United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013 No. 141

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 10, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO 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.

IMPROVING HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this body has attempted to repeal the health care law 41 times. The act's repeal or delay is being used as leverage in the current budget fight, but I just want to take a few minutes to remind people why we passed the health reform law in the first place.

Let's remember the situation before ObamaCare became law. Clearly the status quo was not sustainable. The number one cause of personal bankruptcy in the United States was medical costs, and 60 percent of those who filed for bankruptcy had insurance. Forty-seven million Americans were without health care. Premiums were rising three times faster than wages, eating up more of our paychecks and bottom lines.

The average family was already paying a hidden health care tax of over $1,000 annually in premiums as a direct result of subsidizing the cost of the uninsured. Small businesses were paying 18 percent more than larger employers for health insurance. People with preexisting conditions were denied coverage or thrown off their coverage when they got sick and needed it most. Senior citizens fell into the doughnut hole and had to pay hundreds of dollars out of pocket for their prescriptions.

We cannot go back. We cannot repeal this essential law. We must move forward together and fix the very real problems with health care reform; but before we do that, we have to stop spreading falsehoods and set the record straight about what is in the law and what is not.

Myth number one: Members of Congress and their staffs are somehow exempt from the law. Not only are Members and their staff not exempt from the law, but they are actually subject to extra requirements. Insurance marketplaces that Members and staff must now join were actually designed for people who currently do not have insurance or get it on the individual market. People who already have insurance through their employers, like Members and their staff, don't need to get insurance through the marketplace because they already have coverage. Still, due to a messaging amendment in the ACA, Members and their staff were required to get their insurance through the marketplace and they will.

Myth number two: the Affordable Care Act is a job killer. First of all, 97 percent of small employers are exempt from the requirements to provide insurance. Second, most large employers who are required to provide coverage already do so. Aside from reporting requirements, the ACA will only require about 1 percent of businesses to do anything differently. Some on the other side of this aisle often cite a Congressional Budget Office report which said the ACA would lead to a reduction in the amount of labor in the economy by one-half of one percent. What the critics failed to add is that the same report noted that the small reduction in labor would come primarily from people choosing to work less.

There are legitimate concerns from small restaurants and hospitality entities that are worried about affording affordable coverage for their part-time employees. These concerns are real and should be addressed; but exaggerating claims that the ACA is a job killer and trying to repeal or defund it rather than remedy it does nothing to help those businesses with real concerns.

Myth number three: the Affordable Care Act is driving up premiums. Some historical context is important here. Premiums grew 119 percent between 1999 and the year 2008. Over the last 2 years, premiums have only increased an average of 4 percent. On the individual level, because insurance companies can no longer charge older individuals significantly more than younger folks, this will shift some costs to younger Americans. However, the insurance subsidies provided by the law will significantly blunt those potential cost increases. Those who are uninsured with preexisting conditions who previously could not get coverage will likely pay less. Finally, those with employer-provided coverage, the majority of Americans, will see little change.

We need to do more to hold down the cost of health care; but rather than talking about real cost reduction reforms, opponents of the law are simply trying to repeal it—41 times. This Nation's health care system faces real

Printed on recycled paper.

challenges, and we need real solutions. If critics of the law spent as much energy on developing legitimate solutions as they do on perpetuating falsehoods about the ACA, we might make some progress. Let's stop the fear-mongering, come together and have a real conversation about improving our health care system.

END HUNGER IN AMERICA NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here we are, 10 days into the Republican government shutdown and just a few days away from hitting the debt ceiling, and the Republican leadership continues to spin its wheels. The American people are rightly blaming congressional Republicans for this shutdown, and they will blame Republicans for a default too.

Every day seems to bring a new Republican strategy: repeal ObamaCare, defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, stage a non-filibuster filibuster, ask for the entire Romney economic platform in order to raise the debt ceiling, yell at park rangers, fund this part of the government, fund that part of the government, pay furloughed employees, pay essential employees, hold a conference meeting, hold a press conference.

Meanwhile, as the Republican Conference tries to get its act together, Americans across this country are feeling the impact of the shutdown, and that impact grows every day. Last month USDA released the annual figures on food security in America. These are the statistics of the number of people who don't know where their next meal will come from, essentially the number of hungry people in this country; and once again we see the effects of the Great Recession showing up in these food security numbers.

According to USDA, over 49 million people are food insecure. That means they are hungry. Seventeen million are children. These figures are virtually unchanged from previous years. It means hunger is not getting better in America. It is not getting worse, but that is no consolation.

While these figures are bad enough, House Republicans apparently thought they should be worse and decided to pass legislation cutting $39 billion from SNAP, our Nation's best, most efficient and effective anti-hunger program. Those cuts would cause hunger to get worse; 170,000 unemployed veterans would lose access to SNAP. Two million kids would be kicked off the free school meal program. Overall, around 4 million people would lose access to SNAP because of these terrible cuts.

Now, that is pretty bad, especially considering that hunger is still a problem in America; but it is still not bad enough for the Republicans, so they shut the government down. Now, I know this shutdown isn't about hunger; it is about irrational demands by a few Republicans. But like the bill cutting SNAP by $39 billion, the impact of the shutdown is beginning to make hunger worst in America.

Look at Nevada, where 362,000 food stamp recipients will see their benefits halt on November 1—not reduced, halted; 425,000 women, infants, and children would see their food benefits provided under WIC halted as well. That is right, nearly 800,000 hungry low-income Nevadans would lose access to food because of this Republican shutdown.

But it is not just Nevada. North Carolina announced on Tuesday that it had discontinued issuing food and nutrition benefits through WIC to women, infants, and children specifically because Federal funding for the program has dried up. Eighty percent of those Carolinians eligible have already received their October benefits, but that means 20 percent of the 264,000 enrolled low-income women, infants, and children will not get the help they qualify for to buy the food they need including formula, fruits, and vegetables.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue hearing stories like this as the Republican shutdown continues. More and more low-income families will see the food they rely on taken away from them simply because Republicans in Washington will not open the government.

This is not the way to end hunger now, Mr. Speaker. We will only end hunger now if we finally come together and decide that ending hunger is a priority, that it is something we believe we can do, and that we commit ourselves to accomplishing it.

Mr. Speaker, we can stop hunger from getting worse by reopening the government. We can stop hunger from getting worse by preventing $39 billion in SNAP cuts from being enacted. We can stop hunger from getting worse by preventing the automatic cut to SNAP already scheduled to take effect on November 1 from taking place.

We need to end this Republican shutdown today. Republicans should not let poor Americans go hungry simply because they can't agree on a political strategy in Washington. That is not right. That is not how we should treat our fellow Americans. It is wrong, and they know it. We should be working to end hunger now, not to make hunger worse. We can eliminate it. This is a fight we can win if we just find the political will and courage to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying once again to my Republican colleagues, bring a clean continuing resolution to this House floor so we can have an up-or-down vote so that we can reopen this government and so we can prevent hunger from getting worse in this country.

HUMAN CONSEQUENCES OF IRRESPONSIBLE AND IRRATIONAL 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 continue speaking out about the human consequences of this irresponsible and irrational government shutdown. We are now 10 days into this ridiculousness, and what I have been doing is spending time on the phone each day with the people from my region who tell me their stories about suffering due to the needless and increasingly maddening shutdown.

I recently spoke with the family of Jeremiah Johnson. They are from a town called Prophetstown, Illinois. It is a small town of about 2,000 people in Whiteside County, right in the heart of my congressional district.

Jeremiah is a disabled combat veteran who served his country bravely in Iraq. He now is also a Federal law enforcement employee who happens to be working without any pay; and while he is receiving no paycheck, he is also worried about the disability benefits being delayed because of the shutdown. So absolutely a double whammy for this father and husband.

In fact, he and his wife, Pam, just celebrated their 18th wedding anniversary on Monday; and rather than go out and celebrate like many couples do to mark their joyous occasion, they ate at home because they don't know when to expect their next paycheck. So Pam made a pie for her husband and Jeremiah gave his wife an anniversary card, very simple and very sweet. On top of that, their 12-year-old daughter, Carissa, actually offered her parents her entire savings in case they need it. When Pam told me this story, she got a little emotional about it and spoke over and over about just what a good daughter they have.

So in spite of their seventh grader's loving offer and Pam and Jeremiah removing any extravagance from their wedding anniversary plans, of course they remain worried about the lack of a paycheck and really their own ability to be able to pay their car payment and their house payment. This is absolutely an unacceptable way that we would ever as a Nation treat our disabled veterans like Jeremiah.

We have the votes right now to open up our government and put Jeremiah and his family at ease; but there is one way to do this, and it is only if Democrats and Republicans come together. That is our path. It is that simple. It is commonsense, it is reasonable, and it is absolutely the right thing to do.

TRIBUTE IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF MARVIN DANIEL PRICE

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr.

Marvin Daniel Price, who passed away July 21 at the age of 81. Mr. PRICE came to my attention because he is the youngest known person ever to play professional baseball in the United States of America. At the age of 14, Marvin played with the Chicago American Giants in 1946.

One might wonder how this happened. Well, his sister, Ms. Gloria Price Simpson, tells the story that one day Marvin couldn't come out to play because he was sick. The other kids looked up to him, so they spotted him in the window and asked him if he would call the balls, and so he called out, safe, foul ball, fair ball.

He always imagined that baseball would play a major role in his life, and in fact it did. At the age of 14, professional baseball soon became a reality for Marvin when he was spotted playing baseball in Washington Park by the legendary Chicago Giants outfielder Jimmy Crutchfield. A tryout was soon arranged with then-owner J.B. Martin at Comiskey Park where manager Quincy Troupe originally thought he was the new bat boy.

It didn't take long for him to show that he wasn't there just to distribute the equipment. Marvin put on such a show that the Chicago American Giants decided to take him on a barnstorming trip to the South where he could play without jeopardizing his amateur status back in Chicago. Playing against hardened black baseball veterans in the South, Marvin displayed an awesome hitting performance.

After a week he returned home to Englewood High School, where he graduated and went on to play professionally with the Cleveland Buckeyes, New Orleans Eagles, and Chicago American Giants where he batted .390. Just as it looked as though Marvin was headed for baseball stardom, he enlisted in the military and spent 4 years in the United States Coast Guard.

After his stint in the military, he continued to play semi-professionally; and over the next 30 years, he worked as a supervisor with the Chicago post office while working part-time with the Chicago Park District teaching young people not only about the game of baseball, but the game of life.

On Friday, October 11, at U.S. Cellular Field, formerly known as Comiskey Park, there will be a memorial ceremony in Price's honor. Family members, friends and supporters, members of the White Sox and others are invited to come and celebrate his rich life and history. He was indeed a legend before his time, and so we salute you, Mr. Marvin Daniel Price, the youngest known professional baseball player in the United States of America.

VERY REAL AND DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues would have us believe that our current Federal shutdown has no real consequences. I have heard some even suggest that this period of suspended government should be thought of merely as a slowdown or a slimdown. There is talk that the shutdown is causing no real pain. The most extreme anti-government politicians even express the hope that such a cutback in government programs and services should be made permanent, and too many others are content to hang back and let those with extreme views have their way for the time being.

But I stand here today to remind my colleagues and the public that cuts in government funding and government programs have consequences, sometimes deadly. It is a lesson we learned in 2006 when annual coal mining deaths soared to 45, a 10-year high, reversing an 80-year trend of steadily falling fatalities, a trend attributed in part to years of underfunding the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

It is a lesson we should heed now. This year, as of September 4, 14 coal miners had died on the job in our country; and this past weekend alone, three coal miners lost their lives at work over 3 consecutive days, including one miner in West Virginia. Think about that. In the first 9 months of the year, 14 coal miners perished on the job. In the first 9 days of the government shutdown, three coal miners have perished.

Mr. Speaker, even one death is one too many. Now, no one has linked these recent deaths directly to the government shutdown, but the inability of this Congress to pass a simple bill to fund all the operations of our government has resulted in cutbacks of routine inspections that are essential to the complex system of safety oversight of this complex industry.

Miners and operators know that MSHA's multi-layered inspection and enforcement system has been hampered. Assistant Secretary Joe Main has said:

> Three miners killed on 3 consecutive days is extremely troubling. The fact that this occurred over a weekend when there may have been a greater expectation that an MSHA inspector would not be present is a red flag.

I hope that everyone in the coal industry, from the CEOs to the office staff, to security guards, to the coal miners themselves, will redouble their vigilance and take every possible step to ensure health and safety; and I urge my colleagues in this body to abandon this ridiculous political showdown that is undercutting the safety in our mines, our industrial facilities, our food chain, and so much more.

This is not a slowdown. It is not a slimdown. This is a politically driven shutdown, and it has real and dangerous consequences for the people who put their faith in us to provide them with basic services to ensure their well-being, to protect their lives, and to simply do the job that we have been elected to do: to lead.

PAIN OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS TOO GREAT

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as this shutdown drags on—and I concur with the comments of my colleague from West Virginia—it is serious and having serious consequences. The American people are left to wonder why.

Back here in Washington, D.C., you have all kinds of talking points and spin, and it circles around and can easily get very confusing as everyone seems to focus on the wrong things as to what caused this. And, really, it is very simple; and I think understanding it and getting Democrats and Republicans to stop talking past each other is the first step to getting out of this.

We have to understand that basically when you pass a budget to fund the government, the first thing you argue about is how much money is spent on it; and we had that argument and, believe me, there are deep disagreements between the Republican House, the Democratic Senate, and the White House on that.

But an agreement was reached between Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and HARRY REID on the level of funding; and that level of funding, frankly, is vastly lower than Democrats want, and we were going to go forward with that until the Speaker changed his mind and decided that he wanted something else. So if you are wondering why HARRY REID, the Senator, the Majority Leader in the Senate, is upset about this situation, it is in part because he had a deal and the Republicans went back on that deal.

But it gets worse than that. So instead of simply agreeing to the amount of money that would fund the government, Republicans are now saying, no, they want policy changes within the budget in order to fund the government, in order to just simply keep it open and in order to raise the debt ceiling so that we can pay our bills.

Now, policy changes do occasionally happen within appropriations bills, but only when they are agreed upon between the House, the Senate, and the White House. And the problem that the Republicans have and what they have had for 3 years is they simply do not have the votes to pass the policy changes that they want because they didn't win the election last time. President Obama won the election, Democrats control the Senate, and, ironically, Democrats actually won 52 percent of the vote for Congress, but because of gerrymandering, Republicans wound up with more seats.

But however we got here, they do not have the votes to advance the agenda that they want to advance, and they

are willing to shut down the government and stop funding it and not raise our debt ceiling; and, by the way, every day we get closer to that debt ceiling and not raising it is a day that is bad for this economy, all because they can't pass their policy agenda through the present Congress. Which raises the interesting question, What is that policy agenda? And that perhaps is the most frustrating thing about this.

We heard originally that they didn't pass the continuing resolution to fund the government because they wanted to end ObamaCare. Now editorials have been written by leaders; by the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR. I have heard PAUL RYAN say, no, no, no, it is not about ObamaCare; we understand we are not going to get that. Okay. So what policy change is it that you want? And this is where you get into the deficit. But, again, the Republicans haven't specified what they want on this.

Now, we know if you go back through 3 years of history, what they say they want, they want tax reform, though it hasn't been specified, and they want cuts in entitlements to get us closer to a balanced budget. They are completely unwilling to consider any revenue increases.

Now, the problem with this is the President doesn't agree. The Senate doesn't agree. The deficit is a problem, no question, but Democrats believe that part of that solution has to be revenue; and to this point we get $600 billion in revenue as a result of the deal that was reached last January in exchange for over $2 trillion in cuts, $2 trillion between the cuts that were made in the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the cuts that have now been forced on us by sequestration, $2 trillion in cuts and $600 billion in tax increases.

But be that as it may, the Republicans don't have the votes. They don't have the support of the President, and they don't have the support of the Senate to get those cuts, and yet they insist on shutting down the government.

Now, the big problem is what is it that they would want in tax reform and entitlement reform? And this is the thing that I think the American public is unaware of. The Republicans keep saying that they want entitlement reform, which means cuts in entitlements. They keep saying that they want tax reform. They have been in charge of this House for 3 years. They have not brought to the floor or passed out of committee any tax reform or any entitlement reform.

They put it in their budget, which is just sort of a big-picture list of future objectives of what they want to do. Why haven't they passed legislation? If they are willing to shut down the government and cause all of the pain that we have heard because they fervently believe that we need entitlement cuts and tax reform, the least they can do is bring it to the floor and tell us what it is.

Oddly, the President and Democrats have put more on the table in terms of reforming our entitlements. As part of the Affordable Care Act, we made reductions in Medicare, which the Republicans beat us up for and which has been responsible for Medicare actually going down in inflation.

The only solution for this, tell us what you want and understand how this situation works. The pain is too great.

VOTE FOR A CLEAN CR AND DEBT CEILING BILL

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge you to turn away from this destructive path of threatening the full faith and credit of the United States Government as a means to extort political concessions and to subvert the democratic principle of majority rule. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to become the Speaker of the House and not spokesperson for a fringe cult within the GOP caucus.

The Affordable Care Act is settled law. In fact, the negotiation for any change to the Affordable Care Act is possible and perhaps even desirable under so-called regular order, and that goes for the other ransom demands that the GOP has made.

Now, of course, the reason for this crisis, this shutdown of the government and the debt crisis, has now shifted from repealing or delaying ObamaCare to vague demands for negotiations. We have seen a laundry list, Mr. Speaker, of other so-called demands: approval of the Keystone pipeline; concessions on payments to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid; tort reform; repeal of job-killing regulations, that is, protections for clean air and clean water.

The latest demand is Republicans passed a bill to create a superdupercommittee that includes instructions that the committee can only resolve our budget crisis by considering spending cuts and entitlement cuts, but no new revenue. In other words, Mr. Speaker, you don't really want to negotiate. It is just obvious from your words and deeds, Mr. Speaker, since you, Mr. Speaker, have blocked negotiations 18 times over the past year.

Mr. Speaker, you are putting the country through this ''shut-er-down'' theater that you called for in the last Republican campaign, in the last cycle. ''A nuclear weapon'' is how Warren Buffett characterized failure to raise the debt ceiling.

Let me say that again. The world's most respected financial markets expert compared this now familiar Republican tactic as a weapon of mass destruction, a weapon that is ''too horrible to use.''

Let me quote Yalman Onaran in Bloomberg:

> Failure by the world's largest borrower to pay its debt, unprecedented in modern history, will devastate stock markets from Brazil to Zurich, halt a $5 trillion lending mechanism for investors who rely on Treasuries, blow up borrowing costs for billions of people and companies, ravage the dollar and throw U.S. and world economies into a recession that would likely become a depression. Money managers, economists, bankers and former government officials interviewed for this story, few view default as anything but a financial apocalypse.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, you continue to take default off the table. Meanwhile, even the discussion of default is driving up borrowing costs for the U.S. as investors demand higher yields to buy short-term U.S. Treasury bonds. Short-term borrowing costs have doubled and now are at the highest levels since late 2008. Heaven help us if you, Mr. Speaker, actually drive the U.S. into default.

Think about this: the $12 trillion of outstanding government debt is 23 times—23 times—the $517 billion Lehman owed when its bankruptcy sparked the 2008 financial crisis. The full faith and credit of the U.S. debt is the collateral for banks, financial contracts, and repurchase markets throughout the world, the collateral that stands behind global finance and investment. It is why we are the world's reserve currency. Any default by the U.S. will have very real and extremely serious consequences and trigger a self-inflicted global financial crisis.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, the full faith and credit of the United States is not open for negotiation. I urge my colleagues to cease using the debt ceiling and economic calamity as a political tool and vote for a clean CR and debt limit bill.

NEED TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT NOW

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady just expressed the dynamics of a pending default, and I could not agree more with the horrors of her description. It baffles me, literally baffles me, that in actuality we are sitting idly by, the Republican leadership, watching Rome burn.

