges. They are killing police officers. They are killing politicians. And on top of it all, they are not just transporting cocaine, they are transporting young girls in the slave trade. And they are transporting weapons. This is happening in northern Mexico just south of our border. Mexico is on the brink of a failed state because of this, and it is the direct result of an open border policy.

Now the Secretary of Homeland Security, former Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano has been on record. What does she say? She says that the border is secure. That's what she says. I have just got to tell you that I know firsthand that it's not. And the people who live in Arizona know that it's not. The people who live in Texas know that it's not. The border is not secure.

But here's what we have done in this body. We have passed laws to secure the border. Has the border become secure? No. Have thousands of people died since those laws have been passed because we haven't secured the border? Yes.

The President's job per the Constitution is to faithfully execute the laws, not pick and choose which laws he wants to follow based on political preference, which is what he has been doing.

So if it is all right, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona. You have been near and dear to this for a very long time. If you have some comments, I would love to have you share them.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Yes, it has been something that we have been dealing with in a very up close and personal way.

As a matter of fact, about a month and a half ago, I had the good fortune to meet with Arizona's adjunct general. He's over the National Guard for Arizona. He was finishing up his term in office, and I said, Sir, what is your biggest concern when it comes to possible terrorist activity here in Arizona? We don't have a lot of the national weather pattern problems like they do in other parts of the country, like hurricanes and tornadoes. We have some dust storms every now and then, and we have had some terrible fires. But I was truly interested, and I wasn't trying to lead him in any direction. But he said, without a doubt, the thing that keeps me up at night, the thing that worries me more than anything is the porousness of our border, and the fact that about 15 percent of the people that we apprehended last year were not from Mexico. Many of those people were from the Middle East. What I worry about is because it is so lax and

so easy to get across our border, that some terrorist is going to be able to get across the border with a suitcase bomb and detonate it and a lot of people will be injured or killed. That was his big concern.

So then I had an opportunity to sit down with some of our ICE people that are stationed in Arizona. They are the ones responsible for interior enforcement. I had a long conversation with them. You know what they told me? They said, You know, we don't need a lot more assets to get the border secured; what we need is for this administration to enforce the law. We need them to let us do our jobs. We are law enforcement people. We see the law very, very clearly. We know what the laws state, but our hands have been tied by this administration. They won't let us do our jobs.

He then proceeded to tell me that we have done these surveys on a regular basis to try to determine where employee morale is at, and they said it's at an all-time low ever since they've been doing these surveys right now within ICE, especially in Arizona because they feel they are not empowered to do their jobs, and they wonder, what am I doing here. Many of them want to be transferred out or just kind of, you know, march in place and do their time and get out as soon as they can, but the morale is terrible. These are honorable, decent people who want to do their jobs.

The other side would have you believe that no, this is just about some honest people who want to come across the border and get jobs in the United States and take care of their families. It's not just about that. As we saw with Brian Terry, with the gun smuggling, Fast and Furious, guns are being smuggled across the border, drugs are being smuggled across the border, and unsavory characters who have bad ideas on what they want in the United States are coming across the border, and one day the piper is going to have to be paid. So the border is far from being secure. We have the ability to do it, but this administration will not let them do their jobs.

Mr. DESANTIS. Thank you for that. It's interesting. As you bring up former Secretary Napolitano, that brings up the Presidential appointment and confirmation process. The Constitution provides for Cabinet officers and judges, that the President will nominate, the Senate votes to advise and consent to confirm, and then at that point they can become appointed and fill the office.

There is also another provision in article II of the Constitution, in section 2, involving what are called recess appointments, and it says:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

This made a lot of sense at the time, especially because you'd be in session, people lived all over the country. They'd take a horse-drawn carriage to get to Washington and back, so the Senate may be out for months and months. The Founders didn't want government ground to a halt. It's been used more recently if the Senate is on a recess, the President can kind of strategically figure that out and appoint somebody who might not otherwise be confirmed. Well, what this President did was a step further than that. He actually said that if the Senate says that it's not in recess, if they are just adjourned for say a day, a couple days and they are having pro forma session, that that doesn't actually count as a recess in his judgment and he can go ahead and do recess appointments, people to the National Labor Relations Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Board that would not otherwise be able to be confirmed. A lot of people cried foul about this, and it actually got tied up in the courts. Normally, we have to check some of these things, but there was somebody who had standing to bring a lawsuit. It has gone to two different Circuit Courts of Appeal and they both said, Look, the President can't just unilaterally determine when the Senate is in recess. The Senate is either in recess or they are not. If it is just that they go to sleep at night and come back the next morning, the President can't wait until midnight and just thrust somebody into office. So both of those courts have said that the President has overstepped his authority by shoving these recess appointments in office while the Senate was not in a formal recess; they were just adjourned within that term of service. And so I think the Supreme Court is going to hear that this time. I think they are definitely very likely to agree with those courts and say if the President can determine when it is a recess, then the whole idea of advise and consent gets swallowed up by the exception, and that's just not something that's going to work.

The gentleman from Arizona is interesting with his history because I listed some major pieces of legislation and how they all got broad bipartisan support. And the last one I mentioned was the 1996 Welfare Reform Act which Congress basically passed. It got vetoed and passed again, and finally President Clinton signed it. And the core of that, as I understand it, was that you would actually try and incentivize work instead of dependency, and so it had work requirements for able-bodied folks. I think the results of that were very, very positive. It essentially changed the incentive structure and actually gave people hope to get off dependency and into a productive life.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona because the President has basically watered down those work requirements unilaterally, and I think that will have a negative effect.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Yes, I was right in the middle of all those debates. As a matter of fact, before I came to Congress, the Arizona Legislature, which I was part of, actually passed a bill called Workfare, which was very similar to what we passed in 1996. It recognizes the idea, I think the truth, and there is an old Chinese proverb: If I catch a fish for you, you'll have food for a day. If I teach you to fish, you'll have food for your life.

That was the model we tried to employ, and that was that people have to work. They have to give something back for the welfare payments that they are given. It was called Workfare, and that is what we decided to do here in the Congress.

And it did one other thing, Congressman, that no government program can or normally does really do, and that is help instill dignity in people. I think one of the things that has really broken our country is that we have become this welfare state, a bunch of dependents across the country. I think that giving somebody the opportunity to be able to give something back actually helps preserve, I think, the human spirit. We all want to feel like we have some worth, that we have some relevance to society. And the old traditional welfare program is almost like we'll pay you to stay out of society. We'll give you just barely enough to subsist, but you stay out of society. And that's the message, subliminally or otherwise, that it gives to those people.

□ 1530

We don't really have much to offer you. You don't offer much value to society, so we will pay you to stay home. We thought of a different idea, I think a vastly more compassionate idea, and that is to have people be able to give something back so they didn't get something for nothing. Also, along the way, they actually got skills and abilities that they didn't otherwise have so that they could learn how to work, they could learn how to hold down a job.

That was one of the key components of the welfare reform that we passed in 1996, that while we send that money out to the States, that there are work requirements. I think that's reasonable. You don't get something for nothing. You have got to get out and help pull the wagon instead of having everybody cart you around. That's reasonable.

What did this President do the moment he got in office? He started through executive orders granting waivers to each of the States, getting rid of those work requirements. Again, that was a law that was passed in 1996, signed by President Clinton, and the President coming after changes the terms of those laws. To me, as far as I am concerned, not only is that lawless, it is foolish, because it is hurting the very people he purports to help. I believe that rather than helping them, it is keeping them down.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for that.

You mentioned just as the President came into office, and I remember the first thing, and I wasn't here. None of us were in Congress at the time. Just as a citizen, I was Active Duty Navy. You were probably too, Mr. BRIDENSTINE. But we had this stimulus bill that had been passed. This was a huge thing. Part of that, as I've learned more about it, is that there were actually requirements that the executive branch was supposed to submit timely reports that would document the different spending and what was going on. I think even the Vice President said, Hey, I am going to be the watchdog on this. It is, in fact, the case that most of those deadlines have just been completely disregarded, that you haven't seen the type of reporting that was envisioned by the law, and that's perhaps because the law wasn't successful at engineering an economic recovery.

Shortly after that, though, one of the biggest issues that happened in 2009 was the auto bankruptcy. This was something that was unusual because the White House actually got very involved on the ground in terms of refereeing the rights of the various parties, including the creditors.

I now yield some time to the gentleman from Arizona to discuss that because you had mentioned that was something that had bothered you at the time. The floor is yours.

Mr. SALMON. I appreciate that.

When we talk about the rule of law, the rule of law means that it applies equally to everyone. Of course, today, we have talked a lot about how within ObamaCare the rule of law does not apply equally to everyone. Some people get waivers. Depending on what kind of company you work for, some companies get waivers. Some unions get waivers. When it comes to individual health care policies, some people get grandfathered and they get to keep their policy, and other people get letters saying their policy is canceled.

We have exchanged, in this country, at this point under ObamaCare, the rule of law for the rule of man, where you have nameless, faceless bureaucrats that don't represent anybody and make decisions that change the law for individuals. That's not what was intended by the Founding Fathers.

As the gentleman from Florida said, when you think about creditor rights and you think about the bailout for Chrysler, you have different classes of creditors. In the case of the Chrysler bailout, you had secured creditors. That means that in the hierarchy structure, they were superior to the shareholders. They were superior because they were lending the money. They weren't the owners of the company. They had rights that were above the shareholders.

In the case of Chrysler, what happened is the President came in, like you said, and they got very involved. In fact, they changed the rule of law for the rule of man, where you had bureaucrats coming in and making a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out. In fact, they were bullied. I think they received 30 cents on a dollar for investment, if I remember correctly. But the secured creditors would be bullied to give up their investment, and the people who actually came out ahead were the unions, who were not secured creditors. This is a violation of bankruptcy law.

Again, the President's job is to faithfully execute the law, not change the law for political preference and not replace the rule of law with the rule of man, which is what they did in this case. Politically, they made a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out, the unions would be made whole, and at the end of the day—here is the fallout from that: in the United States of America, all across this country, and in the world, people are making decisions about where they're going to invest money. If you look at the investment opportunities in the United States of America right now, if you're going to invest in Big Business, the whole too-big-to-fail mantra that we have heard over and over again, if you are going to invest in Big Business, you are going to have to take a risk, and that risk has nothing to do with the return on investment or whether or not the company is sound. That risk is now political risk. Because as an investor, politically you could be wiped out, even if you have a secured debt instrument.

When you replace the rule of law with the rule of man, especially as it relates to business, people make decisions to invest elsewhere. And if you look at our country right now and you look at the capital investment in our country, we could be doing much better. Of course, if we had a President that adhered to the law, rather than changing the law based on political preference, we might see more investment in our country. Of course, investment is how businesses grow. It is how they raise money to open up a new plant or open up a new store, and capital investment is how new firms get created and it is how jobs get created and grow. So what we have right now is the replacement of the rule of law for the rule of man, and it is been detrimental for our economy as it relates to the securities industry.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank both the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Arizona for coming here today to offer their views. Their comments are much appreciated. The great thing about these two guys is they will stand up to people, regardless of party. They will stand up to people in their own party. They will stand up to people in the other party if what they're trying to do is not the right thing because these guys want to do the right thing.

I just want to conclude by invoking two giants in American history in terms of some of the issues that we discussed today and kind of what they mean.

The first is the Father of the Country, George Washington. When he took the reins as the first President of the United States, he made the comment ''I walk on untrodden ground.'' So he had a great sense that it wasn't just about him. He was already the biggest hero in the country. He could have taken over the country after defeating the British. He could have been king, but he surrendered his sword and retired to Mount Vernon until he was called back to further service. He was very sensitive to the idea that he was trying to establish a framework for freedom that could last generations, and it wasn't just about his own personal glory. What he tried to establish was the proper role of an executive in a constitutional system. There's a lot of people that said you either have a strong executive and it is a monarchy, or you just can't have a strong executive. I think he laid the foundation to say, actually, you can have a constitutionally circumscribed executive power that was nevertheless a force of good for the country.

The other gentleman that I would like to mention is Abraham Lincoln, who's obviously one of the greatest presidents we have ever had. His earliest recorded speech was a speech before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois. This was in the 1830s, so he still had decades before he was President. I don't think he had been elected to anything even locally at the time. He was really concerned about the future of the country because he said you had this great Revolution, you had this great Constitution, you had these wonderful decades where people were actually living and breathing that. Obviously, he felt that there was a lot of work to do because he spoke out against things like slavery, but he thought that the ball was moving in the right direction in terms of individual freedom. But he feared that as the Founding Fathers and their generation passed away, that people really wouldn't have something that they could all have to organize around and be faithful to in terms of our country. So what he told people to do was to really embrace constitutional principles and the rule of law.

In his speech, he said:

> As the patriots of '76 did to support the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty.

He went on to say:

> And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

I think what Lincoln was getting at was this idea of American

exceptionalism. It is not because we as Americans are anything special. I am certainly not anything special. It is not that we are so much better than anybody as people. The exceptional part of the country is the origins of the country and the principles that the country is designed to further. That, I think, is what Lincoln was talking about; that when you embrace the Declaration, when you embarrass the Constitution, you're embracing a framework in which individual liberty is the paramount objective of society, and that is why things like the separation of powers and proper lawfulness from the legislature and executive are so important. It is not just because this is all a game and we want to try to blow the whistle on people who are in the other party. It is because ultimately this constitutional structure and these protections are what make us different from all the countries that have come before and all the countries that have been founded since.

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

INSIDE THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). 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, for a government that shuts down, there sure seems to be a great deal going on. Down here on the Mall, somehow the National Park Service, which has been, parenthetically speaking here, presiding over a park service, beginning with the Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial, has not had God mentioned in any memorial since that time. We don't have time or a place for mentioning God, as our memorials have in some way in the past, but, by golly, we have got time during a shutdown to approve a permit to allow people who want to demand that—though they are here in this country illegally—they have a right to demand rights. This administration, just as it did with the Occupy Washington movement, facilitates that.

We know with the Occupy Washington movement there was all kinds of lewd, lascivious stuff going on in public. The Park Service didn't seem to be bothered by that. But let veterans show up to the World War II memorial, and they have got barricades. Let World War II veterans, who fought their way to the top of Mt. Suribachi, try to get to the monument that commemorates climbing to the top of Suribachi, they put up big obstacles to our veterans getting there.

So the message from this administration very clearly is that if you are illegally in the country, we will bend over backwards to let you commit all kinds of acts on the Mall; we will send Capitol Police down to pick up your garbage; and if you just want to illegally occupy a public area, we will let you do that. We will let you use the basest services in public. All kinds of lewd and lascivious things were going on there with the Occupy Washington movement, and that was allowed to continue on and on and on.

□ 1545

However, if you have served your country in the United States military, then we're going to try to make life miserable for you. It just might be those people that have hung on to their God and their guns and love America and love the Constitution, so this Homeland Security thing is sure a threat. Which is quite interesting.

You know, with all the things that are going on, we have seen that this administration has not had a problem with some things that some of us felt were a problem, such as, like I've mentioned in the last couple of years, one of the members of what was originally the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group named Elibiary from Texas, who was placed on there. And then he got a promotion from Secretary Janet Napolitano up to the Homeland Security Advisory Council, and, gee, now we're finding out that he's continuing to defend one of the principals of the Holy Land Foundation.

We're finding out that he is still defending, he still considers them to be unjustly prosecuted even though Federal courts have found that crimes were committed and that terrorism was supported by the Holy Land Foundation. The Dallas Federal court, along with the U.S. Court of Appeals in New Orleans, found that groups like CAIR, which has now changed its name to WTF, and ISNA, groups like that were the largest front group for the Muslim Brotherhood in America.

So it's rather interesting, because this administration has made life so difficult for our veterans just trying to get here and enjoy the memorials. I've been down to the memorials I think every day until today, and it's amazing. I've been down there different days, all hours of the day and night. You're lucky if you see one park ranger in the area of the World War II Memorial, and yet now they've got them very strategically placed.

They will stand there with the barricades closed most of the time. If some group comes up and explains that they're a World War II veterans group, then they'll open and let them through, but they stand there intimidating. Sometimes an officer comes by with a canine, which is a bit more intimidating to most people. So unless Members of Congress are standing there, we see people come up and get intimidated and walk away, unless a Member of Congress goes up and says, Please, come in. You are welcome.

Fortunately, veterans of Vietnam and Korea are just going around the barricades and fortunately are not being stopped. At the Lincoln Memorial, though, when a couple of Members of Congress encouraged people to come on up, like they do at the World War II Memorial, they said that it appeared that the park SWAT team—I mean, officers came in from all over, threatening arrests. Get out of here.

It's just amazing how far this administration will go to hurt Americans that love America, that have served this country.

And then we find out about Americans killed in Afghanistan. There should have been no problem whatsoever with the Defense Department cutting the $100,000 checks to these families. There should not have been. And if there was any doubt, then the bill we passed before the shutdown began should have taken care of that. There was plenty of prerogative to do that. But we had to come back today and pass another bill just to say get a check to the families of those who lost a loved one serving this country, because the administration is playing hardball and has gotten policies in place that are hurting as many Americans as possible. But when you look at who's advising this country's top leaders, is it any surprise?

Here's a story from October 6 from The Daily Caller:

> Senior adviser to the Department of Homeland Security is an old friend of an activist who was convicted in 2008 of financing the terrorist organization Hamas.
>
> In an interview with The Daily Caller, Mohamed Elibiary, a member of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, reiterated claims he made this summer that former Holy Land Foundation President and CEO Shukri Abu Baker is innocent and a victim of political persecution.
>
> Elibiary, who in his position on the council also has regular access to classified information, said the United States insults Muslim dignity and compared the Muslim Brotherhood to American evangelicals.
>
> Elibiary confirmed to journalist Ryan Mauro of the Clarion Project in August that he is a longtime friend of Baker. The Mauro interview can be read at the Center for Security Policy.
>
> Baker and four other officials of the closed Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development were convicted of using the charity to finance Hamas in 2008. It was the largest terrorism financing trial in U.S. history. Federal prosecutors described the foundation, which was closed by the U.S. Government in 2001, as an entity of the U.S. Muslim Brotherhood.
>
> Elibiary first disclosed the relationship in a 2007 article in The Dallas Morning News. He met Baker as a teenager and was so moved by the terrorist funder's explanation of alleged Israeli persecution of Palestinians that he says he began donating monthly to Baker's foundation until it closed in 2001. The friendship continued, with Elibiary meeting with Baker for coffee the day before he was convicted.
>
> Elibiary maintains that Baker is innocent. And in 2010, he wrote that the U.S. Government was ''using the law to force compliance with unjust foreign policies.'' He reiterated his belief that the U.S. should not have prosecuted the Holy Land Foundation.
>
> The Muslim activist has never disguised his support for Muslim Brotherhood extremism. In a 2006 letter to the Morning News, he defended the fanatically anti-American

early Brotherhood leader and theorist Sayyid Qutb stating, ''I'd recommend everyone read Qutb, but read him with an eye to improving America not just to be jealous with malice in our hearts.''

Let me insert here, Qutb wrote, in Egypt, a book called ''Milestones,'' where a guy named Osama bin Laden gives a great deal of credit for radicalizing him. And here we have someone that Janet Napolitano handpicked to be at the highest advisory council level, have access to classified material, somebody that thinks the guy that radicalized Osama bin Laden is somebody we all should read with an eye toward improving America.

''Elibiary has been honored by the FBI's Society of Former Special Agents,'' the article says. And again, parenthetically here—it's not in the article, but we also know that the FBI continued a relationship with CAIR, even knowing that they had gathered evidence that showed that CAIR was a large Muslim Brotherhood front organization which was supportive of the Holy Land Foundation. Even knowing those things, even knowing that it was implicated as a named coconspirator in that trial, amazingly, it took until 2008 and 2009 for the FBI to suspend their partnership with CAIR. And we know that CAIR continued until they changed their name here recently in the last few weeks to WTF.

They continued to complain. They have instant access to anyone in this administration. They helped get the FBI material, training materials purged of anything that might be offensive to someone who was a radical Islamist.

The article says:

In September, Elibiary was promoted to senior adviser at the advisory council, a title held only by select members. Other council members include William Bratton, the revered former New York police commissioner and Los Angeles chief of police; former CIA Director Bill Webster; and L.A. County Sheriff Lee Baca.

And we have this, which has been tweeted out:

I'm honored to be reappointed to the Secretary of Homeland Security's Advisory Council and promoted to senior fellow position.

That's Mohamed Elibiary. This article says:

''If you've ever wondered why the Obama administration believes that the Muslim Brotherhood is a moderate force for good and partners with known U.S. Muslim Brotherhood entities, this interview with Mr. Elibiary helps us find an answer,'' Mauro said.

Elibiary received national attention in June 2012 when Minnesota Republican MICHELE BACHMANN and four other Members of Congress—one including me—wrote a letter to the Department of Homeland Security, naming him as one of three advisers with extensive ties to the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamist organizations and causes.

Anyway, it's just amazing. And it is also amazing, when I confronted Secretary Napolitano in a hearing about the fact that Mr. Elibiary had accessed classified material and I was told by the director of the Department of Public Safety, Steve McCraw, in Texas, he had spoken with her chief of staff. He had confirmed that he had briefed her totally on what Mr. Elibiary had done, and they would be looking into it. When I asked her about it the next day after her chief of staff had said she had been totally briefed, she looked me in the eye and said she didn't know anything about it. But she did say she would investigate.

We now know from a Freedom of Information answer from the Department of Homeland Security, they never investigated. Even when you had a writer, a journalist, Patrick Poole, wrote a story stating that Mr. Elibiary had actually shot two documents that they knew he had downloaded from the classified Web site, he had shopped it to a national media, and Mr. Poole confirmed to me that they have never once asked him about his sources. And we then had it confirmed from the FOIA request that actually they never did an investigation. Instead, they just promoted him. It is incredible. But then again, when you look at what this administration is doing to those who don't necessarily worship Allah but worship God and believe in God and have served the country, this administration is making it tough.

One of our most revered monuments, Mount Rushmore. Well, I was quoted accurately in the media over a week ago saying, After shutting down these open-air monuments, just sidewalks where you can roll around in disabled veterans' wheelchairs, what are they going to do next, put drapery over Mount Rushmore? Well, it turned out what they did—I guess I shouldn't have said anything because maybe it was the power of suggestion.

Oh, there's a way we can make people miserable. Even though it's a State road, built by the State of South Dakota, maintained by the State of South Dakota, patrolled by the State of South Dakota, we had Federal authorities go put cones and barricades to prevent people from being able to pull off to the side of the road to even take pictures of Mount Rushmore. Somebody, while the government was shut down, sent enough park rangers out to put up massive numbers of cones to try to make life as difficult as possible simply for people who loved America, who just wanted to pull over and get a view of Mount Rushmore.

□ 1600

They weren't going to patrol it. South Dakota does that.

When South Dakota, our dear friend, KRISTI NOEM, she said when South Dakota had pointed out, hey, this is State road, the Federal authority said, oh, no, but this is on Federal land, and we're not letting anybody pull over.

So this is what you get. This is the way Americans are treated unless you're going to be illegally in the country and have a protest, then we will give you permits, whatever you want.

I was gratified to hear our friend, Representative NOEM, point out to us that, though sad that South Dakota had 4 feet of snow in some places, unfortunately, that covered all the barricades and cones, strictly in the interest of safety, South Dakota had to send their snowplows and wipe all the snow, and there was no way to sort out the cones and barricades, so apparently they were in some ditch somewhere.

But for safety purposes, because they were just trying to help those South Dakotans and Americans that wanted to see Mount Rushmore get through that road, that State-built road.

So, anyway, another chance to make Americans miserable, but Mother Nature came through, followed by South Dakota, making things safer.

Here is one. This is out by the Moore Farm that hasn't gotten a dime of Federal money since 1980. Former Park Director, National Park Service employee as director, been a director for 32 years, they barely make it, but they have lost $15,000 to $20,000 just by being closed down.

They rented barricades to take out there and close down a colonial farm from the 1700s and, as a result of this mean-spirited action by an administration, this farm may close down for good. They are running out of money.

But I have a dear friend that has arrived on the floor, and I would certainly yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, here on pointing out really the hypocrisy of what's going on with the public's lands, the public's parks, the way this is being used as leverage by the folks higher up in this administration to try and extract from the American people, from those of us in this House, perhaps, what they want.

He mentioned the thing in South Dakota there. Now, there is a lot of suffering going on in South Dakota where a lot of ranchers have lost a lot of livestock. And if anything, if your government has the ability to do something, it should be finding ways to help people, instead of putting up cones where they aren't supposed to be on a State highway they claim is on Federal land.

So if all those cones are in the bottom of the canyon that they may have had to rent or what have you, similar to the barricades they are putting up around the monuments and memorials here in this town, where they have to go out and rent barricades on company time with furloughed employees even to set them up and put sandbags in place, this an insult to the American people. It is an insult to all of our Honor Flight folks that have been coming in to town, anybody that would use what would normally be 24-hour memorials, 24-hour monuments.

So what gives? I don't understand.

You know, getting to the bottom of this here, we have this impasse in the Congress here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is about time this is ended because we are hurting the American people by the actions of this White House, by the impasse, the Senate.

We have sent over various, either all-inclusive CRs, or the bits and pieces we are doing to try and fund things as a priority, one at a time, that are very important to the American people. Funding our veterans, funding the basic ability when we have had fallen soldiers come home here in this recent news story, that their families can't even go pick them up because of an unyielding-ness by this administration, by those in the various bureaucracies to instead work to help American people in a time of fiscal straits that we are in, to help as much as possible, they are looking for ways to instead hurt them as much as possible.

What is with this?

We can even go back to previous impasses where, at least, President Clinton would sit down with the Republican House or Republican Senate or, after a while, it was a Republican House and Democrat-controlled Senate. There has been a mixture, over time, of putting aside the bitter partisanship and figuring out how we are going to hammer this out.

If we can do it with President Clinton, we can do it in previous Presidencies. This isn't the first time there has been this kind of impasse or this type of slowdown or shutdown. Yet this time seems to be unique in the meanness and the bitterness that's coming down from the intractability at the White House level and over on the Senate side as we have put forward solution after solution.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time just momentarily, it is also worth noting that here in the House we have actually had numerous Democrats vote with us. So the only really bipartisan thing that has been going on in this whole Capitol are our bills to fund certain parts of the government.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA Yes, thank you. Yes, we have had unanimous votes go off this floor with nearly 200 Democrats joining us on two of the pieces of legislation, and anywhere from 25 to 35 to 40 on many of the other pieces that have gone out. So it has been a bipartisan effort. I think both sides of the aisle see this is really a nonpartisan issue on these issues we are working on.

And so why do they have to rest on Senator REID's desk over on the Senate side?

Why do we get threats of vetoes from the White House when we find agreement?

We would find agreement on almost the entire CR if we got that one provision there, where even some of the Senators themselves, and now we are seeing it in the press where, I think you mentioned Wolf Blitzer has now joined with Senator MANCHIN as well as Senator BAUCUS in thinking the Obama health care take over is a train wreck, that we are seeing a pretty diverse group of people saying, you know, a 1-year delay would not be an unreasonable thing.

As we have seen the exchanges rolling out, they are not working very well. And people, when they are looking finally to find out what the prices are, what it is going to cost them, maybe people thought they were going to get it for free. They were going to get a rebate; they were going to get a lower price. A lot of Americans, especially the youth, are going to see higher prices. They are not going to see the savings.

And if you look at the track record of the government operating things, government generally doesn't do things cheaper, and we are going to learn this in a very detrimental way to our economy, to the health care for the people of this country as this Obama health care takeover continues to roll out.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I am sure that Mr. LAMALFA has had people ask, as I have had, now, why in the world is ObamaCare costing so dramatically much more than the health insurance we had before?

And then we get notified we are actually getting less health care.

And my friend mentioned Wolf Blitzer, this article in National Review online quoted him as saying if they weren't fully ready, talking about the Web sites, ObamaCare Web sites, they should accept the advice that a lot of Republicans are giving them, delay it another year, get it ready, make sure it works.

They know how to do it; but if they didn't get it ready on time, then maybe fix the problem and make sure people don't have to worry about it.

But we come back, it is a disaster. It is more expensive than people's health care was before. They are getting less health care; they are not keeping their doctor. And most—it sounds like an awful lot of Americans are not keeping the policy they have. So why is it costing so much more?

And what people that don't know need to understand, when you hire thousands and thousands of people who don't provide health care to be navigators through the health care system, and you hire 18,000-or-so more IRS officers to go through every detail of people's personal financial and personal life, and they don't provide any health care, they may cause some health problems, but they don't provide any health care—you add all this bureaucracy—it is going to cost more and you are going to get less treatment, and it is not going to be as good a treatment.

I yield back to Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Exactly. Now, who are the navigators?

Weren't they supposed to be vetted as to who they are, go through security?

And as well, look at the track record of the IRS. Do the American people really want 18,000 or so IRS individuals helping with their important personal health data?

I mean, there have been laws passed to make sure that that is a very secure thing. Sometimes even inconvenient to the patient, where you might be at the doctor and say, well, don't you already have this information from my other doctor?

There are very strict guidelines in how your information is traded around. Now it is going to be in the hands of navigators that are unvetted and with IRS agents that have some very huge security issues already with the way that is being used against certain organizations.

Mr. GOHMERT. And there is a story today from the Daily Caller about the White House IRS exchanged confidential taxpayer information by Patrick Howley. So if you think your personal information is secure with the IRS, or with the Federal Government, it is already showing you should not be comfortable with it happening.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. The most outrageous thing for most folks, though, is that the waivers, many individuals in this country are asked for and got to be outside of this as it was coming together; and more and more are asking for it, some are being turned down.

But especially, I guess, buying off Members of Congress through the OPM, allowing Congress and Capitol Hill to be exempt from this. If it is such a great program, if it is going to work so well, why would we be subject to a waiver?

Why are they talking about there would be a brain drain on Capitol Hill because everybody would be leaving because they can't afford the health insurance?

How does that work?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, apparently, our time is expiring. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, helping me. And we should not be treated any differently. The President and his family need to sign up.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that when I went out to the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, the Iwo Jima Memorial, this administration had tried to prevent World War II veterans from getting to the symbol of Mount Suribachi, and there were three busloads of World War II vets up there at the memorial, and the barricade was in pieces.

God bless our World War II veterans.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3261. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Tranportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0209; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-17514; AD 2013-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 213, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3262. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0263; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-17535; AD 2013-15-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3263. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0197; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-17524; AD 2013-15-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3264. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1285; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-073-AD; Amendment 39-17544; AD 2013-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3265. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1033; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-17504; AD 2013-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3266. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0669; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-17540; AD 2013-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3267. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17536; AD 2013-15-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3268. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0093; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17515; AD 2013-14-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3269. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1156; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17500; AD 2013-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3270. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0564; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-17494; AD 2013-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HALL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111-148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to limit the application of such Act to certain imported plants and finished plant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281. A bill to transfer criminal enforcement and investigative authority and functions of certain agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 3280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . . '' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 25: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 262: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 455: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 460: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R 565: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 666: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 669: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 685: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 719: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 794: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 831: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 961: Mr. COSTA and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 964: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1100: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1150: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1226: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1276: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1339: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1385: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1428: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1429: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1507: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1690: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1705: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1907: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1921: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1992: Mr. COOK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1998: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2016: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2023: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2027: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2296: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2330: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2502: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2509: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2542: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2560: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2575: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2654: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2738: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2780: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2794: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2839: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2902: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3040: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 3080: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 3118: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3163: Ms. BASS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3178: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3183: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3188: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3212: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3232: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3274: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
HR. 3275: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.J. Res. 64: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JONES.
H.J. Res. 91: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H. Res. 30: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 208: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 247: Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 254: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 353: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 360: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 365: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013 No. 140

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, in whose presence our souls take delight, to whom in affliction we call, forgive us for continuing to sow to the wind even when hearing the sounds of the approaching whirlwind.

Lord, when our Federal shutdown delays payments of death benefits to the families of children dying on faraway battlefields, it is time for our lawmakers to say ''enough is enough.'' Cover our shame with the robe of Your righteousness. Forgive us, reform us, and make us whole.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HEITKAMP thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

MEASURES READ THE SECOND TIME

Mr. REID. There are two measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1569) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

DEBT DEFAULT

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is very hard to find, on occasion, common ground in Washington. Of late, it has been hard all the time.

There is one thing on which Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree: there is no more important issue before Congress than to prevent a catastrophic default on our debt. Default would put our economy in grave danger, and that is a gross understatement. I have said it, so many of my Republican colleagues have said it, and the business community is shouting it from the rooftops.

Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein said this about averting default—he is not known as a great liberal or outstanding Democrat, but he is known as a great businessman. He said:

While the current government shutdown is unfortunate, the impacts of a debt default would be magnitudes worse and should not even be considered a viable option. The economic damage associated with default or near default would be severe and have serious consequences for the recovery of the U.S. and global economy.

That was amplified the last couple of days by Christine Lagarde, head of IMF, who says this is just awful for the world economy.

The world economy affects us. We affect it. No country in the world affects the world economy more than we do. We are going to affect it in a very negative fashion, which will have tremendous negative consequences for us.

There are some Republicans in Congress threatening default, even elated that we are going to have one, saying it doesn't really matter.

Warren Buffett said that using the threat of default to extract political payment ''ought to be banned as a weapon. . . . It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use.'' Warren Buffett said this, and his father was a Republican Member of Congress.

Business leaders are begging us to do the right thing and to do it now, quickly. In addition to America's reputation in the world, the bedrock of the global economy is at stake, as I have already stated.

Yesterday a bill was introduced that would remove the specter of default and allow the United States to pay its bills with no preconditions or strings

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

attached. Republicans and Democrats may have our differences, but neither side should hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage while we resolve them.

Let's reopen the government. Speaker BOEHNER could end this government shutdown today, an hour from now, by letting the House—the entire House—vote on the Senate's clean bill and reopen the government. When the Speaker is on national TV and other places saying: We don't have the votes, he will never know that because he won't let the measure come to the floor. Of course it has enough votes.

Let's reopen the government and pay our bills. There is no reason for Republicans to drag out this process and force the Nation's economy ever closer to an economically catastrophic default. Then let's negotiate. Two hundred days ago to the day, Senate Democrats passed a budget, led by Senator MURRAY, that reflects our priorities. Since then we have asked 20 times to negotiate a compromise within our budget and the one passed by Republicans in the House. We are not afraid to negotiate, but we need someone to negotiate with. We need a dancing partner. If Republicans end this irresponsible, as it appears now, government shutdown, remove the threat of a cataclysmic default, and stop objecting to a budget conference, we could start negotiating now.

Republicans have already been so harsh on rhetoric. Republicans have already done enough harm to our economy with a reckless shutdown designed to undermine the law of the land, ObamaCare. But the consequences of a first-in-history default on the debt would be far worse—even worse than the 2008 financial crisis from which we are still recovering. Two years ago, the last time the Republicans flirted with this terrible idea, America's credit rating was downgraded for the first time in the history of our great country. The stock market dropped 2,000 points. It has already dropped 7 or 8 percent over the last few weeks.

Raising the debt limit doesn't cost taxpayers a single dime, and Republicans shouldn't claim it does because it doesn't. That is certainly not what they claimed when George W. Bush raised the debt ceiling seven times. Congress has raised the debt limit more than 90 times since it was created in 1939, the majority of those times with Republican Presidents. Ronald Reagan asked Congress to raise the limit 18 times—twice as many as any other President. He, being the great orator he was, said that to do what is being done now, to use an example of why someone should never do that, he called it ''outrageous.''

Raising the debt ceiling simply allows payment of bills we have already incurred—bills for wars and tax breaks paid for with borrowed money—and basically the simple operation of our government.

I heard one Republican Senator today—I read about it—he said: Well, we have enough money coming in to pay the interest.

Social Security payments would not go forward, and that is only the beginning.

To even consider defaulting on these obligations or to use the threat of default to extract concessions is terribly irresponsible in a negative fashion.

Republican Governor Jon Huntsman, Governor of Utah, an extremely liberal State, said this about the current Republican brinkmanship over default:

> It's pretty sad, pretty pathetic for the greatest economy on Earth to be experiencing this . . . Russian roulette with our . . . economy.

He continued:

> We have to see it as an economic issue. . . . If you think the government shutdown is a big deal, that's a hand grenade compared to a thermonuclear weapon that would be hitting the debt ceiling.

Yesterday the minority leader suggested that the only way to disarm this weapon is for me to engage in one-on-one talks with the Speaker of the House. I am happy to talk to JOHN BOEHNER anytime. We have talked. But it is obvious to me that no amount of talking will make Speaker BOEHNER either willing or able to end this shutdown and prevent a catastrophic default.

In fact, as my friend the senior Senator from Arizona said yesterday, it is time for the Senate to deal and to lead. He is right. We have an issue coming before us momentarily—the debt ceiling. We have to be the Senate, lead, get that passed, and send it over to the House of Representatives. We have already passed a bill to reopen the government. We have already done that. We are going to go a step further. Senate Democrats have introduced legislation to avert a default on this Nation's obligations.

I say to my Republican colleagues in the Senate, the time for misleading rhetoric is through, and the time for responsible leadership is here. We are happy to work with our Republican colleagues, open the government, pay our bills, and negotiate anything—anything they wish to talk about.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Each morning, the Senate opens with the customary prayer by our Chaplain and the Pledge of Allegiance. This is an opportunity for Members of the Senate to reflect on two important things: first, our mission on Earth not only as elected officials but as human beings and, second, our devotion and loyalty to this great country.

I have listened to most of the prayers that have been offered over the past 9 days of the government shutdown by Dr. Barry Black. He is a retired admiral from the U.S. Navy and came again before us this morning to offer a prayer. This prayer had a very important message. It was short and direct. He talked about this government shutdown. He reflected on the fact that we literally have families who in the last few days had that awful knock on the door where they were told their son or daughter had died in service to his country in the U.S. military. There were 5 over the weekend and I understand 17 over the course of this government shutdown.

Sadly, the support we always give to these families is not there. It is not there. Customarily, within 24 to 36 hours they are given a sum of money in advance on the benefits that soldier earned so they can take care of funeral expenses and the obvious needs of their family. We can't do that because the government is shut down. That awful knock on the door was not followed by the consolation of this government helping these families. We offered to many of these families an opportunity to come and to be there to welcome, at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware, the return of their fallen hero. We can't offer them that benefit because the government is shut down.

Dr. Black said to all of us this morning, all of those who believe a government shutdown is just another political gambit—what he said, we should remember, and his words were direct and simple: Enough is enough. Enough is enough.

It isn't only a matter of these families losing that loving son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, or sister; it is a matter that our government that asked them to risk their lives for this great Nation will not stand by them in this moment of grief.

Yesterday, the junior Senator from Texas came in and said: Oh, I think we have already voted to take care of that. It is not true. What is happening now is the House of Representatives—the House of Representatives, which refuses to reopen the government—is scurrying to pass a little bill that will take care of these families. Let's get that bill in, they said. We don't want to face the embarrassment of another headline like this.

That isn't enough. It isn't nearly enough because the embarrassment of this government shutdown goes beyond this grievous situation with these bereaving families. It goes to so many different levels.

Think about this for a moment: In the United States of America, when it

comes to infant formula for babies, 60 percent of the infant formula is sold through one government program called WIC—Women, Infants, and Children Program. It is a program that brings in pregnant mothers and moms with new babies and does its level best to make sure those babies are healthy and off to a good start in life.