Let me read for you a note that I got from my district, Mr. Speaker. ''I have no idea if any of you still are in office, but until further,'' this is asking whether my staff is still in office, ''but until further notice we have been furloughed effective at 9 a.m. today. I will send you an email when back in the office, which I hope is soon, especially since the Senate has not yet passed a bill to pay us even if furloughed. So we just all hope this is a short time off.''

Who is this? The Houston VA regional office. Isn't it interesting my friends rise to the floor of the House with such indignation about the VA, the VA centers, and, yes, tragically the devastation of families not receiving their memorial benefits; yet here we are today, another day of the government shutdown, and an email into our district offices indicating that the VA office is closed.

Another emergency call came into my office as a fire ravaged a home of 40 or so veterans. In ordinary circumstances, they would have the VA office to help resettle them; but we are rolling up our sleeves in Houston and my message is to those veterans that we are going to work to find you a place to stay. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the VA services are shut down while the home of those veterans burned. Who are we in this country if we cannot think of those who are lesser than we or who need to be helped with a helping hand?

Mr. Speaker, let me also say to you that while we are in the midst of this shutdown, this Republican obsession with the Affordable Care Act, poor people are suffering. There are millions of dollars impacted with the supplemental nutrition program, the school lunch program. Poor people need us to open the doors of this Congress to raise the minimum wage. Today is the day that I will celebrate and encourage America that the people of this country need to have a minimum wage of $10.10—$10.10.

But we can't get any action in this place for the poor people of America. The families, the young families, the young mothers and fathers, the millions of children impacted by Head Start, some 57,000 seats lost and growing across the Nation, poor people who need access to early education, poor people, both rural and urban, who need to have a minimum wage—Mr. Speaker, we can't do that because the government is shut down.

Why is it shut down? Has there been a hurricane or has there been an earthquake? Is there a volcanic eruption? Is there some other natural disaster? Are we under siege by a foreign territory? No. There is an extreme faction in the Republican Party that dominates the dialogue and the action.

What the American people want us to do is to vote now to open the government. They want what the Democrats want: to pay the bills. They want us to talk. We have been willing to talk. They want us to cooperate. We have been cooperating. We have agreed to the Republican number. We agreed to their tax issue, and yet they want to be obsessed with the Affordable Care Act. They want to take away health benefits from Americans.

And then the votes that they put on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, these are political votes. We will vote again today, political votes, while people are suffering with cancer. And the Friends of Cancer Research will tell them a thing or two. Their letter says:

> The Friends of Cancer Research, a cancer research think-tank and advocacy organization that brings together people and stakeholders who have overcome the barriers standing between patient and treatment, urges Congress to take a comprehensive approach to fiscal policy.

They don't need a piecemeal bill on the floor of the House.

We need to stop the extreme attitude. We need to recognize that the poor people of America, the people of America, need this shutdown to stop; and the extreme element of the Republican Party needs to stand down while Republicans, 20 of them, and Democrats, 200-plus, vote to open the government now.

THE CONTINUED SHUTDOWN OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY HOUSE REPUBLICANS

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, day 10 of a Republican shutdown of the Federal Government. Where are we? Well, the consequences are cascading. They build up: $373 million a day in new Small Business Administration loans frozen, preventing small businesses from getting started, preventing small businesses from expanding and hiring new workers; 10,000 applications a day for Social Security benefits and Medicare frozen. Veterans benefits, we have reduced the backlog by 30 percent. The people who are reducing that backlog, furloughed.

I had a constituent in my district who lost a loved one at Walter Reed Army Hospital. When the funeral home came to collect their loved one for preparation for his final burial, there were no doctors for the death certificate because they had been furloughed.

This affects every American. Sometimes we are not aware of how interwoven Federal services are in our lives. We count on and take for granted that the Federal Government is protecting us from diseases. There is research being done on a crash basis to make sure that antibiotic-resistant infections don't kill us and our children. It is a real threat. Those researchers, furloughed. Protecting illnesses and invasive species, including deadly species, from coming into the United States, at risk because the men and women who are charged with that mission are furloughed.

We are now a subject of conversation all around the world. What happened to America? How can we be a beacon for others? How can we be a model for how to run a country? How can we lecture an emerging country about democratization and how it works for its people when we allow this kind of brinksmanship, this kind of spectacle, and the danger to our own country and its people?

It is reckless. It causes real harm. The solution is at hand, and that is a clean funding bill for the government and a clean debt ceiling to make sure we are good for our debts. We have been good for our debts since the founding of the Republic, since Alexander Hamilton established the creditworthiness of the United States in George Washington's first Cabinet.

Never has there been a risk that we wouldn't be good for our bills, and yet we have one faction in the Republican caucus seemingly dominating that conversation on that side of the aisle, more than willing to embrace the threat of default. Almost every major business group has pleaded with this Congress not to do that, not to even play with that. The last time they did, in 2011, our debt was downgraded for the first time in American history; $2.4 trillion worth of household wealth was lost, including $800 billion on the equity markets that fell 625 points the next day. It hurt America. It is hurting America now.

We can bring up a clean funding bill before the floor of this House tomorrow—today. We have got the votes to pass it. It is a matter of Republican leadership. Will they allow the democratic process to work in this body? On behalf of the country, can we not put aside partisanship just once for the sake of our country and do the right thing and reassure the world we are standing together to do that right thing, protecting the creditworthiness of this country, protecting the American people by providing government and turning our backs on anarchy? That is really what some are preaching: you don't need government; government is always bad; government never works; government doesn't protect you.

That philosophy is dangerous and that philosophy, unfortunately, is at work here in the House of Representatives.

It is time to turn our backs on that philosophy and embrace the needs of this country and the wonderful people we serve.

THE HIGH COST OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I received an email from Scott, a constituent of the 5th District who lives in Boone, North Carolina. Here is what he had to say:

> With all of the talk to this point about the effects of the Affordable Care Act, it has just turned into brutal reality for me and my family. I received a letter from Blue Cross Blue Shield this week regarding my coverage. All of the promises of if you like your current health coverage, you will be able to keep it is absolutely untrue. Blue Cross has dropped my current plan that I was relatively happy with and was expecting to continue using. Blue Cross will be moving me into a new plan where the cost is devastating for my family. My monthly premium is increasing 55 percent, $3,816 more per year, and my out-of-pocket expenses will cost my family an additional $3,650 per year. So, all in all, I will be paying an additional $7,466 next year for health insurance and copayments on top of my already high premiums. I do not qualify for any of the subsidies either, so this one is all on the back of this middle class family of four. I have a 4-year-old daughter and a 2-year-old daughter. I have no choice but to keep them covered any way I can as any father would. But the new outlays of $7,466 will be a huge burden. We will

all have to make some big changes in our family to be able to afford this. I knew the Affordable Care Act would be tough on someone like myself, but I had no idea how hard it would hit me and my family.

Mr. Speaker, Scott is not alone. Families across this country are baffled by ObamaCare sticker shock. Accepting the devastating truth that costs will be much higher for them next year, some families are trying to find a way to make it work, but they can't even get to the Web site.

But what do they hear from Washington? ObamaCare apologists say, Be patient with us. We will get these glitches sorted out. It will take a few years, and you will all be used to it.

Mr. Speaker, if only those voices in Washington would be willing to give the American people the same time and patience they are demanding. A bipartisan House majority has asked for families to have 1 penalty-free year to figure out what ObamaCare will mean for their families and for their budgets, 1 penalty-free year, not unlike the penalty-free year the President gave to Big Business all on his own.

Fairness: that is what we have asked for. Fairness: that is what Senate Democrats are refusing to discuss. Fairness: that is what the President describes as ransom.

ENDING THE SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States had the House Democratic Caucus in the East Room for a discussion. Today he will have the Republican caucus, and he will also have the Democratic Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all the Republicans go engage the President, because the President gave such a clear and convincing argument about why what is going on is wrong and has to stop. If the President is told by the minority party in one of the Houses to get a funding bill passed to fund the government that he has to repeal some act, where does that stop? If we get a continuing resolution, and this one was until December 15, and they ask the President to abolish the landmark legislation that he signed and that this Congress passed a few sessions ago, the next thing could be, well, we are not going to continue the government again unless you repeal the EPA, or we are not going to do it unless you repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act, or maybe 6 months down the line we are not going to repeal it unless you and Vice President BIDEN both resign.

You can't give in to these types of tactics to have bills repealed because of a minority within a minority of one branch of government and not go through the regular order of the House passing, the Senate passing, the President signing or vetoing, and then let the Court decide if it is constitutional, which has happened with the Affordable Care Act.

The President made it clear that he wants to work with both sides; but he is not going to give in to these types of tactics because it wouldn't be fair, not only for him but for the next President and the next President and for the United States of America. Presidents and the country should not be held ransom by the demands of one group, and the President is standing for the Presidency and for the country and for the Constitution.

The Affordable Care Act is not going to be repealed, and the other party knows that. Now they have proposed working on entitlements and long-term deficit reduction. The President will talk to them, engage in dialogue; and hopefully after the Republicans attend and listen to the President today, they will see that this has been a mistake for the American people and a mistake for their political party and they will end this shutdown, reopen government, pass a continuing resolution, and pass a debt ceiling, even if for only 4 or 6 weeks, which the pundits think may happen. It will get us out of this crisis.

And hopefully the minority group within the Republican caucus will let the Republican Party continue to be what it had been in the past, a party of business, and not a party that was anti-business and threatening a debt ceiling issue and a default on our debt which would be catastrophic to the national markets and world markets. Hopefully, within those 6 weeks of dialogue with the President and the leaders of Congress, they can come to some agreements, and we won't have this type of brinksmanship again.

The President is a convincing individual. He is very knowledgeable, he has great people working for him, and he is looking out for the future of this country. This shutdown was totally avoidable. The continuing resolution, which was only going to be to November 15 on the Senate side and December 15 on the House side, accepted the House of Representative's budget figures, which was the PAUL RYAN budget.

The PAUL RYAN budget is anathema to Democrats. We don't like it. It has got cuts to so many services that are important to people in this country: cuts to Head Start; cuts to SNAP payments, formerly known as food stamps; cuts to veterans; cuts to programs that help people get through the day; energy programs when it gets cold to help you pay your utility bills. These cuts are anathema to us, but we accepted them to keep the government going. The Democrats in the Senate accepted them, the Democrats in the House, the President.

But the House Republicans who put that figure out and got accepted, that wasn't enough. They had said, all right, now you have got to repeal, abolish, and/or change to the point of trying to get to abolishment of the most important bill that has been passed in this House of Representatives since 1965 when the Civil Rights Act and Medicaid and Medicare were passed.

It is not going to happen. We are the last industrialized country on the face of the Earth to have national health insurance. It is the right thing to do; and it is folly for Governors and the States that haven't allowed the Medicaid expansion to go forward to do that and I hope they would.

I hope the Republicans come to their senses and we end this shutdown.

TIME TO GET AMERICA BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, it is day No. 10. Mr. Speaker, today is day No. 10 of a government shutdown, a totally unnecessary government shutdown. This is a manufactured crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is time that we open the government back up.

Mr. Speaker, if our leadership is not able to get together, if the House, the Senate, and the President are not able to sit at the table, then maybe it is time to turn to rank-and-file Members.

This morning over 50 of us came together, Democrats and Republicans, from all over America, from Kansas, from New York, from Florida, from California. We came together not to fight, but we came together to fix problems. We came together as no-labels problem-solvers.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to get America back to work. We are ready to start moving this country forward. We need to start solving problems, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that there is an easy three-step solution to get the country back on track.

Mr. Speaker, number one, let's open up the government.

Mr. Speaker, number two, let's pay our bills. We have always done that. So let's raise the debt ceiling.

Number three, let's come together as Democrats and Republicans and let's negotiate. Let's actually put a real budget together, a budget that starts to address our debt and the deficit; a budget that starts to make sure what we hand off to our children and grandchildren is the same as the country we inherited from our parents and grandparents—a country that thrives, a country that leads the world.

We have to get serious about the challenges that we face and we have to stop these manufactured crises. We have to stop the bickering. This is divided government. It means Democrats and Republicans coming together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to join with the no-labels problem-solvers and do what our motto is, let's fix problems, not fight. We are ready to go and get America back to work.

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 10 o'clock and 55 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 Guillermo Maldonado, King Jesus International Ministry, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we come together in this House of the Congress to exalt Your Holy Name, thanking You for the rights and freedom You have given us. We ask You for Your wisdom to come upon each Member of Congress as they come together in the business of establishing righteous laws.

We pray, Lord, that Your Kingdom come, that Your will be done in this place as it is in Heaven. Only by Your Holy Spirit can there be real unity, real reconciliation, and real solutions to the pressing issues that come through this House.

Lord, Your Kingdom is righteousness, peace, and joy. May Your righteousness prevail. May Your peace cover each Member of Congress. Give them wisdom. May Your joy be heard throughout the land. May You bless the United States of America.

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 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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 GUILLERMO MALDONADO

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, today we have just heard the words of Pastor Guillermo Maldonado. We are honored to have him as our guest chaplain in the House.

Pastor Maldonado is the founder and senior pastor of King Jesus International Ministry in Miami. His ministry, Mr. Speaker, is one of the fastest-growing multicultural churches in the United States and is recognized as the largest Hispanic church in the entire Nation.

Pastor Maldonado, by the way, along with his family, has demonstrated unsurpassed leadership and dedication not only to his local ministry but to communities and ministries across the Nation. He and his lovely wife, Ana, are dear friends of mine and my family who I trust and I greatly admire. So again, we are truly blessed to benefit from his spiritual wisdom and his guidance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

BIPARTISANSHIP STARTS WITH A TALK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, then-Senator Barack Obama decried a proposed debt ceiling increase as a ''sign of leadership failure'' and then voted against raising the debt limit. Two years later, Candidate Obama referred to the $4 trillion debt accrued by his predecessor as ''irresponsible'' and ''unpatriotic.'' $6.1 trillion and 4½ years later, he is demanding that Congress raise the debt ceiling without so much as a conversation as to what we can do to get control of spending and leave less debt to our kids and grandkids.

This seems less than responsible to me. To have any hope of solving the challenges before us, leaders have to be willing to work together. So let's defend our credit rating by getting control over our bills and strengthening our fiscal foundation.

Whether the challenge is ending the shutdown or confronting our debt, divided government demands bipartisan solutions, and finding bipartisan agreement starts by sitting down to talk.

A LOST PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my constituents back home in Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City, Michigan, sent me here because they felt that I could represent them in a democratic body and protect their interests. Unfortunately, because of the willfulness and intransigence of some on the other side, we can't have a simple ''yes'' or ''no'' vote in this body to reopen government. Despite the fact that all Democrats and around 30 or so Republicans would be willing to take up the Senate-passed bill to reopen government, we have not been given the opportunity to do that.

What very few know—and I assume some on the other side may not even realize—is that the rule that was adopted here on October 1 takes away a longstanding privilege of Members of the House to call up a Senate bill in the event of a dispute between House and Senate versions of the same legislation. You have taken away that basic right that my voters and the Representatives of this body all should continue to possess in order to achieve or pursue your ideological goal of using a government shutdown to get what you can't get at the ballot box. This is wrong. It needs to end. We need to bring up the Senate-passed bill to reopen government today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HEALTHCARE.GOV

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, online enrollment for ObamaCare has been open for just 10 days, and healthcare.gov has already proved to be an unmitigated disaster.

Madam Speaker, the launch of ObamaCare's Web site was originally slated to cost the American taxpayers $93 million. It is now reported to have cost over $634 million and, with so many problems and failures, will undoubtedly cost even more. Already it has been taken offline to try to fix the glitches.

What is worse is that the administration hasn't been able to give a clear picture of what this $634 million has gotten us. The number of people who have actually been able to enroll is completely unclear.

Madam Speaker, the Web site has been a failure thus far and a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. President Obama insisted on a mandate but didn't figure out the details of how it would actually work.

MEMORIAL FOR 1ST LIEUTENANT JENNIFER MORENO

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

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, who died on October 6, 2013, in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Lieutenant Moreno died of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near her dismounted patrol. Lieutenant Moreno was a member of the Cultural Support Team supporting a Joint Special Operations Task Force for the U.S. Army's Special Operations Command.

Born and raised in San Diego, Lieutenant Moreno graduated from San

Diego High School and went on to receive a bachelor's degree in nursing from the University of San Francisco. She was commissioned in the United States Army as a nurse corps officer, where she served as a clinical staff nurse on a medical surgical unit.

The commander of the Ranger battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Patrick Ellis, said, ''She was a talented member of our team who lost her life while serving her country in one of the most dangerous environments in the world. Her bravery and self-sacrifice were in keeping with the highest traditions of the 75th Ranger Regiment.'' Her awards and decorations are numerous, including being awarded the Bronze Star posthumously.

Madam Speaker, I know we all extend our deepest condolences to her family and friends who have suffered this tragic loss. Her loved ones will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY, JACK MATES

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize and wish a happy birthday to World War II veteran and Las Vegas Distinguished Flying Cross Chapter chairman Jack Mates, who will celebrate his 90th birthday on October 14.

Mr. Mates served in the United States Army Air Force during World War II and was a B–17 squadron leader based out of Italy. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight against the enemy in the Mediterranean theater of operations. According to his award citation, Lieutenant Mates consistently displayed outstanding courage, aggressiveness, and intensive devotion to duty throughout all engagements.

With his aircraft frequently severely damaged by heavy enemy fire, Lieutenant Mates courageously remained at his station, battling his way through to his targets to aid materially in the utter destruction of vitally important enemy installations and supplies.

After his honorable discharge, Jack Mates worked closely with his father, learning the marketing business, and in 1959 was part of the group responsible for the introduction of Velcro to consumers across the United States. He later became president and chief executive officer of Velcro USA in 1980, upholding his central role while helping expand the brand until his retirement in 1986.

Mr. Mates helped found the Distinguished Flying Cross Society in 1996 in order to preserve the history and tradition of military aerial heroism. Since that time, he has remained an active participant in DFC society activities and served as Las Vegas chapter chairman.

According to friends and family, Jack truly lived the American Dream and embodies the reason we refer to his generation as our greatest. It is with great pleasure that I join Lieutenant Jack Mates' family and friends in wishing him a very happy 90th birthday.

IT IS TIME TO VOTE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from the veterans cemetery in Houston, Texas, that is notifying us to indicate that, as of October 15, this cemetery will have reduced staff and will have to reduce the number of burials for our heroes who all of us commit to honoring.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal employees are locked out of serving the government, of serving America. I just came from visiting with the representatives of thousands of Federal employees who were out in the rain, begging to come back to work. So the extreme faction of Republicans that don't want to open the government and raise the debt ceiling need to listen to the plea of those people.

I am going to introduce today a resolution that says that we will no longer tie a legislative issue to the idea of continuing to serve the American people, keeping the government open, and raising the debt ceiling. We have been ready to talk. We have been ready to cooperate. We have given in to their number. We have done everything, as Democrats, to be part of the American leadership. Now, it is time to vote. Unlock the door for the workers who want to work for America.

THAT WOULD BE LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the 57 Democrats in the House who have consistently voted with Republicans to pass targeted appropriation bills to fund the Federal Government. I am disappointed that so many House Democrats have cast votes to support a continued shutdown.

Last night, the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a Democrat, confronted President Obama over the District's budget in a White House meeting with the House Democratic conference. Ms. HOLMES NORTON argued for Senate Democrats and President Obama to pass and sign the bill she supported with Republicans to permit the District of Columbia to utilize tax revenue it collects to fund municipal services during this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is correct. It is long past time for the Senate leader to take up H.J. Res. 71 and all of the other bipartisan targeted appropriation bills that have been passed out of the House. By rolling the 11 House-passed bills into one, more than half of the partial government shutdown would be over. The American people deserve as much.

□ 1215

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CONGRESSMAN BILL YOUNG

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleasures that I have had serving in this august body is the people with whom I have interacted over the years, and one such person is Representative BILL YOUNG.

Now, I know that we have a lot of issues to be discussing, and I will be discussing them, but I wanted to take time out today to say how much I appreciate serving with a gentleman whom I have gotten to know, love, and respect. He has been in this body for over 42 years, and I have spent my better than 20 years mostly serving on the Appropriations Committee. It was a great pleasure serving with BILL YOUNG.

BILL has said to reporters that he is a bit disappointed in the current state of affairs. He says this is a different Congress. He is right. It is going to be even more so without his great service.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

(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 shocked to learn that the House and the Senate have already agreed on a level of funding.

There are only two issues stopping the shutdown from stopping right now: number 1, make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare laws as everybody else; and, number 2, the President gave Big Business 1 year off. We want families to have an opportunity for 1 year off.

Equal treatment for America's families who work hard and play by the rules, that is the Republican plan. That is what the argument is about.

To give special benefits only to big corporations and special interests is not fair, it is not right, and it is not good for the United States of America.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of men, women, and children victimized by domestic violence.

This is an issue that is very personal to me. Nine years ago, my cousin, Dr. Robin Lynn Mitchell, my namesake, was murdered in her sleep by her husband in an act of domestic violence. A few months later, a campaign volunteer of mine, Velton Lacefield, was shot and killed by her husband in a similar crime.

Their stories, however heartbreaking, are, unfortunately, not unique. These tragedies play out over and over every day in our communities across America. The National Network to End Domestic Violence estimates that three women are killed each day as a result of domestic violence. It touches just about every home, no matter your ZIP code or your income bracket. Nearly three-quarters of Americans know a victim of domestic violence.

But that is just the human toll. Domestic violence also costs the U.S. economy over $8 billion annually in emergency room visits, mental health services, and lost productivity.

So as we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month, let's commit ourselves to working to put an end to these tragedies, for Robin, for Velton, for all of us.

THE OFFER STILL STANDS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, after two previous attempts to keep the government fully funded, House Republicans adopted a measure that fully funded the government, fully funded ObamaCare, but simply delayed the individual mandate for a year. Now, this proposal was summarily rejected by House and Senate Democrats, and the government shut down.

Now, I can understand why they might take that position. They actually thought the exchanges would work, but they haven't worked. They have been a complete and unmitigated disaster. And after more than 3 years and $600 million of development costs, they are far, far from being ready.

So, with this new experience, what is so unreasonable about delaying the mandate for a year while these problems are addressed?

This should be a win-win for everyone—reopen the government and give the Democrats' signature program 1 year's reprieve from complete collapse. That is what Republicans offered on September 30, and that offer still stands.

HOW THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS HARMING THE PEOPLE OF HOUSTON

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and classmate from South Carolina on how we will miss Chairman YOUNG. He has been a great statesman in serving our House.

But today I am here to talk about how we are 10 days into the Republican shutdown of the government services. Every week the shutdown continues cuts 0.3 percent of our gross domestic product, and the stock market has dropped 900 points in the last 2 weeks. Now they want to hold the full faith and credit of our country hostage.

This is how it is hurting our Houston area economy:

Over 3,100 NASA employees at Johnson Space Center in Houston have been furloughed as a result of the House majority's refusal to keep the government open;

The Small Business Administration has closed its Houston office and is unable to issue grants and loans and services to small business owners;

Houston's regional VA center is closed. The government shutdown has forced VA to furlough 9,000 employees, delaying processing of the VA benefits.

If the shutdown continues into late October, payments for more than 3.8 million veterans will stop. We owe it to our Nation's veterans to make good on our commitments to them, and we can't do this with closed facilities.

OBAMACARE? NO, THANK YOU.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get my hands wrapped around this ObamaCare thing.

The policy is: the IRS is going to tax Americans unless they purchase a government-sanctioned product, which they may not want, off a government-run Web site, which costs $634 million to create and does not work.

And what do they have to expect for that, once they go through that process and put their personal information there?

One disclaimer in one State's exchange goes as follows:

> Any or all uses of this system and all files on this system may be intercepted, monitored, recorded, copied, audited, inspected, and disclosed to authorized State government and law enforcement personnel, as well as authorized officials of other agencies, both domestic and foreign.

Mr. Speaker, no, thank you.

IT IS TIME TO DO OUR JOBS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night, I spoke with a woman in Madison, a Federal employee who works as an air traffic controller and helps ensure the safety of thousands every day, and she asked me why should she be working when she doesn't even know if or when she will get paid—and I didn't have a reasonable answer for her.

I received a letter from a woman in Baraboo who relies on Federal contracts to run her small business. She asked me how she is going to be able to make payroll this month if the government doesn't pay its bills—and I didn't have a reasonable answer for her.

I don't have a reasonable answer for why the Wisconsin National Guard can't conduct its training, why local small businesses can't grow their business and have loans through the Small Business Administration, and why 113,000 infants, children, and pregnant women can't receive nutrition assistance from the WIC program.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the GOP House leadership starts acting like responsible Representatives. Let's reopen government; let's prevent our country from defaulting; and then let's sit down and negotiate our budget, as Democrats have been requesting for the last 6 months. It is time to do our jobs.

NEW ENTITLEMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today just to ask this simple question to my colleagues here in the House and to our counterparts in the Senate, and that is simply this: Does it make sense for us to speed ahead with $1.3 trillion in new entitlement spending when our country is in the middle of a debt crisis and Medicare and Social Security are on the brink of bankruptcy?

If the answer is ''yes,'' then you can go home and explain that to your constituents. If the answer is ''no,'' maybe we could explain why we are doing it.

STOP HURTING THE PEOPLE WE CAME HERE TO HELP

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received this letter from Lori Sywensky. She wrote:

> As a Commissioner of the Northhampton County, Pennsylvania, Housing Authority, I wanted to make you aware that the County's Housing Authority issued layoff notices today to over half of its staff members because of financial uncertainty created by the government shutdown.
>
> The next pay period would be payable on November 1, 2013, and since we cannot assure that there will be sufficient funds to honor that payroll, it has been determined that there is no legal choice other than to shut down operations of the Housing Choice Voucher Program and effect a temporary layoff beginning on Monday, October 14, 2013.
>
> If not resolved soon, over 500 landlords will next be notified by the Housing Authority that rent payments will not be issued, resulting in lost income for them and potential eviction for 637 families.

That is what she wrote.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time we stopped hurting the people we came here to help?

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 10 of ObamaCare exchanges being up, or supposedly being up. We now know the problems with the exchanges are not just due to high traffic; rather, technology experts have reported the real problems are with the actual structure and shoddy software used for the exchanges.

The Hill reported on October 8, from one expert, James Turner, software engineer, ''It's probably the most broken release that I have ever seen.''

I am hearing firsthand the frustrations from my constituents. One constituent said:

> The program freezes up when you try to enter your tax filing status. You can't get past it. Same thing happens when I try to apply over the phone. I've called every day since October 1, all different times of the day, and have gotten nothing but the runaround, one excuse after the other, that their system is down.
>
> I've called during peak time. I've called during off-peak time, but apparently there are no on-peak hours. If I can't get qualified for a subsidy before January 1, we will have to let our insurance lapse.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I say, this is a defective exchange, and it is only part of the problem.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN THREATENS THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF SOUTHERN ARIZONANS

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of Southern Arizonans is my first priority. I represent 83 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border, and the people who live near it are very seriously affected by criminal activities along that border.

Since the shutdown, our Border Patrol agents have faced uncertainty about their pay and the future of their mission. These brave men and women are our first line of defense in securing the homeland. They deserve our respect and support.

Last week, an agent's wife called my office about a decision her husband was forced to make, the decision between missing a loved one's funeral or attending it on furlough, putting his paycheck and his family at risk.

This reckless shutdown hurts the families of our agents who put their lives on the line every single day. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and we must end this irresponsible shutdown now and restore certainty to the Border Patrol for the safety and security of Southern Arizonans and our entire country.

PRAY FOR OUR LEADERS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we all are well aware, a lot of emotion is in this Chamber and in this body at this time, and maybe that is the way it should be.

We remember back to the first Constitutional Convention that it almost shut down as well, until Benjamin Franklin stood up and said, We need to go to prayer, asking for the wisdom of the Almighty. Maybe that is what we need as well.

Mr. Speaker, above your rostrum there are words etched into stone from DANIEL WEBSTER, who said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we need to be doing. And so, as today, thankfully, the President and leadership in the House are meeting in negotiations, I call for our citizens, as well as us, to be in prayer, asking for wisdom for the President, for our leaders to come to a conclusion that will move this country forward.

TELL THE SPEAKER TO PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, my wife had a call last night from one of her best friends. She was angry, disappointed, and frightened. Her husband is a civilian worker at Scott Air Force Base. His paycheck was one-half what it usually is. Their son is a community college student who just got laid off. Their daughter is disabled. They are my voters. They are my friends.

What do I tell them?

What do I tell the veterans whose disability claims aren't being processed?

What do I tell the laid-off prison guards in southern Illinois who will lose their food stamps?

What do I tell the retired mine workers who have lost their pensions in bankruptcy and now have to worry about their Social Security checks?

I can't tell them to call their Congressman. They already have.

I tell them, Call 202–225–6205, and tell the Speaker to put America and its government back to work.

□ 1230

CAN WE TALK

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. President, can we talk?

I am pleased to hear that President Obama, 10 days into a government shutdown, is finally willing to talk with a contingent of House Republicans at the White House this afternoon. After all, there is plenty to discuss.

Everybody in this room, Democrat or Republican, knows that too many of our youth are underemployed or unemployed. Mr. President, our youth want to work.

Everybody in this room knows that we need tax reform to make our businesses competitive in the world and bring American jobs back to America.

Everybody in this room knows that Social Security and Medicare are on a pathway to insolvency and have to be shored up so that we can make our promises good to our seniors.

Thank you, Mr. President, at long last for sitting down to talk. Maybe if we could spend more time talking and less time posturing, we might be able to deal with some of these very significant problems.

Let's all pray that these talks are fruitful and improve the lives of all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

LET'S VOTE AND KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OPEN

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, across the country, Americans are asking a simple question: When will their government open?

Every day, more Americans are denied services they need. Children who rely on Head Start are being turned away. New mothers and their infants are being denied nutritional assistance from WIC. Small businesses are losing demand for their services or are having trouble accessing loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration, costing jobs we cannot afford to lose and at a time when our economy continues to struggle.

While this is happening, what have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle done? They waste precious time with incremental bills that have no chance of enactment. That is not responsible governing. It is an excuse to put out a press release. The American people do not want more press releases. They want action.

Every day that the government stays closed is a lost opportunity for our economy and our communities. Let's vote and keep this government open.

THROWBACK THURSDAY

(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, in honor of Throwback Thursday, I would like to read to my colleagues the words of then-Senator Barack Obama during the debate on March 16, 2006, about raising the debt limit:

> 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 U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.
>
> 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 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.

That was spoken by Senator Barack Obama on March 16, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, we have a $17 trillion debt today under the leadership of President Obama. I would say today is the day to come together as reasonable people to resolve this crisis.

SHUTDOWN EFFECTS IN EL PASO

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, the government shutdown continues to harm the communities I represent and the more than 43,000 Federal employees in El Paso who dedicated their careers to public service.

The Federal district court in El Paso is one of the busiest in the country. It handles a large volume of immigration and drug cases, among many others. I recently heard from Maureen Franco, a Federal public defender, regarding the shutdown's impact in El Paso.

In the U.S. Attorneys Office there, the prosecutors and public defenders are working, but not getting paid. In addition, their staffs have been furloughed. The result: prosecutors brought only 35 cases on Monday. On Tuesday and Wednesday, only nine people were brought into court. When our government works, the average is 55 a day.

The same number of people are being arrested, but the shutdown means we are not prosecuting them in a timely manner. It is likely that these individuals are remaining in detention at taxpayer expense, costing us more than if the government were open. Justice is not being served, nor are the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the shutdown. Please allow an up-or-down vote. It will pass this House on a bipartisan basis. It will be signed into law by the President. We can reopen the government today.

PASS A FARM BILL

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, for 2½ years, I have come to this House floor and talked about the importance of a farm bill and the need to have a farm bill for our national security interests. Our producers in this country make sure the people that live in this country have the opportunity to partake in an affordable and safe food supply, not relying on another country to feed us, or they truly would control us.

We don't have a farm bill today, but the Speaker has assured me we will go to conference soon and get one done. But let me tell you about a tragedy that happened in South Dakota last week.

This picture beside me would be very sad if it just reflected one situation in South Dakota, but western South Dakota is littered with tens of thousands of dead cows, horses, and sheep that were killed by a tragic blizzard that hit South Dakota just last week.

The stories we have heard of losses to families are tragic. One mother visited with us and told us about driving her kids to school every day, and it looks like she is driving down a road covered with dead cattle filling the ditches.

We have a farm bill because we need to make sure that there are disaster programs to cover situations like this. The livestock programs that I authored that are included in the farm bill that needs to be signed into law would help protect some of these families and keep them in business in the future.

WE HAVE WORK TO DO

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it is day 10 of the unnecessary and harmful government shutdown and a week away from when we reach the debt ceiling and risk an economic shutdown. It is time to end this dysfunction.

Across this country, people are out of work and wondering, When will this shutdown end? Will the United States default on its debt? And, importantly, Why can't our elected Representatives resolve this?

We can resolve this, and we can do it today. A majority of the House and Senate and our President support compromise legislation to reopen the government. The Speaker should schedule a vote now. And the majority of Americans—our constituents—are opposed to letting a debate about the Affordable Care Act excuse Congress from fulfilling its basic obligation to pay the Nation's bills.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, let's get the government open, make sure we don't cause the Nation to default, and sit down and face the challenges together. We have work to do to build the economy and to begin to rebuild and restore our Nation's confidence in this United States House of Representatives.

GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is so interesting to hear my colleagues talk about how they want a clean CR. Just so that everyone realizes, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying is give us the money—no strings attached, no accountability.

What we continue to say to our colleagues is we want an accountable CR—accountable to the U.S. taxpayer, who is footing the bill for this government. It is not Federal money that we appropriate or that we spend. It is taxpayer money coming out of the pockets of hardworking men and women.

As I read emails from my district in Tennessee, what I hear repeatedly is, number one, We cannot afford the $17 trillion in debt. It really scares us. It frightens us for the future of our children and grandchildren.

We cannot continue to monetize $75 billion worth of debt each month. We have to get our fiscal house in order. That is what we seek to do.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, while Republicans are trying to destroy the Affordable Care Act, the American people are embracing it—and have been for the past 3 years. Even my district, which is rightly upset over not being included in the exchanges like other Americans, has benefited.

Let me tell you a story I heard from one of our doctors.

According to one doctor, the preventive care without copays and 26-year-olds being able to stay on their parents' insurance has helped keep her practice afloat. The up-to-35 percent tax credit for small businesses and the rebate from insurance companies that didn't meet their medical loss ratio allowed her to relieve her employees of their portion of the health insurance premiums. This, and many other ways, is how the Affordable Care Act is working in my community.

Like a few other places in the law, fixes may be needed, like for the territories. The President and Democrats will address them, but in a rational manner.

So I am calling on my Republican colleagues to end the hostage-taking of this Congress, of our Federal employees, of our economy, and the good faith and credit of our Nation. Don't fight us. Join us. Support the Affordable Care Act—a good law that is expanding access to affordable health care for all of us. When some of us benefit, all of us benefit.

Let's vote on a clean CR, open up our government, and lift the debt ceiling today.

WE AS A NATION NEED TO RETURN TO GOD

(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, I rise today in honor of a gentleman who is with me in the Capitol. He was the high school valedictorian at Liberty High School.

This summer, during his valedictorian address, he ripped up his approved speech and delivered The Lord's Prayer in defiance of the school district's decision to no longer include prayer at graduation.

This is someone that reminds us that we as a Nation need to return to God. I am thankful for him and the inspiration of his generation.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has now 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 unemployment crisis.

We have lost millions of jobs through outsourcing and technological changes. We have lost millions of jobs due to the Great Recession. We are losing millions of jobs through sequestration and State budget cuts. And now we have the nerve to shut down the government, risk default, and bring our employees to the gates of hell.

Mr. Speaker, open up this government. Raise the debt ceiling, and get us back to dealing with the real crisis: job creation.

The mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803 (a)), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Mitchell Draizin of New York, NY, to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York

BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security 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 (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

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 certain components of the Department of Homeland Security 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 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or in the Pay Our Military Act of September 30, 2013, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6) under the headings ''Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—U.S. Customs and Border Protection'', ''Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement'', ''Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—Coast Guard'', ''Protection, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery—National Protection and Programs Directorate—Office of Biometric Identity Management'', and ''Research and Development, Training, and Services—United States Citizenship and Immigration Services''.

(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 ''Border Safety & Security Act''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Border Security and Enforcement Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution 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 Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 79, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise to present the House with a bill that sustains our critical border security and enforcement operations within the Department of Homeland Security.

Right now, at this very moment, there are brave men and women patrolling our borders, manning our ports of entry, and conducting border enforcement, drug interdiction and investigative missions, but they are not being paid.

Right now, at this very moment, border security and enforcement operations are being conducted but with minimal essential personnel.

Right now, at this very moment, the National Targeting Center, at which Customs and Border Protection officers check traveler watch lists and ensure that dangerous criminals and cargo never reach American soil, is operating, but its personnel are not being paid.

Right now, at this very moment, the E-Verify system is not operating, making it impossible for employers to check the lawful immigration status of potential employees.

So this bill before us provides for continuing appropriations to ensure that frontline agents along our borders receive their pay and that certain components of DHS can carry out their border security and enforcement missions at full strength.

Let me remind my colleagues that our border is not secure. In fact, our border is constantly under siege from smugglers and traffickers alike, and it is our duty to ensure that sufficient resources are provided to carry out the necessary security, enforcement and interdiction efforts. That is precisely what this bill does.

This bill ensures that Border Patrol can fully conduct its operations from San Diego to Brownsville and all along our northern border as well. This bill ensures that ICE can fully conduct its investigations. This bill ensures that the Coast Guard can fully conduct interdiction in both the source and transit zones and off the coasts of California, Texas, Florida, and all maritime approaches to the United States. This bill ensures that our immigration verification and biometric identity systems are up and running. This bill also takes steps to turn on our E-Verify system.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that the government is shut down despite the numerous attempts to move forward. We have repeatedly offered versions of continuing resolutions to sustain the government's operations, but to no avail. Furthermore, we have offered to negotiate, to convene a conference and work out the differences in a professional and orderly manner, but such offers have been refused out of hand.

This bill is yet another offer to the other side of the aisle to at least fund vital components of the government. We have a duty to ensure our borders and coastlines are safe and secure and that our laws are being enforced. This bill does this without increasing the rate of spending and in a manner entirely consistent with the text of the noncontroversial H.J. Res. 59. In short, the bill before us is about getting our priorities right.

It is my hope that the passage of this bill will not only support our border security and frontline agencies but will also lead to the reopening of the entire Federal Government.

In closing, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to lower their partisan blinders, to come to the table and work out the current impasse so that we can get on with the business of fixing our Nation's budgetary mess.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Have we had enough yet?

The American people are fed up with partisan games and procedural gimmicks. They see right through them, and they are demanding that we come together and get the government back to work today.

If the Speaker of the House is so sure that the votes for a clean funding bill are not there, he should call the vote to prove it to the American people. But he won't do that, because everyone in this Chamber knows that the Senate-passed continuing resolution would clear this House in a heartbeat and end this Tea Party-fueled dream of government collapse.

Today, the majority has decided that the government function they want to give political cover to is border security. Border security, obviously, was not very high on their list. We have had to wait 10 days before they have gotten around to it.

Of course, the question remains: Why didn't they think more about border security or cancer research or the national parks or women's and children's nutrition when they were shutting the government down in the first place last Monday? Ten days late and billions of dollars short, you might say.