In my State of Illinois, in the largest county, Cook County, 50,000 mothers depend on WIC—the WIC Program that provides the basics for healthy moms and healthy babies. The WIC Program runs out of money this month. When it does, the support for these families, for these moms, and for these babies is in danger.

Why are we doing this? Is this part of the Republican strategy—sick babies, mothers unprepared to deliver? Is that part of their strategy? Is that their leverage for what they want to achieve? If it is, I have three words for them: Enough is enough.

I just left my office where I had a group of people from my State visiting for whom I have a special affection. They are with what is known as the Primary Health Care Association, and I will bet the Chair has a similar association of some type in her State of North Dakota. These are the folks who open the clinics in the neighborhoods and small towns so that people who aren't wealthy have access to a doctor and a nurse. I love them, I just love them to pieces because they have invested their whole lives in helping folks who are often ignored. They told me that despite the sadness they feel, and even the anger over this government shutdown, there is a feeling of elation now that the insurance exchanges are open under the Affordable Care Act. They say people are coming in and saying: You won't believe it, but I qualify for health insurance for the first time in my life. These are the clients, these are the people they help every day, and now these people have the peace of mind of health insurance.

That drives some on the other side crazy—to think ObamaCare will go forward and provide this kind of help. In my State, over 250,000 people have already visited the Web sites. They are signing up now for health insurance, many of them for the first time. Ours isn't the most successful State. It appears that per capita the State of Kentucky is one of the most successful, with some 10,000 people already signing up for health insurance—health insurance they otherwise can't afford or don't have.

This is part of the debate in Washington. The Republicans, many of them, are arguing we have to shut down the government, we have to shut down ObamaCare, we have to stop these people from signing up for health insurance. It is not going to work. They cannot reverse history. This is a law that has been on the books almost 4 years, enacted by Congress, signed by the President, judged constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court—a law on which we have had a referendum in a Presidential election. When President Obama stood up and said: I am going to fight for affordable health care and health care reform, and the Republican candidate said: I will abolish it, President Obama won that reelection by 5 million votes. That is the verdict of history. That is the judgment of the American people. That is how we guide a democracy.

There are some very wealthy, very extreme who will never accept the results of an election. They think with enough money they can overcome the voice of democracy. They are wrong, and that is why what we are setting about to do here is to reopen this government, pay our debts, and then work out whatever remains in terms of issues.

I ask my staff each morning to give me a list of what is happening because of this government shutdown. I can't keep up with it—I mean, page after page, issue after issue. Here is one. There is a major salmonella outbreak affecting hundreds of people in many States right now. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service has announced an estimated 278 people across 18 States, mostly in California, have been reported ill. They are working with the Centers for Disease Control, along with State and local officials, to track that. But that said, we have to understand that with a government shutdown these agencies are not fully staffed.

Families and children across America are vulnerable because of this Republican shutdown strategy. For some, it will mean an illness they will get over in a few days. For others, it could be more serious. The words of the chaplain ring in my ears: Enough is enough.

We keep hearing about this piecemeal approach of the House of Representatives, where when they see these ghastly headlines of bereaving families who are denied the basic benefits that we offer families of those who have fallen in service to America—when they face that embarrassment—they quickly manufacture a little spending bill to cover it, saying: Oh, we will take care of that one. Chuck E. Cheese's calls it whack-a-mole. And that is what they are doing. Each time a story pops up, they try to knock it back down.

The Center for American Progress has done a review of the 14 bills passed by the House. They find approximately $83 billion in funding—just about $6 billion a bill. The total amount of nondefense funding in the original House-passed continuing resolution was $469 billion. Therefore, the House bills that already have passed and are currently under consideration make up less than 18 percent of the total. So for all the efforts of the House of Representatives, sending over these bills to react to embarrassments from their government shutdown, they can't keep up with it.

The simple honest answer is to open the government. We have passed the bill and sent it to Speaker BOEHNER. He is living in political fear of calling that bill because he knows it will pass. The Democrats overwhelmingly will support it, and enough moderate Republicans will step up to reopen this government, and Speaker BOEHNER cannot accept that reality. He is afraid to call a vote.

How many more embarrassing moments will we have, reporting on situations such as these poor families who have given their all, who have lost their loved ones, and now they are asked to suffer because of the Republican shutdown? It has to come to an end.

Yesterday on the floor I appealed to moderate Republicans in the Senate to step up—step up and join us. We are going to have a bill before us in a short time—I hope sooner rather than later—that is going to avoid a default on America's debt. If we default on October 17, it will be the first time in the history of the United States that will have occurred. It will have a devastating impact on businesses, on jobs, and on the savings of Americans.

If you have a savings account, if you have a retirement account, have you been watching it over the last several days? Have you seen what the Republican shutdown has done for your plans, for your future and your family? This is unacceptable, and it will get dramatically worse unless we pass, in a bipartisan fashion, this extension of the debt limit for the United States of America. This will be a chance for moderate Republicans in the Senate to speak up and stand up.

Before I close, I want to say a special word about my colleague, my Republican Senate colleague MARK KIRK, who announced this week he would vote for a clean debt ceiling. I have said it back home, and I will say it here on the floor. It is the right thing to do for my colleague. It is the right thing to do for America. But I want to express my appreciation for his leadership. I hope his example of stepping up and saying he is going to put the country first before his party is one that will be followed by other Members on his side of the aisle.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE EXCHANGES

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Illinois, and I have heard him make reference to the insurance exchanges that opened last week. It was 1 week ago President Obama's health insurance exchanges opened, and by all accounts it was a complete disaster.

The administration had 3½ years to prepare for the big launch. It spent months and millions of dollars advertising the start date. Yet on October 1, the American people had their first chance to sign up, and the exchanges flopped. It was a complete fiasco.

The administration tried to say it was caught off guard. They said they were caught off guard by too many people going to the Web site on the first day. Even Saturday Night Live ridiculed the excuse. They said: That is like 1–800–Flowers getting caught off guard on Valentine's Day.

There were glitches the first day, but they lasted the whole week—the entire first week. The question is, Did the administration finally get its act together? Well, actually, no, it didn't. The past weekend they had to pull down the Web site to try to fix some of the worst problems. USA TODAY, a newspaper whose editorials have actually in the past supported the health care law, had as yesterday's headline: ''Health sites generate more error messages than coverage.'' That was the headline. The subheadline: ''Exchange launch turns into an inexcusable mess.''

An inexcusable mess. And they go on:

> . . . the administration managed to turn the experience for most of those visitors into a nightmare. Websites crashed, refused to load, or offered bizarre and incomprehensible choices. Even though the system was shut down for repairs over the weekend, Monday's early reports continued to suggest an epic screw-up.

The front page of the Wall Street Journal on Monday read: ''Software, Design Defects Cripple Health-Care Website.''

One does not take down a Web site for minor glitches. These are signs of major trouble. Some of us have been warning that the administration has failed to prepare properly. We said there would be security holes that would expose people to fraud and identity theft. It turns out the administration didn't even get to the point where the security flaws would actually matter early on because people couldn't even start entering their personal information. The exchanges were failing to launch. People got repeated error messages, and they couldn't fill out forms or applications. They couldn't create an account to start looking at the most basic of information to even make comparisons. When they tried to telephone to get help, they found long wait times and they got disconnected entirely. Even the administration's biggest cheerleaders admitted defeat. One reporter at MSNBC spent so much time trying to show viewers how to sign up for the exchange Web site on line that she actually gave up. They were playing this on television. She finally threw in the towel saying:

> If I were signing up for myself, this is where my patience would be exhausted.

The Wall Street Journal tried to find out what went wrong. It talked to computer experts, who looked at the healthcare.gov Web site, and what the computer experts said is, ''The site appeared to be built on a sloppy software foundation.'' According to those experts, ''such a hastily constructed website''—and, of course, they had 3½ years—''may not have been able to withstand the online demand last week.''

Even the far-left Wonkblog at the Washington Post couldn't believe how badly the administration had failed. One of its columnists wrote:

> The Obama administration did itself—and the millions of people who wanted to explore signing up—a terrible disservice by building a Web site that, four days into launch, is still unusable for most Americans.

It wasn't supposed to happen this way. President Obama promised using the exchanges would be like, in his words, shopping on amazon.com. Well, Amazon can handle 13 or 14 million transactions every day with no problem. There are over 5,000 Web sites generating more traffic than health care.gov.

So how many people were able to successfully enroll in the health care exchanges on the first day? We have no idea. The administration doesn't want to talk about it. First, they said: We are thrilled so many people were checking out the Web site. By Sunday, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew was on multiple television shows refusing to answer questions about how many people had enrolled and just repeating the White House talking points. He claimed 4.7 million people had visited.

If they are willing to tell us how many people have visited the Web site, why won't they tell us how many people actually got coverage?

The administration says they won't provide any data to back up its claims until at least November.

Remember, California claimed 5 million people visited their Web site for its own State exchange for the first day. They later had to back up and say that wasn't true. It turns out they had 645,000 visitors—less than 1 million, not the 5 million they claimed. That is a State that spent $313 million on their site and it couldn't handle even that many people, because they had trouble.

President Obama said he was going to have the most transparent administration in history. The health care law is this administration's signature accomplishment. October 1 was the day they had been working toward for more than 3 years, and now the President won't tell the American people—won't tell any of us how many people have even signed up for health insurance. Why not? What is the President trying to hide?

CNN looked into the 24 States that set up their own insurance exchanges under the law. They found that as of last Friday, about 52,000 applications had been started. That is not how many people have actually completed their application successfully; it is just they have started. It is not how many people have gotten insurance; that is just how many people get to the point of starting their application.

Even if the Obama administration fixes the technical problems with its health insurance Web site, it will not have fixed the many problems with its health care law. The law will still not give people the lower cost, high-quality care they wanted—which is the reason we needed health care reform in the first place. But I think the American people will hold the President to his promises and hold the Washington Democrats who voted for this law to their promises.

The President, right before the exchanges opened, said coverage in the exchanges should cost less than your cell phone bill. He said you should be able to keep your doctor. And he said it would be as easy and secure as amazon.com. So far, the President's health care law has failed on all of these. That was exactly what many of us warned would happen.

It doesn't matter if the ObamaCare exchange system failures happened because of heavy traffic or because of design flaws. The administration officials should be embarrassed, but they should not be surprised. Republicans warned the exchanges were not ready for prime time, but the President and Democrats ignored calls for a delay.

Why is the administration insisting now on fining people—fining people who don't have insurance, even though they can't sign up on the Web site successfully? The President unilaterally gave big businesses a 1-year delay in the employer mandate. Workers should get the same break that bosses get. If bosses get a 1-year delay in penalties, why shouldn't hard-working men and women all across the country get a 1-year delay of the individual mandate?

President Obama should have delayed the launch of his insurance exchange until it was ready. That would have been the fair thing to do. It is still the right thing to do. It is also the fair and right thing to give individual Americans the same delay of the mandate that the President has unilaterally—without the action of Congress—given to businesses all around this country.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, yesterday the Veterans Affairs Administration announced it would furlough 7,000 Veterans Benefits Administration employees, and as a result activities and services in the following areas would be suspended: The education call center, personal interviews and hearings at regional offices, education and vocational counseling, outreach programs including at military facilities, the VetSuccess Program on campuses.

But this announcement is only the beginning of the contraction in the

services and activities of the VA. In fact, VA also announced that at the end of the month it will run out of funding for compensation, pension, educational and vocational rehabilitation, and employment benefits.

What does that mean for America? What are the consequences of the VA saying this shutdown means we are shutting our doors to processing and paying the claims of men and women who have served this country, who have been disabled as a consequence of that service, who have earned educational benefits so they can come back and continue to contribute to this country? What that means to America is we are in effect defaulting and failing on a core obligation this country has to men and women who serve and sacrifice. America is failing to keep faith with its veterans, and America is failing on one of its most essential obligations.

We ought to be ashamed and embarrassed that 7,000 men and women, who want nothing more than to help their fellow veterans—in fact, half of those 7,000 men and women at the VA are themselves veterans—have been told: Go home. In fact, at the end of the month the benefits, pensions, and educational benefits that are received by veterans will have to be suspended because the VA is running out of money. Right now it is in effect continuing on the leftover money, which will last only through the end of this month.

I spoke this morning to a veteran named Jordan Massa, a native of Bridgeport, who served for 6 years in the U.S. Army as an infantryman, including two tours in Iraq. Jordan Massa was injured in an IED explosion, a roadside bomb, that left him severely disabled with ear and back wounds as well as posttraumatic stress. Jordan Massa waited for 2 years after he applied for the benefits he needs and deserves, until October 1—just days ago—when he heard the good news that he would be receiving the disability benefits to which he is entitled—not as an act of charity or beneficence; he is entitled to those disability benefits. Now Jordan Massa is on the verge of being denied the benefits he needs and deserves because of this shutdown. A Connecticut native, awarded the Purple Heart, he has been a student at Tunxis, and has sought to help other veterans as a counselor—giving back to this country even after his service in uniform.

I spoke also to Aaron Jones, who works at the South Park Inn Shelter, which serves homeless veterans in Hartford. That shelter is full.

There are thousands of homeless veterans in Connecticut and millions across the country who also are a mark of shame and embarrassment for this country. The greatest Nation in the history of the world is failing to provide for men and women who have worn the uniform and now are homeless.

He is telling me the government shutdown has created an additional obstacle to those veterans who want to leave that shelter to find permanent housing. Some are there for emergency, about 7; some are there in transitional housing, about 10; and they want to resume productive and constructive lives. This shutdown has created an additional obstacle to their doing so. In fact, for Aaron himself, who is a veteran and served in the National Guard, a tour in Bosnia, a tour in Iraq, this shutdown is a horrendous obstacle.

At this moment as I speak on the floor there is a House hearing. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has, as its principal witness, the head of the VA, General Shinseki, who has served this Nation with distinction and dedication and has sought valiantly to reduce the backlog in disability claims and to provide benefits more efficiently and effectively to our veterans.

Rather than using General Shinseki as a political punching bag, the House should simply have a vote. They should vote on a simple, straightforward, no-strings-attached funding resolution that would enable those 7,000 VA employees to come back to work and serve the people they love. It would provide for other essential services, whether at NIH serving cancer victims or the other agencies that work with the VA to help serve our veterans, such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The piecemeal approach the House is taking, a ''cause du jour'' approach to governing, is simply inadequate and irresponsible. The bill they have sent to us, while it deals with the VA, would not provide for those other agencies that are essential to the VA's work, whether in training or housing or processing claims.

This Nation should by embarrassed and ashamed. This legislature ought to be embarrassed and ashamed that it is failing to keep faith with Jordan Massa, with the folks who live at the South Park Inn Shelter, and countless other veterans in Connecticut and across this country who are entitled to benefits, pensions, and processing of their disability claims so they can receive what they deserve and need. If the House votes it will pass a simple, straightforward funding resolution, if the House is permitted to simply say yea or nay to that very straightforward, simple measure, this Nation will keep faith with Jordan Massa, with Aaron Jones, and with the countless millions of other veterans who at the end of this month will lose the benefits and pensions they are entitled to receive as a result of their service and sacrifice to this Nation.

I ask the Speaker of the House to simply allow a vote. Let the House vote so we can open government, pay our debts, and then reach a budget that is comprehensive and responsible and meets the needs of those veterans and many other Americans who are harmed and handicapped, enduring hardship as a result of the failure of that body. It is a small minority in one branch of the legislature, one branch of our government that is failing our Nation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand we are in morning business. I ask consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I wish to talk a little bit about the government shutdown—what else. It is my understanding that my colleagues across the aisle, I understand I will not have the opportunity to speak to any one of them, but should they come out on the floor—they are out on the Senate Capitol steps exhorting the House to send something they prefer over or to simply end the shutdown with a clean bill. I however would have suggested they would go over to the House steps as a gesture of good will. I am not sure any Member of the House—I know when I was in the House, I am not sure I would have appreciated either party getting on the Capitol steps and urging me to doing something when I was in the House. But be that as it may, perhaps it is a good will effort as opposed to further demands.

I want to make sure everybody in Kansas is aware—and I know I speak for everybody on our side—the Republican side of the aisle did not want to shut down the government. As everybody knows, we have the current continuing resolution. I am sorry we have to continue to go through continuing resolutions. This is where we bundle up everything from appropriations bills, some of which have already been worked through, and then simply meld them together into a continuing resolution. We do not do appropriations bills anymore. That would be called regular order. I truly resent this. I find this most unfortunate.

So here we are, trying to consider how to fund the government. Many of us believe this funding measure should do everything possible to also control spending. That seems to be the real issue. Chief among these proposals would be to defund or at least delay the health care reform law. My colleagues and I have supported multiple measures to try to avoid a shutdown.

In the past few weeks Republicans have offered no fewer than three solutions to avoid the government shutdown, and I voted to keep the government open every single time. Most recently, the House is passing mini-CRs to open the government piece by piece because we cannot come to an agreement on a continuing resolution. Most

people, if they pay attention to the media—or if the media even covers this—understand what the House is trying to do, which is to open the government piece by piece. The first item of business would be to certainly fund the Veterans' Administration. We have all seen what is going on down at the World War II Memorial and, unfortunately, at the Marine Corps War Memorial as well, where we have yet to break the barrier. Being the senior marine in the Congress, I may lead a charge at the memorial sometime later this week. I have not made up my mind yet.

At any rate, that is just not reasonable. There are a lot of things being done, including no death benefits for people who have paid the ultimate sacrifice recently in the current wars that continue to go on. That is abhorrent. Why that decision was made by the Department of Defense I do not know.

At any rate, the House is trying to target these particular items, most of which have been identified by the President. So these mini-CRs by the House mirror what the President says in regards to the hurt that is being caused by the shutdown. What the President identifies, the House is trying to fix and then send over to the Senate. It is very unclear whether the majority leader will even allow a vote in regard to these measures. Senator CRUZ spoke to this in regards to a plan A, when we were discussing this in the Republican conference.

At any rate, the majority leader has refused to consider a single one. So this debate is not about shutting down the government, it is actually in part to protect Americans from what I call the disastrous health care law that is damaging our economy, raising taxes, and costing people their jobs. It is about a President who is unwilling to lead, unwilling to even come to the table to negotiate.

The President is now indicating he might want to negotiate on a short-term continuing resolution, but we do not have an agenda. We have had quite a few people offer plans. The distinguished Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, has a plan—it should be a bipartisan plan—that calls for a short continuing resolution, repeal of the medical device tax, and then fixing the sequester so the different agencies would have the authority to pick and choose how to meet the guidelines with regard to the Budget Control Act. Then it allows oversight responsibility to the Appropriations Committee to take a look at what the various Secretaries would do and make sure that is all right. This would be plan B.

We have a plan C by PAUL RYAN that I just read about in the Wall Street Journal. So we are not lacking in plans. What we are lacking is a room. We don't have a room, we don't have a table, we don't have chairs, and we don't have anybody in the chairs, they don't want anybody in the chairs. By the way, I would just as soon not have another supercommittee that turned out to be not very super, selected by leadership. We could have the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction, and the Ways and Means Committee in the House, which has jurisdiction, and I will bet we could come up with something that would be reasonable. At any rate, it is still about the majority leader insisting, no, he is not going to consider something like this. Unless, of course, the President would change his mind—and I hope he does.

My colleagues across the aisle have refused to consider even the most moderate proposals such as repealing the medical device tax as recommended by Senator COLLINS and ensuring that Members of Congress and their staff are treated the same as the average American in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Let me repeat that: that Members of Congress and their staff are treated the same as average Americans in the ObamaCare exchanges. When that came up in the Finance Committee, long before ObamaCare was passed or, for that matter, before it left the Finance Committee to go behind closed doors, in the majority leader's office—where I think he was singing with Mr. Rich, in terms of singing behind closed doors, but that is another story—at any rate, that first time I think it was Senator GRASSLEY who said he thinks it is only right that Members of Congress and their staff live under the same rules. He proposed that amendment. I voted for it then and I would again. It did pass then and, of course, now it is defeated by those across the aisle.

After failing to pass a budget last year and the 3 years prior to that or to pass a single funding measure this year, the Federal Government has been operating under a stopgap measure, as I mentioned before, called a continuing resolution. This is not what the people of Kansas expect from their government.

Despite multiple disruptions and critical delays, the exchanges became active as of October 1, about a week ago. However, since then we have heard feedback that the exchanges are off to a rocky start, are unusable or totally disappointing, fraught with frequent error and messages from a failure of a major software component. That is also not what people expected from any government program, and certainly not what has been sold as the President's signature domestic achievement.

Unfortunately, this was not unexpected for those of us who have opposed the law since the beginning, but it does bring up an issue. If you watch the news media—and for that matter, the comedy shows that follow later in the evening—there is always somebody who is trying to sign up on a computer and following the instructions given by the Department of Health and Human Services.

After you log on, the first page shows a smiling face, and then you get maybe three questions. I was interested in one of the questions I heard had been asked: What do you eat? What is your favorite food?

If that's true what on Earth does that have to do with signing up for ObamaCare? Maybe they are concerned with somebody they feel might be obese or something like that, and maybe that is the person who ought to be signing up. I just don't know.

I know when I went through the first 16 pages—when I was reviewing as a member of the Finance Committee—of the draft on how you sign up, I got to page 3, and must say I would not give any database that kind of personal information. I think part of the delay is probably caught up on that. But you can't even get past page 3, and then it says you must wait.

I don't know how long we are going to wait. I know the President has called it simply glitches and bumps in the road. I think the front page of the Washington Post saying that many people had warned the administration that this was not going to work is certainly pertinent with regards to this discussion. I would offer up that these are system failures as opposed to bumps and glitches. I don't know when this is going to be worked out.

Despite a government shutdown, my colleagues across the aisle will not even consider solutions which acknowledge the widespread concerns expressed by the American people have with ObamaCare.

Let me also point out something else. The nominee to be the new head of the IRS—I asked him first why on Earth he would want to take on that job. He said, I am Mr. Fix-it, and that is what his resume says. I asked him a couple of questions, and I wished him well. I said: How are you going to implement and enforce this fine that is going to be on everybody if they don't sign up? I understand, from the administration, that nobody has to submit their eligibility requirements with regards to income. This is going to lead to fraud, abuse, and scamming. Second, you can't even sign up to begin with, and third, how on Earth is the IRS going to find anybody when they do not have the information or capability to do that?

I asked the distinguished nominee, who will come before the Finance Committee, where I will ask him again: How are you going to do that? He said: I need 8,000 more people. I said: What do you think the chances of that happening are around here? They would have to be trained, right? He said: Right.

They don't even have the people to enforce this if, in fact, they are going to enforce the fine. So why not just tell the American people: I am sorry, but we are not ready to fine people. We are not ready to have people declare their eligibility with regards to income, and we are not ready to sign people up yet because of the glitches, bumps, or failures in the system. So just delay it. Maybe they could delay it—as one prominent newscaster has proposed—

and just say: Look, if you want it, sign up for it, do. If you don't, you don't have to. You won't have to anyway because you are not going to get fined because the IRS has no capability to fine people. How are they going to do that? Are they going to cut your rebate check? Most of the people don't even get rebate checks. This is a mess that is just falling apart.

I, for one, am going to do everything I can to not let this stalemate stand. I am a senior member on the Finance Committee. I would encourage my colleagues basically that we meet, and that we discuss a continuing resolution that would extend funding out and allow us to try to work together on the systemic problems that face us with regards to the national debt.

I want to work toward a solution. I am going to do everything in my power to bring my colleagues to the table. I think they want to come to the table. We have a lot of responsible and good people interested who want this to end just like this side wants it to end. But we race headlong into another debt ceiling debate with the President in the exact same position as he is in the shutdown—unwilling to lead, unwilling to even come to the table, and we still have the majority leader saying no. We have White House officials running to the media declaring that we will default on our debt, the sky will fall, and this will be the fault of Republicans. These claims of inevitable default are false given the operation of the government and the cash flowing into the Treasury each month. They are clearly posturing—and dangerously posturing at that. No one wants a default or a shutdown by shotgun. Nobody wants a default—least of all me. It is the height of irresponsibility to make these claims and all along the way refuse to negotiate.

What we are asking for, and what we must do, is very simple: Consider a debt limit extension and budget changes at the same time, which would allow us to address our debt problem. Contrary to what Secretary Lew and other administration officials say, this is how these issues are handled. This is regular order. The debt limit, for at least the last 27 years, except for one small extension, has been attached to larger spending cuts and budget reforms. This is not unprecedented. This is how we do business. This is regular order.

The President's position is at odds with the stance taken by his predecessors from both parties. They saw the common sense of coupling deficit reduction with the extension of the debt limit. It is hard to figure out the President's thinking on this. Maybe now that a huge portion of Federal spending is on autopilot, he simply wants a blank check to fund the government with automatic increases in the debt limit. I want to mention something else that bothers me. I would like to go into negotiations with at least certain things that are guarantees, things which have been guaranteed before. I am talking about guarantees in the Budget Control Act, and I am talking about the so-called fiscal cliff. The fiscal cliff protected 99 percent of Americans from a tax increase and had an estate tax reform that made sense and some real progress on capital gains.

The Budget Control Act, as we all know, led to the sequester. Again, Senator COLLINS has a plan that would fix the sequester and would give people more flexibility on how to do it, but also with oversight by the appropriations committees to make sure it is done right.

In meeting with the President—and he indicated in a press conference the other day that maybe he would invite more people to the White House. I appreciated being invited to the White House about 6 months ago. The subject came to a grand bargain. We were asking how this would work out.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask for an additional 5 minutes if I may have it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Madam President. I will try to wrap up. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator who wishes to speak. I will try to get this done.

We were meeting with the President. I was bringing up the issue of regulations, but the rest of the people were talking about a grand bargain and what could happen. The President said on tax reform: Why can't we start with a clean page? Basically everybody agreed. And then he said we could also take mortgage interest, charitable giving, retirement, and we can means-test those and start from there. I thought, oh boy, here we go again—income redistribution. That is not the answer.

I would just say that before we enter into any negotiations, we ought to make sure that the Budget Control Act and the fiscal cliff bill, which were negotiated in good faith with the Vice President and which have resulted in lower spending, in the first actual decreases in spending by the Federal Government since the Korean War. That is unbelievable.

So in going to negotiate, I don't want to give up in regards to those decreases, and I don't want a situation where the President has said: I gave to you on CPI so I need $800 billion in revenue. The distinguished majority leader has said it is $1 trillion. So if we are going to raise $1 trillion in revenue, then here we go again and whatever negotiations come down the pike are going to be more spending and more taxes. People are just figuring out what their tax bill is going to be with ObamaCare. We don't need a situation where we sit down and negotiate simply for more taxes and spending. Without going into the constitutional implications of granting any authority on autopilot to the President, I would say I am adamantly opposed to giving any President that much control over the budget.

Why does all of this matter? Why am I making this speech? Why is my friend across the aisle going to make her speech? The debt limit is currently $16.7 trillion. The debt has increased about $6 trillion since the President took office—more than any other President in our history. The main source of this tremendous growth in our debt is entitlement spending, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. PAUL RYAN has a plan to fix that. It ought to at least be on the table, and that way we can see a path for where we can go with it.

Without changes, spending on these programs is expected to grow by 79 percent over the next 10 years. In fact, by law, there is no upper limit on how much we spend on these programs. This spending—added to interest payments on the debt—will make up close to 65 percent of the budget in 10 years. By then we won't have any discretionary spending.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that we remain on an unsustainable path. All we are asking—prudently, I hope—is that any increase in the Federal debt limit needs to be coupled with real, tangible cuts in discretionary spending and meaningful, structural reform to entitlement spending. We need to get this done to rein in our unsustainable debt and to ensure that these programs are there for our children and our grandchildren.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Thomas Sowell, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution from Stanford University be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[From the Standard Times, Oct. 6, 2013]

WHO SHUT DOWN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

(By Thomas Sowell)

SAN ANGELO, TX.—Even when it comes to something as basic, and apparently as simple and straightforward, as the question of who shut down the federal government, there are diametrically opposite answers, depending on whether you talk to Democrats or to Republicans.

There is really nothing complicated about the facts. The Republican-controlled House of Representatives voted all the money required to keep all government activities going—except for Obamacare. This is not a matter of opinion. You can check the Congressional Record.

As for the House of Representatives' right to grant or withhold money, that is not a matter of opinion either. You can check the Constitution of the United States. All spending bills must originate in the House of Representatives, which means that congressmen there have a right to decide whether or not they want to spend money on a particular government activity.

Whether Obamacare is good, bad or indifferent is a matter of opinion. But it is a matter of fact that members of the House of Representatives have a right to make spending decisions based on their opinion.

Obamacare is indeed ''the law of the land,'' as its supporters keep saying, and the Supreme Court has upheld its constitutionality. But the whole point of having a division of powers within the federal government is that each branch can decide independently what it wants to do or not do, regardless of what the other branches do, when exercising the powers specifically granted to that branch by the Constitution.

The hundreds of thousands of government workers who have been laid off are not idle because the House of Representatives did not vote enough money to pay their salaries or the other expenses of their agencies—unless they are in an agency that would administer Obamacare.

Since we cannot read minds, we cannot say who—if anybody—''wants to shut down the government.'' But we do know who had the option to keep the government running and chose not to.

The money voted by the House of Representatives covered everything that the government does, except for Obamacare. The Senate chose not to vote to authorize that money to be spent, because it did not include money for Obamacare.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid says that he wants a ''clean'' bill from the House of Representatives, and some in the media keep repeating the word ''clean'' like a mantra. But what is unclean about not giving Reid everything he wants?

If Reid and President Barack Obama refuse to accept the money required to run the government, because it leaves out the money they want to run Obamacare, that is their right. But that is also their responsibility. You cannot blame other people for not giving you everything you want. And it is a fraud to blame them when you refuse to use the money they did vote, even when it is ample to pay for everything else in the government.

When Obama keeps claiming that it is some new outrage for those who control the money to try to change government policy by granting or withholding money, that is simply a baldfaced lie. You can check the history of other examples of ''legislation by appropriation,'' as it used to be called.

Whether legislation by appropriation is a good idea or a bad idea is a matter of opinion. But whether it is both legal and not unprecedented is a matter of fact.

Perhaps the biggest of the big lies is that the government will not be able to pay what it owes on the national debt, creating a danger of default. Tax money keeps coming into the treasury during the shutdown, and it vastly exceeds the interest that has to be paid on the national debt.

Even if the debt ceiling is not lifted, that only means that government is not allowed to run up new debt. But that does not mean that it is unable to pay the interest on existing debt.

None of this is rocket science. But unless the Republicans get their side of the story out—and articulation has never been their strong suit—the lies will win. More important, the whole country will lose.

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield back any time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, as my colleague from Kansas said, I also came to the floor today to talk about the unnecessary government shutdown that is continuing and is having widespread ramifications in New Hampshire and across the country.

I would like to respond to some of what he said about the Budget Control Act and about the current state of the deficit. The fact is the deficit, under this President, has been reduced by more than 50 percent since he took office. It is on course to reach a little over 4 percent of GDP by the end of 2015, I believe. By 2023 it is expected to get even lower—down to a little over 2 percent. There is no doubt that we need a plan to deal with the long-term debt and deficits of this country.

Most of us who supported the Budget Control Act thought that was what we had done. We put a committee in place that was actually going to come up with an agreement on how we could get to a long-term plan to deal with this country's debt and deficits. It is really unfortunate that some of the people who were appointed to that committee didn't share in that commitment.

I think it is important to remind us all where we are. We have made significant improvements on reducing the deficit in this country. We have been willing to look at a long-term agreement to deal with the debt and deficit, and I think that is what we ought to do. I would hope that as the result of this government shutdown, we can get some agreement from both sides of the aisle to actually do this.

My main purpose in coming to the floor today is to talk again about the impact of the shutdown on too many people who were caught in the middle between this unnecessary inflicted crisis that we are seeing in Washington and the impact that it is having on families, small businesses, the economy of New Hampshire, and the country.

We are now in the ninth day of the shutdown. In New Hampshire we have seen hundreds of Federal workers who have been furloughed. Some of those workers are back to work. Fortunately, at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard most of those people are back to work, and that is very good news. We still have people at the Forest Service, and we have people who work for the Federal Government in other capacities all over the State who have not been fortunate enough to be called back to work.

I would just remind everybody that even for those people who are back at work, they are not being paid. They are working without pay.

In New Hampshire Small Business Administration loans have been halted, and that is true across the country. The Federal Housing Administration and VA loans have been slowed down. At the White Mountain National Forest, which is a Federal forest that hosts more visitors than Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks combined, people who are traveling through our beautiful White Mountain National Forest at this time of the year so they can look at the foliage are not even able to use the restrooms because of the shutdown.

This morning I wanted to speak about some of those businesses I have heard from who are being hurt by the shutdown. New Hampshire is truly a small business State. Ninety-six percent of employers in the Granite State are considered small businesses and they are the backbone of our economy. They are also where most of the new jobs are going to come from.

Two out of every three new jobs in the United States is created by a small business, but the shutdown is hitting them hard. I heard this morning from two of our businesses that have been established in the State for a long time. They have national reputations.

Titeflex, which is an aerospace company in the lakes region, does a lot of business for the Department of Defense and they also provide supplies to larger companies. They told me their inventory is piling up on their docks now because they don't have anybody to inspect it, because those Federal officials who do that are not working. They are furloughed. They said it is really going to be a problem in 10 days if they don't get this resolved, when they have to report to the corporation their bottom line numbers, which will show on their reports, and that will affect their company.

Then I also heard from some representatives of Smith Tubular, which is a medical device equipment company that does business with the VA and with the military, and they also do a lot of work with the FDA. They said they are seeing their contracts affected, and they have heard from FDA that they couldn't provide the payments they normally provide to them because there is nobody at FDA to process those payments. So that is having an effect on the ability of businesses to innovate, to provide the products that are needed.

We have seen an impact on lending in New Hampshire. The Small Business Administration has reported that loans are not being originated. One does not need a Ph.D. in economics to understand that if small businesses can't access capital and credit, there are real economic consequences. One of our largest SBA lenders in New Hampshire is a company called the Granite State Development Corporation. Twenty of their loans are on hold already because of the shutdown.

Then this morning I heard from a community bank in New Hampshire called Provident Bank that it has about half a dozen SBA loans being held up right now. One of those loans is for a newly starting up entrepreneur who wants to open an Orange Leaf Frozen Yogurt franchise in New Hampshire. All the paperwork is ready to go, but Provident Bank can't get the final approval for the loan until the SBA is up and running again. So if the shutdown continues, Provident Bank is concerned that interest rates are going to rise, and if interest rates rise, the cost of borrowing for small businesses is going to go up.

As the Presiding Officer knows, because her State is much like New Hampshire with a lot of small businesses, access to credit is the lifeblood

of those small businesses. Right now, we are preventing them from getting the help they need.

Then we have small businesses in New Hampshire that rely on consumer demand. I heard from Charles Moulton, who is the owner of a New Hampshire maple syrup company called New Hampshire Gold. This is the time of year when people are coming to see the foliage and sample our maple syrup in New Hampshire. He has four employees and his maple syrup company has a storefront in New Hampshire, but it also sells one of their signature products, their maple syrup, to Zion National Park in Utah—kind of an unlikely location for a New Hampshire maple syrup, but New Hampshire Gold sells to tourists who come there from all over the world during the summer and early fall. But now, because Zion National Park is shut down, as are all of our national parks, New Hampshire Gold sales have dried up. While they continue to sell in Concord, NH, in their retail store, much of the cushion they needed to get through the winter into next year comes from that location at Zion. They can't afford to lose those dollars as they are thinking about how to get through the rest of this year.

New Hampshire Gold is just one of the thousands of small businesses that have been hurt by the shutdown of our national parks. Visitors to the parks spend nearly $13 billion a year in regions within 60 miles of the parks. This shutdown is hurting not just visitors to those parks; it is hurting small businesses such as New Hampshire Gold and all of the other small businesses around our parks who depend on that tourism business.

There is no doubt this shutdown is hurting our economy. Economist Mark Zandi projected that a 3-to-4-week shutdown would reduce gross domestic product by 1.4 percent during the fourth quarter. He noted that the projection likely underestimates the economic fallout, since it doesn't fully account for the impact of such a lengthy shutdown on consumers, businesses, and investor psychology.

The bottom line is clear: The shutdown is bad for our economy, it is bad for middle-class families, and it is bad for the country.

As we look at the looming deadline for when we need to raise the debt ceiling so we can pay the bills this country has incurred, there is potentially even greater fallout for America. Holding the economy and critical services hostage to score political points is irresponsible. We need to open the government. We need to raise the debt ceiling so we can pay our bills. With the economy finally showing signs of improvement, the last thing we should be doing is what is happening right now.

I am hopeful the House will do what is right. I am hopeful they will pass a short-term funding bill. That action will get our government running again, and then we can continue to negotiate on what we need to do to address the long-term debt and deficits in the country, as well as talk about where we need to invest to make sure this country stays competitive in the future.

I yield the floor.

QUORUM CALL

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 4]

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Casey	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Merkley	Stabenow
Franken	Murphy	Warner
Heinrich	Murray	Warren

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Graham	Mikulski
Baldwin	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Hatch	Nelson
Boozman	Heinrich	Portman
Boxer	Heitkamp	Pryor
Brown	Hirono	Reed
Cantwell	Hoeven	Reid
Cardin	Isakson	Rockefeller
Carper	Johanns	Rubio
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Chambliss	Kaine	Schatz
Chiesa	King	Schumer
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Markey	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCain	Warner
Fischer	McCaskill	Warren
Flake	McConnell	Whitehouse
Franken	Menendez	Wicker
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—18

Alexander	Crapo	Moran
Barrasso	Cruz	Risch
Blunt	Enzi	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cornyn	Lee	Thune

NOT VOTING—4

Begich	Paul
Inhofe	Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The senior Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, when a house is on fire, the reasonable thing to do is put it out and then figure out what happened to prevent the next one.

When a ship is headed toward rocks, the reasonable thing is to steer away and then work on charting a better course.

When a government is shut down and is headed toward a default that economists would say is catastrophic, the reasonable thing to do is end the crisis, steer away from the next one, and work together on a long-term plan to avoid these crises in the future.

We are now in the second week of this absolutely unnecessary government shutdown. Every day we are hearing more and more about the tremendous impact this is having on our families and our communities across the country. It is only going to get worse.

We can end this today. It does not have to continue. We are holding the door open for our Republican colleagues to join us in putting a stop to this madness. All they need to do is come in. Senate Democrats have spent the past 6 months trying to get Republicans to join us at the table in a budget conference. We knew there were two options: conference or crisis—working together toward a bipartisan budget deal or lurching separately into a completely avoidable government shutdown.

A number of Republicans joined us in a push for negotiations, but no matter how many times we tried, we were blocked. We were pushed to this point by a refusal to negotiate, and now the only path forward is for the House to end the crisis and then join us at the table at which we have been waiting to sit for 6 months.

Democrats want to negotiate. We want to have this conversation. We think the only way out of this cycle of constant crisis is for the two sides to work together, to make some compromises and get to a fair and responsible long-term deal. But it does not make sense to do that while our families and our communities are being hurt by this government shutdown and while the threat of a default hangs over their heads.