As someone who has worked for years in a bipartisan spirit to secure our Nation's border, I certainly appreciate that border security is one of the most sensitive and dangerous areas of the budget with which to play partisan political games. But I have to ask: What about the many other critical homeland security functions that this bill wouldn't do anything to fix, including protecting our Nation from cyber attacks, for example, or keeping our aviation and mass transit systems safe or funding the Secret Service or developing the next generation of explosive detection technology?

We cannot continue to pick winners and losers by providing temporary funding for government services, operations and personnel. This piecemeal approach to governing is failing our constituents and is failing our economy. The only solution is to reopen the entire Federal Government by calling up the clean funding bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we were told by Republican leaders not to worry. Furloughed employees should stand by, they said, while the House votes to open the government one news cycle at a time. Americans' livelihoods can't wait for another news cycle. We are tired of waiting. We are tired of this charade.

Let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to our basic job description: to keep the government open, to pay the country's bills, and to negotiate a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, revives our economy, and secures our fiscal future. The first step is a clean continuing resolution. Let's do that today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in support of his bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is around the 15th time that we have been trying to engage the other body in conversation about how we can reopen the government. They just simply refuse to talk about anything. We have sent over CRs. We have sent over amendments. We have sent over bills. This is the 11th of the many appropriations bills—CRs—at the sequester level that we are going to send to the Senate, and they just simply refuse to talk. I have never seen such a show of negligence and attendance to public duties.

Normally, the time-honored tradition in the Congress—since the founding of this great country—is that, when the House passes a measure and when the Senate passes a measure and they differ, we appoint conferees: the Senate picks out some Members, the House picks out some Members, and we send them off to the back room to work out the differences and to bring the bills back. That is the way it has operated for all of these years. Yet the Senate just simply refuses to talk anything about how to reopen the government.

This bill will help protect our homeland from terrorists, drug traffickers, smugglers, other criminals, and it facilitates legal immigration and ongoing investigations. Right now, our frontline operations are operating at a bare minimum. The men and women who are at work to protect our borders and our ports of entry are working without pay, and employers cannot guarantee the lawful immigration status of their prospective employees.

To reinstate these critical functions, H.J. Res. 79 provides funding for border security efforts at the current annual rate of $18.8 billion. This includes funding for the Customs and Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Coast Guard, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Office of Biometric Identity Management.

These are functions of the Federal Government that are critical to our safety and well-being. They should not have to suffer the effects of this shutdown, but if we pass this bill today and if the Senate passes it and if the President signs it into law, it will stop any further adverse effects from befalling our border security while we work toward reopening the entire Federal Government.

Piece by piece, the Republican House has been working toward reopening the government over the past week. We have done this all with no help—no input—from the Senate. The only thing we have heard from the Senate is a resounding ''no''—''no'' to working with us on a task force or on a committee to reopen the Federal Government and ''no'' to talking with us about our concerns over the multitude of fiscal crises we face. Despite this, the House has passed 15 bills over the past week to fund the government. This is on top of the continuing resolutions we put forward prior to the end of the fiscal year and the regular appropriations bills the House passed. Imagine what we could do if the Senate would come to the table and work with us. We could solve the problem.

There is no question about it that we are never going to be able to get out of this mess if we don't come together, have a real, adult conversation, listen to each other earnestly, and negotiate in good faith. This crisis can't be solved by one party alone or by one body of the Congress alone. This bill is an effort to keep the ball moving toward our goal of ending the entire government shutdown.

The Senate has asked for a clean CR to achieve that end. The funding in this bill is clean and in line with the spending from the last fiscal year. It is essentially what I put forward in my initial, clean CR. So I hope, with that in mind, the House and the Senate will pass this bill in short order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished ranking member, and let me thank the chairman of this committee. Let me ask again for the hardworking employees of the Federal Government and for the hardworking employees of the Department of Homeland Security to stop being locked out.

Mr. Speaker, as my ranking member indicated, I am the ranking member on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee. This piecemeal approach does not comprehensively address the question of the needs of homeland security.

Frankly, I am in support of the work of Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Coast Guard. You will find, probably, no greater supporter on these issues, but we need to be able to pass legislation such as H.R. 1417, comprehensively, to address all of the border aspects of this Nation. This is a gamble. This is throwing the dice. This is seeing whether or not we can get this piece and that piece, but it doesn't comprehensively deal with the entrances and exits. It doesn't comprehensively deal with comprehensive immigration reform.

My message is to have a clean CR, to open the government, to protect our homeland security employees, and to protect the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79, the "Border Safety and Security Act."

As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I strongly support the missions of Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Coast Guard.

You will find no greater advocate in Congress for the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security who work on the frontlines every day.

That is why I am greatly troubled that the Republican Majority continues to take a piecemeal approach to funding our vital homeland security agencies, activities, and personnel.

They know this bill has no chance of becoming law, but are putting on a piece of political theater today to pander to a fringe element within their party.

We must not gamble with our Nation's security by picking winners and losers at DHS.

Instead, this House needs to do its job and provide appropriations for the entire Department of Homeland Security, so that all of our Federal border, immigration, and homeland resources are operational.

I call on the Republican Leadership to allow reasonable Members on both sides of the aisle to approve a Clean CR so that we can get DHS, and our entire government, working as it should be for the American people.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the authorizing Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. I want to thank my colleague and good friend from Texas, the chairman, who knows the border, perhaps, better than any other Member in this body.

We are all here, Mr. Speaker, to try and work through our differences over government funding. I hope that no one in this Chamber truly believes that we should play politics with the security of our borders, our last line of defense.

□ 1300

Yet right now, as we debate this important funding bill, our agents at the Department of Homeland Security—the Border Patrol, CBP, and ICE—are not fully funded, which diminishes their ability to secure our Nation's borders and puts American security and lives at risk.

What kind of message would it send to our constituents all over this great country if we threw up our hands and said that providing for the common defense under the Constitution is no longer a priority? Yet that is exactly the debate we are having today.

As the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I will not stand by and let politics get the best of us. Our brave men and women on the border in my home State risk their lives daily. Just a few weeks ago, I visited with Border Patrol agents, border sheriffs, and ranchers in the Rio Grande sector in south Texas, which has seen a 55 percent increase in illegal border crossings. This is not just an immigration issue, Mr. Speaker; it is a national security issue. Our border agents on the front line must be fully funded.

I urge my colleagues to support the Border Safety and Security Act.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), an outstanding member of our Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the latest in a long line of disingenuous bills that won't bring us closer to ending the dangerous and reckless Republican shutdown.

This bill represents an irresponsible approach to the serious challenge of defending the homeland in an increasingly dangerous world. This bill purports to protect the public; yet, it leaves critical functions of the Department of Homeland Security unfunded.

For example, there is no money for TSA to keep the flying public safe; there is no money for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to identify terror plots that endanger American lives; and there is no money for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office to guard the homeland against smuggled weapons of mass destruction.

Clearly, Republican obstructionism is undermining our American democracy and threatening our American national security.

Mr. Speaker, the Boehner shutdown and Republican gamesmanship are hurting American families and endangering the American public. Let's defeat this bill, vote, pass a clean budget, and get all our government working to serve and defend all the American people and our American way of life.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, vice chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security and a member of the great class of 2002.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the bill that we are debating here, the Border Safety and Security Act.

As vice chair of the House Homeland Security Committee and chair of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I, along with so many others, have worked to ensure that Congress gives the agents and the officers in the field the tools and the direction that they need to keep drugs and terrorists and others who would do us harm from entering our country. That is what this legislation is about today.

Much of the controversy surrounding the government shutdown has actually focused on ObamaCare. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing, absolutely zero, in

the bill that we are talking about right now that has anything to do with ObamaCare.

The only thing that is in this bill and that we are discussing today is whether or not we will help provide the funds to ensure that we can protect our Nation's borders and pay the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol, the Customs and Border Protection, and also the Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

I know many of our friends on the other side of the aisle will once again oppose this legislation because they say they need an entire government funding bill or they won't accept anything else, yet I would note that they are calling Republicans ''absolutists.''

I also know that there are many on the other side of the aisle that will support this bill and will help us pass this, again, with a very strong bipartisan majority. I simply hope that the leaders of the Senate will look at the strong bipartisan support of this bill and take it up. Border security, Mr. Speaker, cannot be a casualty of our inability to compromise. The agencies that are responsible for protecting this country must be fully funded.

I urge the House to support this bill today, to pass this bill today, and I certainly urge the Senate and the White House to join us in supporting the men and women across the Nation charged with protecting our border.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the full authorizing Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank Ranking Member PRICE for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79, the Border Safety and Security Act.

This is the second time in 2 weeks that I have come to the House floor to discuss cherry-picked funding at the Department of Homeland Security. Neither last week's measure nor the one before us today stands a snowball's chance of ever being enacted into law. Even if they did, Congress still would not have done its job to fully fund the important homeland and non-homeland security activities carried out by the Department of Homeland Security.

As ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am troubled that the Republican majority is not only picking winners and losers within the Federal Government, but also within the Department of Homeland Security.

This country faces real threats every day—from natural disasters, to accidents with catastrophic results, to terrorism. The people we represent deserve real action, not petty posturing. For today's installment of the ''mini-CR'' show, the majority is shining the spotlight on ICE agents, Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, and Coast Guard personnel. Americans see through this hollow attempt at using patriotic Americans serving in the front lines of Homeland Security as pawns.

If the majority is serious about ensuring that our patchwork of Federal border, immigration, and homeland resources are operational, they would reopen the entire Department of Homeland Security. This majority is not serious about taking real action. They want to score political points with a fringe element in their party.

I call upon like-minded colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with me and approve a clean CR.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. With every passing day, more injury is done to our economy and our standing in the world. The once unthinkable—a default on U.S. debt—is looking more and more possible.

We must stand together and inject some rationality here and bring an end to this long national tantrum that has been orchestrated by 50 of the most radical Members of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the majority must let this House consider and pass a clean CR so that we can get this government up and working again.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), my colleague, the chairman of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and a hardworking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Chairman CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, the question we are about to vote on is very simple: Do you support—yes or no—fully funding our law enforcement officers on the border and our Immigrations and Customs Enforcement officers?

This is not complicated. It is not anything more complicated than we are, as the majority in the House, seeking to find areas of agreement. Common sense and common courtesy and any negotiations require that you find areas of agreement that are absolutely essential, set those aside, and move on to the issues where you may have some disagreement.

This is not complicated. Yes or no, do you support fully funding our Border Patrol agents and our Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents? That is the only issue before us.

We have, as a Congress, already fully funded our military. We made sure that our men and women in uniform were paid. We have already, in this House, set aside funds to make sure that our veterans are paid. We passed legislation to ensure that they receive all the benefits that they have earned by their service to the country.

Any negotiation—anyone, anywhere in the country—if you have a disagreement, you find areas where you can agree that are very important and you get those behind you, and then you get to those areas where there are disagreements.

There are fundamental important differences that are a core principle to us as constitutional conservatives. We do not want to participate in bankrupting the United States of America. We do not want to participate in socializing the greatest health care system the Nation has ever and the world has ever created. We will not idly stand by and allow our children and grandchildren to inherit such a crushing level of debt and taxation that they cannot afford and their quality of life will be diminished. These are matters of core principle to us.

Our right to be left alone as Americans is, I think, one of our most important. Certainly, Texans feel that way. But, first and foremost, we believe in law enforcement. We believe in supporting our military, and we urge our colleagues to vote with us today to enforce the law.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

While the men and women who secure our border risk their lives, their paychecks are in jeopardy. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is talking about border security, particularly after they have frozen salaries for the Border Patrol for the past 3 years.

Yes, we should fund border security. I have been a strong advocate for funding border security. But we cannot adequately protect our homeland by funding one agency at a time. We also must fund the Secret Service, the TSA, and cybersecurity, none of which, Mr. Speaker, is included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the claim that Democrats aren't negotiating is absolutely false. The Senate adopted the most important part of the House bill—the funding level—and the President supported it even though Democrats want greater investments to support economic growth. The only thing Democrats say ''no'' to are irresponsible efforts to put health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies, which has nothing to do with keeping the government open.

That is democracy. That is negotiation. We have done more than meet in the middle, but the Republicans now say ''no'' to their own bill.

We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only support a reasonable solution to allow a vote on the Republican-written, Senate-passed bill.

Vote ''no'' and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), another fine colleague from the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman PRICE for yielding.

I was sitting in my office listening to this, and I realized that what our sessions are about are telling the American people some of the truth some of the time. The truth of the matter is that this is all about the fact that an extreme division of the Republican Party doesn't like the Affordable Care Act, which was signed into law 3½ years ago, and so they are using the appropriations process to shut down Congress.

We keep saying you don't need to do this. It has been a law for 3½ years; and guess what, in those 3½ years we have passed 17 CRs; 17 CRs have been passed since the Affordable Care Act was enacted. And guess what, Republicans voted for almost every one of them. So what is the difference now?

This is just craziness. Our whole country is being put at risk because they won't do what we have done every year because they don't like the Affordable Care Act. Now if you don't like something, use a law-making process called an authorization. When you don't like something, you take a different bill and fix it. You can say, well, we don't like it; we don't even want to fix it. I use the argument that the Democrats didn't like Medicare part D because of the way it was being done. We voted against it, but we never shut down government. We got around to saying, yes, it is the law; let's fix it. When you pass a big law, there are always some things you need to fix. We can fix things, but this is not the process to do it, shutting down government. And the idea of bringing you whatever you like today, we are just going to vote on one thing, one part of government. Now we are onto just one piece. You know we are never going to get around to all of the pieces because they don't like all of government. So they hold these votes.

This is ridiculous. This is putting the country, the world, and lots of people at risk. We could just pass a keep-the-government-open bill, which we have done 17 times since 2010, 17 times without this rancor, without this division.

Come on. Don't give us part of the truth some of the time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has any more speakers.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues today have spoken accurately of the time-honored tradition of passing a budget in this Congress and then passing appropriations bills, one hopes on budget and on time, in an orderly fashion, conforming to the agreed-upon budget resolution.

Now, for a while this year, we thought we were on the same page with regard to agreeing on a budget going forward. In fact, colleagues will remember that Republicans badgered the Senate in past years for not having passed a budget. This year, the Senate passed a budget. The Senate worked hard and passed a credible budget; we looked forward to a more normal process being resumed.

But we were soon disabused of that, because the Republican leadership of this House steadfastly refused to go to conference to work out a common budget with the Senate which, of course, is the normal process.

We have been urging that the House go to conference for months. Why did they refuse? We have thought a lot about that. One possible reason is that no comprehensive budget plan could possibly pass their conference, given the Tea Party influence in that conference these days. That is the explanation that is suggested, I have to say, by the failure of Speaker BOEHNER's ''Plan B'': remember that, back in December? They left President Obama's budget overture on the table, never taking him up on that comprehensive offer.

But then after a while, our Republican friends warmed up to the idea of stalling on this, and we gradually realized: They are running out the clock! The Republicans are running out the clock. Why are they doing that? Maybe they are looking for a crisis atmosphere, letting the government shut down, running up against the possibility of default. In a crisis atmosphere, maybe they think they can extract more. Maybe they can extract more, by demanding a ransom, a political ransom. the Affordable Care Act, whatever. Because now with the clock run out, you are talking not just about negotiating a budget; you are talking about demanding a ransom merely to keep the government open; demanding a ransom merely to pay the country's bills, basic constitutional responsibilities which this body should meet without any threat of extortion.

Meanwhile, of course, they understand the public doesn't like this. So we have the spectacle today of yet another bill seeking political cover, to fund piecemeal a function of government which has been in the news and which people value.

Well, this charade has to end. Yes, we need to get back to the normal budget process in this country. The first step is to pass a clean funding bill to reopen the government, and the votes are here in this body to do that this afternoon. We also must lift the threat of defaulting on the Nation's debt.

And then, sure enough, let's get on with the negotiating of a comprehensive budget agreement, a budget agreement along the lines of the budget plans of 1990 and 1993. These budget plans helped produce a robust economy, and eventually produced 4 years of budget surpluses. We paid off $400 billion of the national debt in those years. Those were comprehensive agreements, to be sure. They were politically tough. They did include revenues. They included all categories of spending. They were painful votes for many in this body, but I continue to think they were among the best votes I ever cast. That is where we need to go. We all know that.

The question is, can we find the political will to get there? Let's muster that political will. We have had enough of the ransom demands. Let's reopen the government, let's lift the debt ceiling, and let's get on with serious negotiations, the kind of budget negotiations we should have been having all year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if anyone has been watching what has gone on in this House for the last couple of weeks and this week, it reminds me of the movie ''Groundhog Day.'' The alarm rings, and we stand up and we do the same thing and we hear the same arguments consistently. I mean, you could have just heard this argument, and that is the argument that has been made throughout the entire almost-2 weeks now. So maybe it is time to talk about something that is called regular order in this House of Representatives.

We have something called the appropriations process. We divide up the funding of the government into 12 sections, and we have classification of those sections and each subcommittee presents a bill to the committee for the funding of a certain Department. In our case, Mr. PRICE and I deal with Homeland Security. That bill is then brought to the floor and passed by the floor after it passes out of regular committee, and then it is sent to our colleagues in the Senate on the other side of this great building. At that point in time, normal procedure would be for them to deal with the appropriations process on their side.

So I can't speak for all of government, but I certainly can speak for Homeland Security, and Mr. PRICE, I don't think, would dispute this: we passed our bill out of the House. So we don't even need to be here today, and we shouldn't even have needed to be here last week when we were here because, quite frankly, we have given a bill to deal with the problems of financing and supporting those people who defend our borders and all of the other things that we take care of in Homeland, and it has been sitting on the desk of Mr. HARRY REID in the Senate since June of this year, a long time before this so-called crisis arose. We could have it completely passed and signed by the President if the Senate

had just done regular order. But they haven't.

So as it relates to the issues we discuss here today, the reason these issues even come up is that the Democrat-controlled Senate has not done their job, and they have not dealt with the appropriations process.

Today, as last week, we are dealing with an important portion of this process. It is so important that the very security of our Nation depends upon a secure border. The great debate that has gone on for 3 or 4 years, recent years as we look at the overall immigration crisis, is: What about the security of our borders?

We have spent billions of dollars making it as secure as we can, and we will continue to secure those borders. All we think we should do is pay the people that are doing the job now and get the border secure. This is important to the future of our Nation.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res 79, a bill which claims to fund border security, but in reality is just a continuation of the piecemeal approach to funding government operations being used by the House Republican leadership to create political cover for their continued refusal to hold a vote to immediately reopen the entire government.

I support funding border security and appreciate greatly the dedicated men and women who work to keep our borders secure, but I do not support this bill because, in the end, it does more harm than good.

I believe the proper way to fund border security is for Congress to fulfill its responsibility to pass regular appropriations bills. The House passed a full year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security in June that would provide $40.1 billion more for DHS than the bill before us today.

Using a cherry-picking approach to fund selected programs within an agency neglects other important programs within that same agency. In this case, supporting H.J. Res 79 funds border security at the expense of other Homeland Security-related functions like the Secret Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Transportation Security Administration and the Office of Disaster Assistance at the Small Business Administration.

The fact is that by taking up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and sending it to the President for his signature tonight, we can fund border security, DHS and all the other important programs and services of the government. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the Senate CR so we can end this shut down and get all our federal workers back on the job.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 79 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1335

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution.

S. RES. 267

In the Senate of the United States, October 9, 2013.

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: Now, therefore, be it

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.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

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.

BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 79 will now be resumed.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Shea-Porter moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 79 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. SHEA-PORTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. 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 New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit to end this harmful and unnecessary government shutdown. I do this by offering a motion that would bring to the floor the continuing resolution that has already passed in the Senate and awaits consideration in the House.