I served on the supercommittee. I worked with my colleagues to write and pass our budget here in the Senate. I know Democrats and Republicans have some serious differences when it comes to our budget values and our priorities, and I absolutely believe we owe it to the American people to try to

bridge that divide and to find common ground. But are we really going to ask them to wait patiently, continue suffering through this shutdown, keep watching as we cruise toward an economic calamity while another supercommittee gets together and has a conversation? That does not make sense. Let's have those conversations, let's have those negotiations, but let's end this crisis and get to work.

Yesterday I heard something from the Speaker. He said he didn't want to end the shutdown or address the debt limit now because that would be ''unconditional surrender to the President.'' Have we really come to the point where simply allowing the government to open is considered by one party to be a political loss? Are we really in a place where the majority of one Chamber in one branch of government believes allowing the United States of America to pay its bills is a major concession?

I say to my Republican friends who are here today, imagine if our roles were reversed. For example, I have been working very hard this year to write an early childhood education bill that I am passionate about, and I believe it will really help our children and our families. I suspect there are a few people in this Chamber today, including several on the Republican side, who could one day see themselves in the White House. If that day were to come, what would my Republican colleagues do if I said to them that if they did not pass my bill to expand pre-K, I would get all the Democrats together and we would refuse to pass any spending bills until we got what we wanted? And if that led to a government shutdown because they refused to let my bill pass, what would they do if I demanded a supercommittee to discuss ways to invest in our children before I allowed a vote to open the government again? I would humbly suggest that my Republican colleagues would say exactly what Democrats are saying now: This is not a legitimate way to negotiate, and the only path forward is to end this crisis and then have a conversation.

The great American system we hold so dear—our democracy that is the envy of the world—simply cannot work if a minority of Members can threaten to shut down the government or devastate the economy if they do not get their way on an issue—any issue. That is not what Democrats did when we were in the minority, and it is not what we should do should that day come again. Our system was designed to push both sides toward negotiations in a divided government, to encourage negotiation and movement toward common ground. It breaks down when one side refuses to negotiate in advance of a crisis, and it falls apart when a minority refuses to allow the basic functions of our government to perform unless their demands are met.

I know all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, came here to fight for their constituents, to solve problems, to make this country work better. I know there is nobody here today—not a single Senator—who was sent here to shut the government down or to push this country toward an unprecedented default on our loans. And I know so many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, are sick of the constant crises. They hate seeing their constituents get hurt.

As my friend the Senator from Arizona said yesterday, I think we should find a way to sit down and find a way out of these dead ends. That is what I am here today to offer—a way out, a path forward. It is not a defeat of one side or the other, it is certainly not any kind of surrender, but it would allow us to get out of this mess that has been created and open a path to negotiations so we can avoid the next one. I am going to ask consent once again to start a budget conference as soon as the current crisis has ended. Democrats have made it clear we want to negotiate. We couldn't have made it more clear. We will sit down and negotiate over anything the Republicans want, and we pledge to work as hard as we can for as long as it takes until we get a fair long-term budget deal to end these constant crises. But first this current crisis needs to end and the threat of the next one needs to be lifted.

Republicans don't need a hostage. There are plenty of things Democrats want out of a long-term deal for which we are very interested in making some compromises. So I urge my Republican colleagues to please consider taking us up on this offer. We can end this today. We can do the right thing for our families and the communities we represent, and we can get back to work helping people, solving problems, and working together.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

I respectfully ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives a message from the House that they have receded from their amendment and concurred in the amendment of the Senate with respect to H.J. Res. 59, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Is there objection?

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, on this side of the aisle we agree it is good to negotiate, and we should. I would only hope the President of the United States would be a part of that negotiation in order to make it successful.

But I would ask my friend why the request is contingent on passage of the House continuing resolution. The Democrats have already rejected the House's request to go to conference on the CR, seemingly in contrast to what they are now asking for, which is a negotiation.

Hopefully, we will pass H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, which will create a bicameral, bipartisan group to address the CR and the debt limit situation.

But on the Republican side, again I would say to our friends that we have a longstanding request to make sure reconciliation instructions are not in order in a budget conference so that the debt limit can be increased on a strictly party-line vote.

We happen to think it is a problem if the debt ceiling is raised as the Democrats are requesting, that we would see the debt go up by 68 percent under this President—more than all other Presidents in American history who preceded him. We think that is a bad idea.

So I would ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether she would consider an amended unanimous consent request, and we would ask that the Senate, by way of amendment to her request, proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25 be amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate; and I would further ask unanimous consent that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Washington so modify her request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, let me make one observation, which is that sometimes I think those who have been objecting now 21 times to our request to go to conference have forgotten whom I would be conferencing with, which is the Republican House majority. What they fight so adamantly and strongly for here in the Senate will be well and ably represented in a conference committee. That is the point of a conference committee. That is what our democracy was set up to do in a divided government, where we have the opportunity to do that.

Having a conference committee to work out our budget agreement is exactly what I have asked for, but I will object because what the Senator's request does is simply say: We are going to keep our government closed. We are not going to allow people to do the functions that are so desperately needed. We are going to stay closed, and we are going to hold that hostage.

As I said so clearly when I spoke before, we need to open the government, we need to pay our bills, and we need to negotiate. That is what our request does, that is what the Republican request does not do, and so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modified request.

Is there objection to the original unanimous consent request?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Washington for her 21st time in coming to the floor of the Senate and asking the Republicans to join us in a conference committee to resolve budget differences between the House and the Senate. Twenty-one times Senator MURRAY has come to this floor simply asking to negotiate, and the Republicans, who have been arguing that we don't negotiate, turned her down 21 times—the latest by the senior Senator from Texas. The junior Senator from Texas shut down the government over the notion of defunding ObamaCare, and now the senior Senator from Texas has said he objects to going to a conference committee to resolve our differences, Republicans and Democrats, between the House and the Senate.

If we are going to restore this Senate to the orderly process, what the Senator from Washington has asked for is very basic—open the government.

This morning the Chaplain of the Senate started by acknowledging the five families who were notified, after they had lost a military member—a son, a husband, a brother in Afghanistan over the weekend—he noted that in their bereavement they were being denied the basic benefits this government gives to these grieving families after they have lost someone in uniform. The Chaplain of the Senate said it this morning: Enough is enough.

This notion that closing down our government and keeping it closed is somehow acceptable political conduct is outrageous. We just left a press conference where Maryland Senators MIKULSKI and CARDIN, and Senator KAINE and Senator WARNER of Virginia, spoke about the impact to their local economies and the loss of these jobs with this government shutdown. I can tell stories of Illinois, with 50,000 Federal workers who have either been furloughed or their checks are being withheld for the most part. This is unnecessary, and it is unacceptable.

We were in the midst of a terrible accident last week, right before October 1. A train ran into one of our Metro trains coming back from the airport, and 30 people were sent to the hospital. The National Transportation Safety Board went out to investigate the accident to find out what led to this terrible thing. They had to leave at midnight on October 1, after having collected what evidence they could, because the government was shut down. The investigation was suspended. That is one small example. There are the five families who are grieving. And it goes on and on.

What we hear from the Republicans is we will take care of each of these as it arises. We will pick out the vital functions of government. So far, all of the bills passed by the House of Representatives combined represent only 18 percent of the domestic discretionary budget of the United States.

So each day, as another tragedy occurs, as another embarrassment to this Republican strategy emerges, they will try to find a way to fix that story, to fix that problem. It is time for us to fix our sights on a solution that is befitting the great Nation of America: Open the government and pay our bills while we negotiate.

That is the only responsible way to approach it. I am sorry that for the 21st time the Republicans have come to the floor and denied the request by the Senate Budget Committee chair, Senator MURRAY of Washington, to sit down and negotiate. Twenty-one times Republicans have refused to allow us to enter into a bipartisan negotiation. That is why we face the problems we do today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, it is a good thing that Democrats for the first time in 4 years passed a budget—at least brought one to the floor and passed it on a strictly partisan basis. Before that, they not only didn't pass one, they didn't bring one to the floor for 4 years and refused to do so, even though a specific provision of the United States Code actually required them to do so. It was a stunning development.

Senator Conrad, then the Democratic chair of the Budget Committee, wanted to bring up budgets, fought to bring up budgets, and one time said he was going to bring up a budget. But Senator DURBIN and others in the leadership apparently had a vote, and they voted against him. Senator MURRAY, to her credit, has gotten a budget through. The Presiding Officer is a member of that committee, and they got a budget through this year, which was a good thing. I am not sure, but I suspect Senator MURRAY was one of those who blocked Senator Conrad from even bringing up a budget for 4 years. So I think it is a bit aggressive to say Republicans are blocking a budget when the history is they haven't even voted on one.

Secondly, there are Members on this side of the aisle who simply say the legislation necessary to raise the debt ceiling again should be passed—like legislation should be passed—on the floor of the Senate, and it would require a 60-vote point of order where you have to have 60 votes to pass.

In conference, a raising of the debt ceiling would be put on the budget which only requires 51 votes for passage. We have simply said we would allow the budget to go to conference and agree to conference, but we want a commitment that our Democratic colleagues will not try to sneak through raising the debt ceiling on the budget—which doesn't require but 51 votes. Our colleagues have flatly refused. If they would make that agreement, we would go to conference.

I think our Democratic majority should agree to that. They have indicated they don't intend to put it on the budget. One time Senator DURBIN said he didn't think it was appropriate to put it on the budget. If so, let's make clear we are not going to gimmick it up and add that to it.

The reason we have had such contention at this point in history is that we are facing fundamental challenges relevant to the whole future of America financially. It is a time of great importance. The American people understand this. The American people want us to take action to place this country on a sound financial path.

So we are heading to the debt ceiling. By law we limit the amount of money Congress can borrow and how much money we can spend above our current level. We are now spending about $3,500 billion a year and we are taking in about $2,800 billion a year. Think about it. That is what we are doing every year, and it is unsustainable.

In August of 2011 we faced a debt ceiling, and the American people told Congress: We want to clip back on your credit card. You are not going to continue to borrow this much money every year. Before you raise the debt ceiling, we want you to show that you are going to be more frugal and are going to manage our money better.

Republicans dug their heels in and said, Mr. President, we are not going to raise the debt ceiling until you agree to some financial constraints and that you are not going to keep spending recklessly every year.

After a tense time, a committee was formed and an agreement was reached, and this is what we agreed to: First, we would raise the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion. Then, over the next 10 years we would reduce the projected growth of spending by $2.1 trillion—one for one, as Speaker BOEHNER said.

So it gave Congress 10 years to find cuts. But in a little over 2 years, we have already borrowed another $2 trillion. We have hit the debt ceiling cap again, and we have not yet come close to saving the $2 trillion we promised to save.

And by the way, these are not really cuts. When you look at the U.S. budget, the budget was projected to increase spending from $37 trillion over

10 years to $47 trillion over 10 years. With the Budget Control Act, spending would increase from $37 trillion to $45 trillion over 10 years. That is not really a cut in spending, is it?

Yes, the way it has been carried out hits some departments more than others—particularly the Defense Department—and we need to adjust that. But fundamentally, the reduction in the growth of spending that was part of the BCA last year was not extreme, not irresponsible, and should and must be preserved.

But colleagues, the President of the United States, after signing that agreement in August—the sequester is part of the BCA. It was all part of the same deal that created the $2.1 trillion in savings. In January, after that August, he proposed a budget that would increase spending another $1 trillion and would raise taxes $1 trillion. That is basically what our colleagues passed in their budget this year: to spend $1 trillion more than the Budget Control Act said we should spend and raise taxes another $1 trillion over 10 years.

This is a total abdication of the promise we made to the American people. We said, OK, American people, we are going to vote to raise the debt ceiling. A lot of people didn't like any raising of the debt ceiling. Phone calls to my office were against any raising. People said, It is time for you guys to live within your means like I have to do in my house.

So we raised it. But we promised we wouldn't spend so much. We promised we would reduce spending by $2.1 trillion, but over 10 years. Do you know what a lot of cynics around here said? They said, Congress won't adhere to that. That is just a bunch of baloney. They promise that all the time, and then they breach their promises all the time. That is why the country is going broke.

That is exactly what the President did in January of 2012, 6 months after the agreement—he proposed to spend another $1 trillion above the amount of money we agreed to spend 6 months before. Why?

I didn't really want to sign that agreement. I didn't really want to cut that much money. So I am not bound by it. I didn't make a promise to the American people. I forgot all about that. That was 6 months ago. Oh, a 10-year promise, that we are going to contain the growth of spending for 10 years? Forget that. I don't want to do that. I want to spend more. I have investments I want to make. I have taxes I want to increase.

This is fundamentally what is occurring here. So we have got to stand firm and adhere at least to the containment of growth in spending in the Budget Control Act. We have to. Failure to do that is a capitulation in our promises to the American people, a total abandonment of any pretension that we will be fiscally responsible in this body. It is just unthinkable that we would abandon the limits we had in the Budget Control Act.

The sad truth is the Budget Control Act reductions in the growth of spending do not come close to putting us on a firm financial footing. We are still on an unsustainable debt course, as our Congressional Budget Office has told us.

Yes, we have seen a reduction in the deficits this year of $600 billion. People say that is great.

George Bush has been called profligate, and sometimes he was. The highest deficit he ever had was $470 billion. The year before his last year in office was $167 billion.

President Obama in his 6 years will have averaged almost $1 trillion a year in deficits. We have never, ever come close to that kind of deficit before in the history of the Republic.

So what does a budget say that says we want to tax people $1 trillion more and spend more money under these circumstances? I will tell you what it says.

From the President and the majority here in the Senate, it says: It is not our problem. We can't find any more ways to reduce the growth of spending. We can't save another dime. You people just don't understand. There is no way we can save any more money. We have a problem, though. And do you know who is responsible for it? You, the American people. It is your fault. You won't give us enough money. If you would just send more money, another $1 trillion, another $2 trillion, another $600 billion which was passed in January, just another few hundred billion more or a trillion here and a trillion there in taxes, why, we could solve all of the problems. Send us more money. And by the way, we will use that money to create government programs and government bureaucracies that impose great costs on the American economy and have in fact resulted in the declining wages of American workers to a degree that is not acceptable.

We need a growth-oriented, lean government—a lean government that serves the people for the least possible cost and reduces these deficits. Deficits themselves are pulling down the economic growth in our country. The size of our debt is so large, we have never had anything like it, it is already beginning to diminish the prospects for growth in our economy and reduces job creation and reduces wages.

I know we are in a tough time now. We certainly need to work our way out of this. But the President negotiated over the debt ceiling in August of 2011, and we made at least a step forward. In fact, it was the most significant fiscal step this country has taken, maybe in decades, and for the last 2 years we have actually spent less money than the year before. Think about it. To hear people talk, they would think the country is going to collapse.

But we have had a modest reduction in spending, and that has been good. It has been good. But it is not nearly enough to put us on a sustained path.

We need to save Social Security, we need to strengthen and save Medicare, we cannot afford the Affordable Care Act. We have witnessed a total misrepresentation on the Affordable Care Act with regard to its cost. The Government Accounting Office, an independent auditor, has told us it is going to add at least $6 trillion to the debt of the United States over the long term under its likely set of assumptions. It does not pay for itself—nowhere close. It is as unstable financially as Social Security is over the long term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Let's keep working. Maybe we can develop some ways to confront our financial problems. It is absolutely critical that we do that. We have a moral responsibility to do that and we have to start working together to achieve it. I think the President needs to back off his statements that he will not negotiate on the continuing resolution or the debt ceiling.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask my colleague from Alabama, if he has a moment or two more, after I read an official consent request, if he might stay for a moment and answer a question about how that budget conference committee works?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have a moment.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, through the Chair, I want to pose a question about the budget conference committee. I think it is something that has puzzled a lot of people across America.

We hear some folks standing and giving speeches saying for 6 months we have been trying to get a conference committee and we have other folks who are standing and saying we will be glad to go to conference as long as there is a deal beforehand on exactly what is done in the conference committee.

In that regard, I thought it would be useful to have a little bit of perspective here. My understanding is that anything that comes out of the budget conference committee would have to have agreement of both the team of delegates from the House side and the team of delegates from the Senate side. That is a question I ask of the ranking member of the Budget Committee, to clarify that process?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. Of course that is correct. I understand the Speaker has indicated there is no guarantee that the increase in the debt ceiling would not be a part of a conference report that came out of conference committee. We have independent Senators in this body who simply said we do not think we should be subjected to having the debt ceiling increase without a full debate and the normal processes of 60 votes in the Senate. That is where the disagreement lies. People can have disagreements about the validity of their concern, but

it is a legitimate concern. If there is no intention to move a debt ceiling increase at 51 votes, why wouldn't my colleagues agree not to do it? That is the disagreement I think that now exists.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, might I ask about a couple of other pieces to this puzzle. Why not, with that concern—I pass this question through the Chair to my colleague—why not, with that concern, simply ask the House delegates to carry that concern, rather than blocking the start of the conference committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I say to my colleague, through the Chair, it is very simple. Senators have rights. They have a right to assert those privileges on the floor of the Senate. We have Senators who say you should not do this, you should not raise the debt ceiling on the budget and we do not want to go to conference unless you do agree not to sneak that through without a full debate and 60-vote threshold on the floor of the Senate. Attaching it to a bill that is a budget deal that is huge and would have a lot of interest in it would make it even more difficult to separate that question out. Rightly or wrongly, that is their view.

I say I don't see any problem and I am amazed at the intransigence of the majority of not just accepting that. I don't think it is likely, as the Senator indicated, that the House would add that to it, frankly. I am not too worried about it. But some are and that is causing the disagreement right now. I think it would be great to go to conference. I would like to see a conference occur, frankly. I think it is an unusual and positive development that after 4 years of not even bringing a budget to the floor, that we now have the majority here passing a budget so we can try to do something with it in conference—although I have to tell you, all of our colleagues, there is a big difference in the budgets. The budget passed out of the Senate with our majority that every Republican opposed completely busted the Budget Control Act. It is nowhere close to what was agreed to in that Act 2 years ago.

I think we have a huge gap to cover in conference. It is not impossible and it would probably be a healthy thing to start that process. I wish my colleagues would relent and commit not to try to sneak the debt ceiling increase in on the budget.

I thank the Chair. I appreciate my colleague, a member of the Budget Committee, who contributes ably and works hard to try to do the right thing around here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, the thing that puzzles me, if my colleague would still consider responding, is that there is a process on the floor of giving instructions to a conference committee.

My colleague has left the floor, but the question I would have followed up with is, given that there is a specific process in the Senate for doing budget instructions to a conference committee, why not utilize that specific process, hold a vote on the conference committee instructions, rather than blockading the conference committee from starting?

I guess I will have to rhetorically answer the question, that there is no good explanation for why not go through the normal process and propose a Budget Committee instruction for our conferees.

Then the question becomes, couldn't we resolve this today? Couldn't we resolve this today, have a proposal put forward to instruct the conferees, vote on it on the floor of this Senate, and it either passes or it does not? Isn't the whole budget process designed specifically to be a simple majority process under the Budget Act so we can indeed get the job done and not be paralyzed?

I think—I believe the story—and I would have liked to have had the perspective of my colleague—but I think the story is a determination to not allow a majority determination of the budget instructions, to, instead, allow a minority to do so. I believe also that is an absolutely unprecedented situation, but I wanted to clarify that and understand whether there was in fact precedent for this type of determination that in a simple majority budget process, a minority would blockade a budget conference.

It is very strange that this should become such a central issue. But I want Americans to understand that essentially it boils down to this: For 6 months we have been trying to start a budget conference committee. A small group, a couple of individuals have wanted to instruct that Budget Committee but to do so without going through the normal process on the floor so they could do it as a minority rather than as a discussion and decision of the Senate as a whole. It is that precedent that seems unacceptable. I think if the tables were turned it would be felt strongly on the other side.

I hope to keep exploring these questions, because this 6-month obstruction of being able to get the budget that provides a framework for spending is deeply damaging. This body absolutely has to be able to do its fundamental work in determining the budget, getting a budget conference, getting a budget number, doing the spending bills, all appropriations bills—because otherwise we are careening from crisis to crisis.

I am going to shift gears here. I am going to step back from what is going on immediately with the shutdown and ask where did the seeds of this come from? If we turn back to about April of 2009, shortly after I first came to the Senate, there was a memo put out by an individual named Frank Luntz. Frank Luntz was providing a roadmap on how to block any sort of improvement in our health care system. Frank Luntz said, and he was specifically instructing my colleagues across the aisle—he said it doesn't matter what is in the health care bill. It doesn't matter what good it does. Whatever it is, let's attack it and call it a government takeover.

This was long before anyone even knew what was going to be in the bill. So this strategy of poisonous partisanship rather than problem solving has been with us since at least April of 2009. Therefore, a series of myths were generated. As the process proceeded, those who were behind the myths kind of doubled down on them. For example, we have in the health care reform a process by which small businesses can join together and get the marketing clout of a large group to negotiate lower rates and get a better deal. But under the Frank Luntz ''let's demonize and deceive'' strategy, instead of honoring the fact that the small businesses will be able to get a better rate, there has been an assertion this would hurt small businesses.

In the health care reform bill we have a process by which individuals who have no market clout can band together and get a much better deal. We are seeing significant drops in rates for individuals across this country under the marketplaces that are just now opening for signup. But indeed, under the Frank Luntz ''deceive and demonize'' strategy, it became: Let's tell people insurance rates will go up instead of down.

We have a bill before us—not a bill but a health care reform law coming into effect—that ends abuses in the insurance industry. There was a situation where you could not get a policy if you had a preexisting condition; the sort of situation where if you had insurance and you got sick you would be thrown off the policy; the fact that your children were not able to stay on your policy until they were able to get health care insurance of their own.

These bills of rights are reforms that are deeply sought by Americans across this country, urban and rural. But under the Frank Luntz ''deceive and demonize'' strategy, there was simply an assertion, unfounded, that this would destroy the insurance system.

You have a process whereby, under the marketplaces, insurance companies will have to compete, private insurance companies. Yet under the Frank Luntz strategy adopted by some of my colleagues across the aisle, they decided to say this would hurt competition even though it strengthens competition. It puts before people, apples to apples, companies having to lay out their rates and benefits under these different levels of insurance. We are seeing that competition from private companies proceed to lower rates.

Let's fast forward. We had that phase of the ''demonize the plan'' even though we have to mischaracterize it and deceive and delude Americans about what is in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I will wrap up with a sentence or two and yield to my colleagues. Thank you for coming to the floor to continue the conversation.

I think it is so important that we proceed to put our government back on track and quit careening from crisis to crisis, doing damage to communities and families across our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business for debate only be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the majority leader be recognized following morning business; further, that the Republican side have the time from 2 p.m. to 2:45 p.m., and the majority have the time from 2:45 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today is day 9 of the government shutdown. House Republicans piously blame everyone except themselves, but there is no mystery about what is happening.

It is very simple: They continue to refuse to permit a vote on a continuing resolution to keep the government operating for one reason—they disagree with one law, the Affordable Care Act.

That law, debated for months, voted on dozens of times, signed into law by the President, and ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court, will finally make it possible for tens of millions of uninsured Americans to obtain affordable health insurance, including those with pre-existing conditions.

House Republicans and a handful of tea party Senators don't like it, and they have used all kinds of scare tactics to try to derail it. Yet, millions of Americans who know better, who want to protect their families, have already shown that they want to sign up.

Unyielding in their opposition, tea party members of Congress, for whom ''compromise'' is a dirty word, are on a crusade to hold the Federal government hostage until the Affordable Care Act is repealed. It is a form of extortion that has no place in a democracy.

Then, after a couple of days of angry phone calls from outraged constituents, in an attempt to blunt the criticism, the House Republican leadership abruptly changed course and decided to pick and choose which government agencies and programs to fund.

This latest ploy is revealing for what it says about tea party Republicans. It is as if they suddenly learned for the first time that the Federal Government is comprised of millions of hard-working Americans, in every State, who perform countless tasks the rest of the country depends on.

Did they not realize that many of the people who sent them to Washington depend on the Federal Government for their monthly pay checks? That every American depends on the Federal Government to inspect the safety of the food they eat, the water they drink, and the air they breathe? That America's students and farmers depend on loans from the Federal Government?

That countless needy families depend on Federally funded Head Start programs? That the Department of Health and Human Services pays for the vaccines that protect American children from polio, measles, and other diseases?

It has been interesting to hear the Speaker of the House. He wants the President to, ''sit down and have a conversation.''

President Obama has shown time and again he is willing to compromise, sometimes more than some would like. He sat down with the Speaker last week. But no President should negotiate the terms of keeping the Federal government operating. And no Member of Congress should recklessly toy with the United States defaulting on its debt payments for the first time in history, and when the world is finally recovering from a devastating global recession.

The Senior Senator from Maryland, the Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, has done an excellent job of explaining what is at stake—not only for American families but for the reputation of the United States, the world's oldest democracy. Senators should be aware of the impact of the shutdown on thousands of American companies that depend on financing from the Federal Government to export their products and invest overseas.

During this shutdown, the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation cannot provide new loans or insurance to U.S. companies. This means that every month those companies—U.S. companies—lose $2 to $4 billion in revenues, jeopardizing some 30,000 American jobs.

If the shutdown continues, the Department of State, which conducts all kinds of services for Americans and programs overseas, will be severely affected. In fiscal year 2011, when the Federal Government came close to shutting down, the Department estimated that 70 percent of its Washington staff would be furloughed.

Do our Tea Party friends think these Federal workers just sit idly at their desks doing nothing? That they are some kind of luxury we cannot afford? Wait until one of their constituents is falsely arrested and imprisoned overseas, or robbed, or badly injured, and there is no one at the State Department to help them. Almost 800,000 children under the age of 5 die of diarrhea annually, mostly due to unsafe drinking water and poor sanitation. Those deaths are entirely preventable. A prolonged government shutdown would mean curtailing water and sanitation programs for millions of people in the world's poorest countries—programs that have always had strong bipartisan support.

Malaria causes half a billion deaths a year, 90 percent of them children. A continued shutdown would force the U.S. Agency for International Development to stop funding malaria prevention programs, putting tens of thousands of lives at risk.

Speaker BOEHNER is right. Shutting down the Federal Government is ''not a damned game.'' But what the House is doing is playing Russian roulette with the U.S. economy and people's lives. There is no excuse for it, and the Speaker has two choices: stop it, or continue to roll the dice with the U.S. economy and the lives of millions of American families and programs that protect our Nation's security.

At the State Department, the shutdown has already forced the cancelation of International visitors programs that enable future foreign leaders to experience this country first hand. Instead of seeing what a great country this is, they see our political system in disarray. It is embarrassing for our embassies and should be embarrassing to all of us.

Despite the shutdown, the State Department still must ensure the health, safety, and welfare of nearly 10,000 academic exchange participants in the United States and abroad. Either those students and scholars will have to return home, or the organizations and universities that are responsible for implementing the exchanges continue operating without knowing if, or when, their costs will be paid.

We have heard about the impact of the shutdown on the U.S. national security establishment, including the Department of Defense and the intelligence community. But the shutdown may also affect the State Department's anti-terrorism programs that support law enforcement and border controls in countries highly vulnerable to terrorist threats, such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Kenya, and Niger.

The shutdown has halted trade talks between the EU and the United States on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Plan. This deal would harmonize U.S. and EU regulatory standards, and eliminate trade barriers. It would bring real benefits to the U.S. economy. Yet the Tea Party shutdown has prevented U.S. trade officials from traveling to Brussels to negotiate with their EU counterparts. Instead, EU diplomats remain at the ready to talk to nobody.

Because of the shutdown, President Obama had to cancel his trip to Asia this week. We hear quite a bit about the Administration's ''pivot to Asia,'' but it is hard to pivot in another direction if you can't even get one foot out of your own country.

Who made it to the Summit instead? China's President Xi filled President

Obama's seat next to Vladimir Putin. Is this who the tea party wants to lead in the lower income Asian countries? For the sake of our economy and national security, we need our President to have a seat at the table.

The list goes on and on, but these are just a few of the impacts of the shutdown that are only beginning to be felt. As this needless work stoppage drags on and more people are furloughed and programs are cancelled, our diplomats, our international development programs, our leadership in international organizations, and our national security will suffer.

It is as foolhardy as it is wasteful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am pleased to be here on the Senate floor this afternoon. I am saddened by the circumstances we find ourselves in and look for a solid, responsible, and quick resolution to our differences in regard to continuing resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California Mrs. BOXER follow me upon the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, again, under the circumstances we find ourselves in, I look forward to a quick and responsible resolution to the differences we have and that we move forward with the funding of our Federal Government.

I would point out that a reason we are at this point is we need a continuing resolution because the Senate failed to do its work in the first place. While, for the first time in 4 years, the Senate passed a budget, it was never reconciled in conference with the House. I am certainly a Republican who would be supportive of that reconciliation of the conference committee to work out the differences between a House-passed budget and the Senate-passed budget.

The reality is that there are 12 appropriations bills—and I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I take that responsibility very seriously. I was excited to become a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee when I arrived here at the Senate. I saw it as an opportunity for us to establish our priorities and determine what we should be spending money on. Yet not 1 of the 12 bills that are required for us to pass across the Senate floor has been passed this year; therefore, on September 30 we ended up with no funding in place, and it creates this opportunity for us to have this debate and discussion about a continuing resolution at a time in which there is great leverage on that issue.

What I lament and what I wish would have happened is we would have passed 12 appropriations bills and then worked out the differences with the appropriations process in the House.

Today I want to speak about a particular issue related to the shutdown of the Federal Government—the lack of funding. Prior to that occurring—prior to September 30—both the House and Senate and the President signed legislation called Pay Our Military Act. It was designed to make certain that our military men and women had compensation should there be a shutdown. I appreciate that legislation passing and am pleased it is in place now we are in the circumstance we are in. There were rumors and concerns about how that bill would be implemented by the Department of Defense. The Senator from West Virginia Mr. MANCHIN and I led an effort in which we had 50 Senators in a highly bipartisan way ask the Secretary of Defense to interpret that legislation in a broad way that would make certain our furloughed civilian employees who support our military men and women, as well as our Reserve component—those who serve in the National Guard and Reserve—would be put back to work for the benefit of the Nation's security.

I thank Secretary of Defense Hagel for his decision to implement that legislation in a broad way that did exactly that—returned furloughed civilian workers at DOD, the Department of Defense, back to work, and gave the ability for our National Guard and Reserve members to continue in their responsibilities for defending our country. Again, I thank Secretary Hagel.

I am here today to point out that we have an additional problem, in fact, one that is equally, if not more, serious than that, and that is that we have read and heard that those who die in the active service of our country are not now able to receive the death benefits that come to their families upon their death. I can't imagine that there is a Senator of any political party or persuasion who thinks that is a desirable outcome.

With Senator MANCHIN and others, we worked at bringing this issue to the attention of the Department of Defense, asking Secretary Hagel, in a letter that was led by Senator COONS and Senator BLUNT, to use every opportunity, full authority, wide flexibility—whatever circumstances the Department of Defense could find—to provide the benefits to those who died in service to our country.

There is a special tax-free payment of $100,000 to eligible survivors of members of the armed forces who are killed in action. Those benefits usually arrive within the first 3 days following the death of a service man or woman. This helps the family—certainly not overcome their loss—to have the necessary funds for funeral services, to travel in this case to Dover Air Force Base to meet their loved one as he or she returns home, and to overcome the lack of a regular paycheck. This death gratuity is such a small price to pay to honor and recognize someone's family who has lost a member of their family in service to our country.

At least the stories are, the reports are that this situation is due to the inability of us to resolve—to work with the President, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate—the continuing resolution, and so work is being done so that the death benefit will be available. My understanding is that the House of Representatives is poised to pass legislation to make certain that the Department of Defense has the authority to immediately pay those benefits. I hope that is a piece of legislation that is met with unanimity of support here in the Senate.

We have asked Secretary of Defense Hagel if he has the ability to do that within his current legal jurisdiction, within the law—if he has the ability to do that within the law that he does have—and we anxiously await and hope the Secretary can do that. But, if not, I hope this Senate will unanimously confirm that legislation that would allow the Secretary to pay those benefits immediately.

Again, I just can't imagine any of my colleagues ever thinking that under any circumstance, we ought not step forward to resolve this issue. Just because we can't resolve everything—it seems to me there is a method of operation too often here in the Senate that if we can't solve every problem, we are unwilling to solve any problem. On those things on which there is such significant agreement, we ought not let anything stand in the way of coming to the aid and rescue of a family who now so desperately grieves the loss of their loved one.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT PATRICK HAWKINS

We know over the weekend there were five soldiers killed in Afghanistan. There are five families as of today who would be in this circumstance. I would like to pay tribute to one of those five: SGT Patrick Hawkins. He was born October 1, 1988. He graduated from high school and enlisted in the Army in his hometown of Carlisle, PA.

SGT Patrick Hawkins, according to his Italian commander, was described as a brave and incredibly talented Ranger. The description of his death revolved around the fact that he was moving to aid another wounded Ranger when he was killed. His actions, according to, again, his commander, were in keeping with the epitome of the Ranger creed, which is, ''I will never leave a fallen comrade.''

Sergeant Hawkins dedicated himself to serving us—to serving our families, to serving all Americans—and he ultimately paid for that service with the loss of his life. I pay tribute to this soldier as an example of many who have sacrificed in similar ways over a long period of time, but especially for those five who this weekend lost their lives in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Hawkins was awarded the Bronze Star and the Meritorious Service Medal. He was awarded a Purple Heart. None of that replaces the loss of life. He is survived by his wife, who is

a resident of Lansing, KS, and her parents, who are residents of my hometown of Plainville, KS.

So today, on behalf of my colleagues in the Senate, I pay tribute to a soldier who in serving his country lost his life, who leaves behind grieving family members and friends, and who epitomizes what we all should know in service here in the Senate, which is what I spoke about earlier on the Senate floor this week. That is, if we need a reminder about how this place should work, we should look to our service men and women who, for no partisan reason—no Republican or Democratic reason—volunteered to serve their country. They concluded there were things much more important than life itself, and that being the ability to have a country that we know and enjoy as the United States of America, that has the freedom and liberties guaranteed to us by our Constitution, and creates the opportunity for every American to pursue what we all call the American dream.

Today, I pay tribute to one more hero, one more soldier, one more American who, through service to others, was willing to sacrifice his life for the betterment of his family back home and for the future of a country that we all love and call home, the United States of America.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, would it be possible—because Senator CASEY and I were each thinking we would get 10 minutes and we are willing to cut that to 15 minutes between the two of us—could we ask unanimous consent, if the Republicans don't mind, just slipping a little bit, because people took extra time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. So we will each have about 7½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we are going to fix the injustice my colleague spoke about—the injustice to the families who lost their loved ones. Let me be clear about one of those five families who were denied the benefit and someone important to me a constituent of mine—Army 1LT Jennifer Moreno from San Diego, who was killed this weekend in Afghanistan by a roadside bomb. Jennifer was 25 years old. Because of this shutdown brought to us by the Republicans, those families have to suffer even more than they are already suffering.

Let's be clear. This never had to happen. This government has been shut down by the Republicans for one reason, and JOHN BOEHNER was honest about it. He said:

> The American people don't want to shut down the government, but the American people don't want ObamaCare. They don't want the Affordable Care Act.

Let me say that to close down the government because a person doesn't like a law that was passed almost 4 years ago, to shut down the government because a presidential election was lost and which was based, in large part, on this—to shut down the government, to keep our people—millions of them—from getting affordable care for the first time, it is a disgrace. It is. There is no other way to say it, except maybe it was said beautifully here. It was said beautifully here by the chaplain: ''Enough is enough.''

We are going to fix this problem; of course we are, this indignity our military families had to face. But let's be clear: It never would have happened if the government had been open.

We have two things that are in our job description. I know the Presiding Officer knows that quite well. One is to keep the doors of government open officially. We do our best, but we don't always succeed. There are problems here and there. Keep the doors open. Just as a pilot has to fly a plane, just like a teacher has to teach a class, just like a nurse has to give a vaccination, we have a basic responsibility to keep this government open, and we know how to do it. They pass a budget over in the House, we pass it in the Senate, the conference is called, they hammer it out, and we have a budget plan, and none of this would be happening. Let's be clear. The Republicans have objected now 21 times—21 times—to Senator MURRAY, the chairman of our Budget Committee, so she can sit and confer with her counterpart, PAUL RYAN, and hammer out the details of a long-term budget. But, no. The Republicans don't want to do that. They want to hold the country hostage. They want to put our backs up against the wall, or the backs of the American people. Why? They don't like the health care law.

If a person doesn't like a law, that person tries to repeal it. They tried to repeal it 43 times. It went nowhere. If you don't like a law, try to replace the people who support the law. Oh, they tried. They tried and they failed. I served with five Presidents, three of them Republican. I didn't like everything they did; believe me. But after they won and they had an agenda, I did what I could, and so did my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to carry it out the best I could, to fix it where I could.

Let me just say this: We are in a shutdown because they are throwing a temper tantrum about the health care law, the Affordable Care Act. I wish to share some news with them, because I went home to see how the health care law is working in my State. I want to say what I know. I know it is working. By now we have had more than a million distinct visitors to our site, coveredCA.com. We have tens of thousands of applications. We have completed more than 20,000. Small businesses by the hundreds are coming on to the site.

In the time I have remaining, let me read to my colleagues about one woman the Republicans want to stop from getting health care by shutting down the government. According to the Associated Press, nothing could dissuade Rachel Mansfield of La Quinta, who sent in an application to Covered California last week. Rachel has been waiting for the exchange to start so she and her husband could get health insurance. Rachel is self-employed. Her parents currently pay a $530 monthly premium for her coverage. Her husband has been rejected for health coverage because he was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. Rachel's new premium, instead of it being $530 for just her, will be $400 for both of them, with higher quality coverage than she currently has.

That is why the Republicans are having a temper tantrum, to stop my constituent from, for the first time, having peace of mind and having good insurance? Come on. If you don't like the law, work with us. We can make it better.

Then there is Melissa Harris. According to the Fresno Bee, Melissa stopped at a CoveredCA tent on campus. She is paying $600 a month with help from her family for insurance through her former employer. She has diabetes and hypertension and, under the Affordable Care Act—which prevents insurance companies from denying coverage for preexisting conditions—she can now afford health insurance on her own. And the quote from her, from my constituent is, ''It's a Godsend for me—a blessing.''

It is a blessing. And that is why the Republicans are shutting down the government, to stop my constituent from getting a blessing of health insurance.

There was another story of a man who waited on the phone for 40 minutes, and he finally got on. He signed up and he said: You know what, I have been waiting for years. Forty minutes was nothing.

So I say to my friends, the law is the law. Open the government, pay our bills, and we will negotiate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator's time is expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the rest of the time to Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, thank you very much. I know our time is limited.

I want to start on an issue that I think all of us are coming together on no matter what party we are in, and that is what has been happening to our military families.

On Sunday, as noted by the Senator from Kansas a few moments ago, SGT Patrick Hawkins from Carlisle, PA, was killed in action in Afghanistan when his unit was hit with an IED, an improvised explosive device. Sergeant Hawkins was moving to the aid of a wounded Ranger when he was killed. Due to the shutdown, Sergeant Hawkins' family cannot receive the death

benefit provided to soldiers to cover the funeral and burial expenses for that family.

Today I am joining an effort with a number of Senators writing to urge Secretary Hagel to use whatever discretion he has to provide the death benefits to the Hawkins family as well as the other families so we can meet the promise we made to those families. I know the President is working on this issue, is working with the Office of Management and Budget and the Defense Department on a solution to this problem.

Mr. President, I will move to the question of where we are now. This is a shutdown brought about by the tea party. We know that if Speaker BOEHNER would simply hold a vote on the bill that is before him, which would fund the government, this crisis would be over.

So we should continue to take steps, No. 1, to open our government; No. 2, to pay our bills and make sure we do not miss a bill and default; and No. 3, to negotiate—or I would argue to continue to negotiate because we already negotiated a budget number which was much lower than our side of the aisle wanted. We agreed to $70 billion less from the other side. If that is not a compromise and a negotiation, I do not know what is.

We know this sentiment and this position to make sure the government opens is a point of view that is shared by Democrats, Republicans, and Independents across the country. By way of example, nine Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation—four Republicans and five Democrats—are supportive of a so-called clean bill that does not have attachments to it, to open the government, to make sure we can have a functioning government, to pay our bills, and then work together on longer term solutions. Just a couple of examples—and I know our time is limited.

As this tea party shutdown moves into its second week, the Women, Infants and Children Program—we know it by the acronym WIC—will no longer be able to be funded in many States across the country. We know this program provides nutritional services to more than 8.9 million participants per month, including 4.7 million children and 2.1 million infants. A quarter of a million of my constituents in Pennsylvania depend upon this program. For now—for now—the State government is using carryover funds to keep the WIC Program running in Pennsylvania. If the government shutdown continues to stretch on, this may put the program in jeopardy.

We know the impact this shutdown is having on older citizens across Pennsylvania and across the country. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is no longer able to provide health care provider oversight. While Medicare claims are still being paid, the shutdown has caused a reduction in the number of initial surveys and recertifications for Medicare and Medicaid providers. If providers are unable to be certified, then they cannot serve beneficiaries.

Home- and community-based services are adversely impacted. We know that even though Social Security checks are going out, at the same time those who are hoping to be enrolled in Social Security do not have that opportunity.

Let me read from a letter we got from a constituent in northeastern Pennsylvania talking about this individual's parents.

> Besides our personal difficulties due to the Budget Impasse, my elderly parents live with the worry of when and if they will receive their Social Security checks. At 85 and 83, they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my Mother saying she can't sleep and has a stomach ache from the worry about where our country is heading. Middle and low income families cannot afford another economic downturn, we are just barely recovering from the last one.

That entire passage came from one individual in northeastern Pennsylvania writing about her parents, and I think that is the best summation I have read about what this is doing to people. The worry and the anxiety, in addition to the harsh impact, are things we should not accept.

Finally, I will conclude with some comments about national security.

I support—and I know this is widely shared—the passage of the Pay Our Military Act and welcome the Defense Department's decision to bring the majority of furloughed staff back. We mentioned the death benefits for families. We are all together on that. But all the while—all the while—that the Speaker does not put a bill on the floor that will open the government, we see the impacts on our national security. Seventy percent of the intel community's workforce has been furloughed. These are people who work every day to keep us safe from terrorists, and they are not able to work. The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Asset Control has a skeletal crew, and they are not able to do their work, which is part of our national security.

So if we are doing the right thing, and if the Speaker and his party in the House are doing the right thing, they would vote today to open the government, to ensure that we pay our bills, and to continue to negotiate. It is very simple. What they have in front of them is a 16-page bill. I think they could pass it this afternoon and reopen our government and give that family in northeastern Pennsylvania some measure of peace of mind instead of the worry and the anxiety and the fear that are caused by both the government shutdown and efforts made to even contemplate defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 58

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last Saturday the House voted 400 to 1 to express the view that a government shutdown should not interfere with the ability of military chaplains to provide services for our servicemembers. The House took that vote amid reports that chaplains were limited in their ability to minister to those who sought their services even if ministers were doing so on a volunteer basis.

We have heard reports that those who have scheduled baptisms might not be able to have them. Obviously, this is not a tolerable situation. We have a very large military presence in Kentucky. The folks at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox do not need this. We need to remedy the situation immediately and care for the troops who have volunteered to defend us.

The House has already taken a stand, in an overwhelming, bipartisan basis—only one vote against it. It is time for the Senate to do the same. So I would call on the majority to allow a vote to express the Senate's views that servicemembers in my State and every other State or overseas should be able to receive religious services. This is one vote we should have today. Some of my colleagues will talk this afternoon about some of the other votes we should also have. The government may be shut down, but our service men and women should not be caught in the middle of this impasse.

I had indicated to my colleague, the majority leader, that I would ask unanimous consent after my remarks, which I will proceed to do now. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 58, which was received from the House; I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, there is no question when we look across the Senate or across the House, people of different political parties, people of different faiths all support any kind of religious service for members of the armed services. There is no question about that. Our budgets indicate that every year. That is a widely held point of view.

Unfortunately, what we are seeing is a continuation of an effort to pick and choose what areas of our government should be funded. We should not have an exercise where we choose between our soldiers and our kids or between

one priority versus the other. We should vote and work together to open the government. It is as simple as that. Open every service that is part of the Federal Government.

Open the government, pay our bills, and continue negotiations which started a long time ago on the current budget. I come from a State which has well more than 1 million veterans. No State in the country has contributed more to the armed services of the United States than Pennsylvania. I will take a backseat to no one when it comes to supporting our troops and supporting their families.

That is why we are all coming together to make sure the death benefit is paid for those who recently lost their lives, including Sergeant Hawkins from Pennsylvania. But this process we are going through today is just another attempt to not deal directly with the question of how we are going to operate the Federal Government.

We should urge our colleagues in the House to have a vote today. It would take a matter of minutes for the House to vote on a bill that will open the government, allow us to make sure we are paying our bills, and do everything we can to continue to work together on a longer term budget agreement.

So I would first offer a modification and ask unanimous consent as follows: that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, expressing the sense of the Congress that the House should vote on the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution passed by the Senate; that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Republican leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CASEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Republican whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there are obviously differences in this Chamber over the fiscal direction of our country, but we should be united in our efforts to do right by our uniformed military and their families and certainly their survivors. The way they have been treated is simply unacceptable—indeed, it is outrageous. The President's spokesman today said he is looking for a solution. We are here to offer one to him. Washington has not gotten a lot right lately but now is our chance. The legislation I will be offering a unanimous consent request on would right this wrong by ensuring that the families of the fallen receive four essential benefits: the death gratuity benefit, the coverage of funeral and burial expenses, coverage of travel to both the funeral and the dignified transfer of their loved one's remains and the temporary continuation of their housing allowance.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 91, making continuing appropriations for survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers for fiscal year 2014, the measure be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, would my friend agree that we have just learned that the President said he would solve this in the next hour. Would my friend be willing to wait until 4 o'clock today and renew his request at that time if it has not been done?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, responding to the distinguished majority leader, if that will help facilitate this getting done, we would be glad to work with him. Hopefully, we can find another area, as we did for military pay for our uniformed military, where we can begin to mitigate the hardship caused by this shutdown.

Mr. REID. I think on this issue it would be the best way to proceed; that we can do something together, and hopefully the White House will be in on what we are trying to do. So I ask my friend to renew this at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if businesses ran their operations the same way the government is running this shutdown, they would be bankrupt. Oh, that is right. That is kind of where we are, isn't it.

Our national parks, particularly the ones that are revenue producers, are shut down. Yellowstone Park is a revenue producer. You pay to go into the park. You pay to travel through the park. The roads connect Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. It is a thoroughfare. You have to pay to be able to do that. But right now you cannot do that, which means you probably have to travel an extra 300 miles to get to your destination.

The park does not get the revenue, and not only that, there are people in the park who are visiting there and they have been made to leave. They were made to leave in a very ungracious way. One of the tours was from Japan, Australia, Canada, and some people from the United States. They had reservations at Old Faithful. That is one of the historic places in the park, one place that everybody goes because they like to see the geyser go off. It is probably the most famous geyser in the world.

But they were told they had to leave. They had 2 days of reservations. They said: OK. You can stay for the 2 days. But an armed guard was outside of their room and they could not leave their room to go watch the geyser go off, which they do not have any control over, nor can they harm. It has been written up as Gestapo tactics that met senior citizens in Yellowstone Park.

So we are giving up the revenue and we are creating a bad impression. We should not be doing that. We ought to be taking revenue. The revenue is a little more difficult than that because we have concessionaires in the park, people who run the hotels and the stores and the filling stations and the other services in there. They pay a fee for doing that and a percentage of what they take in. So we are not getting that percentage now either.

They are losing about $4.9 million a week by not being able to be open. There are a lot of other things I could say about the way the parks are being treated here and around the country, but the ones that are revenue-producing are particularly egregious.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 203, H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations; I ask further that the measure be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I appreciate the motion of my colleague, as someone who comes from a State where tourism is the No. 3—and we have 38 million people—it is the No. 3 business in our State. We have national parks. But guess what. You fellows over there, you did not take care of all of my recreation land under the Army Corps. You did not take care of all of the BLM land.

This whole notion of funding the government piecemeal is absurd. This is the greatest Nation on Earth. All you can do is come with these little, mini, piecemeal bills. Let's face it. We would not be going through any of this angst, and my friend would not have to have any of that emotion if the Republicans had not shut down the government.

I wish to state the rest of my reservation. We certainly support the notion that our parks should open, but we also support the notion that this government should open. If the Senators don't like certain functions, let's duke it out and find out which ones we have the votes to do away with. I know a lot of you don't like the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act. Fine, let's fight that out.

I see my colleague from Wyoming is here. He and I are constantly debating the issue of what should be a priority, but we don't do it this way. We need the entire Federal Government open. People need to get paid. The communities around the parks, around the

BLM land, around the Corps recreational lands, around our NASA Ames facility, and I could go on and on—they need to be paid because the mom-and-pop shops are suffering. We don't do government by piecemeal, not in the greatest Nation on Earth.

This reminds me of a woman who is drowning and someone goes to rescue her, but he only takes her halfway to the shore and leaves her to drown. This is what this is about. We don't say: I will save this child, but this one I don't have to save. I will save this community because I kind of like it, but this community, sorry. No one party has a right to do it, not the Republican Party, not the Democratic Party. We don't have the right to decide which kids live and which kids die, which families thrive and which sink, and which communities suffer and which communities don't. None should suffer, not in this Nation.

Open the government, pay our bills, and let's negotiate. Let's negotiate on everything.

I have a modification to suggest to the unanimous consent request, if I might.

I ask unanimous consent that the consent be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Wyoming so modify his request?

Mr. ENZI. Reserving the right to object, the reason we are in this mess right now is because we didn't do the budgets piecemeal. We are supposed to do them piecemeal. We are supposed to do 12 separate spending bills. We are supposed to do them one at a time. We are supposed to have the right to amend them. This way we can get into the details of what we are spending, instead of an Omnibus bill, which is what is being suggested by this amendment.

Had we gone through each of those, we could have had all of these discussions. This is how we should do it, which is our second most important task. Our most important one, of course, is the defense of our country, but the second most important one is the spending bills, and we are not doing the spending bills. I know the other side will say: Well, we brought out one, it was filibustered, and we didn't get cloture on it. We only did that one time. There should have been every one of these bills brought up with the right to amend and then they wouldn't have been filibustered. Then they could have been passed when the House sent their companion bill. Since we didn't do the process right, we are stuck with the continuing resolution.

Piecemeal is one way we can get it through. There was a request for a conference between the two sides. That was turned down by the Democrats. It would have been a chance to raise all of these things at once. That was turned down.

I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object to the original request.

I feel I must respond. Senator MURRAY and I looked at each other and said: It feels as though it is ''Alice in Wonderland.''

Where were my colleagues 21 times when the chairman of the Budget Committee or her representatives asked to go to conference on the budget resolution, in which the conferees would negotiate how to fund the various parts of government, and that instruction would be sent to the appropriators? I do not understand what is happening here.

All we hear on the other side is negotiate, negotiate. They won't remember—selective memory, perhaps—that they objected 21 times to going to negotiations on the budget.

I have to say, this is the saddest display coming from the Republicans, who serve in the greatest legislative body in the world, to try to fund this government on a piecemeal basis, leaving some of our families winners and some of our families losers. It is pathetic, and they have caused this Republican shutdown. They can end it.

Because I feel my friend's narrow, piecemeal approach to running this country is very wrong for this country, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Does the Senator from Wyoming still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. ENZI. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. My friend from Wyoming mentioned the fact that we should bring up appropriations bills. As someone who has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for quite a long time, I would remind my friend from Wyoming that earlier this year, on the first appropriations bill that we passed out of committee under the leadership of Senator MIKULSKI—it was the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill—if I am not mistaken, it had a number of Republican votes in committee. It was brought out onto the floor. An extraneous amendment was offered by the Senator from Kentucky, whereupon I believe Senator MIKULSKI, our leader, filed cloture on the bill so we could vote on the appropriations bill.

I say to my friend from Wyoming that all the Republicans on that side voted against cloture, voted against taking up that one appropriations bill—I am sorry, I am reminded that we had one Republican, the Republican from the State of Maine who did vote to go to cloture on that bill, one Republican out of all those on the other side.

I say to my friend from Wyoming, we tried to bring up the appropriations bill. It was Republicans who objected to even dealing with that appropriations bill. I would ask my friend from Wyoming if he had looked at that history and understood what had happened on the bill that came up at the time.

I thank my friend from Wyoming for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I have looked at both of the histories that have been discussed. One of them is the budget. The failure of the budget to not have a conference committee did not stop the Appropriations Committee from going through and doing 12 appropriations bills. I think that is what I count on the calendar that could have been brought up. There was only the one brought up.

The Senator has said, appropriately, that in committee there ought to be some amendments, but on the floor there were none.

What we have spent a lot of time on around the body this year is try to negotiate how few amendments would be brought up. That has taken longer than it would have taken to vote on the whole issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Eagle Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eagle Tribune, Oct. 8, 2013]

'GESTAPO' TACTICS MEET SENIOR CITIZENS AT YELLOWSTONE

(By John Macone)

NEWBURYPORT.—Pat Vaillancourt went on a trip last week that was intended to showcase some of America's greatest treasures.

Instead, the Salisbury resident said she and others on her tour bus witnessed an ugly spectacle that made her embarrassed, angry and heartbroken for her country.

Vaillancourt was one of thousands of people who found themselves in a national park as the federal government shutdown went into effect on Oct. 1. For many hours her tour group, which included senior citizen visitors from Japan, Australia, Canada and the United States, were locked in a Yellowstone National Park hotel under armed guard.

The tourists were treated harshly by armed park employees, she said, so much so that some of the foreign tourists with limited English skills thought they were under arrest.

When finally allowed to leave, the bus was not allowed to halt at all along the 2.5-hour trip out of the park, not even to stop at private bathrooms that were open along the route.

''We've become a country of fear, guns and control,'' said Vaillancourt, who grew up in

Lawrence. ''It was like they brought out the armed forces. Nobody was saying, 'we're sorry,' it was all like—'' as she clenched her fist and banged it against her forearm.

Vaillancourt took part in a nine-day tour of western parks and sites along with about four dozen senior citizen tourists. One of the highlights of the tour was to be Yellowstone, where they arrived just as the shutdown went into effect.

Rangers systematically sent visitors out of the park, though some groups that had hotel reservations—such as Vaillancourt's—were allowed to stay for two days. Those two days started out on a sour note, she said.

The bus stopped along a road when a large herd of bison passed nearby, and seniors filed out to take photos. Almost immediately, an armed ranger came by and ordered them to get back in, saying they couldn't ''recreate.'' The tour guide, who had paid a $300 fee the day before to bring the group into the park, argued that the seniors weren't ''recreating,'' just taking photos.

''She responded and said, 'Sir, you are recreating,' and her tone became very aggressive,'' Vaillancourt said.

The seniors quickly filed back onboard and the bus went to the Old Faithful Inn, the park's premier lodge located adjacent to the park's most famous site, Old Faithful geyser. That was as close as they could get to the famous site—barricades were erected around Old Faithful, and the seniors were locked inside the hotel, where armed rangers stayed at the door.

''They looked like Hulk Hogans, armed. They told us you can't go outside,'' she said. ''Some of the Asians who were on the tour said, 'Oh my God, are we under arrest?' They felt like they were criminals.''

By Oct. 3 the park, which sees an average of 4,500 visitors a day, was nearly empty. The remaining hotel visitors were required to leave.

As the bus made its 2.5-hour journey out of Yellowstone, the tour guide made arrangements to stop at a full-service bathroom at an in-park dude ranch he had done business with in the past. Though the bus had its own small bathroom, Vaillancourt said seniors were looking for a more comfortable place to stop. But no stop was made—Vaillancourt said the dude ranch had been warned that its license to operate would be revoked if it allowed the bus to stop. So the bus continued on to Livingston, Mont., a gateway city to the park.

The bus trip made headlines in Livingston, where the local newspaper Livingston Enterprise interviewed the tour guide, Gordon Hodgson, who accused the park service of ''Gestapo tactics.''

''The national parks belong to the people,'' he told the Enterprise. ''This isn't right.''

Calls to Yellowstone's communications office were not returned, as most of the personnel have been furloughed.

Many of the foreign visitors were shocked and dismayed by what had happened and how they were treated, Vaillancourt said.

''A lot of people who were foreign said they wouldn't come back (to America),'' she said.

The National Parks' aggressive actions have spawned significant criticism in western states. Governors in park-rich states such as Arizona have been thwarted in their efforts to fund partial reopenings of parks. The Washington Times quoted an unnamed Park Service official who said park law enforcement personnel were instructed to ''make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting.''

The experience brought up many feelings in Vaillancourt. What struck her most was a widely circulated story about a group of World War II veterans who were on a trip to Washington, D.C., to see the World War II memorial when the shutdown began. The memorial was barricaded and guards were posted, but the vets pushed their way in.

That reminded her of her father, a World War II veteran who spent three years in a Japanese prisoner of war camp.

''My father took a lot of crap from the Japanese,'' she recalled, her eyes welling with tears. ''Every day they made him bow to the Japanese flag. But he stood up to them.

''He always said to stand up for what you believe in, and don't let them push you around,'' she said, adding she was sad to see ''fear, guns and control'' turned on citizens in her own country.

Mr. ENZI. I object, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. For the benefit of those on the other side of the aisle, I am not going to end my remarks with the issue of a unanimous consent, but I still have things I wish to say.

No one supports a government shutdown, not my side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle. Could we have avoided this situation? Sure. The government could be open and fully operating today but for the majority. There was an unwillingness to engage in a legitimate debate over proposals to amend ObamaCare or any other issues that have come before us, not even having a debate on those pieces that have come over from the other body. Hiding behind a motion to table is a way of avoiding debate.

As we know, the House passed and the Senate defeated three different continuing resolutions. Each one of those would have kept the government open and prevented a shutdown, but they were rejected by the Senate majority.

We are in this position because the majority refused to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans or as we now in Congress will be treated when it comes to health insurance.

We could have considered each of the 12 individual appropriations bills and passed them into law. But the Senate Democratic leadership has been derelict in that responsibility.

The Senate did not get into debate on a single one of those bills prior to the end of the fiscal year. I heard what my colleague from Iowa said, that one was brought up, then amendments were filed, and there wasn't a motion to move ahead. The point is the Senate is a deliberative body. Every Senator has a right to offer an amendment. We were denied that right by the majority or at least weren't assured of that right by the majority, and that is why cloture was not granted.

Of course, what the American people deserve is fair consideration of all the money we appropriate. We don't get that consideration on a continuing resolution, we get it lumped into one piece of legislation. We should, as the Senator from Wyoming said, be considering separate appropriations bills.

I remember not too long ago that a chairman of an Appropriations Committee on the other side of the aisle, when they were in the majority, was bragging to the Senate that for the first time in a long time the Senate passed every single appropriations bill before the end of the fiscal year. If it could be done then, why can't it be done now? But it isn't going to be done if we aren't willing to debate the bills.

It seems to me the American people, the taxpayers, deserve a thoughtful and good-faith effort to find common ground on our spending matters. It is a duty to pass spending bills.

Passing a continuing resolution has become a new normal around here. That is not right. It is not acceptable. While we wait for the Senate majority and the President of the United States to come to the negotiating table and end their government shutdown, we should be working to fund or reopen areas of government where there is agreement.

This is what we did when we passed the Pay Our Military Act, where we all agreed to pay those both in and out of uniform who defend our freedom. We made a commitment to them because of their commitment to our country. The military people deserve that piece of legislation.

This is what we should be doing to open our national parks and monuments. That is what we should be doing to ensure the critically important work of the National Institutes of Health.

Why hold these widely supported and critically necessary areas hostage? Why is the majority insisting on an all-or-nothing approach? Why can't we agree to fund these things we agree on and negotiate the rest?

At the very least, a little bit of common sense ought to prevail. It was common sense, for instance, when the minority leader made the point about chaplains. It is common sense that chaplains have an obedience not only to the government but to a higher authority, and they ought to be able to exercise that wherever they are.

We have a situation that the parks aren't open. We have a situation where the World War II Memorial was closed down. Open-air memorials have never been closed down when we had shutdowns in the past. A little common sense prevailing would avoid a lot of these situations we are bringing before the Senate for consideration.

Remember, the House of Representatives has passed legislation to keep the government open, and the Senate has refused it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 85

Mr. COATS. There is an interesting debate going on without achieving any results. Let me take a crack at trying to make a more persuasive argument to see if my colleagues across the aisle would agree.

We can disagree on what is an essential function of government, what is a

constitutional function, what we ought to be funding and not funding. That is some of the debate we are in today.

I don't think anyone can disagree that an essential function of government is providing for our national defense, providing for homeland security, protecting Americans from terrorist threats, and responding to natural disasters. There is an organization in the government called the Federal Emergency Management Agency—FEMA is the common name—which is there to provide support to first responders whenever a natural disaster hits, whenever an intended disaster through an act of terrorism threatens this country or threatens Americans. These are functions that have to be immediately responded to, and FEMA has, over the years, improved significantly its ability to play a critical, crucial role in responding to these types of efforts that put Americans at risk.

What I am bringing forward, because we now know that while some functions of FEMA are being supported and funded and manned, many of those who would be essential should a disaster hit, whether it is natural or manmade, have been furloughed and are not available to assist in that first response. So I am simply asking that we consider seriously and gain support for the funding of FEMA to its full extent.

We have recently seen natural disasters in the United States. We had tornadoes roar through southern Indiana. FEMA was there just last year immediately. We are still in hurricane season, though we have been very fortunate this year and have not had a major hurricane land on the continental United States. Karen was in the gulf, but it dissipated. I might remind my colleagues hurricane season runs to November 30, so we are not out of the woods yet.

We have just seen a disaster in the Upper Midwest with an unprecedented amount of snow falling affecting ranchers, affecting communities; and some of our Northern States—South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, and others—have seen massive flooding and wildfires throughout the West. All of these are disasters that need to be responded to and FEMA plays a major role in all of that.

Who knows what potential terrorist attacks or threats are out there where we may need to have an immediate response. So what I am asking is that we consider funding FEMA at its current annual funding rate of $10.2 billion. This bill will extend funding for FEMA until December 15, but funding in the bill could end sooner if Congress, hopefully, reaches a larger budget agreement before that time. Hurricane season doesn't end until November 30, as I said. We can ensure this critical government function is not in any way limited by passing this bill, which was supported by 23 Democrats in the House of Representatives. So it does have bipartisan support.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 210, H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to commend my colleague from Indiana for noting the important role the Federal Government plays when it comes to natural disasters. There is not a Senator on this floor who hasn't seen this Federal response in his or her own home State because of a natural disaster. The Senator from Indiana is proposing we respond to these natural disasters with the government agencies that have been authorized, that are appropriated—usually appropriated—the funds to do so. He has picked one of them, FEMA, and he has picked it because of the possibility of a hurricane. That is a legitimate observation.

Unfortunately, the Senator from Indiana is not telling the whole story. FEMA plays an important role. Wouldn't the Senator like to have the National Weather Service fully funded so we could see the hurricane coming in advance? Sadly, it is a casualty of the Republican shutdown. Wouldn't the Senator like to have the Coast Guard available to have aerial observation of the oncoming hurricane and to provide that information to save lives? Sadly, it is not included in the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Indiana, and many of their functions are the victims of the Republican government shutdown.

I am sorry too that when it comes to the actual damage done by a disaster, FEMA plays an important role but not an exclusive role. The Senator from Indiana knows this, as I do from Illinois. Listen to the other agencies that are a critical part of responding to natural disasters: The Small Business Administration, they are usually the first on the scene with the Red Cross. Sadly, they are closed down because of the Republican shutdown of the government, and the Senator doesn't include them in his natural disaster request; DOT—Department of Transportation—and the need for emergency highways in the midst of hurricanes and tornadoes is not included in the request of the Senator from Indiana; the Corps of Engineers, the National Guard and Reserve, and the Public Health Service, none of these are included.

But the good news for the Senator from Indiana is we can take care of this together. I am going to suggest a modest modification to his request that covers all of the disaster agencies of the Federal Government that respond and keep us safe and do everything to put families back in their homes and businesses back in business. It is just a basic idea. Let's reopen the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senator from Indiana be modified: that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean, no-strings-attached continuing resolution for the entire government and every disaster agency of the Federal Government. It is something that is already in the House of Representatives and has, reportedly, the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I hope the Senator from Indiana will stick with me. Let's get the job done and accept this modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will Senator from Indiana so modify his request?

Mr. COATS. Reserving the right to object, I think my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, has made an important point. There are agencies that relate to the role FEMA plays when a natural disaster or our homeland security is threatened. I don't disagree with that. Therefore, I would be willing to modify my amendment to include the Coast Guard, the National Weather Service, and those agencies listed by the Senator from Illinois as a part of this. So directing this toward applying to natural disasters and threats to our homeland security, I think we should include those agencies. I think we could go forward with that request.

But I don't think that is what the Senator has offered. He offered a total CR, which we know is not going to go forward under the current circumstances, even though all of us want to get to that point. But as was discussed earlier by my colleagues, the regular order is usually to take appropriations—pieces of appropriations—and pass them on an individual basis. That simply is what we are doing, given the constraints we have that prevent us from doing that and coming forward.

I would say this: Three times the House has sent over opportunities to take up the full CR that have been rejected by the other side and a fourth opportunity to sit down and negotiate how we would go forward, which has also been rejected. So it works both ways.

If the Senator would be able to acknowledge the addition of what was listed directly related in his statement, then we could give that consideration here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as modified?

Mr. COATS. It is sort of a Ping-Pong game.

Mr. DURBIN. Which request, my request?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. As modified by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me see if I can clarify.

Reserving the right to object, I understand the Senator from Indiana acknowledges that just appropriating money for FEMA does not respond to natural disasters in America. I have offered a continuing resolution which includes all of the disaster agencies. I think what he is asking me to do is to rewrite his original unanimous consent request.

I would just like a yes or no when it comes to my request to modify his original request. I am not certain what he has asked of me for further modification. So I would ask for clarification either from the Senator from Indiana or from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Indiana further modify his request?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I am not able to modify the request that has been made, as I understand it, by the Senator from Illinois, because he goes beyond what he listed as being needed to just address natural disasters and threats to homeland security. He listed a number of agencies that play into that role.

My understanding—and he can clarify this if I am wrong—is that he wanted to expand my request that he consent to adding the limited portion of what he mentioned relating to the role of FEMA and our national security issues and homeland security issues that we are faced with, but he added to that the request for funding of the entire functions of government, and that I cannot consent to.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, this is why this approach is so awful. Coming to the floor with 11 requests for 11 agencies, we estimate there are another 79 requests that need to be made for us to fund our government.

Grow up, Senate. You can't do this one agency at a time. We will be here in December doing agency by agency. What we are offering is a continuing resolution to fund the government, including all of the disaster agencies.

I object to the original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3230

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 206, H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, we are again seeing a request to fund a small part of our government. This request refers to our National Guard and Reserve. These are amazing members of our American family who have given and sacrificed with great honor and who I find to a one are selfless. Not a one of them would say take care of me but do not take care of any of the other Americans who are home today or whose businesses have been hurt or who don't have the services they need because of this government shutdown. I would think the National Guard and Reserve would stand tall and say: Let's take care of every American. It is what I have sworn my own life to do, and it is what this Federal Government should do.

So instead of just taking a piecemeal approach—again, just asking to take care of the Guard and Reserve—I would say to the Senator that it is easy to do this. We can take up a unanimous consent request that has been offered a number of times on our side to simply open the government for all the functions and not those we pick and choose at the moment or by saying one American is more important than another American or one function is more important than another function. It would be like picking your children. We don't do that in our families and we shouldn't do it in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate—passed the Senate—and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota so modify his request?

Mr. HOEVEN. Reserving the right to object, the good Senator is talking about a resolution that has already gone from the Senate to the House. That has already been done. Why do we keep going back to things we don't have agreement on, rather than advancing on the things where we can get agreement?

We have instances where our National Guard is not getting paid. We have instances where our Reserve members are not being paid. We have instances where death benefits are not being paid to members of the military who made the ultimate sacrifice.

We passed the Pay Our Military Act. It went through the House, and it went through the Senate. We passed the Pay Our Military Act. All of our military members and the civilians who support them should be paid. We passed legislation to do that, whether it is Active Forces, Guard, or Reserve. We have done that.

What we are simply asking for here is a measure that would make sure that gets done. That is what we are asking for. Let's make sure they all get paid. We passed the legislation in both Houses. Let's start working on the things we can agree on. That is why I have asked for consent to proceed with the measure, and I object to the request to modify it.

Again, I ask unanimous consent that my original measure, H.R. 3230, Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act, be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, because this request doesn't resupply the stocks for our Guard and Reserve, it doesn't buy the tools or spare parts, it doesn't provide the energy and support they need to keep their facilities open, their electric bills can't be paid, their base maintenance can't be paid, they can't get their GI education benefits or mental health programs they need to make the transition home, because I believe—and I think all of us here believe—we should open all of those functions, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST H.J. RES. 84

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, despite all the noise going on, despite the fight we are having, I think one thing we can all agree is the most important thing for our country is to restore and save the American dream.

With all this talk of an economic recovery, it would shock people around this country who are struggling to find a job or perhaps have a job but the job is a dead-end job and it doesn't pay enough that they can't live off of what they are making—there are a lot of reasons that is happening, but one of the reasons that is happening is because in the 21st century, the jobs we need in order to make it to the middle class require a higher level of skill and education than they did in the past. This is particularly chronic and is hurting people who are growing up disadvantaged, especially children growing up in dangerous neighborhoods, with little access to education and broken families. They are struggling to get ahead, and we are seeing the impact of the societal breakdown every day.

We have a program called Head Start. This program helps children 5 years of age and younger. There are about 1 million kids a year who benefit from this program. It helps them get meals, it helps them get access to medical screenings, physical therapy for children with disabilities, and access to quality prekindergarten education for these children. This is not a perfect program. I would like to see reforms. I

would like to see this program become portable so that children and their families can access the best provider possible. But now is not the time for this debate. Now is the time to do everything we can to protect this program in the short term because as we speak there are thousands of children around this country already being impacted. In my State of Florida, almost 400 children have already been cut off from these services.

The reason I think this issue is different from the other ones that have been debated here is because the one thing you can't get back is time. Every day that goes by is one less day of education these children get. You can never give them back the time. You can always go back and pay somebody the money you owe them, but you can't give them back time.

So I would like to make a request that I hope will be accepted. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 84, which makes continuing appropriations for the Head Start Program, which was received from the House; I further ask that the measure be read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak before I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida, now wants to fund the Head Start Program. That is all well and good. We all recognize how invaluable the Head Start Program is. But I must say that listening to this request and the previous request and the other requests that have come up reminds me of an analogy.

The Republicans, quite frankly, have torn down the wall of government, and now they want to rebuild it brick by brick, but the way they want to rebuild it is by stacking the bricks. Here is a stack of bricks here, here is another stack of bricks, and here is another stack of bricks. Anyone will tell you that if you build a wall like that, it will be very weak. It won't hold together.

Our government is built from a wall of interconnected bricks. Look at a brick wall sometime. See how the bricks are interconnected. It provides strength. They all rely upon one another. They are interconnected. They provide a bulwark. If you stack those bricks one after the other, you will have a weak wall.

Now what the Republicans are saying is: Well, we have torn down that wall by shutting down the government. Now we want to build it brick by brick, but we will just stack them. We will have a brick here and a brick there.

This is what I am getting at with that analogy. The Senator from Florida wants to fund the Head Start Program—all well and good—but the Head Start Program is not a separate brick in that wall, it is interconnected to so many others.

A variety of other Federal programs are used in the Head Start Program. For example, States use the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program. They use the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—TANF—Program. They use the social services block grants to provide wraparound services. In this way, for example, they can use some of those funds to extend the Head Start day from half a day to a full day. They can extend it from a full day to later hours for parents who have different working hours and working conditions. Under a shutdown, we don't have these other programs. So you might have the Head Start Program, but these other ones are all shut down.

Head Start providers use funding from the Child and Adult Care Food Program, which is funded under a whole different auspices of the government, but this food program comes in to provide healthy meals and nutritious services. I say to the Senator from Florida, I have visited a lot of Head Start centers, and they have nutritious food for these kids. That doesn't come under the Head Start Program, that comes from the Child and Adult Care Food Program. That is also shut down right now.

So, again, you could fund the Head Start Program, but all these other programs interlock and provide the support necessary for a good Head Start Program.

I might also say that the Head Start Program is a need-based program. So if someone wants to get their child into a Head Start Program, sometimes documentation is used and needed—documentation such as last year's tax returns. What was your income? Well, as long as the IRS is closed right now—out of 94,000 active IRS employees, 87,000 are furloughed—the IRS is not processing those.

The point I make to all and to the Senator from Florida is that it is not enough just to say: I want to reopen the Head Start Program. All of these bricks are interlocked. That is why it is so important to get the government running again.

If the Senator from Florida wants to cut funding for some of these other programs, there is plenty of opportunity to do that through the legislative process and the appropriations process. But just to say we are going to fund the Head Start Program, I say, with all due respect, that is a cruel irony to hold out to all of the families who use the Head Start Program that somehow, yes, we want to fund Head Start, but all the other things that go to support it and make it work, we are taking that away, and like a wall built of stacked bricks, it will fall over because it won't have the other supports that are needed.

So I respectfully object to the request from the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, let's be very clear here today. Republicans have come to the floor to reopen the government. We have offered request after request to reopen the government. We have offered to negotiate. From the other side, we hear: We will not negotiate, we will not compromise, and we will not reopen the government.

We have offered 13 different compromises today to reopen the government. We are willing to open the government.

They say: You must agree to everything or we will open nothing. We will not compromise.

We say to them: Why don't we open the parts of government we agree on?

Can we not end this farce of putting security guards in front of the World War II Memorial? My goodness, it is an open park. They spent more money closing it than we spend keeping it open. We spend more money guarding the World War II monument than we do protecting our Ambassador in Libya. It has become a farce.

Eighty-five percent of your government is open. We have offered today to open another 10 percent. Compromise means coming together and voting on some of the things on which you agree.

Every program we have wanted to open today—the national parks, NIH, Veterans Affairs, allowing funerals, for goodness' sakes, for our military heroes who have died in action—they say: We agree to it, but we won't agree to it.

So let's be very clear. Republicans have offered today very specific proposals for opening the government. The Democrats have uniformly rejected every appeal to open the government. So when one of our heroes can't have a funeral, when one of our people cannot be buried in Arlington Cemetery, when a World War II veteran goes to the monument and is barricaded and kept from viewing the monument to celebrate their service, be very clear that Republicans have asked to open the government, and the Democrats have rejected opening it at every point. In fact, they are very explicit with their strategy. We will not negotiate, they say. The President says he will not negotiate under pressure. My question is, When will he negotiate?

We have had one good thing happen for the American taxpayer in the last 5 years. The bad thing is $7 trillion has been added to your kids' and your grandkids' tab. One good thing happened, and it happened under duress, and it happened with regard to the debt ceiling. The sequester actually cut the rate of growth of spending. It didn't cut spending, but it is cutting the rate of growth of spending. The sequester

happened under duress. The other side loves debt, loves spending, and doesn't care how much your kids or grandkids will have. They don't care. They have rejected every compromise.

What we are saying is that $7 trillion of debt under President Obama is too much. The country is struggling. Economists say 1 million people are out of work because of the economy and because of the debt and because of the burden. And what do they want to do? Heap more debt on your kids and grandkids. I say enough is enough.

Let's reopen the government. Republicans today have said we will open the government. Let's open the parts we can agree to.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 207 for H.J. Res. 70 to open the national parks, to make continuing appropriations for the year 2014; that the measure be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it was my understanding that the Senator from Kentucky was going to make a request relative to the Veterans' Administration. The request relative to the national parks has been made earlier today. Is the request for the National Park Service?

Mr. PAUL. Yes. And I can go on. I want it to be very clear that the Senator is objecting to funding the national parks, so when people go to the national parks, they know they can call his office. We want to open the national parks, and we want to make it very clear that the Democratic side is objecting to funding the national parks.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to clarify a few points relative to statements made by the junior Senator from Kentucky.

The first statement: The Democrats will not negotiate. Well, let me remind the Senator from Kentucky—and I am sure he has not forgotten this—the spending level for the continuing resolution is the Republican's spending level which we agreed to in negotiation, $978 billion on an annual basis.

Mr. PAUL. It is the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. It is the figure Republicans placed as part of the negotiations, which the majority leader agreed to. That was a negotiation which led to that number which Speaker BOEHNER agreed to.

Secondly, this argument by the Senator from Kentucky that the Republicans are here today to open the government—let me at least remind the Senator from Kentucky that it is their failure to pass the continuing resolution by the Republican majority in the House that has closed the government for 9 straight days. We passed the continuing resolution to keep the government open at Republican spending levels. The House has refused. This is a Republican shutdown.

Point No. 3.

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Let me finish my statement. I reserved the right to object and I have the floor—I stand corrected. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor, but I can stand and speak reserving the right to object to his unanimous consent request. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The right is at the sufferance of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. PAUL. I will suffer longer.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky because I went through a period of suffering a few moments ago.

The point I would like to make to the Senator from Kentucky about the national parks is one I hope he will understand. We want to open the entire government including the national parks and other lands, recreation facilities that are owned by the Federal Government beyond the national parks. When it comes to the World War II memorial the Senator made reference to, I was just there. We had a group of honored veterans from World War II who came from Illinois last week and I met them. They had access to the World War II Memorial. The reason there was any restriction was because the Republican shutdown took the employees away, which made it impossible for them to man their post.

Here is my offer to the Senator from Kentucky. It is not new, but it tells the story. Do the Republicans want to reopen the Government? Here is your chance.

I ask consent the Senator's request be modified as follows: That the amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that has passed the Senate, it is a clean continuing, no-strings-attached resolution for the entire government including the national parks and many other important things. It is something that is already over in the House. It could be called in a matter of minutes and passed by a bipartisan majority in the House.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. I am not opposed to a clean CR. If we want to have a clean CR at a level at which we can balance the budget, I am all for it. If the Senator would accept a modification of a top-line number of $940 billion to replace $988 billion where appropriate throughout the continuing resolution, I can support his unanimous consent for a continuing resolution to go back over to the House.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the Senator object to my modification?