I know that not everyone is thrilled with this level of funding. Many of us in the Democratic Caucus think it cuts too deeply into important investments, while many of our Republican colleagues feel it doesn't cut enough. The Senate bill is a compromise, but it is a compromise that is acceptable to the majority of us in order to continue the vital functioning of the government that all Americans pay for and that all Americans deserve.

Unfortunately, a small faction of the majority party continues to hold the entire government hostage while it tries to obstruct the Affordable Care Act. I understand they disagree with the Senate and the President on certain issues, but shutting the government down to try and achieve an ideological goal that could not be achieved through the legislative process, through the Supreme Court, or through the ballot box is beneath the dignity of this body. That is why I urge my colleagues to support my motion and allow us to get the government up and

running again. Then, and only then, can we resume debate and discussion on other critical issues like creating jobs, supporting our veterans, and, yes, improving the Affordable Care Act.

As of today, it has been 10 days since the government shutdown. That is 10 days where we haven't had studies going forward at the National Institutes of Health, 10 days where the Small Business Administration hasn't been lending money to entrepreneurs and small businesses, and 10 days where families haven't had access to the critical services to protect those who need it most.

In my own district, the Small Business Administration normally gives out an average of $237,000 in loans each and every day. That is a total of $2.37 million in loans that haven't been made to the small businesses of New Hampshire's First District.

The majority has failed my State and others. All the American people are asking for is for us to open the government. They would be happy with a clean bill. We could put people back to work with a clean bill. We could continue lending money to small businesses with a clean bill. We could fund cancer research with a clean bill.

But instead of putting an end to the government shutdown by passing the funding bill that the Senate has already agreed to, Republican leaders in the House are offering bills to open individual agencies and programs instead of the entire government. Make no mistake, that is not an honest attempt to open the government. These cherry-picked funding bills serve only to give political cover to the very people who caused the government shutdown.

As former Republican Presidential candidate and Senator Bob Dole said, along with my dear colleague, JOHN DINGELL:

> Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans—and, indeed, all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them.

Former Republican Senator Judd Greg, who was chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, said:

> A small group of Republican legislators led by the junior Senator from Texas decided to take as hostages government operations and the raising of the debt ceiling. The price of release was to be the death of ObamaCare. This approach never had a snowball's chance in Texas of succeeding.

However, here we are still shut down 10 days after the start of the new fiscal year; and, instead of voting on legislation that if brought to the floor would pass and open the government, what are we voting on? The same little, tiny piecemeal appropriations designed for messaging and attack ads that we have been voting on all week. It is Washington politics at its worst.

It has been 10 days of this sort of chicanery, and it is time to give it up. Let's stop the gamesmanship; turn the lights back on; reopen the government; and address the actual critical problems addressing the country.

We need more jobs. We need to find ways to grow the economy, make education more affordable, and invest in our decaying infrastructure. All of these are problems that our constituents sent us here to deal with, and they are what they expect us to work on.

That is probably why, yesterday, when Gallup released polling on what Americans believe is the most important problem facing our country, it should come as no surprise to find that, for the first time in history, they picked dysfunctional government. It has always been either the economy, unemployment, or jobs that were the most pressing problems. In yesterday's poll, though, it was us. I can't say that I am surprised, because I agree with them. We need to fix this, and that starts by doing the basics like funding the government and raising the debt ceiling.

I will end with one final quote from my former Republican colleague, Senator Gregg. He said:

> People who have no interest in governing cannot be allowed to be the dominant voices in a major party.

I thank you for your support, and I hope you will support this critical motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

As I am sure you are aware, the Chair has ruled on October 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 of 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 New Hampshire wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us set up a commission to examine deficit reduction?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that our taxpayers can receive the benefits they have already paid for, to recommit deals with government expenditures. And right now we are running a deficit. So isn't the amount the government is spending a relevant topic to the deficit reduction?

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 be able to do their jobs? What kind of a strange House is this that would force this situation on our Federal workers?

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

□ 1345

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

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

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Department of Homeland Security. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 9, 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 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. SHEA-PORTER. 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. CARTER. 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. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommital.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Calvert	Denham
Amash	Camp	Dent
Amodei	Campbell	DeSantis
Bachmann	Cantor	DesJarlais
Bachus	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Carter	Duffy
Barr	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Benishek	Chaffetz	Ellmers
Bentivolio	Coble	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fincher
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Black	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Boustany	Conaway	Flores
Brady (TX)	Cook	Forbes
Bridenstine	Cotton	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Cramer	Foxx
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Broun (GA)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Buchanan	Culberson	Gardner
Bucshon	Daines	Garrett
Burgess	Davis, Rodney	Gerlach

Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
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
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 (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—196

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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Smith (NJ)
Young (FL)

□ 1410

Mr. CONYERS and Ms. BASS 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 539, I was detained in a hearing and missed rollcall 539. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—249

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)
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
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
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)

NAYS—175

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
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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
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
Rahall
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

Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Young (FL)

□ 1418

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.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(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 come to the podium today in recognition of the passing of my predecessor and one of the Members of this body. Joining me at the podium are two members of the Minnesota delegation. Representative ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota's Third Congressional District was a longtime friend of former United States House of Representatives Member and Senator, Rod Grams. Also joining me at the podium is United States Representative RICK NOLAN of Minnesota's Seventh Congressional District, which was also part of the territory represented by former Representative Rod Grams.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former Member of both this House and the United States Senate from the State of Minnesota, Representative and Senator Rod Grams. Rod peacefully passed away late Tuesday evening after a lengthy battle with cancer. He was only 65 years old.

Rod Grams was a very humble man of principle. He grew up on a family farm in Crown, in eastern Minnesota, where he received his ''eternal crown.'' It was the same farm that his father grew up on. It is the farm where Rod acquired his diligent, hardworking, Minnesota-grown work ethic.

Rod Grams worked in broadcasting for nearly 25 years in Minnesota. He earned a reputation as a positive communicator who understood how to speak with his fellow Minnesotans. He then built his own business and realized the happiness and challenges of creating jobs and making a go of his American Dream.

Rod lived life to the fullest, and he showed others how to do the same. He successfully navigated the real world, which shaped his views before serving as Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District Representative and then the entire State of Minnesota in the United States Senate.

Rod Grams was dedicated to maintaining personal liberty and doing everything within his power to protect Americans against the constantly growing size and scope of the Federal Government's intrusion into the lives of real Americans that he represented at this great Capitol. With his keen eye and long-term vision, Minnesotans had a dedicated advocate here in the Halls of the United States Congress.

It was an honor for me and my husband, Marcus, to know Rod Grams for decades. He was a leader, an example, but, more importantly, he was my friend. My heart goes out to his wife, Christine, to his four beautiful children, and to the light of his life, his grandchildren.

While Rod Grams will be greatly missed here in this body, we take comfort in the fact that he contributed so much by way of his service to the great State of Minnesota and to our country. We all benefit from Rod Grams's monumental legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask now that the House of Representatives observe a moment of silence to honor the incredible life of former United States Senator Rod Grams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Will all Members please rise.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for organizing this delegation, along with Congressman KLINE, who has joined us as well, and acknowledge the passing and remember a wonderful servant from Minnesota, Congressman and U.S. Senator Rod Grams, who lost a very courageous battle to cancer recently. He passed away peacefully with his wife, Christine, by his side.

I actually got to know Rod Grams first. Our families went to church together. I was just a young student, but I always remembered Rod Grams not only as a successful small businessman, but someone who was a famous anchorman on Channel 9 KMSP. That is where he got his start in politics. He left the news and actually ran for Congress back in 1992 and then the United States Senate in 1994.

The one thing I will always remember about Rod Grams is that he always maintained his small-town, rural Minnesota values. He embodied those values. He shared those values. He always lived them to the fullest, and we remember his service to our State.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for being down here to remember somebody who was, in many ways, bigger than life: big, tall Rod Grams.

He wanted to do something for his State and his country, and he did. He came to the House of Representatives to serve one term. While he was here in his freshman term, he ran for the United States Senate and won.

Rod had a lot of things he worked on, but one of them was the child tax credit. It was a long, tough slog that he brought all the way across the finish line, and that is just who Rod was. He didn't quit. He knew what he was about. He was an independent thinker. He was unafraid to take a stand and speak up for his State and his country.

We will miss him.

□ 1430

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am proud to say that Rod was a constituent of mine in the last years of his life, running a small town radio station at which he did just a wonderfully good job.

He was always so thoughtful and so dedicated to public service and so highly regarded by all who knew him. He was a wonderful public servant. He contributed much to the well-being of Minnesota and to this Nation and to the civility of this Chamber, itself. His contributions are enormous, and his presence will be forever apparent here, and we will miss him greatly.

We extend our deepest, heartfelt sympathies to the family and to all of those who had the good fortune to know and work with Rod Grams.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here to simply pay great tribute and honor to a dedicated public servant—a person who loved his country, who put it all on the line for the betterment of his neighbors and fellow Americans. Rod Grams is a proud son of Minnesota, and he will be deeply missed.

YERTLE THE TURTLE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we enter day 10 of this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown, I once again turn to Dr. Seuss, the well-known author, best known for being able to communicate well to children.

Some wisdom from ''Yertle the Turtle'':

I am Yertle the Turtle. Oh, marvelous me, for I am the ruler of all that I see.

Your majesty, please. I don't like to complain, but down here below, we are feeling great pain.

THE REPUBLICAN SELF-IMPOSED GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss how the Republican self-imposed government shutdown is affecting our Nation's veterans. Just yesterday, VA Secretary Shinseki testified in the Veterans Affairs' Committee, and he put several points straight ahead.

If the shutdown continues, there will be over 3.8 million veterans who will not receive disability compensation payments. That means they will not get their checks in the mail by November 1.

315,000 veterans and over 200,000 surviving spouses or dependents will not see their pension payments.

Education payments to more than half a million veterans using the GI Bill will end.

It is really very shameful that the Republicans are doing this to our veterans—over $6 billion in benefits. Nearly 5 million veterans and their families will not receive their pension payments.

Shame on the Republican House of Representatives.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
A BUDGET FOR VETERANS BY VETERANS,
October 3, 2013.

House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER REID, LEADER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of The Independent Budget—co-authored by AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars—we would like to express our tremendous disappointment that Congress' inability to pass a full annual budget has led to a government shutdown. Your failure is already causing real harm to the brave men and women who have served and sacrificed for this nation.

The current government shutdown has stopped work on the more than 250,000 Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) disability claims that are awaiting adjudication; compensation, pension and education benefits are in jeopardy of not being paid; Vocational Rehabilitation offices are working with reduced staffs; and the Department of Labor's VETS programs and federal employment OneStops are closed. These are real impacts on veterans, many of whom are struggling to transition back into civilian life.

Furthermore, funding the operations of the VA through short-term continuing resolutions (CRs) or other stop-gap measures are not acceptable solutions. Typically, short term CRs don't take into account the effects of inflation or increased demand for VA benefits and services. CRs also prevent VA from starting or expanding critical programs and disrupt or delay vital new research and construction projects.

As the leaders of Congress, we call on you to immediately take all actions necessary to give final approval to legislation providing the full year's FY 2014 appropriation for all veterans programs. Our organizations and the millions of veterans we represent will no longer tolerate Congress leveraging veterans' health and wellbeing to achieve unrelated political ends.

In order to prevent future disruptions to veterans' programs, we also urge you to approve legislation that would extend advance appropriations to all VA discretionary and mandatory appropriations accounts. Advance appropriations have shielded VA health care from most of the harmful effects of the current government shutdown as well as prior continuing resolutions. Now Congress must provide the same protections to all remaining discretionary and mandatorily funded veterans programs, including disability compensation processing and payments. There are currently bills pending in both the House (H.R. 813) and the Senate (S. 932) that could be quickly amended and approved to achieve this goal.

Both government shutdowns and continuing resolutions represent failures in leadership. Congress' obligation to veterans does not start in the eleventh hour of a national crisis; you have an obligation to pass a timely, sufficient budget for all veterans programs, benefits and services.

On behalf of our organizations and all of America's veterans, their families and survivors, we call on you to work together to immediately approve a full year's appropriation for all veterans programs, and subsequently to approve pending legislation to extend advance appropriations to all VA discretionary and mandatory funding. Anything less is unacceptable to the men and women who have served this nation in uniform.

Sincerely,

STEWART M. HICKEY,
National Executive Director, AMVETS.
GARRY J. AUGUSTINE,
Executive Director, Disabled American Veterans.
HOMER S. TOWNSEND, JR.,
Executive Director, Paralyzed Veterans of America.
ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

[From ABC News Chicago—Associated Press, Oct. 9, 2013]

2013 GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN COULD HIT MILLIONS OF VETS, VA CHIEF SAYS

WASHINGTON.—The government shutdown is having a big impact on the country's military. One problem—funding the death benefit of military families—has been solved. Another issue—veterans benefits—could turn into a massive headache later this month.

VA hospitals, like Jesse Brown on the West Side, are open during the government shutdown. But veterans are concerned that disability and other checks could be in jeopardy.

''I got a little money saved up, but a lot of guys here live from check to check, month to month, that's going to be the hard part,'' said Jesus Lebron, Vietnam Vet and Purple Heart recipient.

''I think very few of us are prepared for this—we just have to weather that storm,'' said David Brewster, Vietnam War veteran.

Vets are worried after the VA secretary testified on Capitol Hill Wednesday, warning politicians that the shutdown has slowed the process for disability claims—and the impact could be widespread.

''It's over 5 million individuals who will be involved. This is serious. And I'm hoping the leadership of this committee will help us resolve it,'' said Eric Shinseki, VA secretary.

Shinseki broke down the numbers like this: 3.8 million vets will not receive disability compensation; 315,000 vets and 202,000 surviving spouses or dependents will see pension payments stopped. And because of that, vets are disappointed with elected officials.

''We put our butts on the line. I would like to see them put their butts on the line,'' said Leonard Soria, Vietnam War veteran.

In the meantime, the caskets of 4 fallen soldiers killed in Afghanistan arrived at Dover Air Force Base on Wednesday afternoon. Their families scrambled to raise money for funerals because they did not immediately get the $100,000 death gratuity because of the government shutdown.

''She sacrificed for the country, for her family. Why wouldn't that be taken care of? There is no excuse,'' said Alexandra DiBella, friend of Army 1st Lt. Jennifer Moreno.

Late this afternoon, Congress took action to fix that problem by approving the death gratuity. That impacts 26 families who have had loved ones die since the shutdown.

It's important to note, however, that all VA hospitals will remain open during the shutdown.

In all, more than $6 billion in benefits to about 5 million veterans and their families would be halted with an extended shutdown.

In some areas, like health care, there have been few adverse effects. Health care services are funded a year in advance. In others, such as reducing the claims backlog, Shinseki noted that the backlog has increased by 2,000 since the shutdown began Oct. 1.

At the end of September, the disability claims backlog stood at 418,500, a drop of about 31 percent over the previous six months.

Shinseki drew comparisons to the last shutdown in 1996, a time of sustained peace. The current shutdown occurs as the war in Afghanistan is in its 13th year and as hundreds of thousands have returned from Iraq. They are enrolling in VA care at higher rates than previous generations of veterans.

''They, along with the veterans of every preceding generation, will be harmed if the shutdown continues,'' Shinseki said.

Rep. Jeff Miller, the Republican chairman of the committee, questioned whether the Obama administration had been forthcoming enough in letting veterans know the impact of the shutdown. For example, VA's initial guidance did not mention any impact on payments to veterans or the processing of their benefits, although it was updated before the shutdown began.

Miller said a statement by President Barack Obama made it unclear about whether veterans would be able to continue getting counseling for PTSD. They can, at any VA health care facility.

''We've had some difficulty in the last couple of weeks getting good information about VA's contingency plan and the effects a lapse in appropriation would have on veterans,'' Miller said.

Shinseki said the VA has confronted ''unprecedented legal and programmatic questions'' and would do its best to keep lawmakers informed.

The House has passed legislation that would provide veterans disability, pension and other benefits if the shutdown is prolonged. But the White House has urged lawmakers not to take a piecemeal approach to continuing government services.

Shinseki made that case as well, saying it's not the best solution for veterans. He noted that even if the VA were fully funded, some services to veterans would suffer.

He said the Labor Department has largely shut down its VETS program, which provides employment and counseling services to veterans. The Small Business Administration has closed 10 centers focused on helping veterans create and operate businesses. And the Housing and Urban Development Department is not issuing vouchers to newly homeless vets, though those already receiving the housing aid will still get it.

White House spokesman Jay Carney said Wednesday that veterans had done their job and that it was time for Congress to do its job.

Mitch McConnell's spokesman, Don Stewart, noted that the senator pushed for a vote on House-passed legislation that would protect disability benefits, but Majority Leader Harry Reid objected.

''Maybe Carney should give him a call,'' Stewart said.

The shutdown has disrupted the generally bipartisan workings of the veterans committees in both chambers.

''Do you think Senator Reid doesn't like our veterans or the VA in particular?'' Rep. Tim Huelskamp, R–Kan., asked Wednesday.

''Personally, I think he very highly values veterans,'' responded Shinseki, the only Cabinet member to testify before a congressional committee since the partial shutdown began. ''As to why we are unable, Congress is unable to do its business, I will leave to the members to discuss.''

Meanwhile, some Democrats said a GOP bill passed last week that would continue to fund disability payments didn't include money for such things as medical or prosthetic research and no money to maintain national cemeteries or various construction projects.

''I keep hearing the Senate, the Senate. I put the responsibility directly in the House. We could pass a clean (continuing resolution) and you wouldn't be sitting here,'' said Rep. Corrine Brown, D–Fla. ''I don't blame the Senate. I thank God for the Senate.''

Miller said there was bipartisan support in the House for legislation that would fund the entire Department of Veterans Affairs a full year in advance so it—so it would not be subject to end-of-the-year brinkmanship. The VA had so far not endorsed the effort.

OBAMACARE AND OUR NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in the context of the debate that is going on in the country right now about how we get our national finances in order, I think it is very important to remember that it would be unfair for future generations of Americans—for our kids and our grandkids—if we raise the debt ceiling without making the reforms necessary to get government spending under control. No one wants to default on our national debt, but no one should want to leave mountains of debt to our future children and grandchildren.

Congress must continue to focus on reforming government to avert a national debt crisis. The President says ObamaCare shouldn't be part of the discussion related to funding the government or to raising the debt limit, but ObamaCare is fundamentally connected to spending and debt. The President's signature health care law, after all, was passed through the reconciliation process, which is reserved exclusively for budget-related bills.

For those who use this special budget process to now say that it is not budget-related is very cynical. ObamaCare's projected cost has more than doubled since the President originally claimed it would reduce the deficit. It will cost this country $2 trillion over the next 10 years. I urge everyone to remember that ObamaCare is part of the discussion about how we reduce our national debt.

IN MEMORY OF NEVADA ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEGGY PIERCE

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today saddened by the news that Nevada Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce has passed away.

She was the staunch liberal conscience of the Nevada State Legislature, but she commanded respect from both sides of the aisle because of her steadfast belief in her principles, because she was a hard worker and because she cared so deeply about the well-being of her constituents and the people of Nevada.

I first met Peggy before her time in the assembly, when she was a fellow organizer, helping to coordinate rapid response for displaced workers in Las Vegas after the tragic events of September 11. She was as committed to helping others then as she was in her tenure in the Nevada State Legislature.

She succumbed to cancer, but she did not lose the fight. She put her constituents before herself, and in that sense, she had always been a true public servant.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family.

You will truly be missed, my friend.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IN THE GOLDEN STATE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, today, I will be hosting a number of Members from my home State of California, a State in which the population is so diverse and in which the culture is so rich that it is often described as a microcosm of America.

Every language, every nationality, every ethnicity is represented in the Golden State—a State that is the 12th-largest economy in the world. California's economy is so big that its GDP rivals that of some full-blown, industrialized nations, including those of Australia, Spain, Mexico, and South Korea. The economy in California is crucial to the national economy.