Mr. PAUL. I am offering a new modification to your modification and asking unanimous consent that the Senator accept as a new top-line number, where 988 appears, that $988 billion appears throughout the continuing resolution, that if your objective is to have a clean CR, let's have a clean CR. I am happy to do it. But we need to do it and restrain the growth of spending in our government because your party has added so much our country is drowning in a sea of debt.

If you will agree to a top-line number of $940 billion to replace $988 billion throughout the continuing resolution where appropriate, I would agree to your consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois so modify his modification?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, holding the floor at the sufferance of the junior Senator from Kentucky, I would like to ask him to respond to a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. Sure.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator tell us when was the last time our Federal Government had a surplus in the budget and who was the President at that time?

Mr. PAUL. Could I ask for a germane question?

Mr. DURBIN. Not really.

Mr. PAUL. Part of the answer is it was divided government. The interesting thing about divided government is divided government can work better, and with more conversation, I think we could get beyond this impasse. I think if we would negotiate—and here is the problem. I know now there are some in your party saying you will negotiate but the President said at least, oh, 20, maybe 30, maybe 40 times on national television he will not negotiate until he gets his way and that is still essentially what you guys are saying. You will negotiate after you get your way. The problem is, we think you will not negotiate unless there is a deadline, because the thing is, when you finally did negotiate—and here is my question to the Senator from Illinois through the Presiding Officer—did you vote for the sequester?

The sequester was not a Republican bill, it was voted on by many Members of your party. The numbers are yours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired. Procedurally——

Mr. DURBIN. I object to the modification to reduce the top-line budget number. This was a number negotiated between Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leader. Speaker BOEHNER said this was a number he could pass. I believe since we took a $70 billion cut in

the budget resolution that has already passed in the Senate, I will not agree to further cuts in the programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PAUL. Is there objection to the original—the modification of my motion? I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. I believe what is pending is the original unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original unanimous consent request?

Mr. DURBIN. For the record, the last time we had a surplus was under a Democratic President, President William Jefferson Clinton, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 1 minute of my time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. While the junior Senator from Kentucky is on the floor, I want to make sure the American people know the answer to the question my friend from Illinois asked him—who was President the last time there was not only a balanced budget but a surplus? The answer is Bill Clinton. And I was here when we had that vote. So, I think, was the Senator from Illinois. We did not get one Republican to join us in that budget that actually worked so well that we had a surplus until the Republicans put a huge tax cut for billionaires on the credit card, and two wars.

Let's be clear here, what this is about. We have to open the government, we have to pay our bills, and then let the good Senator from Washington go negotiate with Congressman RYAN, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and yes, we can see our way to a balanced budget. But let's not play these games of government by piecemeal spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as we now know, the government has been closed for business for more than a week. Across the country, newspapers are now filled with stories about how the shutdown is costing us jobs and slashing paychecks and interfering with everything from Head Start to the VA claims. This shutdown has already cost American workers and families a lot of pain and its impacts are only going to get worse. That is why what we heard this weekend from Speaker BOEHNER was so frustrating.

Speaker BOEHNER said:

> The American people expect in Washington when we have a crisis like this, that the leaders will sit down and have a conversation.

Listening to Speaker BOEHNER, you would think a government shutdown fell out of the sky last week and caught everyone by surprise. The truth is it was completely avoidable. Senate Democrats tried to start negotiations to avoid this shutdown 18 times before October 1, and each time an extreme minority of Republicans stood up and said no. Speaker BOEHNER himself even spoke out in favor of delaying negotiations.

This shutdown did not happen by accident. We did not have to have this crisis. This shutdown happened because tea party Republicans and the Republicans who would not stand up to them chose brinkmanship over negotiations for 6 straight months. Now that we have reached this point, Republicans say they are ready to have a conversation—but only if we allow the government shutdown to continue.

Democrats are more than happy to talk about the budget, but Republican insistence on keeping the government closed during these negotiations makes no sense at all. It suggests that they are not thinking about how this shutdown is impacting our families and our businesses, which cannot afford talk at the expense of action.

I would like to talk about some of those impacts today. At a time when we should be focused on creating jobs and growing our economy, this shutdown is hurting workers and businesses and our recovery. From the sandwich shops that rely on Federal employees who come by for lunch every day to construction companies that cannot get contracts because of all the economic uncertainty to major corporations such as Boeing, that are considering furloughs, it is clear the shutdown is putting both public and private sector jobs at risk. Because Federal workers at agencies such as the IRS and Social Security Administration are out of work, thousands of potential home buyers will be unable to get their mortgages approved, which could damage our housing recovery which has boosted our economy.

Our Nation's veterans deserve our gratitude and our respect and all the support we can offer. But this shutdown is creating uncertainty for these men and women who have heroically served our country.

Veterans make up nearly 30 percent of the Federal workforce—30 percent. They are feeling the effects of furloughs. The shutdown has worsened the backlog in disability claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and veterans across the country are now watching and waiting for an end to this shutdown because, if it goes long enough, their benefits could be threatened. Nearly 640,000 veterans in my home State of Washington alone are at risk of losing their VA benefits if this shutdown extends past October. It should not have to be said, but they deserve much better. So do the struggling families who are now wondering how much longer they will be able to put food on their table.

This shutdown will stop funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as WIC, which helps more than 8.9 million struggling moms and young children get healthy food. Many of our States are now scrambling to find money to keep those WIC operations going. The USDA now estimates that we will only be able to continue as usual until the end of October, until their funding runs out.

Other struggling parents wonder where they will send their children while they are at work. More than 7,000 children and their families have lost access to Head Start due to this shutdown. And, by the way, that is on top of the 57,000 slots as a result of the sequestration that has impacted so many.

As much as Republicans may not want to acknowledge it, the effects of this shutdown are far-reaching and severe and, should this government stay closed, it will only get harder for agencies to continue providing services that are so crucial to our families and communities. So when Speaker BOEHNER says the American people expect their leaders to sit down and have a conversation—you know what. That is what I have been saying for the last 6 months. But what I will not accept and what I strongly believe the American people will not accept is starting a conversation while we are in this shutdown, which is hurting our economy and some of our most vulnerable children and families, and does even more damage. Now is not the time to talk about avoiding a shutdown, it is the time to actually do it.

Speaker BOEHNER has said there are not votes in the House to pass a clean continuing resolution that will simply keep our government open. If that is the case, I would like him to prove it. Speaker BOEHNER should bring up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and allow Democrats and Republicans to vote on it. Then he should join Democrats in preventing a default, without delay and without strings attached because, I want to be very clear, a default on U.S. debts would be unprecedented and devastating.

I held a hearing a few weeks ago in our Senate Budget Committee to talk about the impact of brinkmanship and uncertainty on our economy. The economists who joined us warned us that for families in my home State of Washington and across the country, default would mean mortgage rates and student loan costs would rise, making it harder to afford home ownership or even afford tuition; that home prices and stock prices would fall and businesses of all sizes would have trouble financing their activities, which would of course lead to layoffs and surging unemployment.

I am not going to let the tea party cause Washington State families that kind of hardship. But after we have reopened the government, prevented this default, and made sure our families and communities are no longer paying the price for tea party brinkmanship, I would be more than happy to begin the negotiations that Democrats have been out here requesting to have for months. It is clearer every day that there is bipartisan support for those responsible steps. Democrats and Republicans may not agree on much, but I think a lot of us on both sides of this aisle have had enough of tea party brinkmanship and seen enough of governing by crisis.

We are ready, together, to resolve our differences in a way that works for the American people and our economy, and I sincerely hope Speaker BOEHNER will not let the tea party stand in our way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, the U.S. Treasury says that in exactly 8 days it will not have enough money to pay the government's bills. We are not in this position because the Secretary of the Treasury or the President spent more than they were supposed to. The Constitution allows them to spend only what Congress tells them to spend, and that is exactly what they have done.

We are not in this position because investors refused to buy our bonds. Investors are lining up around the block to buy those. We are in this position for one reason and one reason only: Congress told the government to spend more money than we have. Congress told the Treasury to run up our debt to pay for it, but now Congress is threatening to run out on the bill.

If that strikes you as bizarre, you are not alone. The United States is the only democracy in the world where the legislature debates whether it should pay the bills it has already incurred. The United States is the only democracy that regularly considers whether to run out on its bills; that is, to voluntarily default on its debt.

Congress exercises direct control over the amount the Federal Government spends and the amount the Federal Government brings in through taxes and fees. Our national debt is simply a function of those two things—the money coming in and the money going out—and so Congress exercises direct control over the amount of debt we have. If Congress is unhappy with the size of the debt, it should change how much it spends or how much it brings in. There is no other option. The idea that we can somehow renege on our debts without paying a huge price is a fantasy, a dangerous fantasy.

Consider what happened in 2011, the last time the government came up to the edge of a voluntary default. Even the possibility that the government would not make good on its debts spooked investors and pushed up interest rates. According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, the interest rate increase from the last time the United States even talked about default will cost the government $19 billion over 10 years. That is $19 billion that could have brought back funding for Head Start, Meals On Wheels or our military. That is $19 billion that could have eased the interest rates on student loans or been invested in medical research. That is $19 billion that could have been used to pay down the debt. Instead, that is $19 billion that was just flushed down the drain. Does anyone here care about wasteful government? Well, then, that is it.

The last time the government came to the edge of a voluntary default, consumers and businesses got spooked too. The S&P dropped by more than 17 percent, $800 billion in retirement assets vanished, mortgage rates went up nearly three-quarters of a point, costing every new homeowner real money. The net result was less consumer spending, fewer business investments, lower home ownership rates, and slower job growth.

That is what happened the last time Congress came to the edge of a voluntary default. What happens if Congress actually defaults? If that happens, there is widespread concern among economists of every political persuasion that we would plunge into another recession.

Government debt may seem to be an abstract and complicated thing, but, in fact, it is pretty simple. The government owes money to two main groups of people. It owes payments on U.S. bonds, which are mostly owned by foreign governments, and it owes money to the American people for things such as Social Security payments and Medicare reimbursements for hospitals and physicians. It owes paychecks to the military and retirement checks to veterans.

If the Treasury does not have enough money to make all of its payments, then it will likely try to minimize the damage to America's credit rating, and that means making payments on the bonds held by foreign investors, leaving others to absorb the losses.

Who will not get paid? Will it be seniors who rely on Social Security to live? Will it be hospitals that rely on Medicare to operate? Will it be our servicemembers who rely on paychecks to help their families back home? Will it be Federal contractors, large and small, who support millions of jobs nationwide?

The Treasury makes 80 million payments a month and many of them will be delayed. As more time passes, unpaid bills will pile up. From there, it just gets worse. The Federal Government's inability to pay its bills could set off a chain reaction of defaults, sending the financial system into turmoil. Millions of people who rely on Federal payments might not have the money they need to keep current on their student loans or their mortgages or their small business loans. That could cause interest rates to spike, leading to a wave of further defaults, while the financial markets would be faced with the very real possibility that the United States would not have enough money to make payments on its bonds.

American Treasury bonds are considered safe investments. They are considered so safe that they are used as collateral in millions of financial transactions around the world. If the United States does not have enough money to pay its bills, parties to these transactions will demand more collateral or different forms of collateral. That has a domino effect throughout the economy. The end result could be the kind of freeze of the credit markets that we saw after the failure of Lehman Brothers collapsed in 2008, the freeze that triggered the financial crisis.

The idea that we can renege on our debts and not pay a huge price is a dangerous fantasy. I have heard some extremists in Congress argue that even if the United States runs out of money to pay all its bills, it will not be so bad because the Treasury will be able to keep current on its bond payments and avoid a technical default.

That is a heck of a best case scenario, making bond payments to foreign governments, mostly China and Japan, while holding up Social Security payments, hospital payments, and military payments here at home. It is a terrible idea. People count on those payments to live.

It is also a terrible idea that would not work. Just ask top Wall Street executives, including the CEO of Goldman Sachs who said publicly and unequivocally that prioritizing bond payments would still create ''insurmountable uncertainty for investors,'' causing a spike in interest rates that would immediately increase monthly payments on student loans, mortgages, other personal debt, and would cripple job growth. Like it or not, the threat of default will cause this country a lot of pain.

I want to make this absolutely clear: If we run out of money to pay our bills, the world will view this as the first default in the history of the United States. Wall Street and the global financial markets will view this as the first default in the history of the United States.

This fight is about financial responsibility. Financially responsible people don't charge thousands of dollars on their credit cards and then tear up the bill when it arrives. Financially responsible Nations don't do that either. When we put our name on the line saying that a debt is backed up by the full faith and credit of the United States, we follow through. We protect our good name. We protect our good credit.

For many things that we do in Congress, we can make a mistake and then back up and fix it. A default on our national debt is not one of those things. If we default and pay late, the damage could be irreversible.

The first time we flirted with default was the first time in history that America's credit rating fell. If we actually default, some economists estimate we will add $75 billion a year to the debt in additional interest payments. That is three-quarters of $1 trillion over the next 10 years. There are a lot of good things to do with that money. Flushing it down the drain is not one of them.

If we default on our debt, we could bring on a worldwide recession, a recession that would pummel hard-working middle-class people, people who lost their homes and jobs and retirement savings and who are barely getting back on their feet. Maybe we can escape a recession—maybe—but we are playing with the lives of every American, and it is not what the American people sent us to do. This is no time to act out dangerous fantasies.

We must raise the debt ceiling. We must raise it now. A bedrock financial principle of government is to tell the world that the United States always pays its debts in full and on time. That is who we are.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in taking the floor to stress the urgency of action. I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts and her comments about the devastating impact the failure to pay our bills would have on our economy, on our Nation's reputation, and on the worldwide economy. That would make absolutely no sense at all and would put our Nation at great risk.

I thank the Senator for taking the time to explain the specific consequences if we were to allow the U.S. Treasury to be put in the position where it could not honor all of the obligations that have already been incurred.

This is not about increasing spending. This is about paying the bills we have already incurred. Whether it is for those who hold our bonds, those who are entitled to a payroll check or those who are entitled to a contractor's check, we have to honor our bills. That is what America's great reputation is all about.

I thank the Senator for bringing that up.

The combination of a government shutdown combined with not paying our bills will have an impact on our economy that will be very hard for us to overcome. We have already been harmed. This government shutdown has already hurt America. It has hurt us internationally.

This past week President Obama was supposed to be at the Asian economic summit. The Presiding Officer—the Senator from Delaware who serves on the Foreign Relations Committee—knows very well the importance of that particular conference.

The headliner of that conference should have been President Obama pointing out how important the rebalanced Asia is to America's economy and that we are open for business; instead, America was closed for business. The headliner at that economic summit was President Xi of China. That is not what this Nation needed. We were harmed by that government shutdown and the President's inability to travel to Asia. Make no mistake about it, it hurt America.

Our economy has already been hurt by the shutdown. Every day that the government is shut down, it hurts our economy. I can give a lot of specific examples. For instance, there was a report in this morning's paper about the State of Colorado and how it recently experienced one of the worst floods in its history which caused a devastating impact on its economy. They are now telling us that this shutdown is approaching the economic damage to Colorado that nature did to it a couple of weeks ago by the floods. However, there is a major difference: We can't stop what nature does—we can try to mitigate it—but we can stop this government shutdown. This is a government problem that we have imposed on the people of Colorado, the people of Maryland, the people of Delaware, and the people of our entire country.

This shutdown has hurt the taxpayers of this country. I have heard my conservative friends say that we want to make sure we don't spend so much money. We want to help the taxpayers. In this short period of time already the shutdown has cost the taxpayers of this country a reported $2 billion. That is just wasted taxpayer dollars. We have a responsibility to care for the public funds. The way to do that right now is to open government and stop wasting taxpayer dollars.

I have been on this floor many times to talk about the harm we are doing to the Federal workforce. Yes, we are harming the Federal workforce; there is no question about it. I am particularly sensitive because this region has more Federal workers—of the 800,000 who have been furloughed, over 300,000 come from this region. By the way, 30 percent are veterans. The people who have served our Nation are now being furloughed because of this government shutdown. Maryland's workforce is about 10 percent of Federal workers. So this has had a real impact on the State I have the honor of representing in the Senate. Each one of those 800,000 people whom we represent is real. They are not just numbers. These are real people who have been harmed by the closing of the Federal Government.

Let me speak about a couple of people whom I have heard about or who have called me. Kayla is a 15-year-old who I spoke to on the telephone. She told me about how her parents are worried. Both of her parents are Federal workers, and she, a 15-year-old, sensed the fear in her parents as to whether they will be able to pay their bills. We put that family at risk by failing to keep government open.

Melissa Ayres is a furloughed Federal worker at the Social Security Administration. Her husband was unemployed for 2½ years as a result of our economic downturn. Now his company is recovering, but Melissa was the principal wage earner. She stated:

> I have always been the primary earner until Monday. Now I think: What do I do to support my family?

The government shutdown has hurt Melissa Ayres and her family.

I heard from a farmer on the eastern shore of Maryland's Cecil County. He is part of the conservation stewardship program. I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Delaware, is well aware of that. But what this person has done is taken some income away from his farming activities by planting buffer crops. Those buffer crops help with reducing the amount of pollutants that run off into the Chester River, in this case, which will flow into the Chesapeake Bay. So he is being a good steward of the environment, and he enrolled in the conservation stewardship program. As part of that, he gets a payment from that fund, because he is giving up some of the income of his farming activities in order to help us preserve the Chesapeake Bay. During this shutdown, that payment is not being made.

He has put himself in a tough position. He did the right thing. He has put his family at risk. He told me he has a young child who is undergoing certain treatment for his eye. He doesn't know whether he has the money for his child to continue in that medical treatment. He needs the check for his participation in this program.

This government shutdown has had a real impact on real people.

Johnny Zuagar who works at the Census Bureau—I should say used to work at the Census Bureau because he has been furloughed. Of the 5,000 employees at the Census Bureau, less than 40 are currently working—forty out of 5,000. The budget he has for his family is based upon his paycheck. If he doesn't get his full paycheck, he can't pay his bills. So his question is which bills should he pay and which not pay.

That is the situation we are putting people in as a result of this government shutdown.

Marcelo Del Canto was here earlier this week. He works with helping in the fight against substance abuse. He has been a Federal worker for 8 years. He is in the unenviable position that he and his wife both work for the Federal Government, and they have both been furloughed. He is a Marylander and just recently bought a home in Maryland. He has a mortgage. If he doesn't get a paycheck, how does he pay his mortgage? The mortgage company is not going to say: Oh, government shutdown. You don't have to pay your mortgage payments.

This shutdown is having a real impact on real families in my State of Maryland and in every State in this Nation.

Then there are agencies that just can't do their work that will hurt our country. The Environmental Protection Agency currently has 93 percent of its workforce on furlough. That means we are at risk with our public health—clean air, clean water. Our environment is at risk. The Chesapeake Bay is at greater risk because the people out there doing the monitoring and doing the enforcement are not there. Scientists are not doing what they need to be doing in order to help us with public health and to deal with our environment.

Let me tell my colleagues that it is also directly hurting our economy. In Baltimore, one of the most important economic development sites, Harbor Point, in downtown Baltimore, which is being developed is a RCRA site, which requires the approval of the Environmental Protection Agency in order to move forward with the economic development plan. The people who would do that approval process are on furlough. That project is now on hold and the economic development that would help Baltimore and our State economy is now on hold.

The shutdown is having a real effect on real people.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, which is located in the State of Maryland, does work that is so important for innovation, for science, and technology. They do work to help us have a competitive edge internationally. Ninety-one percent of their workforce is on furlough. How do we expect to be competitive?

This year, the SAMMI Awards were recently given out. The SAMMI Awards are given to Federal workers who excel in public service. These are our frontliners. These are the people who are serving their nation, and we want to honor them. I want to recognize some of the people who were being honored at the SAMMI Awards this year. One is Daniel Madrzykowski. He works at NIST. I mention him because he has been there for 28 years. The work he does is to figure out how he can keep our first responders who fight fires safe. He does the research as to how they can go into a building in a safer way. Well, he is furloughed, and our first responders are at a little bit greater risk today as a result of the government shutdown.

The shutdown is having an effect on real people.

I read with interest how we celebrated the Nobel Prize in medicine going to James Rothman and Randy Schekman for the incredible work they did. I don't know if I can explain what they did, but I will tell my colleagues that it is incredible. They were able to reach that pinnacle in their careers and reach their accomplishments because during their career they were supported by the National Institutes of Health. NIH does basic research which is so important—the building blocks for discovery in America. It provides incentives for young people to go into science and to go into research.

Will we have the next group of Nobel laureates? Today it is less certain than it was a week ago. NIH cannot support those types of research grants today. Their people are on furlough. America is not open for business. Real people are being hurt by what is happening.

It is not just in government employment. I can talk about private sector employment.

It was just reported today that Lockheed will be laying off 400 Maryland workers as a result of the shutdown. I can give many more examples of private companies that are laying off people as a result of this shutdown.

The bottom line is this: We hear from some of our Republican colleagues in the House that we have to negotiate, we have to pick winners and losers; we have to wait for a crisis to occur in a particular agency before they will consider a special bill to open some of those agencies. So let me just conclude by the quote I cited once before on the floor of the Senate from the Baltimore Sunpapers. It says, in regards to negotiations and what we should do:

> The gun isn't raised to Mr. Obama's head or to the Senate's. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That's why descriptions like ''ransom'' and ''hostage'' are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to put down the gun. It is time for us to open government and to make sure we pay our bills, and then, yes, we want to negotiate. For 6 months, we have been trying to negotiate a budget. Open government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a responsible budget for this Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the twin manufactured crises that are facing the country: A hobbled government and the threat of default.

I have seen some describe this as a game, and I have heard others say it is just partisanship posturing. But this situation is neither. This is serious business. In fact, I am deeply troubled about this—not only as a Senator representing the State of Rhode Island, but as an American—about where my country is going.

I am dismayed that some on the other side have decided that for whatever reason—and those reasons seem to keep changing—the only way to achieve their goal—and their goals seem to keep changing—is to shut the government down and suggest that defaulting on our debt will have no consequences.

It would be a nice fiction if we could say: Well, America really didn't have to pay its bills. That we don't have to pay for the trillions we spent in Iraq and in Afghanistan, or for the significant tax cuts under President Bush that benefited the wealthiest Americans. I didn't support the operations in Iraq, and I didn't support those tax cuts. I think we could have invested the money much more wisely and helped America.

But the reality is all these bills are coming due, and the United States Treasury has to pay them.

Some of my colleagues on the other side are suggesting: Well, we can prioritize payments. No one will be upset. No one will be hurt if we don't pay the bills as they come due. We will just pick the ones we want to pay.

But these are not Democratic bills. They are not Republican bills. These are America's bills. They were approved by the Congress of the United States under Republican Presidents and Democrat Presidents, under Republican Congresses and Democrat Congresses. And as they come due, they must be paid.

But we are here today in this manufactured crisis that essentially locks out and blocks the American people from accessing their government—from accessing basic government services. Women and children receiving food under the WIC program, Head Start—a whole panoply of Americans who are literally being denied benefits they earned, or benefits that are necessary not just for their health, but for the health and vitality of the fabric of America. Then, on top of that, is the added threat of a default on our obligations—already accrued, already authorized, already appropriated obligations—not new borrowing for new expenditures. These bills are coming due.

We have seen this ever-changing theme from the other side about why they have to do these things. At first it was an effort to repeal ObamaCare. Then it was a 1-year delay of health insurance under the Affordable Care Act. Then it was just a delay of part of the law. Then it was repealing a tax that was part of the law. Now, we have heard about Canadian oil pipelines, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and cutting Medicaid. The rationale keeps changing and suggesting that the reasons behind this lockout are not only unclear to the American public, they are unclear to the proponents. In fact, some are suggesting that this is also about cutting Social Security and Medicare and other programs that are central to every family in this country. Indeed, it seems as though they have transitioned from ''let's take ObamaCare and repeal it'' to ''let's take the New Deal and repeal that.'' In fact, one of our colleagues in the House apparently suggested he didn't know what he wanted; he just knew he wanted something in exchange for an open government that is functioning and a government that pays its bills.

It is hard not to draw the conclusion that many of my colleagues on the other side have simply committed themselves to extracting major policy

concessions, whatever they can get, by threatening to default on our debt and by continuing to lock out the American people from its government. They are sadly using potential economic chaos to get their way.

Now I don't think Republicans are debating seriously—and we have heard this argument from them for years going back—for decades, in fact—to the initial debate on Medicare, that it is evil socialized medicine. Now I am sure during the discussion of the New Deal, there were criticisms of growing central government, but to seriously take away these programs I think would cause the American people to stand up and say no, since most if not every American fundamentally depends on them. Particularly as they get to the point where they are retired or they are approaching retirement.

So now the Republican story has shifted, as they have gotten closer and closer to what seems to be some of their real motivating factors: shrinking government dramatically, not just those parts that are popular. Now they are beginning to hint that this is about something more fundamental. This is about tearing up the basic social contract where people have worked all their lives, paid into Social Security, and will get Social Security benefits. For them, this is about tearing up the social contract that if you have worked, you have paid into the Medicare system, you will get Medicare benefits.

Of course now they have shifted their current story again, and now it is all about negotiation, that we have not negotiated. That is why they have to shut down the government and default on the debt of the United States. The irony, of course, is that Democrats have been, indeed, trying to go into serious and bipartisan negotiations about our budget for many months. Indeed, months ago, in March, as I recall, the Senate, after taking 47 rollcall votes, passed a solid, balanced, and sensible budget plan and asked to negotiate with the other body in a conference. Indeed, at the beginning of the year, the Speaker called for following the budget process, for following regular order.

At one point, the other side even demanded that Senators and Congresswomen and men should not be paid if there was no budget resolution. But, sadly, months later, after we had passed our budget, a handful of colleagues in this body, on the Republican side, have been blocking us from going to conference. They are insisting that as any precondition to a bipartisan conference we could not talk about raising revenue, or take actions that will ensure the government be able to pay its bills. They have essentially stopped regular order.

For his part, the Speaker of the House refused to appoint conferees for months, as well, apparently fearful that Republicans might have to actually vote on some of their proposals that have been incorporated over the years in various Republican budgets with respect to Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs.

But now as we approach default, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying: Oh, it is time to negotiate on the budget.

It was time months ago when we asked to go to conference. It was time weeks ago. Now it is time to ensure that we pay our bills and we open the government.

We have come to the Senate floor 21 times so far to seek to go to conference to negotiate with the House on the budget. What do we hear? When we ask to go to negotiate, no. But, when we ask them to open the government, to pay our bills, they say no let's negotiate. That is not the way to conduct the business of this government. It is not the way to provide the confidence our economy needs to go forward. It is not the way to provide families the confidence they need to face the rigors of daily life—of educating children, of taking care of their health care, of contributing to their community.

We have had consistent and constant objections, which frustrate our ability to go to conference and negotiate, over many, many, many months. But after all their other rationales—defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, delay the personal mandate—now it has come down to let's negotiate, when indeed, Republicans have rejected that approach 21 times on the floor of the Senate.

It is time for the other Chamber to reopen the government and agree to pay our bills. They can do that by bringing to the floor very quickly—and they can procedurally: a clean CR—a term of art that was Washington speak until a week or two ago, but now everyone knows. It simply sets for a few weeks the amount of money we can spend and allows us to open the government.

Americans are being hurt by the shutdown, and they will be hurt even more grievously if we default on our debt. It is continually amazing to me that the other side persists in shutting down the government and threatening to default on the debt.

But, you have a response by the other side, particularly, that is consistent with what we heard during their primary campaign for the Presidency: Let's shut down some government agencies. Now it is the other side of that coin: Republicans will just open a few government agencies, not the whole government, but the ones—and they change or they increase each day—that they think are important. Each day they seem to have another idea about: Well, we have to open this. It will be a good headline. It will be a good talking point.

For example, they have talked about opening the national parks, the Smithsonian, and other museums. But, let's remember that in the House, Republicans have proposed cutting the allocation for the Department of Interior Appropriations Bill by $5.5 billion from last year.

So we have to go forward and we have to resolve this situation. We cannot allow this lockout to continue. We have to do what Leader REID has said quite succinctly: open the government, pay our bills, go to conference on the budget, and then negotiate everything that is within reason to negotiate. Let's do that for the American people. We are ready to do it. I hope our colleagues will agree to do it also.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to start by reading a letter I received this week. So many of us in the Senate are operating with furloughed staff, and we are doing our best to read and respond to the letters we are getting from home, the calls that are coming into our offices. This one touched me in particular. It began:

> My name is MSgt Corey P DiLuzio. I am an Air Reserve Technician at Dover AFB. I have served this great nation for 12 years without question or reservation. Every time I have been called upon, I have answered the call, left my family behind, and served proudly as maintainer for the C–17 aircraft. I know you understand the reach and the mission requirements for such an aircraft. I tell you this not for a thank you or any type of acknowledgement. I tell you this—

Master Sergeant DiLuzio writes—

> because I am also a husband to a woman who has stood by my side in support for every deployment. I tell you this because I am the father of a three-year-old boy who doesn't even question the answer Daddy's at work. I understand a man in your position has made . . . sacrifices as well, however, today I had to tell my family I am unable to work. Not because of anything I have control of, but because of decisions made by individuals who will not miss a paycheck; individuals who will always know when the next check is coming. I write this understanding that it will fall on deaf ears, and I am usually one that remains quiet and follows the orders for those appointed above me, however, enough is enough. Please do your part in resolving this issue so I can get back to serving my country and my family.
>
> Sincerely yours, MSgt Corey DiLuzio.

It pains me that the master sergeant thought his letter would fall on deaf ears, that no one here—that neither I nor any of my colleagues—would hear or care about the concerns of a man—his wife, his family—who has served this country and who stands ready to continue serving this country but whose family is being harmed by the mindless, purposeless shutdown of the government that is now in day 9—this first government shutdown in 17 years, and by all indications one that will continue into another week.

I start by saying to Master Sergeant DiLuzio: I am sorry. I am sorry for the needless pain and difficulty this shutdown is imposing on your family and so many other families across this country. Roughly 800,000 Federal employees have been furloughed at different times in the last 9 days, and while some may be returning to Active service, they

will be getting IOUs rather than regular paychecks. All over this country, private contractors, as we have heard from other colleagues today, are also laying off people because they cannot get the permits or work permission or the site access they need to move forward.

This shutdown is continuing to harm our country, our reputation, our economy, our families. It is a needless, manufactured, self-imposed wound.

I wrestle with this because we are facing twin manufactured crises, as Senator REED of Rhode Island just finished saying: hobbled government due to this shutdown on the one hand and the steadily increasing risk of default on the other—these twin manufactured crises seeking some purpose that is unclear from day-to-day. When this government shutdown started, it seemed to be aimed at what, repealing the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, and then 1 day later it seemed to be aimed at delaying the Affordable Care Act, and then when that clearly was unsuccessful, it seemed to be aimed at seeking some partial repeal of the Affordable Care Act and now it is an ongoing crisis in search of a purpose. The menu of potential demands is growing, and the impact on our families and our communities is growing as well.

The House has been wasting its time on mini microappropriations bills in an attempt to give reporters and folks back home the sense that they are actually doing something, when it is just misdirection. They think all the activity will keep the American people from noticing that Speaker BOEHNER is not bringing up the one bill that could reopen this government in a matter of minutes—a so-called clean continuing resolution, a simple extension of current spending levels.

I know to all who watch—Master Sergeant DiLuzio and many others—we sometimes speak in language that is opaque, that is difficult to understand. We talk about sequester and continuing resolutions and so forth. So I am going to try and work through these issues in a way that is accessible and direct.

Let's be clear. This government is shut down right now because the House would not pass a 6-week extension—an extension to November 15—of what is required to keep us open. Today that would be just over 4 weeks. We are literally fighting over a 4-week funding bill. How absurd is it that all of this is over a measure that would have only funded the government in the first case for another 4 weeks from now. There is, frankly, nothing about this situation that is not absurd.

Every day the House Republicans show up with a new strategy, a new press conference, a new message, and, as I said, all the while not explaining exactly why the government is shut down. Initially, it was shut down to prevent the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, but that is moving forward, as it was always going to be because it is an enacted program.

So what is the current message from the House? They say they are the only ones ready to negotiate, that they are alone at the table, sitting there with jackets off, in their bright, starched, white shirts, waiting for Senate Democrats to meet them at the table and negotiate. Another farce, another fantasy.

I am, frankly, tired and frustrated with the games that seem to be played here. I would like to highlight, if I could, a few of our real efforts to work collaboratively, to answer the question, why won't you negotiate, by saying we have been negotiating.

Once the House votes to keep the lights on and to pay our bills, we will continue to negotiate. I have a simple question. Does the House want us to continue to be a closed-door nation, a nation where we have locked out hundreds of thousands of Federal workers? Does the House want to threaten that we will become a deadbeat nation, a nation that fails to meet its obligations built up over many administrations and many Congresses, Republican and Democratic, or are we going to reopen the government, become an open-door nation, and are we going to pay our bills and become a responsible nation, as we have been in the past?

How did we get here? As a member of the Budget Committee, let me first start, if I could, with the budget resolution. That is how our rules work. We are supposed to begin with a budget resolution that sets a framework for what we are going to spend in the next fiscal year.

For the last 3 years I have been serving here as a Senator, over and over on this floor the call was: Why won't the Senate pass a budget? Well, this year this Senate passed a budget resolution with significant Republican input. Between this floor, where we ultimately passed it, and the committee on which I serve, the Senate adopted more than 40 amendments offered by my Republican colleagues.

We compromised. We worked toward a shared goal. Week after week, as I said, Republicans had asked in past years: When is the Senate going to pass a budget? Yet we did, more than 6 months ago—200 days ago, to be precise, we passed a budget in this Senate.

Our chair, Senator MURRAY of Washington, has tried to take our budget to conference with the House to do as the rules provide, to reconcile and to responsibly negotiate over our fiscal differences—18 times. She has tried over and over and over to take us to conference and responsibly open formal talks with the House to resolve our fiscal differences. Every time that motion has been blocked, denied, barred, all by a very small group of tea party Republicans in this Chamber who have refused to let us go ahead and negotiate as the rules say we should.

I also serve on the Appropriations Committee. Once the budget is framed, once the budget is resolved, we are then supposed to move to appropriations and set our spending levels. As a member of that committee, I have been a part of the process in which we have, in fact, passed 11 spending bills out of committee, 8 of them with bipartisan support.

In order to try to move that process forward, months after the budget was passed, we brought the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill to this floor. It passed out of committee by a vote of 22 to 8, with 6 Republican votes, a strong bipartisan bill to be passed out here on the floor.

What happened? It was blocked. Again, a small number of the other party came and objected and blocked the passage of that bill, a bill that would put Americans to work and strengthen our infrastructure and help support the housing recovery, a bill that would have moved us forward.

Despite every attempt to fund this government through what we call regular order, the budget process and the appropriations process, we, even after that, came to the table, ready to compromise on this continuing resolution.

The Senate budget calls for a top-line spending number of $1.058 trillion, a balanced approach that reduces Federal spending in some areas, raises revenue in others, and makes progress by replacing the sequester. That is the budget we passed in the Senate. It would call for spending $1.058 trillion. The House budget instead called for $988 billion. As you have heard our leader Senator HARRY REID say on the floor this week, he compromised. He agreed to a short-term funding bill at $988 billion, a $70 billion cut for this fiscal year, a major and painful concession for Democrats, particularly those of us on the Budget Committee who had not voted for a $988 billion number.

We have already slashed spending. People are already suffering through the sequester, another thing that was enacted due to comparable tactics the last time there was a near default in 2011. The sequester has resulted in across-the-board spending cuts. It has been dangerous and painful and which I have spoken about on this floor repeatedly, reading letters from Delawareans, such as the master sergeant, commenting on how it is not the smart way to make cuts, it is an across-the-board way, an irresponsible way to make cuts.

That same Air Force base, Dover Air Force Base, suffered furloughs for hundreds of airmen and their families because of the sequester cuts. We had worked out a budget that would have replaced it and would have avoided those sequester cuts in a balanced and responsible way. But instead, in order to compromise, our majority leader agreed to a $70 billion cut for this fiscal year. It was tough for a lot of Democrats to swallow. So, frankly, when I see House Republican leaders go on TV and say Democrats will not negotiate, Democrats will not compromise, I have

to say: That is not the case. That is not the facts I have before me. We have compromised. We have negotiated. In fact, we have tried for months on this floor, more than 6 months, to get the compromise, to get the negotiation to move this forward. Instead, we find when we give an inch, they take a yard.

Today there are some, some in the other party, suggesting that if they are not granted a great big wish list, they will force us to default on our country's sovereign debt. We keep hearing from the other side about the need to compromise and negotiate. I could not agree more. The whole way this body is supposed to work is by following the rules, following the process, going to conference, negotiating and achieving a responsible result.

We have repeatedly solicited Republican input, accepted Republican amendments, and made painful compromises. Now my message is simple: We should be following the rules. We should be following the process of this body. We should turn on the lights. We should pay our bills. I would be happy, honored to continue working with Republican colleagues to find real solutions to our fiscal problems, the way we are supposed to, in a conference negotiating over the budget that was passed here more than 6 months ago.

To the colleagues with whom I share this Chamber but with whom we have some differences over why this government is shut down today, I hope you will listen to Master Sergeant DiLuzio and his family and to the thousands and thousands of other Americans who are writing in and calling our offices. They deserve better. This country deserves better. We need to show we can be the model of democracy that achieves responsible principled compromise.

To my colleagues and my friends in the other party: Stop blocking progress. Let's go to conference on the budget. Let's negotiate. But, first, let's get our folks back to work. Let's get the government open. Let's move forward in a way that honors the best of our traditions and our rules.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 7 p.m., and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to add my remarks now for the third time about this shutdown. I want to say this is not the way we ought to be running our government, and enough ought to be enough.

For example, as you know, the Secretary of Defense has figured out a way he can bring back most of the furloughed civilian employees—there may be a quarter of them who are still on furlough but most of them—by a law that passed here that saw most unintended consequences. But there was a little part of the law where he was able to bring them back for the national security and defense of this country.

But there are still gaping holes. For example, although the active-duty National Guard is not furloughed, a lot of the civilian force and the Reserve force of the Guard is furloughed.

I just talked to an F–22 pilot of the Virginia National Guard. He is a longtime fighter pilot in the U.S. Air Force, flew F–15s, now F–22s. He has transitioned to the National Guard, went to a unit that has the F–22s, which is the Virginia National Guard. All of those Reserve National Guard pilots are still coming in and flying, because we still have to protect the air defense of this country. They are flying, but they are not getting paid. Some of their technicians are there, still supporting the maintenance of the aircraft. Some of them are not getting paid. All of the ancillary support staff is on furlough.

In this example of the protection of the national security, in this particular case providing for our air defense through an Air National Guard unit, is this the way an air guard unit ought to be run?

Instead, it is not being run according to how it should be because of a political tantrum by certain people trying to get their way, instead of allowing the government to be functioning through its appropriations.

There is now a salmonella outbreak, 278 cases in 18 States, including my State of Florida. The Centers for Disease Control, which monitors at one time 30 different diseases operating in this country—now 68 percent of the Centers for Disease Control employees have been furloughed. So because of the salmonella outbreak that has occurred—it may be in the Presiding Officer's State as well. I will look it up afterwards and tell the Presiding Officer. It is in my State. I know it started in California, where most of the cases are.