I am here tonight with my colleagues to speak against the government shutdown that has been manufactured and orchestrated by the House Republicans—a shutdown that is harming the national economy, a shutdown that is harming the California economy and a shutdown that is harming the very communities that we represent.

In my district, the 41st District, which represents Riverside, Moreno Valley, Perris, the largest employer is March Air Reserve Base, with 8,500 people working at the base in some capacity. When the shutdown hit, 500 of these workers were affected by the furloughs. While Congress passed legislation allowing these employees to go back to work, roughly 1,000 National Guardsmen at the base still will not be able to drill this month and will not receive pay.

It is not just our servicemembers who are hurt by this reckless shutdown. Low-income children in my district are suffering, too. The Riverside County Office of Education receives Federal funding through the Head Start program in order to provide childhood development services and to promote school readiness for children under the age of 5. Because of this shutdown, the county is not able to draw down their grant money, jeopardizing these vital services for nearly 3,500 young children in my county.

About an hour east of my district is Joshua Tree National Park, where 92 park employees were given furlough notices. When the shutdown happened, park rangers were forced to notify campers that they had to vacate the park within 48 hours. There are 7,000 people a day who visit Joshua Tree National Park, and this shutdown is estimated to cost nearly $8,000 a day.

Not just the park and its employees are going to suffer; local businesses will suffer as well. A cafe next to the park normally has a line out the door. The other day, the manager reported that the cafe made only $39. This is a small business, Mr. Speaker.

We have to end this shutdown, not just for the furloughed public employees but for small businesses like that cafe.

I am very pleased to be joined by several of my California colleagues, the first of whom is from southern California, the distinguished gentleman, ALAN LOWENTHAL. He represents the cities of Long Beach, Garden Grove and Cypress. He sits on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Committee on Natural Resources.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California's 47th District.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you, Congressman TAKANO.

Our economy, as you pointed out, is being held hostage by Speaker BOEHNER for his refusal to put forth a clean budget funding bill, what is called a ''continuing resolution,'' after we Democrats agreed to use his number. This is keeping us from really dealing with the real job of Congress also, which is to create jobs and to grow the economy.

I've been talking to people in my district to get some specific examples of some of the impacts of this irresponsible shutdown. Then I would like to also talk about some of the personal experiences that people have called me and told me about.

For example, in terms of one of my cities, the largest city in my district—the city of Long Beach—I will talk about the Small Business Administration, the SBA. In the 47th Congressional District, the SBA gives approximately $308,000 in loans per day. It has not given out one loan to small businesses in California's 47th Congressional District since the government was shut down.

What about Women, Infants, and Children, the WIC program? In Long Beach alone, 25,000 women and children use WIC vouchers. That is to keep people from starving. That is to provide food. That funding runs out this month, and there is no other money to provide any funding for the WIC program.

What about housing? There are 23,000 people in the city of Long Beach, and 6,600 housing units receive section 8 vouchers. They pay their rent once a month with these vouchers, and those apartments and those units get reimbursed by the government. There will be no payments to landlords in the city of Long Beach with section 8 vouchers.

□ 1445

But that is just kind of the overview. What about some of the specifics?

Over 20 years ago, a dear friend of mine opened a card shop right near our house in part of the revitalization. I don't want to mention his name, but he opens this shop in the city, works very well, part of the revitalization.

About a year and a half ago, he hurts his leg, goes to the hospital, and finds out that he has, unfortunately, ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease. This past December, he loses his business because he can no longer operate, and today he lies in his living room almost totally paralyzed and barely able to breath on oxygen.

His partner of 24 years—he and his partner adopted a child 19 years ago, who is now 19—his partner is employed by the Department of Defense. He was furloughed. So my dear friend and his partner do not know how they are going to pay their mortgage as he lies in his living room gasping for air. This is not the America that we know.

I have another constituent who is a young lieutenant in a local police agency, local law enforcement agency. After 2 years of applying and going through all the applications to enter the Federal Bureau of Investigations, an 11-week training program here in Washington, 211 of the most selected and highly chosen people throughout 48 States and 24 nations arrived last Monday and Tuesday—they closed down the FBI training facility. All the instructors were furloughed. He will lose his opportunity, the one opportunity to move forward that he had, because we and the Speaker will not bring up—this Congress cannot act, and the Speaker will not bring up a clean funding bill.

I will close by bringing up one other email that I received:

> Currently, an exempt Federal employee working but not being paid, I will be defaulting on my mortgage, unable to pay several obligations. However, stay strong in your resolve. Do not succumb to extortion. We, the people, are suffering. Your colleagues are clueless and, apparently, heartless as well. Please remind them who they work for—we, the people. I am a civil servant. So are Congressmen and Congresswomen. It is time for a wake-up call in the Capitol.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL. I appreciate it. I know you have to run on to a committee, and good luck.

Next, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend and colleague from the Second District, a great leader in the environment, somebody who, in the California Legislature, authored some landmark bills that have improved the environment. He is also among one of the most progressive Members of this body. I sit with him in the Progressive Caucus. Representative JARED HUFFMAN of California's Second District, which includes the cities of Crescent City, Fort Bragg, San Rafael, and other cities. He sits on the Budget Committee as well as the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I want to thank my friend from inland southern California very much for including me in this Special Order hour.

There are so many ways in which this Republican government shutdown is hurting the people of California, hurting the people of my district. But I just wanted to speak for a few minutes about some very particular ways in my district that people are feeling the pain.

The Second District of California is an amazing place. I am honored to represent it. One of the things that makes it special are the abundant public lands. We have protected coasts, parks, recreation areas, forests, and wilderness areas. These public lands are essential to our region's tourism, recreation, and resource economy.

The north coast's tourism economy is a big deal. It creates $3.5 billion in annual tourism spending, more than 42,000 jobs, and nearly $225 million in local and State tax revenue. Visitors from all over America—and, in fact, all over the world—come to our public lands. Thanks to the Republican shutdown, much of that economic activity is grinding to a halt.

The Point Reyes National Seashore is closed. In 2011, this seashore received 2.1 million visitors and brought in $93.3 million in economic activity to the area. The shutdown is starting to impact small business owners in and around the park in West Marin. These are folks who subsist on the tourism dollars that this world-famous seashore and working landscape attracts.

Nearby, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is also closed. That collection of lands welcomes 14.5 million visitors a year. The spending on an annual basis is nearly $300 million for the region because of that visitation. The commissaries and vendors right now are shut down. They aren't purchasing the locally-sourced food that they serve. They are further hurting the Marin and Sonoma County farms and dairies because of that shutdown.

Tourism is one of the most important drivers of Mendocino County's economy further to the north. It pumps in $314 million directly to that county's economy. That was in the year 2011. Seventy-four percent of the visitors to the county come to the public lands—lands that are now closed.

What about California's redwood coast further north in Humboldt County? You guessed it: Redwood National Park is being forced to turn away visitors.

Yet, in response to the shutdown, this House has spent the last week voting on Band-Aid bills that attempt to pit one part of government or one program against all the others. This is a surreal proposition: the idea that our economy is hemorrhaging more than $300 million a day because of this political stunt and our GOP majority offers these Band-Aid bills that aren't going to end it. The Senate is not going to take up and approve these bills, and the President has made it clear that he would veto them even if they did. So this is not going to solve the problem; but that, unfortunately, is how we have been spending our time.

These are not honest attempts to restore funding for our public lands. They wouldn't begin to undo the damage that this shutdown is doing to our resources and our recreational industries. The House majority is pursuing a cynical PR strategy. It is creating Hollywood storefronts rather than seriously trying to reopen our government.

Even if these piecemeal bills were to pass, let's not pretend that it would solve the problem. To give you just one example, one of the Band-Aid bills that we debated and voted on over the last week pretended to reopen our parks, and yet it would not reopen—it completely ignores, in fact—the 2.4 million acres of National Forest Service land. There are many other examples of park and recreation areas and public lands that would have been left behind and still subject to the government shutdown.

In my congressional district, we have major Forest Service lands and a Forest Service presence. Many people in

businesses rely on our national forests being open for business. Just this week, I got word that a salvage logging operation in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest is at risk of being shut down because of where we are with this Republican government shutdown. This is a salvage logging operation in the wake of a serious fire that we have seen. It is a consensus project to harvest trees, to avoid public hazards, to do something that is good for the forest, good for the local economy, and it is at risk of not happening because of this political stunt. This is causing real economic damage and potentially real fire safety damage to the communities that I represent.

So let's stop posturing. Let's stop the PR stunts. Let's stop the Hollywood storefronts. Stop deflecting, stop insulting the intelligence of the American people. Let's have an up or down vote to reopen our public lands and, indeed, to reopen our government.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. HUFFMAN. If you want to—care to stay just a few minutes to have a little back-and-forth.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I would.

Mr. TAKANO. We come from different parts of our great State of California. I know we both share a deep love for our State. I have been to your district, to Sonoma and the great forests that you have in your district. It is a terrible thing to see, just as California is coming out of this recession—I don't know about you, but I visited a number of these businesses during the congressional break, during the work period, during August and early September, and there were so many hopeful stories about people saying, We have gotten through this hump, we have gotten through the worst of the 2008, 2009, and 2010 recession. There was even talk that real estate in my area of the State, which was hit hard, was coming back. I told all these folks I am so glad to hear these wonderful stories.

I just hope that we don't, in Washington, end up, through any unnecessary actions, irresponsible and reckless actions, set back the gains that we have made. I don't know about you, but in my district, certainly, I can see how shutting down the government and threatening to not raise the debt ceiling would have just tremendous adverse consequences on the twelfth largest economy in the world.

Mr. HUFFMAN. There is no doubt about it. I think you are exactly right. Of course, prior to my election in Congress, I spent 6 years in the California Legislature, where we had our own fiscal crises and, yes, at times the government practically shut down. We worked through it. We found compromise.

You are absolutely right, Congressman. California is on the verge of a tremendous comeback. Jobs are coming in; investment is coming into our State. Things are really beginning to happen in a great way in the State of California after a tough period.

Just as it seems we are getting started, along comes this Federal Government shutdown with so many impacts to our economy. The debates that we have here in Washington don't even scratch the surface of how this is hurting people and undermining consumer confidence and setting us back in places like California, where we have the potential to do enormous things in terms of research and so many other ways we contribute to the national economy.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you so much for coming down to speak about how this shutdown, this GOP-imposed shutdown, manufactured shutdown, and how this threat to not raise the debt limit is jeopardizing our entire Nation. But we in California are a tremendous engine behind the whole big picture of the economic mind of our country. An economy which represents 12 percent of the global economy is nothing to be cavalier about.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Absolutely. As we talk about this incredible economic damage and risk that politicians are taking with our economy, what I am hearing from my district is how incredulous people are because there is such an obvious and simple solution and way forward.

Let's have an up-or-down vote on whether we should continue this government shutdown or end it, and even end it, at least temporarily, on Republican budget numbers. That seems so eminently reasonable and sensible. In fact, it was the deal that one House struck and advanced out of that House with bipartisan action. Yet here we are in the House of Representatives with a small faction rejecting that deal, holding the entire country's economy potentially hostage for political reasons. It is just something my constituents can't understand.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I would like to recognize the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD), a Representative from a neighboring district, California's 35th District. I have known Congresswoman GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD, gosh, more than 20 years, when we both began our careers as community college trustees. It is such a great honor to serve alongside her and sit in this Chamber sometimes when we are voting. She sits on the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I also sit. We are both committed to the huge veterans population that we have in the inland empire of the region of California that we both represent in inland southern California.

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, with each day that passes that the Nation is in government shutdown, we put the very livelihood of Americans and the economy in uncertainty: like the over 3,800 Federal employees who live in the 35th Congressional District, these are all hard-working men and women in the Federal Government workforce; like the constituent who wrote us asking why death benefits for veterans were not being paid out; like the dairy owner that called this very morning and wanted to know why they had not received money that was owed to them from the Federal Government.

□ 1500

These are just a few of the cases that are going on in my district; and while progress has been made in the Nation's economic recovery from the greatest recession since the last depression, the Federal Government's shutdown hampers that very recovery. The shutdown sends a bad message to the business community, that government is unreliable.

The 35th District's constituents are not being helped by the Small Business Administration because of the shutdown. The SBA is currently approving zero general small business, real estate, and equipment loans. This hurts the economic development of California's 35th Congressional District.

Last year, the SBA approved almost $500,000 a day in small business, real estate, and equipment loans in my district. This money enabled job growth and benefited the community by spurring economic development in the region. This equates to more than $1 billion not currently being lent to small businesses across the country in 1 month. Businesses in my district, the State, and across the Nation are losing money every day because of the government shutdown. We should be helping businesses start up and grow. We should be doing everything we can to grow jobs and grow our economy. Congress should not be an impediment that slows prosperity in America.

Without a solution to the Federal Government shutdown, low-income women and children will suffer without programs that Congress fought hard to secure. Federally funded programs like the Women, Infants, and Children program, commonly known as WIC, is at risk of having its funding diminished under a government shutdown. WIC provides nutrition education and healthy foods, enabling families to make lifelong healthy eating and lifestyle choices.

In California alone, 1.5 million low-income women and children will be impacted should Congress not act to end this shutdown. This is at a time when 27 percent of California's children are considered to be food insecure, children lacking access to enough food or nutritionally adequate food.

Letting a government shutdown occur when children's nutrition is at risk is irresponsible. Let us be part of the solution and end political gamesmanship that hurts average Americans. Let us feed America's hungry children. Let us get businesses back to business and help America prosper.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from California's 35th Congressional District, GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD.

Now I yield to a true champion of small business. She sits on the Small Business Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee. Representative JUDY CHU has been a friend of mine in California. I know her from various roles we have played in California governance. She represents California's 27th District, which includes Pasadena, Rosemead, Monterey Park, and many other communities. I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. CHU. I thank Congressman TAKANO.

Last week, domestic violence shelters and rape crisis centers all across the country got a notice from the Federal Office of Justice Programs that as of last Friday, thanks to this Republican shutdown, they will not be able to draw down the funds they normally rely on and may have to stop operating.

The shelters in my district showed me the notice, and it gave us all chills. They would be forced to shut their doors, leaving abused victims and children with nowhere else to turn.

Just yesterday, I was in a Judiciary hearing in which an advocate said that their agency had just seen a young girl who was beaten, tortured, and raped for 5 hours. If these centers are not open, where is a girl like this to go?

As a former rape crisis counselor, I know firsthand the damage that domestic violence and sexual assault causes. We can't just leave these victims to fend for themselves, vulnerable to their abusers at the most critical times of their lives. That is why agencies in my district, like YWCA Wangs Haven House, the San Gabriel Valley Center, Asian Women's Center, and House of Ruth, exist, to help victims get their lives together.

This GOP shutdown is beyond shameful; it is disgusting. Enough already. It is time to end the shutdown. It is time to let us vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services. I have known Representative MAXINE WATERS also for a number of years, more than I care to even sort of count. She represents California's 43rd District, which includes south Los Angeles, Hawthorne, and Inglewood.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman TAKANO for organizing this very special Special Order so that we can talk about what is happening with our great State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again call for an end to this unnecessary government shutdown and talk about the significant consequences it is having for the people of my district, California's 43rd.

The recession hit the people of my district hard. Delinquencies, foreclosures, and job losses crippled our economy and our neighborhoods. Five years later, we are just beginning to emerge from these hard times.

But the irresponsibility of the Republican Party has threatened our fragile recovery. Their strategy, planned and financed by extremists like the Koch brothers, Heritage Action, and the Club For Growth, is to hold the American people and the economy hostage in order to push an extremist ideology.

Their desire to eliminate the Affordable Care Act is misguided, wrong, and harmful to the American people. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It has been validated by the reelection of President Obama and supported by the Supreme Court of the United States of America. It is settled law, and we should not be threatening American jobs and the American economy to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, veterans in my district are being harmed by the shutdown. If this unnecessary stalemate does not end by November 1, the Veterans Affairs Department will not be able to issue checks to more than 5 million beneficiaries. This is unacceptable.

In addition, small businesses in my district are being severely harmed. The Small Business Administration's lending program has been stopped, and the process to obtain government contracts has also been halted. In 2012, the SBA approved over $366,000 in small business, real estate, and equipment loans every day in my district. Each day this senseless shutdown continues, hundreds of thousands of dollars in economic development all across my district is being undermined.

In Torrance, Inglewood, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Los Angeles itself, retail stores, restaurants, and small businesses are hurting because of the shutdown. Prominent business groups in my district, such as the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the Torrance Chamber of Commerce, California Chamber of Commerce, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, and 14 other local chambers of commerce across the State have all said that the impacts of a shutdown could be harmful and disruptive to their businesses.

The Republican Party likes to talk about how much they support small businesses, but when extremist billionaires like the Koch brothers start throwing their money around, Republicans tell small business owners, You are on your own.

The Head Start program, which has put thousands of children on a solid path to a well-rounded education, has effectively closed services in many States and regions across the country. California is no exception. I am outraged that our Nation's children are suffering the consequences of these Republican games. The Republican sequester already cut 57,000 children from Head Start. This program is a crucial lifeline in my district, combating poverty and making our communities safer, better places to live. We need to restore it today.

Finally, I want to discuss the shutdown's serious impact on California's fledgling housing market. My district's housing market is finally finding its footing after years of instability. The Republican shutdown is throwing a massive wrench in that process. A prolonged shutdown will cause tremendous harm to home buyers seeking to close on mortgage loans. These delays are detrimental to all home buyers, but particularly those who are buying for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the first paycheck many affected employees will miss as a result of the shutdown. These are hardships many in my district cannot afford. Each day this senseless shutdown continues risks further irreparable damage to my district's economy, families, and businesses. It must end now.

Just yesterday, we heard more bad news for our State. Governor Jerry Brown announced that he will soon be forced to make the difficult decision of whether the State will pay for the continued operation of Federal programs used by millions of Californians. These include programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, subsidized school meals, and nutrition assistance for pregnant women and infants, all of which could be interrupted in November.

I urge my Republican colleagues to stop using the American people and the American economy as pawns in this debate. It is time for the Republican Party to end this ridiculous game and open the government today.

I thank Congressman TAKANO for organizing this very important Special Order.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady for participating. We both love our State. It is such an honor to serve with you in this body.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman who represents California's 29th District. He sits on the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on the Budget, Representative TONY CÁRDENAS, who was also formerly of the California State Legislature. His district includes the cities of Van Nuys, North Hollywood, and other areas of the San Fernando Valley.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and thank you for putting this opportunity together, Congressman TAKANO.

It is a great opportunity to speak here today. I would like to speak to what this is costing my district, and this is just a microcosm of what this Republican shutdown is costing all districts in America, all communities in the United States of America.

Recently, some of my colleagues here in the House have chosen to harm America, harm American families, seniors, veterans, and businesses across the country. They have refused to do their job of providing a budget for America, a budget which would simply pay our Nation's bills. Ladies and gentlemen, this is something every family in America has to do. We must pass a reasonable budget. We must reopen our government. Every day we sit on the sidelines, American families and businesses are losing. They are suffering. There is $300 million in economic loss every day. That is $300 million a day, poof, gone.

When I am at home talking to the people I am proud to represent, their number one concern is creating well-paying American jobs. This Republican shutdown demonstrates how out of touch the party is with the needs of working-class families who are focused on feeding their families and making ends meet. This Republican shutdown hurts America.

In my district alone, the shutdown has stalled the completion of a major project for the Mission City Community Network, a health network that provides medical, dental, and mental health services. Once construction is completed—eventually—they will be able to help 10,000 patients a year going forward. However, this program is stalled because Republicans refuse to allow a vote on a budget.

Congress needs to stop the fighting and should focus on growing our economy. The uncertainty about how long the shutdown will last is crippling our economy. The possibility of defaulting on America's bills is having a serious and negative impact on our position as the greatest country in the world.

□ 1515

It is important for the government to provide stability and security for the people and businesses in our country, and the world is watching us.