But had the CDC been there in full force, instead of 68 percent of them being laid off, maybe we would not have had this outbreak, or they may have been able to spot it and stem it quickly before it spread to 17 other States.

I will give you another example: NASA. This little agency is the one that has the most people furloughed as a percentage of the workforce. Now 97 percent of NASA employees are furloughed. Since most of NASA's work is done by contractors, without the NASA supervisors there now, the contractors are being laid off. You take a place such as the Presiding Officer's State of Ohio, the NASA Glenn Research Center, look at the impact to the people in that community.

You take a major space center elsewhere, such as the Johnson Space Center in Houston, the Kennedy Space Center in my State, look at what it is doing to the lives of people. But remember that we have a mission that is going to Mars that has a unique, one-time-in-2-years launch window, starting the middle of November into the first part of December. If that narrow 3-week launch window is missed because of the lack of preparation of this spacecraft to launch, there is not another launch window for 2 years. Because of that, we were able to get NASA to recall that team. They are there continuing to prepare the spacecraft. They are not getting paid. But at least we are not going to cause all of the additional delay of 2 years and all of the additional expense of keeping that team of scientists together, along with the staging of the spacecraft for another 2 years.

There are three examples: the National Guard, and the defense of this country; the salmonella outbreak, because of the layoffs of the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control; and NASA.

This should not be. Enough is enough. The political tantrum ought to stop. Let us get back to the business of governing.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

SOUTH DAKOTA BLIZZARD

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the devastation that has been inflicted on many in my home State. An early season snowstorm has dumped 1 foot of snow and heavy winds on much of western South Dakota. The thoughts and prayers of Barbara and I are with those affected by this disastrous storm.

Communities and residents are wrestling with the damage caused by downed trees, and utility companies are facing power outages. County, community, and emergency officials have shared with my office numerous stories of volunteers stepping in to help to transport medicines and oxygen to residents stranded in their homes.

Neighbors are helping assist each other with cutting down tree limbs, snow removal, and getting essential food items and medical supplies to the elderly and disabled residents. There are countless reports of people helping to move stuck drivers out of snowdrifts or helping to shovel the roofs and snow from the home of a senior citizen or disabled residents. When people are in need, South Dakotans step up.

One of the most significant impacts of the storm has been on my State's livestock producers. ''Tens of thousands of cattle killed in Friday's blizzard . . . '' proclaims the Rapid City Journal headline.

Silvia Christen, with the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, has shared with me gut-wrenching stories of ranchers who have lost their herds. She said a man near Interior found his cows had pushed themselves and their calves over a Badlands wall and killed many of them. He estimates his loss at 50 percent of his total herd.

A young man east of Hermosa estimates he lost 30 percent of his 200 breeding cows. He found them all in one pile in a draw covered in snow. He saw the heads and hooves sticking out from the snow and can't bring himself to go closer or dig them out. He stated:

> I'm young, but I always thought I was a good rancher. I thought I'd taken care of them but I guess I should have done more.

He hung up the phone with an apology as his voice broke.

Our cowboys are resilient people, but this blizzard comes on the heels of a devastating drought last year from which ranchers still haven't fully recovered.

I am very proud of our State and local officials who have taken immediate action to assist those in need. The National Guard is conducting lifesaving safety operations to ensure folks without power are OK and to open roads. The State is working with a local rendering company to assist with finding, identifying, and dealing with livestock that have been killed. Our ag organizations in the State are providing help and guidance to ranchers who were hit.

The one place where help is lacking is from the Federal Government. Because of the government shutdown, producers can't rely on their FSA offices for assistance.

Since Congress hasn't finished the farm bill, West River ranchers may have to wait for disaster assistance. The 2008 farm bill included several critical disaster assistance programs, including the Livestock Indemnity Program, which provides help to producers affected by natural disasters. Unfortunately, that program expired in 2011, and because Congress hasn't yet completed a comprehensive farm bill, there continues to be no funding available for them.

We passed a good farm bill here in the Senate twice in the past 2 years. I worked to include funding for these livestock disaster programs, which are in both the Senate and House bills. The Senate is ready to negotiate the farm bill, but the House hasn't appointed conferees. The longer they delay, the longer my constituents will suffer without disaster aid.

The House needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, and they need to appoint conferees so that we can finally finish the farm bill.

It will take many months for the Black Hills communities to clean up from the October blizzard. For ranchers who lost livestock, it may take years to recover. But whatever Mother Nature has to deliver, it cannot dampen the spirit of South Dakotans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to give voice to frustrated Nebraskans. I rise to testify to the simple truth that a government should not intentionally make life harder for its people. I rise to say: Enough. Enough press conferences. Enough brinkmanship. Enough dividing people of good will against one another.

I am still pretty new here, but I can say that in Nebraska and in so many other States across this Nation we actually work together—and not just on small bills but also on the big issues. I urge my colleagues to remember where we came from.

While I served in the Nebraska Legislature, we dealt with a major budget shortfall. We didn't go on TV or Twitter or fight; we legislated and we fixed the problem. That is the Nebraska way. We roll up our sleeves, we cut through the talking points, and we get to work.

Nebraskans are pragmatic. They are well informed, and they expect results. So when Nebraskans look at the dysfunction we have here in Washington, they are frustrated, and I am too. I am very frustrated. I am frustrated that this Congress can't pass appropriations bills that comply with the law. I am frustrated that this Congress cannot agree on a budget. I am frustrated with crisis management instead of responsible governance. I am frustrated with being told one thing only to learn it is just not true. I am frustrated with the willful ignorance that goes on in Washington when it comes to our debt. And I am frustrated with the lack of solutions.

The American people do not want us to just stand in opposition; they want us to put forth constructive ideas to solve problems. As a result of Congress's failure to agree on a spending plan, the government is shut down. The result? Well, in yesterday's Omaha World Herald there was a report that Nebraska farmers are unable to cash checks when they bring their grain in after harvest. The article noted:

> State law requires elevators to include a lender's name on a check when a farmer has a loan against the grain. With no one at Farm Service Agency offices because of the shutdown, checks can't be cashed when the lender is the FSA.
>
> ''We've got millions of dollars of grain checks out there that farmers need,'' said Dan Poppe, president of the Archer (Neb.) Cooperative Credit Union, with locations in Archer, Dannebrog and Central City.
>
> He said entire rural economies count on the money.
>
> ''It impacts not only our farmers, who are relying heavily on the money, but also the local grocery store, hardware store, the feed and seed,'' Poppe said.

It is not just farmers and ranchers, it is also our manufacturers and our investors. A constituent from Waco, NB, wrote:

> I am a Dow employee living in your district. This impasse is beginning to threaten Dow's investment in new U.S. manufacturing. Not only will a continued delay push back Dow's plans to create thousands of new American jobs, it will harm Dow's competitiveness and directly impact me and my family. Greater economic certainty will help Dow, its employees, and our State thrive.

The wife of a Federal law enforcement officer from Gretna wrote:

> We are a single income family. We have a 2 and 3 year old and one more on the way. I am due in November. This shutdown will leave us unable to pay our bills.

A 23-year-old Department of Agriculture employee emailed me saying:

> My wife works two jobs to help make ends meet, but we still live paycheck to paycheck. If this shutdown is not resolved within the next few days, we will be devastated financially.

A U.S. Air Force veteran wrote to tell me:

> I applied for Social Security disability assistance on the 15th of August and my claim had gone for medical review on the 26th of August. I have no money, and I just found out yesterday that because of the shutdown SSA claims are on hold.

A furloughed Federal worker from Omaha called my office to say: We are all tired. We are tired of not getting a budget until the last minute. We are all tired. You guys need to do your job.

I agree. I hear these same messages over and over. Nebraskans are tired of the name calling and the blame games. They want to see government work, and they want to see it work well. They are not fooled by the rhetoric, and they expect us to govern responsibly. I agree. That is why I am talking with my colleagues—not publicly in front of the cameras but privately—to see if we can forge a way forward. But I believe we have to do more than just open the government. That is just the basics. We have to address our $17 trillion debt. It is smothering this country, it is jeopardizing our national security, and it is a threat to our children's future.

Congress will soon vote on increasing the debt ceiling—the sixth debt limit increase in the past 5 years. Our national debt has almost doubled since 2006, and our debt limit has grown twice as much as our economy in the past 2 years. Shouldn't the opposite be true? Meanwhile, our economy's lethargic recovery continues sluggishly along at a rate of 1 to 2 percent. This is unacceptable.

Instead of growing our economy by reducing spending, cutting regulations, and overhauling an outdated tax code,

Congress has continued to spend money we just don't have.

I didn't run for office to shut down the government. I ran for office to help hard-working Americans get back to work. I ran for this office to stand for middle-class families who aren't asking government for a hand up, they are just asking that the government stop holding them down. Nebraskans want to know they can provide for their families, and I don't think that is asking too much.

Make no mistake. High public debt depresses economic growth, which in turn dampens job creation. Ironically, our country's debt crisis comes as the Congressional Budget Office is predicting that tax revenues will be at an alltime high—$2.7 trillion in tax revenues. The problem isn't that we have too little revenue, the problem is that we are spending too much.

Part of why Nebraskans are frustrated is that our problems are so clear. We know exactly what they are. There is no mystery here. The American people know you can't keep spending twice what you make. They live within a budget—a budget that must balance—and they expect government to do the same. Our government is a long way from a balanced budget, but we can work at a minimum to try to get there.

Despite these realities, we are not moving forward. For the past several weeks, Members of Congress, the President, and the press have been participants in a circus. After 9 days, there is still no end in sight. Let me repeat that. After 9 days of a government shutdown, there is still no end in sight.

That is not to say there aren't some good ideas out there. Several of my colleagues have offered a number of commonsense proposals that do have broad support. These ideas include repeal of the medical device tax, which was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to its budget resolution by an overwhelming vote of 79 to 20. And this happened in March. Other ideas include a commitment to reducing spending, as required by current law, but we would increase the flexibility for Federal agencies to make smarter cuts. We all agree sequestration is a very clumsy way to cut spending.

That is why we need to provide program managers with the ability to determine which programs are wasteful or less efficient.

It is a matter of setting priorities so we can make wise decisions. That is the Nebraska way, and that is what we need to do in Washington as well.

Senator COLLINS' sequestration proposal would also allow Congress to continue to exercise oversight on all spending and related cuts. That is important. Even the President has put forth ideas to cut spending by $400 billion over the next 10 years. These offers could give us the framework for a real discussion.

Yet we remain at an impasse, unable to move forward. A nation of movers, thinkers, innovators, and entrepreneurs should not be caught in neutral. We should move forward—always forward, and always building a better future. We are the single greatest nation the world has ever known. We have stood as a sentinel of liberty and economic prosperity for over 200 years, yet we find ourselves no longer able to perform even the most basic functions of government. That is not acceptable. Our forefathers, our constituents, and our children and our grandchildren deserve better.

I am ready to move forward. I am tired of waiting, and I am willing to work with any of my colleagues to find a reasonable solution. So let's get to work.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am privileged to represent the State of Ohio, as I know the Presiding Officer is to represent Connecticut, and the previous speaker is to represent Nebraska.

We are home to several large research facilities—medical research facilities, aeronautics research facilities, military research facilities, some that are overwhelmingly represented to do research in pure science. All of them have a major impact in their communities in terms of employment with usually very good-paying jobs—scientists, engineers, physicians, chemists, and all kinds of people in the natural, medical, or aeronautic sciences and all of the support staff. These research facilities are always good for communities. And they not only provide employment, but they provide great wealth for our country. So much of this research helps people in their daily lives and is commercialized into businesses, and entrepreneurs take much of this research and applied science and create more economic activity, prosperity, and good-paying jobs. And that is where this shutdown is particularly problematic.

There are 800,000 Federal employees that have lost jobs as a result of this ridiculous shutdown. I have spent much of the last several days on the phone talking to people running these institutions, talking to smalltown and big-city bankers, entrepreneurs, businesses, union officials, and people who represent or run many of these organizations. All of them think this shutdown is absolutely unnecessary.

Just a moment ago the Presiding Officer and I had a conversation, and we both shake our heads: Why do radicals in the House of Representatives want to inflict this kind of pain—not just on the 800,000 Federal workers, but on the contractors near these facilities, the restaurants, hardware stores and businesses, and the school districts that are affected because people aren't bringing home the income and aren't paying as much taxes—all that happens when this willful government shutdown, orchestrated because a group of people want to attach their political platform, ideas, gimmicks, or statements to legislation we need to pass?

It is pretty simple: Pass the continuing resolution. Keep the government open. That is not a Democratic or Republican platform. That is what we need to do. Don't go around attaching political statements in a political platform to a simple ''keep the government open'' resolution.

The same on the debt ceiling. Nobody is wild about increasing the debt ceiling. Nobody is wild about passing legislation so we don't default. It is not a part of the 2012 Democratic platform to raise the debt ceiling, nor is it a part of the 2012 Republican platform. So when we have a vote, it is not negotiated: Let's add a bunch of 2012 Republican party platform rhetoric to something to raise the debt ceiling so the government of the United States pays its bills. It is not a Democratic or a Republican value to pay the bills this Congress ran up. It is our duty.

We take an oath of office. I took the oath in January 2013. The Presiding Officer took his oath. We know running the government and paying our bills is what you do as an elected official. Those never used to be controversial, until some radicals in the House of Representatives decided that this is a political opportunity. We can accuse the President of not negotiating. We can tell the public the Democrats are willing to shut down the government. The Republican Governor of Nevada to the Democratic majority leader from Nevada this week called it a Republican shutdown. So it is clearly a group of radicals.

Back to what I was saying about these great research facilities. The Presiding Officer has them in Connecticut, I have them in Ohio, and the Senator from Hawaii has them in her State. An administrator of one said it is asymmetrical, killing and building a major scientific endeavor. It is a lot harder and takes a lot longer for a group of engineers, doctors or scientists to construct a very important scientific endeavor than it does to kill one.

Fifty years ago, Speaker of the House Rayburn from Texas at one time said—and I will clean this up: Any mule can kick down a barn. It takes a carpenter to build one.

I will make it more personal. A dozen years ago I was involved in a car accident and broke my back. I was in good health and exercised, but for 3 days I didn't get out of bed. I remember the first day I got out of bed and tried to walk. My leg muscles had atrophied. It takes a lot of time to build up those leg muscles, and it took 3 days for them to

atrophy. I was in my late 40s then and in good shape.

That is also the way science is, in the same sense that it takes a long time and a lot of investment of public dollars and a lot of brain power and really high-quality, talented scientists, engineers, doctors, or medical researchers to do these projects. And then we are going to lay them off for 2 or 3 weeks because somebody has some political idea they want to attach to a continuing resolution. Somebody wants to take their political platform and put it on legislation that the government pay its bills for their political gain.

A leader of one of these major institutions in Ohio told me he had to bring in many of his managers and employees and tell them there were going to be layoffs and furloughs. In some cases, with no end in sight because of this government shutdown, what are they going to do? Their scientific endeavors get interrupted and in some cases may not be repaired or rebuilt. So many of the best scientists and engineers are going to say: I am not coming back and doing this.

So the radical Republicans in the House of Representatives say: OK, we can keep the government open if you repeal part of ObamaCare.

If the President had done that and said: OK, keep the government open, and we will repeal this section of ObamaCare, what would have happened next? Then there would have been another continuing resolution or another end of the fiscal year or another opportunity these politicians would have seized to again threaten to shut the government down and gut something else, some other law they don't like. In other words, if there is a law they don't like, and they are in the position, then they are going to say: I am going to shut the government down if you don't change this law. If the President says yes to that, what happens the next time? Then, I am going to ask the President to get rid of two laws I don't like or I will shut the government down or I am going to block the government from paying its bills because I don't like a law passed back in 1993 or 2007. We can't operate the government like that.

NASA Glenn Research facilities, one of the great NASA facilities in the country; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, a major research facility near Dayton, OH; Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus—thousands of employees, engineers, scientists, technicians, highly-skilled people, very educated, run eight of the national energy labs. Case Western Reserve University Medical School and Engineering School, Ohio State University, University of Cincinnati—I could name one after another. These places can't operate if every 6 months or 1 year they are subject to a potential government shutdown unless the President does what some radical Members of Congress want.

So when people say: First, open the government; second, pay our bills; and, third, let's negotiate—we have already negotiated the dollar figure on the continuing resolution. Every time the continuing resolution expires or the fiscal year ends, every time we have to pay our debts when the debt ceiling limit is reached—if we have to play this game, it is going to mean a potential government shutdown or disruption at Battelle, NASA Glenn, Ohio State's medical school funding and research funding, and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. If that is the way this crowd believes we should run a government, they don't have much regard for government.

Every time they have had a chance, they tried to privatize Medicare, they tried to privatize Social Security. They don't like EPA, Head Start, or Meals On Wheels. They don't like these government programs. I understand that, but play it right. Don't threaten to close the government unless we change the law which Congress passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court affirmed. But if it was my political platform in 2012—even though it was defeated in front of tens of millions of voters—and I don't like what you are doing, then I am going to threaten to shut down the government. Our country is too important and too big for that.

On an international scale, the President of the United States didn't go to China for a major economic conference because he had to be here because the government was shut down. Other countries—particularly China—made fun of us. Other countries basically were asking: Is the United States abdicating its leadership role? And the Peoples Republic of China is not slowing down in their investment in scientific research or modernizing their infrastructure.

If we allow this kind of government shutdown and this kind of activity by radicals in the House of Representatives, this is not good for our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, amid all the rhetoric and the blame games and, yes, even theatrics, I want to make sure the American people actually understand what President Obama and the majority leader are asking us to do. Their position is that Congress should raise the debt limit—actually suspend the debt limit through the end of 2014 and increase our national debt by another $1.1 trillion without doing anything to solve our underlying fiscal problems, including the $17 trillion in debt we have already run up.

I cannot imagine there is anyone in this Chamber or within the sound of my voice who thinks that is a good idea. At some point, if we keep maxing out our credit card rather than dealing with our debt problem, our spending problem, we come back to the bank, so to speak, and ask for our debt limit to be increased another $1.1 trillion, where will this end? I can tell you where I think it will end: It will end in disaster. Ultimately, at some point our creditors will lose confidence in our ability to repay that money. At some point interest rates are going to not be zero or next to zero, they will be up around the historic average, 4 percent or 5 percent, and we will have to pay China and our other creditors more and more of our Federal budget just to pay interest on the national debt.

At some point that becomes unsustainable. It will hurt our national security. It will hurt the safety net programs we all care about, to protect our most vulnerable. Unfortunately, the President and the majority leader remain dug in. Notwithstanding the charts we have seen on this floor that talk about negotiations, there have been no real negotiations. The President called Speaker BOEHNER last night to tell him: In case you missed the message, Mr. Speaker, from when we met at the White House last week, we are still not negotiating.

What is that all about? The President could have sent him a text message with as much information as that conveyed.

I am told the President has invited the Republican Members of Congress to the White House to meet with him tomorrow. I hope that meeting is more productive than the meetings he has already held or the phone conversations he has had with the Speaker. I can only hope the President has reconsidered his unsustainable position, that he is not willing to negotiate.

The Founders of this great country created a Constitution for us with coequal branches of government. Congress is not better or worse than the executive branch. We are coequal. We cannot function without one another. We can pass a law, but it cannot become the law unless the President signs it. The President cannot pass a law without Congress. So we have to learn to work together.

In the context of the recent history I want to recount for everybody, the President's refusal to negotiate is simply unsustainable and quite remarkable. Over the last 30 years, virtually every major domestic policy reform has involved at least some kind of bipartisan compromise.

In 1983, a conservative Republican President worked with a liberal Speaker of the House and Senate leaders from both parties to save and preserve Social Security. That was in 1983. At the time those Social Security amendments were signed into law, Republicans had the same Senate majority the Democrats have today, 54 Republicans then, 46 Democrats. Meanwhile, the Democratic House majority was significantly larger than the Republican House majority today. Yet both sides did what so far we have been unable to do and that is come together, negotiate and reach an outcome. Ronald Reagan, back in 1983, then signed that negotiated outcome into law. In the end, the majority Senate Democrats voted for those Social Security

amendments, as did a majority of Senate Republicans.

Three years later, in 1986, liberal Democrats and conservative Democrats joined together to enact another landmark reform bill. Once again the President's party controlled the Senate but not the House. Once again, there was not a refusal to negotiate; rather, there was a negotiation and a bipartisan outcome—notwithstanding the normal partisan rivalries that will always exist. In June 1986, 97 Members of this Chamber, a massive, overwhelming supermajority, voted in favor of the Tax Reform Act which lowered Federal income tax rates and broadened the base. The final version of that bill was supported by a majority of Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans as well. That was the kind of historic accomplishment that seems to be slipping through our fingers today by virtue of the refusal to negotiate. That was a historic accomplishment that dramatically simplified the U.S. Tax Code and made it more conducive to economic growth—a lesson we would do well to recall and emulate today.

Fast forward a decade to 1996. A Democratic President, Bill Clinton, joined together with the Republican House and Senate and, despite partisan pressure enough to go around and all sorts of heated rhetoric, Democrats and Republicans joined together and reformed our welfare system, helping millions of disadvantaged people to get off welfare rolls and make the transition from dependency to work, dignity and self-reliance. That was a great accomplishment. In the end, 78 Senators, including most Senate Democrats and every single Senate Republican, voted for that.

One more prominent example. In 2001, a conservative Republican President worked with a prominent liberal Democrat to enact a major overhaul to our education laws. Indeed, the No Child Left Behind Act was a direct result of President Bush's negotiations and collaboration with the late Senator Ted Kennedy. The final legislation 87 Senators voted for, including a majority of Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans.

I am not necessarily saying every single one of those pieces of legislation was something that was perfect in every way. I think we have learned there are things that still needed to be done, particularly when it came to education reform, but the three Presidents I mentioned, two Republicans and one Democrat, worked together to make substantial compromises in order to pass Social Security reform, tax reform, welfare reform, and education reform. But they also understood that politics is the art of the possible and they did not treat the word negotiate as a dirty four-letter word.

I want to emphasize one more time that Republicans stand ready to work with President Obama in addressing our country's most serious fiscal and economic challenges. Yet rather than to pursue serious good-faith negotiations over things such as entitlement reform and tax reform, things that would actually be good for our economy and good for our country, President Obama decides to erect and then knock down strawmen.

For example, when Republicans talk about entitlement reform, he says we want to eliminate the safety net. When Republicans talk about tax reform, he says we want to give tax breaks to rich people. That is campaigning, that is not governing.

Here is the reality, though. Republicans do not want to eliminate the safety net, we want to improve the safety net, particularly Medicare and Social Security. We don't want to give special tax breaks just to the wealthy, we want to give all Americans a simpler, flatter, fairer Tax Code that is more conducive to economic growth. We want the type of Tax Code the President's own bipartisan fiscal commission, Simpson-Bowles—the recommendations they made in 2010. Yet the President ignored it, walked away, and has done nothing to contribute to that debate.

We understand, being elected officials ourselves, that all elected politicians have to campaign for office. It goes with the territory. You cannot get here unless you run for office and you win an election. But at some point the campaign has to end. At some point we have to govern. At some point the partisan rhetoric has to give way to actually accomplishing things and solving problems. At some point America's elected leadership needs to demonstrate real leadership and a willingness to govern.

President Obama has now reached a critical point in his Presidency, in his second term. He will be remembered for one thing or another. He will be remembered either as a President who was willing to step up when America needed that kind of leadership, when Congress needed bipartisan cooperation in order to solve our Nation's biggest challenges, or he will leave a legacy, if he does not do that, of a President who refused to do his job in order to try to win the partisan battles.

We need something better and America deserves better. We need a President who will govern and not campaign perpetually.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, our distinguished Republican whip referred to negotiations that occurred regarding welfare reform, tax reform, education reform, No Child Left Behind. These negotiations occurred, yes, but they certainly occurred not in the context of a threat of a government shutdown or the threat of government defaulting on our obligations. There is a very big difference in the context in which these negotiations occurred. That is not what we have before us today.

This past Saturday I came to the floor to share some thoughts on the impact of this government shutdown on Hawaii's Federal employees. In those remarks, I tried to remind my colleagues that we have to think beyond the most recent news cycle. Shutting down government hurts the confidence of the American people in our institutions. It drives people away from public service and it undermines our national security and our economy. If we are going to live up to the legacy of our Nation as the world's indispensable Nation, we have to rise above zero sum politics. We have to show our allies and our adversaries that our political process can withstand grave disagreements. Our process is intended to allow for vigorous debate but to ultimately find common ground.

Over 6 months ago, the Senate passed a budget. So did the House. A little over 6 days ago the U.S. Government shut down. How did this happen? The reason is that Republicans have blocked now 21 attempts to negotiate a Federal budget agreement in a timely fashion. That is how negotiations are supposed to happen—not with the threat of a government shutdown, not with the threat of defaulting on our obligations and debt.

Instead, after 6 months of failing to come to the table, tea party Republicans are holding the U.S. Government—and, if we default on our debts, the world economy—hostage.

Enough is enough. The Senate is prepared to negotiate on fiscal issues. The President is ready to negotiate on fiscal issues. We can find a way forward so we can all agree on the path. But first Congress needs to do its job. It needs to reopen the government and make sure the United States pays its bills. These are fundamental responsibilities.

Just to be clear, defaulting on our debt would be the most irresponsible action I can imagine. It is the most easily avoidable catastrophe in history. We are not talking about a natural disaster, we are talking about a totally avoidable catastrophe. Yet some Republicans in the House believe a default would not be a big deal. In fact, one Member of the House actually said that a default would ''bring stability to world markets.''

That is an opinion that no one outside of the tea party bubble agrees with. In fact, economists, small businesses, bankers, big businesses, realtors, and nearly everyone in between have been clear: Default would be a catastrophe for our economy—and not just our economy either. Our currency, our bonds, and the full faith and credit they are backed by are the linchpin of the global economy. How a default from the world's most trusted Nation could possibly bring stability to world markets is incomprehensible.

We have to stop the ideological games and irresponsible rhetoric, and then we can negotiate on fiscal issues and other policies—mindful of the work

we were elected to do and mindful of the people, families, and communities that elected us to serve them.

Today I would like to share some more stories from Hawaii families and businesses about how the government shutdown is impacting one of the key drivers of Hawaii's economy—tourism.

Each year millions of people from all over the world flock to Hawaii. Our State has so much to offer. They come to enjoy our blue oceans and sandy beaches. They come to visit our breathtaking national parks and wildlife refugees. They also come to learn and pay respect at our historical attractions, such as Pearl Harbor.

Last year Hawaii welcomed over 8 million visitors—a record number. Combined, these visitors spent $42 million per day, of which $5 million supports State and local government activities that benefit our communities. In 2012 about 20 percent of our State's gross domestic product was generated by tourism. That economic activity supports 175,000 jobs in Hawaii.

Due to our location in the center of the Pacific Ocean, Hawaii's tourism industry relies on critical government services to keep people moving and commerce flowing. These include the work done by our air traffic controllers, our customs and TSA personnel, and agricultural inspectors. Many of these workers are on the job, but they are not getting paid right now. Thanks to them, our transportation systems are operating safely and effectively. As a result, visitors are still flocking to our resorts, our beaches, and other attractions. Even with the tea party shutdown, 2013 is on track to be another strong year for tourism in Hawaii.

Unfortunately, at the same time, there are small businesses around the State that are being impacted by this shutdown. For the last 7 days our national parks, wildlife refugees, and historical sites have been closed to the public. These Federal sites are critical to many small businesses, particularly in our rural communities.

Over the past week I have heard from many people—especially small business owners—whose livelihoods are being impacted by the closure of these Federal sites. One tour operator wrote to me:

> Our business is losing money, as do our tour guides who cannot perform the tours to the National Parks. We have to return the money to a lot of our clients because their tours have to be cancelled. Our tour guides are losing income as well, as they will not be able to do the tours.

National parks are some of the main attractions in Hawaii. People travel thousands of miles from all parts of the world, spend a lot of money to come and visit, and then the main things that attract them are closed and they are not able to see them. For a lot of people, these trips are once in a lifetime, and if they don't see them now, they will never be able to see them again.

A restaurant owner from Hawaii Island wrote:

> Well, we are in a small town on the Big Island of Hawaii. Our economy is totally tourist driven. We are dependent on people going to the National Park and stopping at our place to eat. Since the shutdown, our revenue has dropped a lot and we have had to cut hours for employees to compensate for the lack of business.
>
> I'm tired of all this Republican childish actions and wish all politicians would drop the partisan nonsense and do what is right for the American People.
>
> Thank you for your concern.

One gentleman from Maui reminded me that private businesses don't get to pause on meeting their commitments when the government is closed. He wrote:

> My daughter and son-in-law have a tourist based clientele for their bicycle crater tour business on Maui. When Haleakala National Park was closed down, they lost their income and are still having to pay office expenses, etc., etc., as well as their home expenses, but nothing is coming in, as everything is going out.
>
> They are losing hundreds to thousands of dollars a day, their employees who have families aren't able to work with the business closed, tourists who come to Maui to have a good time, part of which was the bike ride down from Haleakala, are angry and disappointed and some even think this is somehow Maui government's fault!

He goes on to say:

> My daughter has six children, mortgage payments. Money is going out, but none is coming in. My family are diligent middle class people who work hard, pay their taxes, vote in every election—responsible citizens who do their part always.
>
> If this ridiculous federal government shutdown continues for any length of time, my family will lose their business and be at poverty level in no time, as will all their employees. Everyone I know, on either side of the political spectrum, thinks the shutdown is ridiculous and unnecessary.

I also heard about the impact of the shutdown on the visitors themselves who go to Hawaii. One person from Hawaii whose family members traveled to Hawaii to visit wrote:

> My family has travelled 6,000 miles on a once in a lifetime trip—sorry—no Pearl Harbor (Dad was a lifer Navy man) no Volcanoes National Park—no Puukohola—these sites are essential to our culture and tourism alike—many are without work—it is just ridiculous over a LAW that has been declared Constitutional—their antics change nothing—just hurt our country.

Another local bed-and-breakfast owner on the Big Island shared the perspective of some of her international guests:

> Aloha, I have a bed and breakfast in Hilo and I feel sorry for my guests who have saved for a once in a lifetime vacation to Hawaii. They have come from all over the world to see our Beautiful Volcano National Park! These Guests do not understand how the government can CLOSE and deny them access to the Park.
>
> This week I have guests from Montreal, Canada; Singapore, Germany, France and Japan! They may NEVER have the opportunity to visit here again. This is Shameful for our country. Not only is this behavior bad for our Country but bad for the world.

The tea party shutdown is also impacting Hawaiian visitors to our Nation's Capital. Yesterday I met with 81 students from Millilani Middle School on Oahu. They made the long trip from Hawaii to Washington, DC, in hopes of seeing historical sites, visiting museums, and learning about their country and our democracy. The trip was saved for and planned for months in advance. The sites and museums were scheduled. Their tickets and reservations were already paid for. They could not rebook their travel even though the shutdown has closed many of the sites they planned to visit. I took them on a tour of the Capitol myself because it was the only way they could see these halls of government. These students are here to learn about our democracy. Many of them asked me about the shutdown and how we were going to get government back on track. What kind of message will they take home with them about how our government operates?

These are just some of the stories that illustrate the real impact of the tea party shutdown on communities, families, and people in Hawaii. So many of the folks whose letters I have shared work hard to earn an honest living. They go to work each day, striving to show our visitors aloha while building something for themselves and their families to be proud of. They play by the rules, meet their commitments, and do what they can to be good community members. Yet, through no fault of their own, many of these Hawaii small businesses are losing income and their livelihoods are being affected.

It is past time for the House to take the responsible action to pass the Senate bill to keep government running and services going. It is not fair to our veterans, our students, and their families when they can't visit our Nation's historical and national treasures just because a small minority in Congress has chosen recklessness over responsibility. It is not fair that this shutdown and these senseless default threats have gone on for a week. This behavior is harming our economy and undermining our credibility around the world. We need to stop the tea party temper tantrum, we need to open the government, we need to pay our bills, and then we can negotiate on other matters.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I appreciate the time to be on the floor. I want to continue talking about what I think are the real problems with where we are today.

What we are hearing in the press is that there is no agreement on a continuing resolution, that there is conflict and lack of discussion in Washington, that the debt limit is coming

up, yet Washington is not capable of solving its problems.

I made some points yesterday about the reason we are not capable of solving our problems is that there is an absence of leadership. We are not only bankrupt financially, we are bankrupt when it comes to our leadership.

I want to dispel the rumor that our problems are not insolvable. They are imminently solvable. We have $126 trillion worth of unfunded liabilities for which Americans are responsible. We have $17 trillion worth of debt, and we have $94 trillion of total assets in this country if you add what the Federal Government and everybody else owns. So the difference between $128 trillion and $94 trillion is $34 trillion, and then another $17 trillion—that is $51 trillion we are going to have to account for. What is in front of us—and by the way, the Affordable Care Act will add $6.7 trillion to those outstanding liabilities net of any tax revenues and tax increases it collects.

So what are we to do? What are the American people to think? They see impasse, lack of conversation, lack of compromise, lack of resolution, and no reconciliation. So I wanted to take a few minutes today to kind of give a little history, first of all, and then outline what is possible—I am not saying we must do it—over the next 10 years that we could do that would put us on a pathway to where we would be solving the problems and not leaving our children an inheritance of debt.

I made the point yesterday that the median family income in this country today in terms of real dollars is exactly where it was in 1989. We are going backward. We are going to go backward this year. What that really means is that the standard of living is declining. The American public is getting further and further behind.

One of the quotes I use—and I don't know if it is accurate—has been attributed to Alexander Tytler, a Scottish historian. Let me read it:

> A democracy—
>
> In this case a constitutional Republic—
>
> is always temporary in nature; it simply cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It will continue to exist until the time that voters discover that they can vote themselves generous gifts from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes with the candidates who promise the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that every democracy will finally collapse due to loose fiscal policy, which is always followed by a dictatorship.

Where are we in that line? Is $50 trillion in negative net worth not a sign that we are going there? Is declining median family income not a sign that we are going there?

What we have seen in this last so-called recovery is the wealthy have done very well but nobody else has. So what we are seeing is history repeat itself in terms of what has been outlined and observed in the past.

Alexander Tytler was also accredited with this, but nobody can prove it:

> The average age of the world's greatest civilizations from the beginning of history has been about 200 years. During these 200 years, these nations always progressed through the following sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependence; from dependence back into bondage.

I think we are somewhere in here, if history speaks accurately, or at least his observation of history.

So what we ought to be about is making sure we cheat history—all of us, together, liberals, conservatives, Democrats, Republicans, Independents—we ought to be about cheating history. How do we do that? Are the problems we have in front of us so big that we can't solve them? I don't think so. Are positions so hardened that we can't think in a long-term way about solving the problems that are in front of our country?

When we talk about the debt ceiling—I have been accosted a lot in the news media in the last 48 hours because I don't believe the debt ceiling equals default on our obligations in terms of our sovereign debt. It just so happens Moody's, the rating agency, agreed with me today; that, in fact, they are not the same thing and they say there should be no effect. That doesn't mean we should. I am not proposing we should. But the scare tactics of saying the Earth is going to collapse if we somehow fail on time to raise the debt limit is not true. The Earth will collapse for Americans if we don't address the underlying problems facing our country—this $50 trillion in unfunded liability and negative net worth.

Here is what we know has happened in the last few years, and it proves the point. It is why median family income is going down. It is because our debt is growing twice as fast as our economy.

Here is our GDP increase over the last few years: $1.199 trillion. Here is our debt: It went up $2.405 trillion. To say that another way, that is 2.4 billion millions. These numbers are unfathomable, but the graph shows it all. Our GDP has increased. So what is happening is that for every $1 in debt we go into, we are getting a deepening decrease in return in our economy, and it is continuing to go down. So the more we borrow, the less well off we are in terms of being able to grow our economy. So the problems in front of us and what we see is what I would say as careerists don't want to solve the problem because the thing that comes to the careerist's mind is how does that effect the next election.

I don't care what happens in the next election in this country; what I care about is whether we are going to address the real problems and secure the future for the country. Whether they be Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, I don't care. We are all in this together. When our living standard goes down, we all go down together.

So how do we solve this problem? The first thing in any addiction—and we have an addiction to spending—is to recognize we have an addiction. We have an addiction to spending. We have an addiction to not living within our means. We just passed $600 billion in January of increased taxes on the American economy, most of that coming from the people who are doing much better during this tepid recovery. Will that solve our problems? Can we tax our way out of this? Can we have confiscatory tax policies that will not hurt our economy and get us out of this? The answer is no, and everybody recognizes it.

What else does everybody recognize? They recognize that a big portion of the problem is entitlement spending, and no political party wants to be blamed for being the person who ''fixed'' entitlement spending unless we do it together. So we have a great opportunity to, together, modify our mandatory spending programs and make significant savings. But having spent the last 9 years with my colleague from Delaware who is on the floor oversighting the Federal Government, I can tell my colleagues there are more things we can do other than that.

So I thought I would spend a few minutes to go over a publication I put out a couple of summers ago, and it is called ''Back in Black.'' It is not perfect. I will be the first to admit it. I know we will not ever pass $9 trillion worth of savings over 10 years. But here is $9 trillion worth of options we could look at and take half of them and actually get on the road to health.

What would getting on the road to health look like? It would be rising personal incomes, not declining personal incomes as we are seeing today. It would be rising median family incomes. It would be faster economic growth.

Mr. President, am I out of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. My request was for 30 minutes when I came to the floor. Evidently, that wasn't made. Is the order of the day 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. COBURN. I would ask for just a short period of additional time if my colleague from Delaware would allow it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. May I ask unanimous consent that the doctor be afforded another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. I will spend some time tomorrow then going through what this is. But it is solving our problem in such a way that it doesn't kick the can down the road, which is what we are getting ready to do.

What I would say in conclusion is by increasing the debt limit, we let the politicians off the hook because then

they don't have to make the hard choices required for us to live within our means.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state his inquiry.

Mr. CARPER. I have no objection; I can stay 10 minutes, 20 minutes. I would like for the Senator from Oklahoma Dr. COBURN to have a chance to explain what he wanted to say. I don't mean to interrupt.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I would just inquire if there are other speakers after Senator CARPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no apparent order of speakers, and if there is no objection, the Senator from Oklahoma can take an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Chair. I truly thank my colleague. He is a great colleague to work with. People are always telling stories about how people don't work together. I can tell my colleagues that the Senator from Delaware Mr. CARPER and I work together. He is my chairman, and I am the ranking member on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, where most of this information came from, and he helped dig it up.

What I say is we have an opportunity to do that. We have an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together, forge a compromise, make major changes that are necessary and absolutely required if we are going to have a secure future. I think we ought to look at it.

So we put together a plan that has $3 trillion—that is $300 billion over 10 years—in discretionary spending; that is nonmandatory. It has $1 trillion in defense spending, which is about what we already have. Health care entitlements is $2.7 trillion, and we can go into the details of that. Tax Code simplification, $1 trillion to come back to the Federal Government. Interest payment savings of $1.3 trillion, and Social Security reform that says it will be healthy for the next 75 years. That comes to $9 trillion that our kids aren't going to have to pay back. That is $9 trillion in money we are not going to borrow. So even if we just took half of that—$4.5 trillion—and said we are going to get on the path to health, we are going to float that $3 trillion that is sitting in cash in Americans' bank accounts and give them the confidence back to invest it in our country, it would make a massive difference in our country because what is going on right now is a crisis of confidence.