This shutdown has sent 800,000 Americans home, telling them don't go to work. For example, in my district, I have a Federal building where hundreds of Americans work every single day serving my community. I went to that building just a few days ago, and it is closed down. The only person that I found working there now is one security guard.

American families cannot afford to wait on Republicans who are holding the Nation's economy hostage. For example, even children are affected. Head Start programs in my district are wondering how long they are going to be able to keep their doors open before they turn those children away. Every time we say that those 800,000 people are not going to work, those government workers, just ask the corner grocery store, the restaurants how they feel about this shutdown. It is affecting everybody, public and private businesses alike.

I want to bring to your attention that it was just reported to me that the districts around Los Angeles, including the one that I represent, that every day the average amount of money that is lent to small businesses is $360,000 in loans a day from the Small Business Administration. That is more than $7.5 million per month. Last year in our district, more than $84 million in loans were approved. That is the equivalent of 2,400 new jobs last year. That is good government at work. However, now that the Republican shutdown is in full force and in place, zero dollars are being lent out through the SBA in my district. That means zero new jobs every single day that the Republican shutdown is in place.

I am very proud to say that I grew up in a family where my mother and father made ends meet to raise us 11 American citizens, and I am very proud that they raised us in a nice, clean, good environment. I have brothers and sisters who have gone to college to get their doctorate degrees, master's degrees, bachelor's degrees; and I am very proud to say I worked with my engineering degree for a while, but then I decided to strike out on my own and run my own business. I know what it is like when a business is trying to grow. And when you don't have access to capital, you don't grow; if you don't grow, you don't create new jobs.

I just wanted to make sure that people understand what it means when the Federal SBA stops lending money. When they stop lending money, new jobs stop in communities throughout America.

House Republicans must allow us to do the one thing Americans want more than anything else from our Congress, and that is to let us pay our bills, let us act responsibly, and let us put Americans back to work. It is simply that, ladies and gentlemen.

Let's get back to work in this Congress. Let's get this government back to work. Let's reinvigorate an economy that was barely starting to get back on its feet but has been shut down.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to my friend and colleague, Representative MIKE HONDA, from the 17th District. I know you, Mr. HONDA, have been a former school principal. You have been in local government as a county supervisor, I think, of Santa Clara County. You have served in this body, I think, since 1996. It is an honor to serve with you, and I know we both love our great State of California. We are very anxious and sad over the potential impacts that both the government shutdown and this threat to not raise the debt ceiling will have on this fragile recovery that we are now, I think, beginning to see evidence of.

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank you, my friend, for this opportunity and this dialogue.

It is a shame that we don't have the same dialogue across the aisle, but our rules prohibit us from being able to create that dialogue and debate in front of this country. As a result, we have this moment in time where we are able to share as members of the California delegation, but also as members of this Democratic Caucus.

We are here today, on day 10, of the Republican government shutdown that has cost over $3 billion in lost economic activity so far. And because of the compounding nature of the economic effects, it is estimated that over a month's time, the economy will be drained of $50 billion.

Almost 1 million people should be working today, and they are not. When our government is forced to shut down, it hurts our economy, closes essential services for low-income families, and disrupts the lives of real people in all of our districts, regardless of where we represent. Important government services that benefit all of us are suspended.

In my district, I have heard from young people that were furloughed, the young employees of the NASA Ames facility. They are wondering how they are going to be able to make rent to stay in their homes or to make ends meet.

The investigators that were working on finding the underlying causes of the Asiana crash and coming up with ways to make air travel safer, we sent home.

I have also heard from those who are waiting to hear back on their Social Security benefits appeals. Because the appeals office is closed, they will not hear back on their cases until this shutdown is over, which means they have less means to make ends meet.

There is no reason this should be happening. All of this pain is absolutely and completely unnecessary. We do have the bipartisan votes, however, to end this shutdown today if the Speaker would allow a clean vote. That might be the most frustrating part of all of this.

Actually, it is the most frustrating part of all of this, that we have the votes here on both sides of the aisle if the Speaker allows us to vote. I am not sure what it is that he is afraid of, but if he let that go and let us vote and let the people vote, then we may be able to reflect the desires and the reflections of what people are feeling in this country.

Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican majority in the House refuse to do their job, and I think they really do believe they are doing their job. I pray that they see and understand that there is real human suffering and economic suffering that comes as a direct result of these irresponsible political tactics, both on the government-wide shutdown and on the debt limit.

For House Democrats, this is not a game. On the debt ceiling, the full faith and credit of the United States should never be in jeopardy. That is our position, and that is the position of economists and business leaders, and that should be the attitude of this Congress.

Warren Buffett called the debt limit a nuclear bomb. Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein said:

Economic damage associated with default or near default will be severe and have serious consequences for the recovery of the U.S. and global economy.

Bank of America CEO Brian Moynihan said:

There is no debate that the seriousness of the U.S. not paying its debts is the most serious thing we have.

The president of the American Bankers Association and former Republican Governor of Oklahoma, Frank Keating, said a default would cost ''hundreds of billions of dollars,'' and even the slightest impact on interest rates ''would cascade throughout the economy.''

This government shutdown and the looming threat of an unprecedented government default are doing significant harm to our economy. The only ones that can't see that are Speaker BOEHNER and the Tea Party Republicans.

House Democrats have started the process on forcing a vote on a clean CR to reopen the government and will soon do the same with a vote on the debt limit. Americans want a vote. A reasonable majority in Congress want this vote. Speaker BOEHNER can call this vote today. But since he won't, we will try to force a vote as soon as House rules allow.

Let's not go 1 more day without a functioning government. Let's stop these games, reopen the government, start the process of ending this manufactured crisis, lift this cloud from over our economy, and have the vote that Americans have been waiting for. Let us vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Congressman HONDA.

I know that before you became a Member of Congress, you had experience as a county supervisor, and I know that counties are often the fiscal agents for major programs, like our nutrition programs, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition programs. I understand that the stimulus funds that we are supplementing, some of these assistance programs—let me try to translate this into ordinary everyday language.

We are talking about food stamps. We are talking about people being able to buy food in order to have the basic necessity of eating. I don't know about your district, but in my district, I know that during the height of the recession, we saw people who were middle class families for the first time having to access these programs. As I say, we are still not fully out of this recession. It is a fragile recovery.

The other effect that these assistance programs had is that they serve as a kind of stimulus to the local economy. People on these assistance programs have to spend the money locally, at local supermarkets. It injects some stimulus effect on the local economies. My understanding is that, come November 1, we are going to see a significant reduction in those programs because we have not been attending to reauthorizing the legislation that funds these programs. We have grave doubt as to what is going to happen to the 47 million people who rely on SNAP.

Mr. HONDA. That is true.

Mr. TAKANO, as you know, I represent a majority of the area that is commonly called ''Silicon Valley.'' We were doing relatively well with the shutdown; however, government contracts, entrepreneurship are going to be affected, and that trickles down throughout the system, including what we call the ''supply chains,'' where other companies throughout this country, in other parts of the State are affected also. This is almost like an arithmetic kind of extension of this impact when—I guess Warren Buffett said it best, that it is a nuclear bomb, because it just continues to spread its impact throughout our country and our economy.

Mr. TAKANO. Isn't it true in Silicon Valley—let's kind of talk about that for a moment—there has been a resurgence of investment, that we are seeing our California budget sort of recovering with additional revenues because your area of the State is helping to lead the recovery?

There are two different subject matters here: the government shutdown, and also this issue of the debt ceiling being raised. We have seen on the Hong Kong markets the short-term debt or the premium that they are charging for this uncertainty about our debt ceiling being raised. In other words, interest rates are likely to raise. Raising capital is going to be a problem.

Do you have any thoughts on what that is going to be doing to our Silicon Valley entrepreneurs?

Mr. HONDA. It is a dampening effect. I think people are less likely to invest, even though there is a great faith in the kinds of activities we have in Silicon Valley. I think those who have the resources to make the investments, they are going to be looking at it twice before they can move forward. I think that they are very concerned about the government's behavior in terms of how we manufacture crisis around the debt limit, how we manufacture crisis about the CR or the budget. All we need is what we proposed a few months ago, and that is a good, balanced budget that would drive this country forward economically and logically.

No family functions without a good budget. What we are doing is we have created a budgetary crisis that guarantees—they have already done it—closure of the government or the dysfunction of a family. When you do that, all hell breaks loose. This is what is happening to our elders, our children, our preschools. There is not a system that has not been affected. The military, our veterans, they are all being affected. So we have to really make sure that the public understands what it is that is happening.

□ 1530

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I don't think we want to normalize or make routine a mode of governing where either party threatens to shut down the government because of a political end they want to achieve or either party decides that they want to threaten the full faith and credit of the United States and threaten the establishment of the American dollar as the world reserve currency because they want to achieve some sort of political end.

We need to give the American people—every business, every family, investors, whether they are domestic or whether they are international investors who want to invest in our economy, including in Silicon Valley, the certainty that we have a responsible government in the United States.

Whoever would have thought we would come to a place where within a year and a half, the last time that this issue came about was—I remember seeing you on August 1 of 2011 when the Budget Control Act of 2011 was passed. But it was linked, I think, unfortunately, to the debt ceiling raise. And the idea that we would normalize this practice, to me, is something that we don't want to see our Nation continue to do.

Mr. HONDA. Yes.

I just want to close by thanking you for this opportunity. The gentleman and I are both educators. And educators know one thing: how to ask a question and come to a logical conclusion. And the logical conclusion right now is that we should have never gotten to this point. We should have never gotten to a point where we shut down this government. We should have done the right thing to make sure that the full faith and credit of our country, like our reputation, is honored. So we need to get back to that point.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just go into my final remarks for this Special Order hour. And I want to remind the American people that the Democrats did offer a point of compromise when we accepted funding for the continuing resolution, which is actually below the PAUL RYAN budget figure. It is a number that the President agreed to, the Senate agreed to, and the House Democrats are willing to agree to. And we know that there was a deal that was brokered by the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader related to it, and we thought that the result would be a clean CR.

But what we cannot afford to do, what I cannot unconscionably do as the Representative for the 41st District, is to bargain away the Affordable Care Act. Twenty-four percent of my population of Riverside County is uninsured. My constituents need the Affordable Care Act to help them get the quality health care that they deserve.

The law includes important consumer protections that prevent insurance companies from denying coverage for people with preexisting conditions. It eliminates annual and lifetime caps on care and allows young people to stay on their parents' plans longer. In addition, the law requires insurance

plans to cover free preventative health services, and it lowers prescription drug costs for seniors by closing the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

So, America, my community's seniors have a lot at stake. The California State marketplace, Covered California, has already received 1 million unique site visits, more than 16,000 applications have been completed, and another 27,000 are partially completed. That is more than 43,000 Californians who have taken the step to get covered in just 10 days.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is all very simple. Congress has a handful of basic functions. Two of them are to keep the government open and to pay our bills on time. These things Congress should be doing already.

The situation we are in reminds me of when my brothers and I thought our parents should pay us an allowance for making our beds. My parents argued that making our beds was something that my brothers and I should be doing anyway, that an everyday responsibility like making our beds wasn't something that was done for a payoff.

What should I get for brushing my teeth? That is obviously a personal responsibility that I shouldn't get anything for. Refusing to fulfill a responsibility should not be leverage for getting something that you want.

The House Republicans are expecting to get something out of this. They are expecting to get something out of refusing to fulfill their basic responsibilities. They are expecting to get something out of refusing to fund the government and refusing to be faithful stewards of the full faith and credit of the United States. They are willing to threaten the American dollar and its status as the world's reserve currency.

There are several Members of this body who do not believe the chaos that would be created by not paying our bills on time. One Member said he believed it would ''bring stability to the markets.'' Others have said that it is a ''scare tactic'' being used by the administration and Democrats. They say this despite every credible economist stating that America defaulting on its debts would be catastrophic.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, imagine if Democrats were this cavalier about an issue as serious as the debt ceiling. We would be run out of town, and for good reason.

I thank my colleagues for joining me today. Let's end this shutdown. Let's end this shutdown, Mr. Speaker. Let's make sure we pay our bills and pay them on time. And let's give the American people the certainty that they need and that they deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have spent my career in San Diego, Sacramento, and DC working with all of my colleagues—no matter the party—to get things done for my constituents in San Diego.

But now sadly, I stand on this floor and watch what I consider to be the greatest show of political dysfunction I have seen during my time in public service.

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak of winning, of putting points on the board. Winning? Mr. Speaker, there is no winning to be had here.

But, I can tell you who is losing—hard working American families, my constituents in San Diego, and the great state of California.

Every day that this shutdown continues more of my friends and neighbors are harmed.

My city of San Diego loses $7 million a week every week that this continues. $7 million. Imagine the investments in our schools, roads, and small businesses that we could be making with that money.

Jobless claims are surging as the many San Diegan contracting businesses are forced to lay off their workers.

Small businesses in San Diego are finding it difficult to sustain their operations, as they lose thousands in stalled federal small business loans and grants.

The many veterans who live in San Diego are finding their hard-earned and well-deserved benefits delayed.

And now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk of negotiating?

The Senate passed a budget in March—in March. For months and months, I have joined with my Democratic colleagues requesting that the House appoint conferees to negotiate a compromise. Nothing. No willingness to open up a dialogue, to negotiate. Nothing.

Now, the government is shut down, and my friends and neighbors in San Diego are suffering. We can fix that right now. We can take a vote to reopen the government right now.

Then we can get together and talk like adults about our differences on the budget—and not use my friends and neighbors as leverage to score points in a game that no one will win. This isn't a game, this is lunacy.

FARM BILL OF 2013

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today as a Central Valley farmer, a friend of farmers, an agricultural employer and an agricultural worker, and the Representative of a community that is dependent upon agriculture for its livelihood.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I understand the specialized needs of various sectors of our ag economy across the country. My priorities for this farm bill are:

First and foremost, providing a 5-year certainty for farmers while saving taxpayers dollars by eliminating direct payments and reforming nutrition programs for the first time since 1996.

Second, we need to support innovative research and development on specialty crops, a major export for our region and our country as a whole.

Third, we must support programs and increase exports and take advantage of all of the new trade agreements we have strengthened and established in the past years and prepare for those markets which are beginning to open to our ag products.

Fourth, we must also protect domestic produce and farms from pests and diseases that primarily come from other countries.

And fifth and finally, it is imperative that we uphold a State's right to protect its own agriculture industry by passing laws related to safety and agricultural production.

It is time to conference on the farm bill and work with our Senate counterparts to produce a final product that will maintain a safety net for those most in need and give American growers and producers a competitive and productive global edge while saving taxpayers money.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from California, my friend and colleague and a strong advocate for agriculture in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not like being dependent on foreign oil, and Americans sure don't want to become dependent on foreign food. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of passing a farm bill.

In my home State of Georgia, agriculture plays a major role in the overall success of our State. Last year, Georgia agriculture was valued at over $14 billion, and the total economic contribution to Georgia was $72 billion. This contribution makes up approximately 10 percent of our gross domestic product and 360,000 jobs. In my district, one of every eight jobs is tied to agriculture.

As a major economic driver of our State, the agricultural industry has suffered without the certainty of a farm bill. Over the past several months, our farmers have had to deal with this uncertainty within the industry because Washington has not been able to agree on a farm bill.

Many of my constituents are left in limbo, trying to decide what to do next year with regard to their crops, wondering if there will be crop insurance or the other things that they depend on for their farm operations and their livelihoods. That is why it is critical to provide the certainty of a farm bill, to boost our economy and help our farmers and our farm families succeed and create jobs.

The farm bill we passed in the House saves taxpayers over $20 billion. I want to reiterate that, Mr. Speaker—over $20 billion and it makes real progress in tackling the drivers of our debt. It consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the USDA and improves agricultural programs to be more cost effective and market oriented by repealing outdated and unworkable permanent law.

I ask my colleagues to join me so we can move to conference and sign a new farm bill into law in order to provide certainty for our country and America's farmers.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I now yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, whenever I drive across Montana, I see signs of our State's strong ag heritage in about every turn in the road. From the fields of sugar beets and wheat to grazing cattle and sheep, these are visual reminders of the importance of agriculture to our State and everywhere across this country.

Agriculture is the backbone of Montana's economy. And as a fifth-generation Montanan, I have a deep appreciation for the value of this industry to our State. Agriculture injects several billion dollars into Montana's economy every year, and one in five Montana jobs rely on agriculture.

But agriculture is more than the economic driver of our State. It is a way of life for thousands of Montana families who have lived off the land for generations. My own great, great grandmother came to Montana as a homesteader. In fact, she homesteaded up in the Golden Triangle of Montana, north of Great Falls, in the heart of Montana's wheat country.

I know how important it is to ensure that young Montanans have the opportunity to continue working on family farms and family ranches. And that is why Montanans are so frustrated and I am so frustrated by Washington's persistent failure to pass a long-term farm bill that provides Montana's producers with the certainty they need and deserve.

Montanans are sick and tired of the political games that have long delayed the passage of a 5-year farm bill. This critical legislation is long overdue, and it is unacceptable that Congress continues to stand in the way of providing our ag producers and rural communities with a long-term solution.

Agriculture is not only an important part of Montana's economy, but it is a critical industry that impacts each and every American. And as Montana's sole voice in the U.S. House of Representatives, I am committed to being an advocate for Montana's farmers and ranchers. We can't wait any longer. We need a farm bill now.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

I now recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

Over the last 4 years and after more than 40 hearings, the House of Representatives has produced a bill that implements needed commonsense reforms for America's farmers.

The FARRM Act is like any other farm bill previously passed. It has strong bipartisan support and makes substantial reforms, repealing outdated policies while streamlining and consolidating over 100 programs.

□ 1545

Advancing a new farm bill into law this year is crucial to the entire country, especially to those in California's Central Valley.

The legislation makes critical reforms to traditional farm programs. The Market Access Program, MAP, will improve export market development and assistance to programs that promote U.S. agricultural products overseas, allowing our specialty crop farmers here in the Valley to expand their businesses.

We eliminate direct payments. We move to a more market-oriented approach where we provide more risk management tools, instead of making payments regardless of market conditions. Many farmers in my district have questioned these economically unfeasible $5 billion payments that go out every year, regardless of market conditions.

The bill makes improvements to the crop insurance program through successful public-private partnerships that ensure farmers have skin in the game. This will eliminate some of the unrealistic requirements that crop insurance agents face every day, such as asking an agent to verify his or her customers' income.

The legislation relieves farmers of unnecessary burdens by including multiple regulator relief provisions. FARRM eliminates the duplicative permitting requirements for pesticides that are already federally regulated. Failure to remove the additional permit requirement will result in an administrative and financial nightmare for agriculture producers, public health agencies, and Federal Government and State agencies.

The FARRM bill makes even more important changes that substantially affect California's 21st Congressional District:

Reauthorizes, strengthens, and fully pays for livestock disaster assistance;

Continues to support specialty crops, just as the 2008 farm bill did, by fully funding core specialty crop industry priorities such as Specialty Crop Block Grants. These grants will fund innovative research for my district's fruit, vegetable, and nut farmers to combat disease and promote consumption across the U.S., and that is important for food security. A nation has to be secure in its food.

The FARRM Act of 2013 will implement the most significant reforms to traditional farm policy in history, while maintaining commonsense, fiscally responsible policies. Passage of this legislation will provide America's farmers and ranchers, especially those in the Central Valley, the certainty and resources they need to produce an adequate and affordable food supply for our country and the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this much-needed legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

PASS THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and thank you to my colleagues who have joined me here today to talk about an important piece of legislation that seemingly has gone by the wayside, like many, many other important issues, because of the dysfunction of Washington right now: a farm bill.

Many here in America don't realize that our current farm bill has expired. But we have an opportunity to pass a food, nutrition, and jobs bill that Congress is supposed to authorize every 5 years. But since it expired on September 30, the good news, though, is that there is still an opportunity to get this 5-year farm bill passed; and when we do, we are going to be able to give our farmers and producers the tools they need to do what they do best. We can do this before next planting season.