The American people don't trust Congress. I think we got a pretty low rating this week and deservedly so. The approval rating of President Obama is at his alltime low. So how do we fix that? We don't fix that individually. We don't fix that by pointing out what is wrong with the other person. We fix that by coming together and solving real problems that will give the American people confidence that we have their best interests at heart—not in the short term, as Alexander Tytler was talking about, but in the long term; that, in fact, we want to secure the future for our kids and grandkids.

I think we ought to be about cutting up the credit card. I know I am in the minority in the Senate. I don't believe we should have another debt limit increase. I think the thing to force us to make these hard choices—because there is certainly not the political will to do it—is to put ourselves in the position where we are forced to make the hard choices.

We are going to make them eventually. Everybody agrees with that. We are basically going to make these changes because there will come a time when we will not be able to borrow money no matter what interest rate we pay. So we are not talking about defaulting on our sovereign debt. We are not talking about not paying interest on our sovereign debt. We are talking about forcing ourselves into a position where we have to prioritize what we spend.

What do the GAO reports tell us? In the last 3 years, the GAO has given Congress wonderful information which Congress has not acted on. What have they told us? They have told us we have 91 different health care workforce training programs—91. They have told us we have 679 renewable energy initiatives, none of which have a metric on them. They have told us we have 76 different drug abuse and prevention programs run by the Federal Government. They have told us the Department of Defense has 159 different contracting organizations, none of them being held accountable. They have told us that at Homeland Security, where Senator CARPER and I chair and vice chair the committee, they have six different R&D facilities, three of which are doing exactly the same thing. We have 209 science, technology, engineering, and math programs—209. We have 200 different crime prevention programs. We have 160 homeowners and renters assistance programs. We have 94 private sector green building assistance programs, none with a metric, and the agencies don't even know how much money they are spending on them. They told us we have 82 teacher quality programs run by the Federal Government, half of which are not in the Department of Education. I will not continue, but my colleagues get my point.

What have we done about those things? Nothing. Where is the oversight on them? There is none. So the whole idea for me—I am thinking about the future more than I am a political career—is I think we ought to be working on those things. I think the American public expects us to work on them.

I will finish by saying we have been running the credit card for a long time. Do we, in fact, have the right or the privilege or the ability to ask for an extension and a raising of our debt when, in fact, we have not acted responsibly with our spending? Nobody else in the country gets their credit raised when they have not acted responsibly. They actually check your credit score. They know what kind of bills you are paying, whether you are getting further behind. So should we, in fact, tear up the credit card? Should we force some good old adult supervision on Congress, where we will actually be forced to make difficult decisions about priorities on how we spend America's money? When I say ''America's money,'' I mean the people out there working hard every day. They may not be the highest tax payers, but it is unconscionable to me that when we spend their money, we are wasting 15 to 20 percent of it all the time.

So I think we ought to tear it up. The way we tear it up is we just tear it up. We tear the credit card up. We shred the credit card, and we say: You are going to live within your means. You are going to start making the hard choices. You are addicted to spending. You are addicted to not being responsible with the dollars you have.

Congress needs to be in a 12-step program, and it should start with us.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague the Senator from Delaware for his patience and his friendship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, Dr. COBURN is a tough act to follow, and I am not going to try to do that. But I am happy to serve with him. We come from different parts of the country, different kinds of training, upbringing, and careers, but we have ended up here together in the Senate for the last 9 years and have had an opportunity to lead, first, the subcommittee on Federal financial management—it is a subcommittee of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—and this year to be the Democratic and Republican leaders of the committee. I enjoy working with him. I find that we have the opportunity to do some really good for our country, and I thank him for letting me be his wingman.

I want to just follow on with what Dr. COBURN has said, by asking us to think of how we spend money and what we spend it for in this government of ours. Then I actually have an op-ed that I read recently in our local paper in Delaware that I would like to read into the RECORD from Dr. Bob Laskowski, who is the CEO and the president of Christiana Care Health System, one of the largest hospital systems not just in our State but one of the largest in our part of the country.

Before I do that, I want to follow on to some of Dr. COBURN's comments by talking about our spending in the Federal Government. I would like to think of it as a pie. It is a big pie. A little more than half of the spending pie goes for something we call entitlements—things we are entitled to by virtue of our age, our station in life, or we might

be entitled to Medicare if we are 65 or older, or Medicare if we are disabled and unable to work, or we may be entitled to early Social Security benefits at age 62, full retirement Medicare benefits 5 or so years after that. We may be entitled to benefits because we served in the military or we are a veteran or somebody with a disability. Those are all programs that are called entitlement programs. A lot of people say they are uncontrollable, we cannot do anything to control them, and they have grown like Topsy.

Today, if you think of the spending pie, over half of it is for entitlement. Roughly, closer to another 5 to 10 percent of spending today is for interest on the debt. If interest rates were not so low, it would be a lot more than 5 or 10 percent. Fortunately, we are blessed to have very low interest rates, but still our interest as a percentage of that pie is somewhere, I think, between 5 and 10 percent.

The whole rest of the Federal government is called discretionary spending, which means we actually have some discretion on how that money is spent. It is not an entitlement program, but we actually have to pass spending bills. We call them, usually, appropriations bills. There are about a dozen of them that cover everything from agriculture to defense, to housing, to the environment, to education, to transportation—you name it. That part of the budget—roughly, close to 40 percent, 35 to 40 percent—is called discretionary spending. More than half of that discretionary spending is for defense—I would say roughly 20 percent of the whole pie, maybe a little more than 20 percent. About 15 percent of the whole pie—a little less than half of the discretionary spending—is for nondefense matters.

So if you think about it, it goes something like this: For the spending pie, over half of it is entitlements. Allegedly, those are things we cannot reduce, control. I do not agree with that. Another 5 or 10 percent is for interest. Then we have roughly 40 percent for discretionary spending, the lion's share of which is for defense, and a little less than half of it is for nondefense spending. Think about that—entitlements, interest, defense spending. You set that aside, and for the whole rest of the government you have about 15 percent. That is domestic or nondefense discretionary spending.

We could actually eliminate domestic discretionary spending in its entirety—get rid of everything, everything we do in government other than entitlement programs, interest, and defense—and we would still have a deficit.

For people who say we can only focus on domestic discretionary spending or squeeze that to reduce the deficit further, the deficit is down from about $1.4 trillion about 4 years ago to about half that today. So we have made progress. It is still way too big, but we cannot get from here to where we want to go in terms of a balanced budget by just focusing on domestic discretionary spending.

I would like to say there are three things we need to do. Dr. COBURN has heard me say this more times than he wants to remember. The Presiding Officer has heard me say it a time or two as well.

There are three things we need to do if we are serious about deficit reduction, facing the reality of today.

No. 1, entitlement reform. These are the President's words: entitlement reform that saves money, entitlement reform that saves these programs for our kids and our grandchildren, and entitlement reform—these are my words—entitlement reform that does not savage old people or poor people, but it is sensitive to the least of these in our society.

The second thing we need to do is to focus on revenues. We need some more revenues. If you look at our country last year, when our deficit was about $700 billion—the year we just finished—as I recall, revenue as a percentage of gross domestic product was somewhere in the area of 17 percent, maybe 18 percent—revenue as a percentage of GDP. Spending as a percentage of GDP was over 20 percent, maybe around 21, 22, 23 percent.

The difference between revenues as a percentage of GDP down here at 17, 18, 19 percent of GDP and spending at 21, 22, or 23 percent, that difference right there is about a $700 billion deficit from the last year.

At the end of the day we need to make the revenues come closer to, actually, the spending. I suggest that we need to take a page out of the book they did in the second term of President Bill Clinton when we had run chronic deficits since 1968. President Clinton asked Erskine Bowles, who was then his Chief of Staff, to work with a Republican Senate and Republican House—a Republican Congress—to see if we could come up with a budget plan that included revenues, included spending, to actually balance the budget.

As we all know the story, famously it worked. A Democratic President, working with a Republican House and Senate, with the help of Erskine Bowles and Sylvia Mathews—now Sylvia Mathews Burwell, who was Erskine's Deputy Chief of Staff, later Deputy OMB Director—they got the job done. They reached across the aisle and worked it out. The deficit reduction plan was a 50–50 deal—50 percent on the revenue side and 50 percent on the spending side. They grew the heck out of the economy. As a result, we had four balanced budgets in a row—I think 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Harry Truman used to say: The only thing that is new in the world is the history we forgot and never learned. I think as we try to figure out what to do with today's deficits and how to get on an even more fiscally responsible track, it would be smart to look back about 15 years and see how it worked then.

For folks who might be watching this around the country, we actually have a budget law. I think our budget law was adopted in 1974. There is an expectation in our Nation's budget law for the President to present us in the Congress with a budget—one budget, not a capital budget and an operating budget but one budget. It is different from the States. It is different from my State, where I was Governor of Delaware for 8 years, where we have a capital budget and an operating budget. But we have one budget.

The President usually submits a budget in January, maybe February. This year it was a little late. The expectation here in the Congress, under the law, is that by, say, the end of April—a couple months later—the House and the Senate would have passed something called a budget resolution.

A budget resolution—what is that? It is not a budget. A budget resolution is a framework for a budget. It includes not nitty-gritty line-item spending plans for everything—defense and nondefense—but it says, roughly, we will spend this much in these programs, and generally, we will raise this much money in these ways from these revenue sources. It is not very specific, but it is a framework for the budget. I like to think of it as the skeleton, and later on, when we pass appropriations bills, when we pass revenue measures, we put the meat on the bones. That is where the real specificity comes along.

For a number of years we have not been able to pass in the Senate, in the House, a budget resolution—they are usually different—and then go to conference, create a conference committee to create a compromise. We have found it difficult to actually come up with a compromise budget resolution—a compromise, a spending plan, a framework for the appropriations bills and revenue measures.

This year started more promising because in the Senate here, in April, under the leadership of our Senate Budget Committee chairman PATTY MURRAY of Washington, we actually passed a budget resolution—sadly, without Republican support. We passed one, and it was one of those like the Clinton years, a 50–50 deficit reduction deal. It did not eliminate the deficit, but it kept it going in the right track. Half of the deficit reduction was on the spending side, half on the revenue side.

Over in the House, they passed a different kind of budget resolution. The budget resolution they passed did a little entitlement reform. But that 15 percent of the spending pie I was talking about—the 15 percent that is domestic discretionary spending—was reduced, as I recall, from 15 percent to like 5 percent. Think about that. We would be talking about—aside from entitlement spending, interest on the debt, and defense spending—having about the whole rest of the government be like 5 percent of our spending. That is not my vision of what our government

should be about. That is not my vision. And I do not think that is the vision of a lot of people in this body and in this country.

So the three things we need to do: No. 1, entitlement reform. It saves money, saves the programs. It does not savage old people, poor people. The second thing, we need some additional revenues.

I remember Kent Conrad, when he was our Budget Committee chairman, gave a presentation at a meeting a year or so ago. He talked about revenues. He talked about tax expenditures. As to the tax expenditures that he talked about, he said over the next 10 years we will see about $12 to $15 trillion go out of the Treasury because of tax breaks—tax credits, tax deductions, tax loopholes, the tax gap—$12 to $15 trillion go out of the Treasury for those tax expenditures. He said more money will come out of the Treasury for those tax expenditures—tax breaks, tax credits, tax deductions, tax loopholes—than all the appropriations bills we are going to pass. Think about that.

He said we have a new way to appropriate money, we just do it through the Tax Code. I would say to our Republican and Democratic friends, this is where I think Senator Conrad was coming from. If we cannot figure out how out of $12 or $15 trillion of tax expenditures a year, maybe 5 percent of those that could be reduced or could be eliminated because they serve no useful purpose, something is wrong with us. If we can do 5 percent of, say, just $12 trillion in those tax expenditures, 5 percent would be about $600 billion over the next 10 years. Match that with entitlement spending reductions, that is about $1.2 trillion. That is a pretty good next step to take in narrowing our deficit on top of what we have already done.

The third piece, in addition to entitlement reform that saves money, saves the programs for the long haul, and does not savage old people or poor people, some additional revenue, generally from eliminating or reducing tax expenditures, the third piece—and Dr. COBURN was talking a little bit about this. He was talking about the way we spend money. We have a culture in the Federal Government. We have had it for a long time. Big companies have this culture too, and some States as well as counties and cities. I call it a culture of spend thrifts as opposed to a culture of thrift. What Dr. COBURN and I attempt to do with the folks on our committee is look at everything we do in the Federal Government to the extent that one committee can. We like to work with the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, with the General Accountability Office, GAO, the Office of Personnel Management, with the General Services Administration, all of the inspector generals across the agencies, throughout the Federal Government. We like to work with nonprofit groups such as Citizens Against Government Waste and others.

We do this in order to figure out what we are doing. How are we spending the taxpayers' money? Are there ways we can do those things, realize the goals we are trying to achieve, by spending less money or getting better results for the same amount of money? We need to do that in everything.

One of my colleagues said to me, when I said I was coming over to speak tonight: What are you going to talk about?

I said I think I will talk about regular order. We talk a fair amount about regular order around this place. We do not always follow it. Regular order, for the people watching who are tuned in wondering what is regular order, means following the rules. In this case, we have a Budget Act that says the President submits a budget the early part of the calendar year. Congress adopts a budget resolution. We do that about the beginning of May. Then we do our work on preparing appropriations bills and revenue measures. In order to go to a conference on a budget resolution, we have to get agreement. The majority leader will come or the Budget Committee chair will come to the floor and say: I ask unanimous consent to go to conference with the House and to name conferees and begin working out a compromise between the House and the Senate.

For many years it was perfunctory. The unanimous consent request was made. We would go to conference with the House. We would go to work on a budget resolution between the two bodies. This year, every time that request has been made—and it has been made dozens of times by Democrats and by at least one Republican—dozens of times—there has always been an objection to keep us from going to conference to work out this compromise.

As much as anything, we need to create an environment where we can focus on doing the three things I talked about: entitlement reform, tax reform that raises some revenues through deficit reduction, and try to focus on everything we do and say how do we get a better result, how do we get a better result for less money or the same amount of money.

I would say to my Republican colleagues who continue to object: Stop. Please stop. Let us actually have a chance to gather in a room in this building and see what we can hammer out to address, not a short-term continuing resolution but actually a thoughtful, comprehensive spending plan as we did 15, 16 years ago when the Republicans were in the majority here, House and Senate, and we had a Democratic President. We got the job done and helped to continue the longest running economic expansion in the history of this country.

I mentioned Bob Laskowski, president and CEO of Christiana Care Health System, a large regional health care system. He did a great job. We are very proud of him in our State. They provide care to a lot of people. He is a doctor and a health system leader. I thought his perspectives on health care reform and the Affordable Care Act were important enough to share on the floor.

This comes from an op-ed that appeared in one of our local statewide papers called the News Journal, a Gannett publication. His op-ed was in the News Journal this past week. I am going to read it. It is not that long. It goes like this:

> With some in Washington promising to speak out against implementation of the Affordable Care Act until they ''can no longer stand,'' it might be a useful reality check to visit an emergency room in any town or city across America.

He goes on to say:

> There you will find thousands of Americans each day that really cannot stand. It is not just because an injury, illness or disease has put them on their backs.
>
> Too often, it is because an eminently treatable ailment has been allowed to turn into something much worse—for the simple reason that the patient doesn't have health insurance and couldn't afford to see a doctor until things became so bad that the emergency room was their only option.
>
> In the continuing cacophony of criticism around so-called ObamaCare, this crucial fact keeps being lost: Our health care system remains badly broken—and in the absence of reform, it will continue to get a lot worse.
>
> I see this—as a physician and as a health care executive; but more importantly, I experience this as the friend of too many neighbors with no health insurance.

He goes on to say:

> I think that might be the reason why 3 in 4 Americans surveyed in a recent Pew Research poll say they oppose efforts to sabotage the law: because they know that the people threatening to derail and defund the Affordable Care Act are not offering a better solution.

Ironically, the part of the Affordable Care Act that we are attempting to implement and stand up across the country right now, the health exchanges or marketplaces, is a Republican idea. It was first offered as an alternative to HillaryCare back in the first term of President Clinton. It is a Republican idea, a business idea.

But I do not care whether it is a Democratic or Republican idea. It is a smart idea to use large purchasing pools, enable people who otherwise would buy health insurance for one person or five people or for a small business—it is a way for them to bring down the cost of their care, use competition to get better options. It is a smart idea.

The idea of another criticism, the individual mandates, people being individually mandated to get health care and if they did not they would maybe face some kind of fine—modest at first, it grows in time—that is not a Democratic idea. Ironically, that is an idea we got out of Massachusetts. The author, the Governor who signed it into law, was the Republican nominee for President last year, Mitt Romney.

So what we have tried to do is take some Republican ideas and some Democratic ideas and, frankly, some good ideas.

And over half of those who ''oppose'' the law today, say they want it fixed, not scrapped.

I agree with that—fixed, not scrapped.

They know that in the absence of reform, there are still too many people who use the emergency room as their only source of medical care; too many families and businesses who cannot keep up with the ever-rising cost of health care premiums; and too many Americans who find nothing but frustration when navigating our health care system—who still fill out too many forms, are prescribed too many tests that do not help them and get passed from office to office without anyone guiding them overall care.

Beginning [last week], millions of uninsured Americans began to shop for quality, affordable health care through the health insurance marketplaces. These marketplaces are a key element of the Affordable Care Act and represent an important step toward putting quality health care within reach of all Americans.

Just as Medicare has enabled seniors to get the care they need to live longer and healthier lives, increasing access to health insurance is vital to unlocking a healthier country, by ensuring something that millions of Americans do not have today: The opportunity to stay healthy through regular doctor visits rather than seeking help only when they get sick.

In some cases very sick.

It is worth remembering: Health care reform is not about special interests. It is about people like us, our families and our neighbors. It is about fellow parishioners and Little League coaches. It is about a neighbor who cuts himself making dinner and a spouse who finds a worrisome lump.

Everyone we know and everyone we love—will need our health care system at some point. Three years after America debated the need for health care reform, millions of Americans who work hard, pay taxes, and raise families still cannot afford to see a doctor. That is wrong.

And even though the resistance of some states to fully adopt the Affordable Care Act will tragically still leave some families in those states in the lurch, we now at long last have the unprecedented opportunity to create a system that will work better for us all.

We should also remember: Over time, the Affordable Care Act promises to improve the system as much for the shrinking majority of Americans who have health insurance as for those who do not.

Access is just the first step. The act provides a blueprint for a new model of care, one that rewards doctors for more coordinated care. Here at Christiana Care [and throughout Delaware] we have seen what happens when we provide that kind of care through reengineered medical practices, known as ''medical homes,'' where doctors are enabled to not only efficiently meet patients' needs but to anticipate them as well.

This coordinated approach makes getting care simpler and makes the lives of those getting care easier. It makes quality better; and, by making care simpler, better, and more accessible, it saves money.

No law as big or ambitious as the ACA can possibly get it all right on the first try. But let us not forget: When Medicare was signed into law, critics warned seniors would languish in long lines, and that we would all long for the good old days before reform took place.

Today, Medicare has helped hundreds of millions of Americans live longer, healthier lives—while reducing the poverty rate among seniors by 75 percent.

Dr. Laskowski goes on to write:

I believe if these historic changes are given a chance, we will collectively create a system that is defined not by volume, but by value. Over the next several years, I know we can make health care in America more ''people focused'' and less transactional by realizing the best way to provide better outcomes at lower cost is by partnering with patients.

As we in health care listen to our patients, we will learn what our patients truly value. Then we will be able to free up resources to help patients get healthy faster and stay well.

The Affordable Care Act is a map toward that future. History is being made.

I will close by saying: While many of our colleagues argue that the Affordable Care Act will lead to rising insurance costs and lost jobs, the truth is that in Delaware and throughout the rest of the country, millions of Americans are already learning they will be able to find quality health care, insurance plans for a more affordable price.

In Delaware and much of the country, millions of Americans will be able to find quality insurance plans for less than $100 a month. I have told my constituents and my colleagues since this debate over health care reform began, this law is not written in stone. We want to make the law better wherever we can, just as we have made the Medicare prescription drug program better, which was largely supported by Republicans. But we actually made it better in the Affordable Care Act.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to enable us to reopen our government, to reassure Americans and our creditors in this country and around the world that we will honor our debts. Then let's get to work right away to improve the Affordable Care Act and these insurance marketplaces and come to a consensus on a bipartisan budget resolution that lays out a spending plan that will get us from where we are to where we need to be.

Last word. I spent some time in the Navy, and the Presiding Officer spent some time in the military. One of the Presiding Officer's sons may be on Active Duty today. Some of the time we used to fly in and out of Japan in Navy P–3 airplanes.

I learned not long ago that in Japan they spend about 8 percent of GDP for health care. In this country, we spend about 17 or 18 percent. Think about that. They spend 8 percent of GDP for health care. We spend 17 or 18 percent. They get better results. For the most part they have lower rates of infant mortality and higher rates of life expectancy than we do.

The other thing is they cover everybody. Tonight when folks go to bed in this country, this evening some 40 million will go to bed without health care coverage. The Japanese, smart as they are, cannot be that smart. We cannot be that dumb. We cannot be that dumb.

There are ways to get better results for less money, including in the provision of health care. We can work together. If we work together, we can make that a reality.

The last thing I will say is I think the Presiding Officer has heard me tell how I love to ask people who have been married a long time what the secret is for being married 40, 50, 60, 70 years. People give me very funny answers. Some are actually hysterical. But every now and then some of them are serious, almost poignant. And I will close with one of them tonight.

A couple of years ago I met a couple who had been married over 50 years.

I said to them: What is the secret for being married 55 years?

They said: The two Cs.

The two Cs.

I said: What is that?

They said: Communicate and compromise.

Think about that. Communicate and compromise. I said: That is pretty good advice.

I got to thinking about it later, and I thought that is also some pretty good advice and maybe the secret for a vibrant democracy—to communicate and to compromise. We think we were willing to compromise on the short-term spending resolution that is the continuing resolution by agreeing to the numbers set by the Republican House leaders. They do not regard that as a compromise, but I think it was an attempt to compromise.

We need to find compromises in a conference on the budget resolution. That is where we should put our money, that is where we should put our efforts in the weeks to come.

I would add one more C. Communicate and compromise, as important as they are, maybe a third C would be collaborate. That would be a good one to add. So three Cs: Communicate, compromise and collaborate. It is what the American people sent us here to do.

I know the Presiding Officer feels that way, and so do I, as does Dr. COBURN. There are a bunch of us who feel that way. So let's do that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is a unanimous consent request on H. Con. Res. 58, a bill to urge the Department of Defense to allow military chaplains to perform duties during the shutdown.

Earlier today, I objected to this bill because I misunderstood its purpose, and I would like to withdraw that objection at this time.

The bill will urge the Department of Defense to allow military chaplains, including contract personnel, to perform religious services during the shutdown and permit services to take place on property owned by the Department of Defense.

Today, just as the Department of Defense and the administration solved the

problem with military families and their death benefits upon the loss of one of their loved ones serving our country, I urge, and I know others will as well, the DOD to ensure that all active-duty members are able to exercise their First Amendment rights and participate in religious ceremonies while they are serving. So that is something I hope we can resolve.

I also want to raise some issues that relate to the shutdown. I raised some earlier, but these are additional concerns I have with regard to the shutdown.

The impact of this shutdown is being felt across the board, across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and, indeed, across the country. It is felt by small businesses, States and municipalities are feeling it already and anticipating much more of an impact as time goes by, and, of course, families are feeling it very acutely. Yesterday I sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER emphasizing the detrimental impact the shutdown was having on my constituents in Pennsylvania.

Just by way of a couple of examples that apply to Pennsylvania and to the Nation, domestic violence programs across the country have been impacted directly by the shutdown. The offices that oversee grants under the Violence Against Women Act have had to shut down and are not able to issue grants or provide reimbursements to local programs.

I would say parenthetically that it took many months for the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization to go forward. There were a lot of problems along the way, a lot of objections. Fortunately, we have the program reauthorized, but now, because of the shutdown, we are having problems with women who are victims of violence getting the services they are entitled to.

We are hearing as well from folks in our domestic violence shelters—shelters that rely upon Federal funds and that have already been impacted by the sequester—the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts that have been in effect since March. These shelters may have to further reduce services to vulnerable victims of domestic violence.

In the words of one State advocate: We are hanging on by our fingernails.

Meaning they are hanging on in terms of just being able to provide services, with funding either limited or funding being jeopardized.

Women trying to escape abusive relationships should not be hampered by the failures here in Washington to end this shutdown.

In terms of Social Security, we know Social Security checks are going out, fortunately, but in Pennsylvania, on average, 2,900 new claims are processed each week. That is the typical weekly total for new claims. This means Pennsylvanians who have reached retirement age and have paid into the system their entire careers are now forced to wait for benefits.

You have to ask yourself: Why should a domestic violence center, with people who work to help domestic violence victims, have to wait for a political dispute where one wing of one party engaged in an ideological exercise allows a government shutdown, and, therefore, that domestic violence center doesn't get the help it needs, and the women, mostly women who are impacted, don't get the help they need.

The same could be said of someone who reaches retirement age and expects, and has a right to expect, their Social Security eligibility will be processed. Why should they have to wait for Washington?

In Pennsylvania alone, when it comes to small businesses, 30 loans, on average, are made each week by the SBA, for a total of $13 million each and every week. The loss of these loans is hindering entrepreneurs from growing their businesses and from obtaining much-needed capital. Again, why should a business owner—a small businessperson who gets help from the SBA and has an expectation of getting that help—and, remember, we average 30 of those loans every week in Pennsylvania amounting to $13 million—why should that all be stopped because someone in Washington has an ideological point to make? It makes no sense, and it is an outrage.

The shutdown is also impacting infrastructure in public lands across the country. Until the government is open, the maintenance of our Nation's basic infrastructure is impacted. In Pennsylvania, a lot of that basic infrastructure involves our waterways—the locks and dams. That whole system which is in place for Pennsylvania and many other States, the maintenance of those locks and dams, is deferred. We all know what happens when you defer maintenance on something as fundamental as infrastructure.

I have been informed that repairs that were scheduled to take place on locks along the Lower Monongahela River in western Pennsylvania are suspended. If you have a problem with those, with a lock—and locks and dams generally, but in particular focusing on the Monongahela River—you stop the flow of commerce or you slow it down substantially. When you slow down or stop the flow of commerce, that affects jobs and the economy of southwestern Pennsylvania. If just one of these locks were to fail, it could have a detrimental economic impact on the whole region.

How about national parks? We have heard a lot about that topic this week and last week. The closure of national parks is negatively impacting Pennsylvania's economy. According to the National Park Service, the communities and businesses surrounding Pennsylvania's national parks and memorials are losing up to $5.7 million in spending by nonlocal visitors for each week the government remains closed. That is just national parks and just in Pennsylvania—almost $6 million—and that is just the beginning of what could be a much more substantial and detrimental impact to the State's economy.

I would go back to the point I made several times—and all of us have made these arguments in different ways—and that is that we know for sure there is a very simple way out of this predicament for Washington but, more importantly, for the country, and that is for the Speaker to put on the floor a bill which both parties now agree will pass. It is a clean funding bill. All it does is fund the operations of the government, albeit at a much lower level—$70 billion less—than our side wanted.

We compromised greatly at the beginning of this process, despite what some have said. So we have compromised to make sure we can fund the government. It is about time for the Speaker to put this bill on the floor. They can vote on it very quickly, and it would pass very quickly. It is only 16 pages long. And that is the key to resolving and ending this tea party shutdown.

I urge the Speaker to do that. I have urged him, as we all have in various ways, and we respectfully suggest that could happen tomorrow. Thursday would be a good day to end all of this so we can get people back to work, we can have the functions of government operating to such an extent the economy can grow, and we can have a lot of debate and discussion about how to fund the government long term or what to do about our fiscal challenges—what to do about a whole range of issues. But it is time for the government to open, and it is time for the House to act to do that.

It is also time to make sure we pay our bills.

Thirdly, it is important we continue to negotiate, just as we negotiated a long time ago, many weeks ago, to reach the point where we can have a bill that would fund the operations of the government.

Some people in the House chose to take a different path which led to the shutdown. It is about time we get them back on the right path, which is to open the government, pay our bills, and then have negotiations and discussions and compromises to move the country forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEATH GRATUITY PAYMENTS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to express my deep disappointment at our failure to adequately provide for our fallen heroes and their families.

Once again, we learn that we have suffered recent casualties. And since the government shut down last week, the Department of Defense has been unable to guarantee full benefits and honors to those servicemen and women who have been killed in the defense of our Nation.

Among those who have given their lives in service of our Nation in recent days are two Army Rangers assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, headquartered at Fort Benning in my home state of Georgia.

These elite soldiers were serving on the front lines in Afghanistan, fighting for democracy and our American way of life when they made the ultimate sacrifice.

I have since been informed that the Department of Defense believes it lacks the authority to make automatic Death Gratuity Payments, to transport the next of kin to Dover Air Force Base so they can receive their fallen warrior, and to provide funeral allowances for the appropriate military honors.

This is simply unacceptable, and it is incumbent upon us to fix this.

It has been my great privilege to visit Fort Benning and meet with the members of the 75th Ranger Regiment over the years.

They live by the motto that ''Rangers Lead The Way,'' and they serve our country regardless of Federal funding, domestic politics, or government shutdowns.

That is exactly what these brave individuals did in Afghanistan, and unfortunately it is our lack of leadership in Washington that has created undue hardship and stress for their loved ones in their toughest time of need.

I understand that our colleagues in the House of Representatives are expediting legislation to provide explicit authorization to the Department of Defense to correct this oversight.

The Senate must act immediately on receipt of that legislation.

We owe this much to these brave men and women, their families, and the thousands of military members who continue to serve in harm's way.

I regret that the President has not taken this issue seriously enough to take action on his own to resolve this problem.

I remain confident that the Senate will take proper actions, and I look forward to passing this legislation as soon as possible.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

At 5:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolutions were read the first time:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 267. A resolution relative to the death of Rod Grams, former United States Senator for the State of Minnesota.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 775

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF ROD GRAMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was:

S. RES. 267

Whereas Rod Grams faithfully served the people of Minnesota with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1992 and served one term as a Representative from the State of Minnesota and later served as a chief of staff in the House of Representatives;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States Senate in 1994 and served one term as a Senator from the State of Minnesota;

Whereas as a Senator, Rod Grams served on the Senate Standing Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, Foreign Relations, and the Budget and on the Joint Economic Committee;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Rod Grams, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Rod Grams.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 9, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Housing Finance Reform: Essential Elements of the Multifamily Housing Finance System.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF ROD GRAMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 267, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) relative to the death of Rod Grams, former United States Senator for the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES 84, H.J. RES. 89, H.J. RES 90, AND H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I understand there are four measures at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the joint resolutions by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89, making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for the fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASEY. I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The measures will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 10, 2013; that following the prayer

and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the time until 1 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; and that at 1 p.m. the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a special caucus meeting with the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 267, as a further mark of respect for the memory of the late Senator Rod Grams of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

JANET L. YELLEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE BEN S. BERNANKE, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KENNETH E. BRANDT
DAVID A. HALL
STEVEN C. HERMAN
DONALD R. MALIN
JOEL V. MILLER
DANIEL J. THOMPSON
JAMES A. TILLMAN
WILEY R. WILLIAMS

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING TAIWAN ON ITS 102ND NATIONAL DAY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Taiwan on its 102nd National Day on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan is a model of success in Asia. Through hard work and ingenuity, Taiwan has become one of the strongest economies in the Pacific Rim. Taiwan also has strong democratic institutions that foster the values of freedom, diligence, and transparency. The accomplishments of Taiwan, whether economic or political, are impressive.

On the occasion of Republic of China's Centennial National Day, I wish for continued trade cooperation between the United States and Taiwan. I also look forward to furthering the common economic interests of the United States and Taiwan, and I would like to encourage my colleagues in our efforts to preserve and strengthen the friendship between our two countries. Taiwan has much to offer the rest of the world, and its innovation and expertise will continue to create new, mutually-beneficial trade avenues.

Congratulations to the Republic of China and I look forward to continuing our partnership with Taiwan.

HONORING KIMBERLY ROADS SCHLAPMAN

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the talent, hard work, and determination of Kimberly Roads Schlapman, a lifelong resident of Habersham County, Georgia. Millions of fans know Kimberly as one of the beautiful, strong voices behind the country group Little Big Town. But many folks in Northeast Georgia were touched by Kimberly's musical abilities, as well as her commitment to her community, long before her rise to stardom.

During high school, Kimberly contributed her time as a candy striper at the Habersham County Medical Center. She was a member of Youth Against Cancer, the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the Student Advisory Board for Community Bank and Trust, the Key Club, the Y Club, and the Student Council. Kimberly also served as vice president of her senior class.

Kimberly was also actively developing her musical skills during this time. She was a member of the Habersham Central High School Chorus. She was also part of the Habersham Central Concert Choir. She was selected to sing in the Georgia Allstate Choir for five consecutive years and was one of six sopranos selected to study vocal music in the Georgia Governor's Honors Program.

While performing in the Habersham Community Theater and other special events in the community, she was selected to represent her state and region in numerous talent competitions. Kimberly's hard work paid off with great success, as she won first place in the National Beta Club competition as well as the International Key Club Convention.

Kimberly continued pursuing music when she enrolled at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, where she was a member of the Samford Singers and the Lake Junaluska Singers. Through these groups, she found a friend in Karen Fairchild. That relationship helped lead to the formation of Little Big Town.

In its 14 years together, Little Big Town has played before more than 4 million people. Last year, they achieved its first #1 radio hit with the song "Pontoon." The song came from the band's fifth album, Tornado, which was recently received platinum certification with sales of over one million copies. Little Big Town was recently honored with two CMA awards, two ACM awards, a Grammy award, and an Emmy award.

Georgians are truly proud of all Kimberly's achievements, both on and off the stage. I join many others in wishing Kimberly and her family the very best.

HONORING THE WALTER BRACKEN STEAM ACADEMY

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate the Walter Bracken STEAM Academy in District One in Las Vegas for being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence and for being designated as "exemplary high achieving."

The Blue Ribbon Schools award is the highest honor that the Department of Education can bestow on an American school. The administration, faculty, staff, and students of the Walter Bracken STEAM Academy should be very proud. You have developed a strong school community where students are encouraged and enabled to pursue their interests and develop their talents, skills, and intellect.

The most important investment we can make for the future of our nation is in the next generation. Walter Bracken STEAM Academy is a prime example of what we can accomplish both individually and as a society when we make access to a quality education a priority.

HONORING DR. CLEM MELTON DOXEY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Clem Melton Doxey for his long and distinguished career in medicine, and as the founder of Marietta Dermatology and The Skin Cancer Center.

On September 30, Dr. Doxey retired from his practice after 43 years of service to his patients and his community.

Since he began Marietta Dermatology in 1970, Doxey's passion for helping people has shown through his dedication to continue expanding his practice and personally serving between 40 and 50 patients a day. Dr. Doxey was the first dermatologist in the Marietta area, and his practice has since grown to 80 employees—including 11 partner physicians—at three locations in Marietta, Canton, and West Cobb.

A native of Louisiana, Doxey received his undergraduate degree in chemical engineering as well as a medical degree from Louisiana State University. After completing an internship at Oaknoll Naval Hospital, he graduated from Pensacola School of Medicine as a flight surgeon in 1963. He served in the First Marine Brigade in Vietnam, and then completed his dermatology residency at Tulane Hospital in 1970. Thereafter, Doxey moved to Cobb County with his family where he would serve the community with his knowledge of medicine. He also taught residents at Emory University for 22 years.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest thanks to Dr. Doxey again for his lifelong devotion to the practice of medicine and dedication to the people of our Northwest Georgia community. I wish him a joyous—and well-deserved—retirement.

HONORING ROBERT GREENE AS HE RECEIVES THE BUFFALO CLUB MEDAL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Robert Greene, as he is awarded the prestigious Buffalo Club Medal. Created in 1956, the Buffalo Club Medal is presented to individuals who represent the ideal, gracious, deeply perceptive, dedicated, self-effacing leader. An accomplished lawyer, humanitarian champion, and dedicated community servant, Bob epitomizes these qualities. Since 2001, Bob has been deeply involved in the creation of a sustainable orphanage for young girls in Haiti, among countless other pursuits, locally and otherwise.

Bob's work in Haiti began with his first trip in November 2001, serving as a member of a medical team through the Catholic Health System of Western New York and the Sisters of Mercy.

Since his initial trip, Bob has traveled to Haiti on over twenty separate occasions, serving in various roles. Since the devastating earthquake in 2010, Bob has dedicated his efforts to planning of and fundraising for a sustainable orphanage for girls ages 4 through 9 on the outskirts of Port-au-Prince.

Upon completion, the orphanage will be a home for over 200 girls. Fifteen bungalows will host twelve to fifteen children each. The orphanage will include a multipurpose building and a primary school, which has future plans to expand to include a secondary school. Grounds will include a large vegetable garden and pond for fish, which will supply much of the food. Solar panels will power the orphanage complex.

Bob's generosity is boundless. Presently, he serves as the Director and Past President of the Notre Dame Law Association, Director and Chairman Emeritus of the Western New York Public Broadcasting Association, Director of the Global Health Ministry, and a trustee of the WNED Foundation and the Foundation of the Zoological Society of Buffalo. In the past, Bob has served as the Chairman of Canisius College, a trustee of the Albright Knox Art Gallery, Director of the Sisters of Charity Hospital, Director and Chairman of the Zoological Society of Buffalo, Chairman of Shea's Buffalo Center for the Performing Arts, the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, and Bishop's Council of the Laity.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor Bob Greene as he receives the Buffalo Club Medal. His personal contribution of time and effort towards the progress and enhancement of our community and those abroad is admirable, and I am grateful for his commitment to such noble causes. I wish him much continued success in all his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 529 and 530.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 529, on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding H.J. Res. 84, making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 530, on passage of H.J. Res. 84, making continuing appropriations for Head Start and for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LA VISTA LIONS CLUB OF ATLANTA

HON. TOM PRICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor the La Vista Lions Club of Atlanta for sixty years of outstanding service in the Atlanta community. Since 1953, the La Vista Lions Club has supported numerous organizations in Georgia that provide essential services to individuals with vision and hearing impairments.

In its most recent history, the La Vista Lions Club has dedicated its time and resources in support of the Georgia Lions Lighthouse Foundation, which provides hearing tests, hearing aids, vision tests, eye glasses, and eye surgeries for Georgia residents in need. Plus, the La Vista Lions Club sponsors activities for children with vision and hearing impairments including the Georgia Lions Camp for the Blind and the Mike Glenn Hearing Impaired Basketball Camp.

Over the past sixty years, the La Vista Lions Club has been a vital asset to our community by providing these services to fellow Georgians. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the La Vista Lions Club of Atlanta on sixty years of outstanding work in the Sixth District of Georgia.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES, for leading the CBC's important discussion on Republicans' refusal to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor and the resulting government shutdown.

The Republican course is a partisan path to nowhere, and it simply leaves our workers with fewer jobs, our families with less security, and our country with less certainty and stability.

The government shut down has left hundreds of thousands of Federal employees immediately and indefinitely furloughed.

Recruiting and hiring for Veteran jobs have ceased. Federal assistance to school districts, colleges and universities, and vocational rehabilitation agencies have been severely curtailed.

Important government research into life-threatening diseases, environmental protection, and other areas has halted.

This has all occurred because some Republicans do not like a law already enacted, that a majority of Americans support. A law that already has helped millions of American families, individuals, and businesses.

Reforming our nation's health care system is a historic opportunity to make health care more affordable and bring the kind of change we were all elected to achieve for the American people.

It's called the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and it secures affordable, high quality and accessible health care. It is about establishing healthcare as a right, not a privilege, for every American.

It is about wellness and prevention, economic security and entrepreneurship, and strengthening the middle class. This historic law is about creating a healthier America.

October 1st marked the first day the public could enroll in the Health Insurance Marketplace created by the ACA.

For many African-Americans, this date marked the beginning of fewer health inequities, increased access to quality care, more affordable health coverage, and greater investments in prevention.

African-Americans and other underserved populations often have higher rates of disease, fewer treatment options, and reduced access to healthcare.

The ACA addresses these overwhelming health inequities through several initiatives including data collection, prevention, workforce development, and quality improvement strategies.

Thanks to the ACA, 7.3 million African-Americans with private health insurance can now receive preventive services, like wellness visits, and diabetes and cancer screenings, at no extra cost, 4.5 million African-Americans who have Medicare coverage can now receive preventive services, like flu shots and blood pressure and cholesterol screenings, at no extra cost, 6.8 million uninsured African-Americans may be eligible for coverage through the new Health Insurance Marketplace.

The new Health Insurance Marketplace is healthcare, made simple. It builds on the last three years, during which many Americans have already seen lower costs and better coverage.

Because of the ACA, 105 million Americans have already received access to free preventive services, 6.6 million Seniors have saved more than $7 billion on their prescription drugs.

More than 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on their insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about saving lives. In Ohio, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, there will be lower than expected premiums in the new Health Insurance Marketplace.

Ohio consumers will be able to choose from an average of 46 health plans in the Marketplace.

For every 10 individuals who are uninsured in Ohio, 6 will be able to find coverage for $100 or less per month, taking into account premium tax credits and Medicaid coverage. As a lifelong healthcare advocate, as a stroke survivor, and as an African-American woman, I know the importance of protecting access to affordable healthcare coverage for all Americans, particularly those who are the most in need.

The new Marketplaces across the country will mean brand-new health and economic security for millions of Americans. It means a healthier, more prosperous nation.

I look forward to helping educate the American people about the benefits of the ACA and continuing to move forward with its implementation. But, with all of the benefits the ACA brings to our country, there are some who still refuse to see how the law helps the American people.

The ACA is the law of the land, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court and which

is currently being implemented to the benefit of millions of Americans.

I urge Speaker BOEHNER and the other House Republican leaders to follow the will of the American people—end their politically-manufactured government shutdown, and pass the clean Senate CR, so that the government can get back to helping the American people.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

HONORING THE WEST HAVEN FIRE DEPARTMENT AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to the members of the West Haven Fire Department, past and present, as they celebrate their 125th anniversary. This is a milestone for this wonderful organization and I am proud to have this opportunity to honor their outstanding work on behalf of the West Haven community.

The men and women who serve as firefighters face risks that few of us can comprehend. Each day, they must be ready to perform under intense pressure—literally in life or death situations as we have all witnessed in recent days. Few things are more important than feeling safe in our homes and workplaces. Our firefighters provide us with that peace of mind. Their commitment and dedication cannot be questioned and our thanks can never repay those who put their lives on the line to ensure our safety. A combination of career and volunteer firefighters, the members of the West Haven Fire Department have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to our community.

On November 6, 1888, a fire broke out at the Hinman Hotel on the Corner of Washington Avenue and Beach Street. Not having a fire department of their own, the City of West Haven sent word to New Haven and asking for assistance. Unfortunately, by the time the New Haven Fire Department was able to respond, the Hinman Hotel had burned to the ground. This prompted the people of West Haven to form their own fire department and on November 18, 1888, Engine & Hose Company #1 was founded.

It was not until 1892 that two more companies were formed. In January of that year, the James Graham Hook & Ladder and the West Haven Hook & Ladder both came to be. In 1895 North End Hose #3 and Seaside Hose #4 (later to become Savin Rock Hose #4) both entered the department. Although the James Grahams would disband in 1902, Engine #1, Hook & Ladder, Engine #3 and Engine #4 all remain active companies to this day. During World War II, a group of firefighters would be formed and funded by the Federal Government for civil defense. At the end of the war these men founded Steven Heights Engine Company #5, bringing the total number of the volunteer companies back up to five.

In 1919, shortly after the passing of House Bill 177, West Haven's first official Board of Commissioners was seated and they continue to serve in the same capacity to this day. On January 24, 1933, the Commissioners appointed the first six permanent paid firemen, establishing the career department. Lloyd Cameron was appointed Chief of Department by the new board in 1919. In 1936 the board made Chief Cameron the first Permanent Paid Chief of the department. Over its 125 year history, the career department would expand from six men to its current compliment of 54. All in all 167 men have been hired by the career department including those who are currently employed.

In 1988, in conjunction with the 100th anniversary of the department, the Department began their Explorer Post program. Young boys and girls of high school age are able to join the Explorers, learn about firefighting and train alongside the members of the Department. Most go on to join the volunteer companies and a few have even become career firefighters.

Today, as they reflect on their history and look towards their future, I am honored to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to every member of the West Haven Fire Department, career or volunteer, past and present, for their outstanding service to our community. Happy 125th anniversary.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TWIN CITIES LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORPORATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Twin Cities Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and the celebration of its 25th anniversary. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Minnesota, and the thousands of families, individuals, businesses, and residents that Twin Cities LISC has supported throughout the years, I am proud to offer congratulations on this milestone.

During the past 25 years, Twin Cities LISC has served as an integral partner in creating safe, livable and sustainable communities. Their dedication to solving society's most pressing issues with collaborative, community-driven solutions has gone a long way toward increasing the health and wellness of thousands of Minnesota families.

As one of 30 urban and regional branches of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Twin Cities LISC has established a reputation as a national leader in rebuilding blighted neighborhoods and improving quality of life. Focusing early attention on improving the quality of low-income housing in Saint Paul, their vision and strategy has expanded to include health and wellness, improving education, increasing family net worth and creating better paying jobs. To date, Twin Cities LISC has invested more than $350 million in grants and leveraged an additional $1 billion in total development into building sustainable communities.

Twin Cities LISC has been a vital partner in developing the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit, Minnesota's largest to-date infrastructure project. By focusing on transit-oriented development, Twin Cities LISC has ensured that the project successfully connects neighborhoods. To address disruptions caused by construction, Twin Cities LISC provided support services to help with job and housing retention. Their efforts to promote diversity and jobs have helped to expand the opportunity created by this major infrastructure project.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Twin Cities LISC and their record of accomplishment in promoting thriving, sustainable communities, I am pleased to submit this statement in recognition of the organization's 25th anniversary.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON ON ITS SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Maine at Farmington as it begins celebrating its sesquicentennial this academic year.

More than 150 years ago, teachers from Franklin County petitioned the Maine State Legislature to establish a State Normal School. In March 1863, after heated debate, the Legislature passed the Normal School Act. That fall, Farmington was chosen as the site for the Western State Normal School, the first public institution of higher learning in the State of Maine. Originally a teachers' college with an emphasis on liberal arts, the Western State Normal School first opened its doors on August 24, 1864 to 31 students who convened in the attic of a building in downtown Farmington. Over 100 years and several name changes later, the school merged into the University of Maine System in 1968 and became formally known as the University of Maine at Farmington, or UMF, in 1971.

UMF currently enrolls over 2,000 students from across the country and the world. It continues to be a national leader in producing exceptional teaching professionals that have a direct impact on the state of Maine. Approximately seventeen percent of Maine's educators earned their degree from the University of Maine at Farmington, including four of the last six Maine "Teacher of the Year" recipients. In addition to maintaining its commitment to training quality educators, UMF has made efforts to strengthen other academic areas, such as the arts and sciences, health, and rehabilitation.

Today, October 9th, also known as Charter Day, marks 150 years to the day since the Maine Legislature signed the school's charter and is the highlight of the Sesquicentennial celebration. The day's events feature a ceremony honoring notable dignitaries, an array of cultural events, a ribbon cutting ceremony for the restoration of Abbot Park, and an evening of visual and performing art. The anniversary will continue to be observed throughout the academic year focusing on the six key academic disciplines of education, psychology, English, biology, mathematics and history. I am proud to have the opportunity to share the impressive accomplishments of the University of Maine at Farmington and look forward to watching the University continue its growth during the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating the students, alumni, faculty, staff, and friends of the University of Maine at Farmington as they celebrate their sesquicentennial.

CELEBRATING TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 102nd National Day of the Republic of China (Taiwan). Also known as ''Double Ten Day,'' this important anniversary marks a special occasion for the good people of Taiwan.

Taiwan is a modern-day success story that exemplifies the prosperity and opportunity that comes from a strong commitment to the rule of law, democracy, and human rights. I know that the people of Taiwan are rightfully proud of these achievements, and I will stand with them to preserve the free and open society that exists there. Indeed, Taiwan has come a long way in a short time. This is why it is more important than ever to strengthen the United States' relationship with Taiwan.

The U.S.-Taiwan relationship is the cornerstone of American foreign policy in the Asia-Pacific region. Earlier this year, I led the successful bipartisan effort to end over four decades of isolation for Taiwan at the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), because safety in international air travel should not be held hostage to geopolitics. I commend the President for signing this important legislation into law, and I am even more excited that as a direct result of our efforts in Congress, Taiwan has finally been invited to participate in ICAO this year. It is the first time since 1971 that this has happened.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. enjoys a very positive and productive economic relationship with Taiwan. It comes as no surprise that Taiwan is America's 11th largest trading partner. In fact, in my home State of California, the two-way trade with Taiwan is even more significant, particularly with so many Taiwanese visitors travelling to the U.S. under the Visa Waiver Program. Given the importance of our trading relationship, I urge the Administration to quickly finish the ongoing U.S.-Taiwan Trade and Investment Framework Agreement negotiations and move on to a broader, more comprehensive Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan.

As we join with the people of Taiwan in celebration of Double Ten Day, it is important to remember that the bond between the U.S. and Taiwan remains vibrant and strong. As a longtime friend of Taiwan, I know that Taiwan's national day is a very special occasion for Taiwanese people living all over the world. So, as we mark the 102nd National Day of Taiwan, let us salute the strong friendship between the U.S. and Taiwan, and let us recognize the shared strengths that make this relationship one of the most important.

HONORING THE BRANFORD ITALIAN-AMERICAN CLUB ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the Branford community in extending my heartfelt congratulations to the Branford Italian-American Club as they gather in celebration of their 75th Anniversary. This is a remarkable milestone for this community treasure!

Today, as the Club members and their families gather to commemorate their 75th Anniversary, they also celebrate the many invaluable contributions the Club has made to our community. People across the country struggle to create a sense of community, a sense of belonging. Growing up in an Italian-American neighborhood, I know the feeling of heritage and kinship that organizations like the Branford Italian-American Club provide. Like so many others, the Club has played an important role in forging strong bonds of friendship throughout the community.

The Branford Italian-American Club's strength lies in the participation and commitment of its members. Over the seventy-five years, the Club's membership has worked hard to preserve and protect the rich history of our ancestors. Whether it through the Bocce League, Dart Club, the Club Cruise, or their participation in such local events as the Branford Festival, the activities offered through the Club allow families to connect with each other—celebrating our shared history and traditions. That sense of heritage and culture is the special gift that the Club gives to their members, our community, and future generations.

Our communities would not be the same without the efforts of volunteers like you whose energy, compassion, and concern touches people's lives every day. Throughout its history, a commitment to community service has been at the center of the Branford Italian-American Club's mission. Its members have volunteered for countless community efforts, volunteering as mentors for children in the local school system, and adopting families in need during the holiday season.

Today, as they gather to celebrate the past 75 years, the members of the Branford Italian-American Club can be proud of the many ways in which they have helped to shape our community. I am proud to have this opportunity to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to the Club's leadership and its members for all of their outstanding efforts to improve the quality of life for others and to make our community a better place. I am also honored to stand today to congratulate them on this very special anniversary and wish them a the best for many more years of success.

CONGRATULATING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR WILLIAM T. BISSONETTE, JR. FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE U.S. ARMY AND AS GARRISON COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR AT FORT McCOY, WISCONSIN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished service of Command Sergeant Major William T. Bissonette, whose tenure as Garrison Command Sergeant Major at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, concludes October 10, 2013. CSM Bissonette's official retirement from the U.S. Army Reserves is January 31, 2014.

CSM Bissonette's 32 years of dedicated service in the U.S. Army is noteworthy in every respect. CSM Bissonette assumed his duties at Fort McCoy on June 26, 2009. Immediately prior to this assignment he served as the command sergeant major of the 378th Military Intelligence Battalion (Battlefield Surveillance Brigade).

CSM Bissonette, a native of Massena, N.Y., entered active duty March 16, 1982 and attended one-station unit training at Fort Benning, Ga., where he became an infantry anti-armor specialist. His overseas assignments include the Republic of Korea, the U.S. Territory of Guam and the Republic of Iraq. His stateside assignments include tours at Fort Campbell, Ky.; Fort Rucker, Ala.; Fort Bliss, Texas; the Pentagon; Fort McPherson, Ga.; and Fort Sheridan, Ill.

CSM Bissonette has served in a variety of duty positions to include anti-armor specialist, machine gunner, weapons team leader, drill sergeant, recruiter, training and evaluation noncommissioned officer (NCO), unit training NCO, advanced NCO Course instructor, first sergeant, operations NCO, operations sergeant major, G7 sergeant major.

He has attended various military schools including the Air Assault School, Drill Sergeant School, Recruiting School, Master Fitness Trainer Course, Battle Focused Instructor Trainer Course, Emergency Preparedness Course, Force Integration Course, First Sergeant Course, Sergeants Major Course, Command Sergeants Major Course, and Garrison Command Sergeants Major Course. He holds an associate degree from Central Texas College.

CSM Bissonette has committed his life to serving our country and has received many deserving awards and decorations, including the Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Korea Defense Service Medal, Expert Infantry Badge, Air Assault Badge, Joint Staff Identification Badge, Army Staff Identification Badge, Drill Sergeant Identification Badge, Basic Recruiter Badge with two Gold Stars, Joint Meritorious Unit Award, and the Army Superior Unit Award, as well as various campaign and service medals.

It has been an honor for me to serve as U.S. Representative for Wisconsin's Third Congressional District during CSM Bissonette's tenure at Fort McCoy. During his

service at Fort McCoy, CSM Bissonette helped transform this vital national training center into one of the Army's best and most effective of the seven active Army Power Projection Platforms. I know his leadership will be greatly missed at the base and surrounding communities, but I am thankful for his leadership and contributions to ensuring that Fort McCoy remains a shining star in the nation's military training infrastructure.

On behalf of my constituents in Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend CSM Bissonette for his years of dedicated service in the U.S. Army and in particular as Garrison Command Sergeant Major at Fort McCoy. My best wishes to him, his wife Katherine and their children Michael and Samantha.

IN RECOGNITION OF MALALA YOUSAFZAI

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Malala Yousafzai. On October 9, 2012—one year ago today—Malala was the target of an assassination attempt by the Taliban because she chose to speak out against their efforts to ban girls from school in her Swat Valley neighborhood of Pakistan. Since then, Malala has emerged as a leading voice for underprivileged children, especially girls, in the fight for global education equality.

Along with former British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and the ''A World at School'' movement, Malala will work to raise $500 million over the next three years to provide education to the 300,000 Syrian school-aged children living in Lebanon. In addition to this and winning an International Children's Peace Prize for her overall efforts, Malala was recently honored at the opening dedication of Europe's largest public library. In a recent address given at the UN, she reiterated her mission, ''They thought that the bullets would silence us, but they failed . . . and then, out of that silence, came thousands of voices.''

For many, Malala Yousafzai, is a symbol of resilience and courage in her fight for global education equality. Please join me in supporting Malala and her efforts on the anniversary of the Taliban's heinous failed assassination attempt. I proudly acknowledge and encourage her to continue her efforts for education equality.

HONORING MYERS FLOWER SHOP AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join the Branford community and the Myers family as they celebrate the 100th Anniversary of Myers Flower Shop—a remarkable milestone for this community institution.

Charles Myers had a unique passion for flowers. Following his studies at Yale University, he dedicated himself to the establishment of a premier flower shop, opening his first location at 936 Chapel Street in New Haven, Connecticut in 1913. In 1940 the shop moved to 28 Whitney Avenue and just seven years later, Charles, while doing what he loved best, suffered a fatal heart attack at the shop. His wife, who had been a long-time assistant at the shop, stepped in to fill the breach until 1950 when his son, Allan, returned home and took over the operation of the family business. Following Alan's passing in 1959, his wife, Sue took up the reins until the third generation of the Myers family, their son Chuck and his wife, Elsie, assumed the leadership role in 1971. Despite the many changes, the business flourished and a new branch was opened in Branford and then another in Guilford. Though the New Haven and Guilford shops have since closed, the Branford shop continues to be a staple of Branford's merchant center at its location at 1008 Main Street. Today, grand-daughters Lee-Ellen and Elsie run the store with the same strong sense of hard-work and passion that was the trademark of Charles Myers.

As it was recently described by one of his grand-daughters, when Myers celebrated its grand-opening, life expectancy was about forty-seven years, few doctors went to college, most babies were born at home, and the speed limit was set at 15 mph to prevent Model T cars from spooking horses. So many things have changed over the course of its one hundred year history, but the one constant has been the company's commitment to outstanding customer service. Lee-Ellen and Elsie remain committed to ensuring that the legacy of their grandfather thrives—bringing flowers from all over the world to its customers, offering great quality and excellent service to every client, and doing whatever they can to make the lives of others just a little bit brighter.

In a recent article about the centennial celebration, Albert Canosa wrote: ''Every industry has its legacies. The Kennedys are synonymous with politics. The Fords are the kings of automobiles. And here in Branford, Connecticut, the legacy of Charles Myers is associated with flowers.'' Myers Flower Shop is a community treasure—a classic example of the American entrepreneurial spirit and the very essence of what we so often describe as the American Dream. I am proud to rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Lee-Ellen, Elsie, and the entire Myers family as they mark this centennial celebration and wish them all the best for continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Monday night I meant to vote against H.J. Res 77. This Resolution was just the latest bill to come to the floor as part of the Republicans' foolish strategy. Funding the federal government one program or agency at a time is a reckless approach, and one I strongly oppose.

To be clear, I support full funding for the Food and Drug Administration along with the entire federal government. Ensuring our food, medications, and medical devices are safe is important. Halting these critical activities is already impacting our communities and the effects will only continue as long as Republicans refuse to bring a clean Continuing Resolution to the floor.

It is time to end this manufactured shutdown, get our federal workers back on the job, and fund every federal program and agency at once.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF PARATRANSIT, INC.

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paratransit, Inc. as they celebrate their 35th anniversary. As staff, passengers, and supporters of this vital transportation lifeline gather to celebrate, I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing them for their invaluable service to the Sacramento region.

For the past thirty-five years, Paratransit has served countless individuals with disabilities and the elderly by offering door-to-door transportation services, allowing them the mobility to lead quality lives. Since its inception in 1978, Paratransit, a private nonprofit corporation, has been innovative in providing a public transportation system with fully accessible options, as well as working with other local nonprofit agencies, assisting them in delivering much needed client-focused transportation. In 1981, Paratransit became the first designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies in the State of California. In 1992 with the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act, The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) and Paratransit partnered to implement the law in the most effective and efficient method to provide service to those with disabilities. That same year, the Community Transportation Association of America named Paratransit, Inc. as Transit System of the Year.

Paratransit's diverse services include a mobility training program that provides assistance to people to learn how to ride RT's buses and light rail cars, giving them independence to work, visit senior centers, go shopping or to doctor appointments, and visit friends and relatives. In 2012, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments honored Paratransit as the Regional Organization of the Year. Their successful Wheels to Work employment program, partners with Women's Empowerment, The Sacramento County Department of Human Services, The Sacramento Housing Alliance, Sacramento Steps Forward, and The California Department of Rehabilitation to help people get employment by providing low-income individuals with job counseling, interview preparation and other services. Also in 2012, Paratransit received the Innovative Transportation Program from the Women's Transportation Seminar for their forward thinking efforts.

Paratransit's maintenance division services its fleet of 150 vehicles, as well as the fleets of 20 other agencies, to ensure safe and reliable public transportation options. It also repairs accessibility equipment, such as lifts and

ramps, and adapts vehicles for disabled drivers. As the 2002 United States EPA Energy Star Small Business award winner, Paratransit is committed to clean energy and a sustainable environment. Its Sacramento facility contains a storm water retention system. They have an expansive recycling program for all waste coolant, motor oil, transmission fluid, batteries, metals and tires. Committed to improving air quality, Paratransit joined with Hybrid Technologies in 2007 to produce the world's first full lithium-powered PT Cruisers.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby recognize and commend Paratransit for their outstanding commitment and service to our community. I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing this fine organization continued success and support as they work to provide seamless transportation options and other important services for everyone in the Sacramento Region.

DEATH BENEFITS BILL H.J. RES. 91

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we lost five warriors on the battlefield of Afghanistan recently. They were 25-year-old 1st Lt. Jennifer M. Moreno; 24-year-old Pfc. Cody J. Patterson; 24-year-old Special Agent Joseph M. Peters; 25-year-old Sgt. Patrick C. Hawkins; and 19-year-old Lance Cpl. Jeremiah M. Collins, Jr.

Unfortunately, their families were given the news not only that they had lost their loved ones, but they were also told that they would not be given the $100,000 in death benefits that they were entitled to receive within three days of the death of their loved ones.

The $100,000 payment is being withheld from the families—two of them Army Rangers—and one Marine and the bodies of the five warriors will be returned to Dover Air Force Base today. Congress needs to act NOW to rectify this absurd and disgraceful situation.

This money helps the families by giving them an immediate source of cash to help get through the tough times surrounding the funeral of their loved ones.

The Pentagon says it has specific instructions from its budget office not to make payments for deaths that occurred after 11:59 p.m. on Sept. 30, 2013—the date of the start of the government shutdown.

Congress passed a bill last week which should have made it clear that the Pentagon had the authority to make these kinds of payments, however this Administration continues to play politics with this shutdown and has apparently directed DOD not to make these payments.

In order to make it ABUNDANTLY clear that DOD has the authority to make these payments, I thank the Speaker for quickly bringing this bill up to the floor.

It is my hope that the Senate quickly passes this bill, and the President signs it. There is no excuse that any other American hero's family is told that they will not get the death benefit they deserve.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE NEW HAVEN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many who have gathered to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the New Haven Manufacturers Association—a remarkable milestone for this outstanding organization. Their leadership, vision, and advocacy have not only served to promote and expand manufacturing opportunities in New Haven County, but have become integral to how our communities and policy makers address manufacturing needs across Connecticut.

As one of the oldest states in our great nation, Connecticut has a long and rich history. At the heart of our state's economic history is a strong manufacturing foundation. Connecticut is incredibly proud of that heritage and can boast of many firsts in manufacturing: the first cotton gin, patented by Eli Whitney; the first factory town in America, planned and established in Seymour; the first movable parts mass production in use, making clocks; the first industrial training school, established by John Holbrook in Derby; as well as the production of the first revolver, portable typewriter, sewing machine, vacuum cleaner, Poloroid camera, color television, and helicopter. Our state's manufacturing industry has and continues to be an important part of our economic success.

For one hundred years the NHMA has been a strong voice on behalf of New Haven Country manufacturers—ensuring that public officials and communities understand the importance of the industry to our economy, that manufacturing employees have access to ongoing training and development resources, and that those schools and programs responsible for training the next generation of these skilled workers are able to do so with the most up-to-date technology and machinery. Over the course of my tenure in Congress I have had many opportunities to work with the NHMA as well as to visit many of their member companies to see first-hand the innovative work they are undertaking. We worked together to bring funding to Platt Regional Vocational Technical High School which financed new machinery for the school's manufacturing program and I have been proud to support their idea of the creation of manufacturing reinvestment accounts which are aimed at reducing the financial burdens our smaller manufacturers face as they seek to expand their businesses.

Their dedication and good work has helped to preserve our state's rich manufacturing history, provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, issues and best practices among their members, and advocate for public policies that enhance manufacturing as a whole. Today, as they celebrate their centennial anniversary, I am proud to rise and join the many community and business leaders who have gathered in extending my heartfelt congratulations and very best wishes to the New Haven Manufacturers Association. Happy 100th Anniversary.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF FORMER MINNESOTA SENATOR ROD GRAM

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to the family and friends of former U.S. Senator Rod Grams who represented Minnesota from 1995 to 2001. He had previously been elected to the U.S. House in 1992 where he served one term. Senator Grams passed away last night at home in Crown, MN. He was 65 years old.

Senator Grams was a Republican who fought hard for the issues he believed in and worked to find common ground on issues that concerned Minnesotans. Before entering politics Sen. Grams was a well known television newscaster in the Twin Cities. I remember watching him frequently.

While serving in the U.S. House and Senate I did not have contact with Sen. Grams, but following his time in elected office I had many interactions with him as he represented various private clients. I always found Rod Grams to be a kind and engaging man who cared deeply about Minnesota.

The public service provided by Senator Rod Grams is to be honored and respected. He was a conservative who cared about Minnesota and its people. Again, Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to his family, friends, and supporters.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,747,419,536,935.48. We've added $6,120,542,488,022.40 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the National Day of the Republic of China. October 10 marks the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising which led to the creation of the Republic of China in 1912.

The Republic of China, or Taiwan as it is more commonly known, has worked tirelessly to become a global player both politically and economically. With a thriving economy, Taiwan already plays a critical role in the global supply chain and serves as a major innovator in the technology industry. I am proud to represent Garmin Ltd. in my district which is an

exemplary company conducting business internationally based in both Kansas and Taiwan. The Taiwanese community is a strong contributor to Kansas's 3rd Congressional district.

In light of these contributions, it is my belief that Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

Taiwan currently plays a major role in ensuring U.S. interests in the Pacific. For decades we have enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship based on trust. It is my hope that we can continue and strengthen this relationship going forward. To achieve this goal, I look forward to working with the Administration to see that a bilateral investment agreement is signed between our countries.

Lastly, as long standing allies, it is time for us as a Congress to reconsider our diplomatic relationship with Taiwan by welcoming high-level officials from Taiwan to meet with their American equivalents in Cabinet level positions.

I commend Taiwan on its National Day, and look forward to a continued partnership.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LOUIS MAGNARELLI, PH.D.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and outstanding community member, Dr. Louis Magnarelli, whose recent passing was all too soon. Internationally recognized scientist, mentor, and friend, Lou was a remarkable man whose kind heart and passion for science touched the lives of many.

Earning his B.S. in Biology at the State University New York at Oswego, an M.S. in Biology at the University of Michigan, and his Ph.D. in Medical Entomology at Cornell University, Lou began his career at the Connecticut Agriculture Experiment Station in 1975. He dedicated a lifetime to his research and his work earned him a distinguished reputation on his area of expertise, medical entomology. He began as Assistant Scientist, served as Associate Scientist, Scientist, and later Chief Scientist/State Entomologist and Vice Director. For the last nine years, Lou led the Station as its Director. His contributions to Connecticut and science were extensive and unparalleled, publishing in excess of two hundred scientific articles. His expertise was not only recognized here but internationally, particularly for his work on ticks, tick-associated diseases, serological testing for vector-borne pathogens.

His colleagues perhaps put it best when they wrote "Lou was not only our Director, he was our colleague and most of all, our friend. His door was always open, both literally and figuratively, for discussion of all matters from the scientific to the personal. His keen scientific and analytical mind was only exceeded by his desire to bring this institution's scientific knowledge and experience to the benefit of the citizens of Connecticut. He was a strong supporter of Connecticut agriculture, the state's trees and woodlands, and the green industry. Lou's wisdom and skillful stewardship as our leader will be sorely missed. Even through his illness, his thoughts were always of the Experiment Station. All Station staff, both present and future, will take tremendous pride in honoring and continuing Dr. Magnarelli's unwavering commitment for Putting Science to Work for Society."

I would be remiss if I did not extend a personal note of thanks and appreciation to Lou for his many years of friendship and service. I often sought his guidance and expertise. Lou's joy and dedication to his work was contagious and I could always count on him for outstanding research or an update on Station's recent work. I am proud of the work that we did together and the many accomplishments that were achieved on behalf of the Station and the residents of Connecticut.

Louis Magnarelli's presence, both at the Station and in the scientific community, will be deeply missed. He worked tirelessly for the people of Connecticut, our communities and the environment. He was an extraordinary individual whose passion for science, exceptional leadership, and compassion for others will long serve as an inspiration to others—that is his lasting legacy. I join so many others in extending my deepest sympathies to his wife, Sharon, family, friends, and colleagues as they mourn his loss.

"CHANGE THE MASCOT" CAMPAIGN

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to participate in a symposium led by the Oneida Indian Nation in support of the "Change the Mascot" campaign. The discussion gave voice to many serious concerns with the continued use of the disparaging slur "Redskins" as the name of Washington's National Football League (NFL) team. I commend and congratulate Ray Halbritter of the Oneida Indian Nation for his leadership and the tremendous effort put forth by his community to raise national awareness of this issue. Below are my remarks from the symposium for the Congressional record:

Good morning. It is my honor to be here today to support the "Change the Mascot" campaign. The "Change the Mascot" campaign is advancing a national dialogue, which is important for Native Americans and all Americans to have.

There are more than 5 million Native Americans in the U.S. They are our neighbors and friends—children, elders, moms and dads, men and women—who care about their culture, their communities, and their country.

Native Americans are not mascots or caricatures to be exploited for profit—not by the NFL or any professional sports team owner. They should never be stereotyped in a dehumanizing, degrading, or demeaning manner.

In the year 2013, for the NFL and a team owner to be so driven by profit that this clearly racist mascot continues to be promoted and defended is truly outrageous. But it has not gone unnoticed. That is why we are here today as part of the "Change the Mascot" campaign. And change is coming.

Let me quote from the September 13, 2013 editorial by the Washington Post: "We hope, too, that Mr. Snyder finally understands that the team's name . . . is a racial slur of Native Americans so offensive that it should no longer be tolerated." They go on to say: "Mr. Snyder should be prepared for the controversy never to end."

There is no dignity or respect in the exploitation perpetrated for profit by the NFL and Dan Snyder's football business. They are promoting a racist slur that must change. And, this campaign is going to keep advancing until that name is changed.

It is my honor to represent Native American families in my Congressional District and throughout Minnesota. In Minnesota, we have eleven Sioux and Ojibwe Nations that have a long and very proud history of contributing to the strength, diversity, and success of our State. In one month—on November 7th—my team, the Minnesota Vikings, will host Washington's football team. That night I am sure the "Change the Mascot" campaign will have a big presence in the Twin Cities. I look forward to welcoming you, Ray!

I want to recognize one colleague who is not here today, but has been the leading voice in Congress on this issue—Delegate ENI FALEOMAVAEGA who represents American Samoa. He is the author of legislation that would end federal trademark protection for the term "Redskin". I am proud to be a co-sponsor, along with Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. And this issue isn't going away.

The hired PR folks, who are now defending Mr. Snyder's football team, cite outdated polls of Native Americans and talk about history and tradition. It's all rubbish and corporate spin to keep the profits flowing.

Mr. Snyder, change the mascot. End this ugly history and tradition of your team's racist slur and pick a new mascot that offends no one—hurts no one—dehumanizes no one.

It's time to put dignity and respect for Native people ahead of your profits.

COMMEMORATING DOUBLE TEN DAY, TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that this Thursday, October 10 is Double Ten Day, Taiwan's national day. I hope they will join me in congratulating the people of Taiwan on this momentous occasion.

Our great friend in Asia, Taiwan, will be celebrating its 102nd anniversary on October 10. Also known as Double Ten Day since it falls on the 10th day of the 10th month, this is Taiwan's National Day and is revered and celebrated in the same fashion as we do the Fourth of July here in America.

Taiwan is today a multi-party democracy with a strong economy that is working to ease tensions with Mainland China, while preserving both its political existence and its vibrant national life. This Double Ten Day marks the 102nd anniversary of China's Wuchang Uprising, a significant development in the Xinhai Revolution. This occasion is especially important given Taiwan's aspirations to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Taiwan has been a great friend and partner of the United States, and I have no doubt that

this important relationship will continue to be a source of strength to our peoples as this new century continues to unfold. I congratulate the people of Taiwan as they commemorate Double Ten Day.

HONORING XAVIER HIGH SCHOOL ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many who have gathered in celebration of Xavier High School's 50th Anniversary. It is a remarkable milestone for this educational institution. "A Catholic community fostering excellence in scholarship, leadership and service," over the course of the last five decades, Xavier has helped prepare hundreds of young men from communities across Connecticut for their future success—educating the whole person: spirit, mind and body within a Christian framework.

Founded in 1963 by The Most Rev. Vincent J. Hines, second bishop of the Diocese of Norwich, as a Catholic secondary school for young men, Xavier High School is sponsored jointly by the Roman Catholic Diocese of Norwich and the Congregation of the Brothers of Saint Francis Xavier. From its earliest days, Xavier has maintained an educational philosophy which seeks "to impress upon students the dignity of the human person created by God, to guide and counsel students in educational and vocational need and to help them prepare for college, for life work, and above all, for life itself."

As the school year closed this past summer, Brother Brian Davis, Headmaster at Xavier, took a moment to reflect on the Xavier's first fifty years in the school magazine's summer edition, commenting on how some things had changed but many had stayed the same—particularly the commitment of the school, faculty, staff, and students to service. Giving back to their communities and working to benefit those less fortunate has always been a central tenant of a Xavier education. Just this past year, students not only spent countless hours working in their hometowns, but also on service trips sponsored by the school to Guatemala and Camden, New Jersey. And the lessons they learn about service stay with Xavier graduates throughout their adult lives, with many remaining actively involved in public and community service.

Xavier has created an educational environment which fosters the spiritual, academic, and physical growth of its students and challenges them to use their talents in service—an environment perhaps best described by their motto, "Be a man. A man like Jesus." The school's motto is central to their philosophy, and is reflected throughout their curriculum and in the day to day activities of the students, faculty, and staff. I am proud to stand today to extend my sincere congratulations to them as they celebrate their 50th Anniversary and wish them all the best for many more years of success.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 10, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 11

10 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the way forward from government shutdown and debt ceiling confrontation toward long-term fiscal sustainability and economic growth.

LHOB–1100

11 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security.

SR–253

OCTOBER 15

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine small businesses, focusing on the government shutdown.

SR–428A

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.

SD–562

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7311–S7355

Measures Introduced: One resolution was introduced, as follows: S. Res. 267. **Page S7353**

Measures Passed:

Death of Former Senator Rod Grams: Senate agreed to S. Res. 267, relative to the death of Rod Grams, former United States Senator for the State of Minnesota. **Page S7354**

Motion to Instruct the Sergeant at Arms: By 78 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 215), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. **Page S7319**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

A routine list in the Army. **Page S7355**

Messages from the House: **Page S7353**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S7353**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S7353, S7354**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7353**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S7354**

Additional Statements

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7354**

Quorum Calls: One quorum call was taken today. (Total—4) **Page S7319**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—215) **Page S7319**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Rod Grams of Minnesota, under the provisions of S. Res. 267, at 6:48 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 10, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7355.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine housing finance reform, focusing on essential elements of the multifamily housing finance system, after receiving testimony from Thomas S. Bozzuto, The Bozzuto Group, Baltimore, Maryland, on behalf of the National Multi Housing Council and the National Apartment Association; E.J. Burke, Mortgage Bankers Association, Cleveland, Ohio; Shekar Narasimhan, Beekman Advisors, Inc., Dunn Loring, Virginia; and Terri Ludwig, Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., New York, New York.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 3 public bills, H.R. 3279–3281; and 1 resolution, H.J. Res. 92 were introduced. **Page H6453**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6453–54**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Collins (NY) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6415**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:41 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6425**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Rod MacIlvaine, Grace Community Church, Bartlesville, Oklahoma. **Page H6425**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014: H.J. Res. 91, to make continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 425 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 538. **Pages H6431–35, H6441–42**

Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 90, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 172 noes, Roll No. 537. **Pages H6435–41**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Esty motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 536. **Pages H6439–40**

H. Res. 373, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 89) and (H.J. Res. 90) and the bill (H.R. 3273) was agreed to yesterday, October 8th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6440, H6440–41 and H6441–42. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HAITI: IS U.S. AID EFFECTIVE?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Haiti: Is U.S. Aid Effective?". Testimony was heard from David B. Gootnick, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office; Thomas C. Adams, Haiti Special Coordinator, Department of State; and Elizabeth Hogan, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Agency for International Development.

HOW WESTERNERS JOINING TERROR GROUPS OVERSEAS AFFECT THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland". Testimony was heard from Lauren Ploch Blanchard, Specialist in African Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Richard Stanek, Sheriff, Hennepin County, Minnesota; Stephanie Sanok Kostro, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Counterterrorism Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

EXAMINING THE IRS'S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING AND ENFORCING OBAMACARE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Examining the IRS's Role in Implementing and Enforcing ObamaCare". Testimony was heard from Sarah Hall Ingram, Director, Affordable Care Act Office, Internal Revenue Service.

HEALTH LAW'S DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "The Effects of the Health Law's Definition of Full-Time Employee on Small Businesses". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN ON VA BENEFITS AND SERVICES TO VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Effect of Government Shutdown on VA Benefits and Services to Veterans". Testimony was heard from Eric K. Shinseki, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary

of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the impact of a default on financial stability and economic growth, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the debt limit, 8 a.m., SH–216.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''The Interpretation of H.R. 3210: 'Pay Our Military Act' '', 11:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on USAF, USN and USMC Development and Integration of Air/Sea Battle Strategy, Governance and Policy into the Services' Annual Program, Planning, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) Process, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3212, the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''EPA vs. American Mining Jobs: The Obama Administration's Regulatory Assault on the Economy'', 1 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on H.R. 3176, to reauthorize the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3189, to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Bungling Bundling: How Contract Bundling and Consolidation Remain Challenges to Small Business Success'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation will hold a hearing entitled ''Funding the Nation's Freight System'', 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Between Peril and Promise: Facing the Dangers of VA's Skyrocketing Use of Prescription Painkillers to Treat Veterans'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, October 10, Full Committee, meeting on Member Access Requests, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing may close.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Thursday, October 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: The time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees.

(At 1 p.m., Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a special caucus meeting with the President.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, October 10

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E1464
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1468
Collins, Doug, Ga., E1463
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1465, E1466, E1467, E1468, E1469, E1470
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1463
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1463
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1463
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1469
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1467
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1466
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1465, E1467, E1468, E1469
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1467
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1465
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1468
Price, Tom, Ga., E1464
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1466
Titus, Dina, Nev., E1463
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1464
Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E1468

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.