Why do we need a farm bill? To promote and grow our economy, to provide certainty to our farmers and producers, and to give them the tools they need to succeed.

For example, crop insurance. Mr. Speaker, crop insurance is working. I even had the opportunity to talk to Secretary Vilsack in one of the hearings on our Ag Committee, and he agreed with me that crop insurance is working. This farm bill strengthens crop insurance, which strengthens our economy, because it strengthens agriculture.

Ag is one of the bright spots in our Nation's economy right now, Mr. Speaker. That should not be forgotten, which is why it is crucial that we pass this farm bill.

We have other policies within that bill that are very crucial to my district and many districts throughout this Nation: conservation, ag research, and trade.

As we stand on the floor today, many of the farmers I represent are out in the field. Mr. Speaker, it is harvest time. That is why we are down here today: to let our producers know we have not forgotten and that we are still fighting for that 5-year farm bill.

Farmers used to just have to worry about the uncertainty of the weather. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have to worry about the uncertainty of Washington. That is unfortunate, but it is something that we can correct when we work together.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to govern. I sought a seat on the Ag Committee because I knew we would have an opportunity to leave our mark on this jobs legislation. We want to get this job done so that our farmers can continue to get their job done.

I appreciate the many colleagues who have already spoken before me and the rest who are down here today for this

farm bill Special Order, as well as many others who have helped move the farm bill forward. And before recognizing my colleagues so that they may share with those watching why we must advance a new farm bill, I want to talk about why the farm bill is important to the district that I represent.

In central and southwestern Illinois, agriculture is key to our local economy. It is 14 counties in central and southwestern Illinois that I am proud to serve here in Congress on their behalf, and it is home to some of the most productive and costly farmland in America.

It is also home to many in the agribusiness sector: ADM, the University of Illinois. My district is home to the largest gathering of ag producers and agricultural-related products in the country.

This is the Farm Progress Show that was just completed in Decatur, Illinois, in July, a whopping success. Sloan Implement is in the 13th District of Illinois. GSI, another global leader, one of the largest employers in my district, and it happens to be the largest employer in my home county of Christian County. Kraft Foods in Champaign, Illinois. The National Corn-to-Ethanol Research Center in Edwardsville, at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, also plays a crucial role for jobs, innovation, and energy independence in our area. These are just some of the reasons that Congress needs to keep working together to advance a 5-year farm bill.

And let's not forget, again, what a bright spot agriculture has been on our Nation's economy. Every $1 billion in ag exports supports nearly 8,000 American jobs. Earlier this year, the USDA, they projected $139.5 billion in ag exports. That is more than 1.1 million jobs supported by American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), my good friend and my colleague.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank my colleague from Illinois for allowing me to speak here today, and I want to thank you for hosting this Special Order hour in general.

Mr. Speaker, although we speak today at a time when Members are very busy working to resolve the government shutdown, it is critical to remember that, while the government may have stopped, the work of our farmers certainly has not. Farmers in each of our districts, whether they are busy picking apples or harvesting fields of corn, are busy at this time of the year; there is no doubt about it. Autumn is the time that farmers in our districts normally look forward to. That is when they have the chance to reap the bounty of the great work that they have done this past year planting and tending to the land.

Our farmers, producers, and agribusiness owners deserve better. They have put in the hard work. They are feeding not only Michigan's families, but America's families and much of the world. We owe them certainty. We owe them a farm bill.

As the only Member from Michigan on the Agriculture Committee, I regularly speak with farmers, not only from my district, but from around the State. Over the last year, they have continually expressed the need for certainty. While they have different ideas on some specific provisions of the overall farm bill, they all agree that we need to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard with my colleagues to move the farm bill forward. I have worked with many local stakeholders in Michigan to ensure that their concerns are addressed in the bill. Now is the time to move forward to a conference.

This afternoon, I come to the floor to say, simply, let's get this done. Let's go to conference, work out our differences, and get a farm bill done. We owe it to our farmers. We owe it to the hardworking families around the country that rely on the food that our farmers produce.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the farmers of northern Michigan for the outstanding work that they have done this season. Now let's get this farm bill done.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague, Mr. BENISHEK.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for again allowing us this opportunity to talk about how important ag is going to be in our economy.

Let's talk about how important this farm bill is to get passed and how we are not that far apart when it comes to the differences in the funding levels with the Senate bill that should be conferenced. And let us not also forget—let us not forget that agriculture isn't just important to the Midwest. It is also important to States like Michigan, where my colleague who just spoke was from. We have heard from individuals from California, from Georgia, from Montana. Ag is a nationwide issue, and we have seen nationwide success in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. YODER. I appreciate my friend from Illinois for putting together this hour for us to be able to come down and have a conversation about how we protect the American farmer.

For months and months now, we have been having a debate in the United States House and Senate about how we can put together legislation that will ensure that the men and women who bring in the crops, who tend to the livestock, who create the food source for our Nation and the world have certain policies that are predictable and that encourage farming as a way of life to continue in the United States.

So I join my colleagues here, those from down in southern Illinois to—we just heard from my colleague, DAN BENISHEK from Michigan, who believes passionately in agriculture and protecting farmers. We are here together today united, standing on behalf of the farmers in our country.

So I call on my colleagues to help us get a farm bill done. Farmers have been waiting a long time for Congress to work together to find a solution. We are obviously divided on a lot of things, but we ought to be united on helping protect the American farmer and our American food supply.

In Kansas, farming is not just a means to make money, and certainly, it is a significant part of the Kansas economy. Along with several other parts, farming and agriculture is a key component of the Kansas economy. But it is also a way for Kansans and Americans to put food on the table for the world. Kansas is the number one wheat producer in the country, wheat that ends up feeding hungry Kansans, hungry Americans in all 50 States, and on most continents. They put in long, hard hours to bring in millions of bushels of grain, grain that will end up on the tables of the entire Nation and the entire world.

But it is also a way of life. Now farmers at home right now—I just spoke with a farmer earlier today. Farmers are bringing in—they are harvesting their soybeans. Some are still picking corn.

For generations, people have come to States like Kansas and Illinois and California and Michigan, and they have come to build a way of life. They have taken, in the case of Kansas, a prairie—it was undeveloped—and they came out there, and they brought their families and they took risk, much risk to carve a lifestyle out of the prairie. And through that hard work, through that determination, through that sweat off their brow, they tamed the wilderness and, in the process, they helped build the greatest nation the world has ever seen. And along the way, they asked for little in return. They built a nation with great bedrock values, good schools, good communities. It was all centered around the small family farmer.

So that is one of the things we are down here to protect and to talk about is continuing that American tradition of the small family farmer. And so they have worked hard. They work long days, sunup to sundown. Sometimes farmers will work through the night, 24-hour shifts even, to bring in the crops when the time has come.

I grew up on a farm myself. I remember going out, my dad going out in the middle of the winter and bringing a round bale to our cattle and ensuring that the livestock could have feed. And that meat that they produced, we produced and farmers produce all across the country, that ends up taking care of Americans everywhere.

So now those farmers, they are counting on us. When they plant their fall crops, they need predictability and

they need certainty. It is time to move past short-term bills. It is time to move past short-term promises. We need to move towards long-term policies that will create stability, that will allow farmers to plant, allow farmers to go back to doing what they do best: growing food, feeding a hungry Nation.

This fall, Kansas farmers are hard at work bringing in the autumn harvest, and they are planting the 2014 crop. They have patiently waited for Congress to act on a farm bill. Now is the time to move forward.

The farm bill provides farmers with crucial safety net programs that allow them to protect their operations from uncertainty and the sudden downturns that can occur when growing crops and raising livestock. These programs are essential in providing farmers with the certainty they need to be successful.

So as we have this larger debate about how to solve the debt crisis, I think farmers have been admirable in this debate. Farmers came forward and said, Look, you know, we receive direct payments. We know that is a burden on the Treasury. We know there are a lot of burdens on the Treasury. We hope that we can all pitch in to help solve our national debt crisis. We are going to voluntarily, we are going to give those things up.

And every other group that comes before Washington, most groups give up nothing. They want more. In fact, in Washington, when you don't get more than you got last year, it is a cut.

Farmers said, We are willing to take a cut. We are willing to take billions of dollars of cuts because we want to do our part to ensure that we are helping resolve the national debt crisis.

□ 1600

So they were first in line to give up support, and some of that support was very crucial to farms and has been crucial to farmers to keep them from ending up in bankruptcy or farms from going under. They are giving that up. No more direct payments. Those are the kinds of reforms we need to do.

Now, what they have asked for in return is a little protection of risk. The expense today to put out a field of crops like corn, soybeans, milo, or wheat, in Kansas, creates a tremendous amount of risk—risk that banks won't cover unless there is some sort of protection in the event of a flood, hailstorm, or a drought, and sometimes all of the above. You can wipe out a single crop overnight.

These farmers have invested their entire livelihood. They don't have a 401(k). They don't have a pension. They don't have some corporate plan to protect their retirement. Their future is in the crop they're laying out in that field, and the proceeds from that crop are going to go to investing in the next crop. And so if that crop goes under and there is no crop insurance, there is no protection for those farmers, then those farmers go under, they go bankrupt, and that way of life ends.

And so my heart goes out to those farmers that that may happen to, but it is a larger issue than just the farmers. Without crop insurance, without that protection, those farmers lose those farms and that means we don't have a food supply that we can count on. That means that the world doesn't have the food that they need to feed the hungry. I know most people get food from the grocery store these days, but it comes from the fields of Kansas and Illinois and places in between.

So it is my hope that Democrats, Republicans, House, Senate, and the President will work together in the coming days to put a farm bill on the floor that we can all get behind that can go to the President's desk and receive his signature. We've got a lot of divisions, but we would be united today—all of us—in protection, in fighting for the American farmer.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My colleague, Mr. YODER from Kansas, brought up so many great points of why it is crucial to have this debate here on the floor of the House.

It seems as though farmers get a bad rap. There is a lot of talk on this floor about growing our economy; and, frankly, ag has been a bright spot in our economy, Mr. Speaker. It is just like Washington. Because of inaction of—a lot of times, Republicans and Democrats—we are not able to continue to allow them to grow their portion of the economy. It just seems like the right hand works against the left sometimes here in Washington. I just want to see us put some good Midwestern common sense that many of us learned right on the family farms in the Midwest, right here to work and into action in Washington, D.C.

Speaking of common sense, I want to introduce my good friend, my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I couldn't agree more. I would like to see a little farm-country sense brought to Washington. I think if that were leading the charge on a lot of fronts, we could resolve some of these issues we have been facing pretty quickly.

I am real proud, Mr. Speaker, to be here to talk about agriculture. When I was first elected in 2008, sworn in in 2009, one of my first picks that I asked for on committee assignments was Agriculture. Today, I'm proud to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee for Conservation, Energy, and Forestry on the Agriculture Committee.

I am proud to be from the Keystone State. I had a number of colleagues at that point in 2009 ask me why would I ever be on Agriculture when I am from Pennsylvania. The fact is, it is our number one industry in Pennsylvania. We have many commodities. We are one of the top providers and producers for the United States—and sometimes other parts of the world—in terms of our commodities that we raise and we grow. We can't speak enough about the importance of this farm bill.

There are a lot of reasons why we all, every colleague in this Chamber, should be supporting the farm bill. I have to say that there are fewer than, I believe, 100 of our congressional districts, out of 435, where we actually grow and raise the food to feed this Nation and much of the world. But the fact is every district has Americans that shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day every time they pick up a fork.

And so one of the principles that guides me, Mr. Speaker, in terms of my decisionmaking on any issue, I call it principle-based leadership. I always start and try to define what my principles are first. By the way, we have been working on this for 4½ years, actually. I remember having hearings. I was in the minority my first 2 years, and we had hearings. The first hearing was in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, specifically on the dairy title.

But the principles that have guided me since day one here in terms of agriculture is that America should always be the place where we have the most affordable, highest quality, and safest food supply anywhere in the world. So every decision I have made in supporting the development, the writing, and actually the passing of this farm bill has been to honor those three principles.

In addition to that, my good friend from Michigan talked about the importance of food security, and I agree with that. It's the biggest threat to our national security. And there are a lot of them out there, Mr. Speaker. I have got two kids that just got back from Afghanistan. I understand terrorist threats and threats to our financial situation, but the most imminent threat to our national security would be at whatever point we would begin to rely on another country for our food supply. This farm bill is the single most important piece of Federal legislation to make sure America has the most affordable, highest quality, and safest food supply.

There are a lot of things that this bill does. It repeals and consolidates more than 100 programs. This is a great example for the rest of government. This is exactly step one on how we begin to reduce our spending appropriately—looking at things that either don't work, things that are duplicative, things that are just not fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed.

It eliminates direct payments, which farmers receive regardless of market conditions.

I am not sure I would have supported past farm bills, to tell you the truth, that were passed before I came here; but I support this one because the reforms we have brought to the agriculture side and the nutrition side are very good. They are very good for the sustainability of our food supply and programs such as our SNAP program.

It streamlines and reforms commodity policy. We are also giving producers a choice in how to best manage

risk. It includes the first reforms to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996.

Why is that important? Because the reforms we put in place, it preserves the future integrity of the food stamp program so that those in the future who need those programs, those men, women, and children who find themselves in poverty circumstances where they need that assistance, they will get it, if we protect the integrity of that program. It is only through these reforms that we are putting into place that we offer those protections so we will be assured that the food stamp program continues into the future to meet the needs of those who need.

It consolidates 23 conservation programs into 13, improves program delivery to producers, and saves more than $6 billion. That's an area of the farm title that I chair. The subcommittee has jurisdiction on conservation.

There are at least four reasons I can think of why that move is extremely important. Number one is cost. This country is facing significant debt, and so we have to be conscious and careful with our spending. We knew that the farm bill—the pie itself—would be smaller. So I think that is just one of the realities.

Second is the need. We are a country that feeds not just 311 million Americans, but we are feeding a lot of the rest of the world. And to allow land to sit idle under the context of some government-funded conservation program is just wrong. We don't want people to go hungry, and so putting more land that is appropriate back into productivity is a very appropriate thing to do; and we do that with this farm bill.

Third is effectiveness. The fact is that under the existing conservation programs, before the reforms we proposed, we have had perfectly sound, tillable, very productive land sitting idle and sitting fallow and receiving some type of government support under a conservation program to do that.

I have met young individuals I am very impressed with that want to go into farming that have never been in farming before. Some have been in farming, but they can't afford to go out and purchase acreage; and so they have to rent acreage. And they are competing under the existing conservation programs with the government; and in competing with the government, they can't do that. They just can't pay that.

All the parts of this farm bill have been well thought out and well prepared. I am very appreciative of the work that has been done on the part of land grant universities, the fact that we are strengthening the role of science and technology when it comes to agriculture. A lot of people talk about STEM—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. I like to talk about how agriculture is all about science and technology.

And I shout out to my own alma mater, Penn State University, which is a land grant university. Those universities help us advance that science and innovation and that technology.

I will finally talk briefly about we have probably one of the best forestry titles that we have ever had in this farm bill in maybe a hundred years. We've got great things in there in terms of making sure that timber is recognized and eligible for that biopreferred labeling.

Today, of all things, the original renewable resource of wood has never been eligible. You could buy a box of bamboo flooring—we don't grow bamboo in this country—and it has got a USDA stamp of approval, biopreferred. But if you buy a box of good hardwood cherry from the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, it is not eligible. That changes in this farm bill that we passed out of the House and we are going to go to conference with the Senate on.

The categorical exclusion allows the Forest Service not to have to waste money during these NEPA analyses every time they do trail maintenance or clear power lines or just routine things that take money away from actively managing a forest in a healthy way.

Finally, the forest access road was a great amendment which basically reinforces that our forests are non-point sources of pollution. That goes a long way in terms of allowing our forests to be managed under State-adopted best practices.

And so I want to thank the gentleman for coordinating this Special Order on a subject that every American should be fully in tune to because of how important it is to have affordable, high-quality, and safe food. That is what our farm bill does.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to address something that my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) brought up. He talked about research. Research in agriculture is crucial to our ability here in America to continue to feed the world. We feed the world from America's farms, and it is under-appreciated and taken for granted.

Part of this farm bill is a research title, where the Agricultural and Food Research Initiative through the National Institute for Food and Agriculture was reauthorized.

Other ways we strengthen and promoted ag research in this bill are doing things like providing new research funding for specialty crops, beginning farmers, and organic agriculture. We have improved accountability and transparency of the ag research programs, and we have harmonized policies under the various competitive grants programs to improve program efficiency and reduce wasteful spending.

Many of my colleagues are talking about ag leading the way in reducing spending here in Washington. Our farmers need to be congratulated for that.

The University of Illinois, in my district—another land grant institution—uses many of these public research programs. Our students are being trained on how to make our food supply safer and better; and through AFRI, the University of Illinois has conducted cutting-edge research aimed at improving food security, achieving more efficient crop production, and promoting animal health through livestock genome sequencing.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, the Southern Illinois University Corn-to-Ethanol Research Center. This is an example of a public-private partnership that is working, where public funds were used in its initial construction; but private entities are doing cutting-edge research to make our Nation's fuel supply cheaper and make our Nation's security better.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I want to thank my colleague and friend from Illinois, Congressman DAVIS, for his incredible leadership on this issue. I know of nobody in Congress who is working harder for the American family farmer than Congressman DAVIS. This Special Order today is just one more example of your leadership.

Farming is hard work, and it is vital to Indiana. Ag industries contribute almost $38 billion a year to the Hoosier economy, supporting nearly 190,000 jobs. The farmers who provide these jobs work from dawn until way past dusk and face great risks when withering droughts or excess rains threaten to wreck their crops.

Despite these challenges, Hoosier farmers manage to overcome adversity, succeed in their businesses, and feed the world. Too often, their work is made even harder because of uncertainties and inefficiencies in Federal farm policy.

□ 1615

The problems with Federal farm laws are many:

Price supports inflate the prices of some consumer goods; payments are made to people not actually farming; outdated and duplicative programs waste money that could be put to better use; rules regarding disaster assistance are too complicated; and they fail to provide enough certainty about whether and what return farmers will receive when they reinvest any profits in their family business.

Many are surprised that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, commonly called ''food stamps,'' is administered by the Department of Agriculture, the USDA. Most agree the program is not well managed. It pays too many people who should not be eligible for help, diverting help from those who really need the assistance. There aren't enough incentives to encourage people to find work, and there is too much waste, fraud, and abuse.

That's why we need a farm bill.

The farm bill which passed the House is not perfect, but it would save $40 billion over the next decade, in part, by repealing or consolidating more than 100 programs that don't work, could work better, or are duplicative in purpose. The bill would stop the nonsense policy of paying people not to farm. Instead, it would give farmers greater flexibility to utilize federally backed crop insurance to manage risk. It also would require food stamp recipients to work more, get drug tested, and become self-sufficient.

American icon Paul Harvey once said:

> And, on the eighth day, God looked down on his planned paradise and said, ''I need a caretaker,'' and so God made the farmer.

Others have spoken about how important it is that we stand up and be a champion for those who farm. A defeat of the farm bill maintains the status quo. We need a conference, and we need a farm bill. A defeat would hurt farmers and taxpayers, but both need the certainty of knowing that farm and nutrition assistance programs work as they should so scarce taxpayer resources aren't wasted on food stamp fraud or on programs that just don't work.

We need commonsense farm reform policy to prevent waste and to make sure the next generation of farmers gets its chance to run the family farm.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague, Congressman LUKE MESSER, a true leader on so many issues here in Congress and for the Midwest. Thank you for being here today to talk about how important agriculture is to our economy.

I know much has been brought up about crop insurance. Some who don't represent agricultural districts think crop insurance is a program that is wasteful, that it is welfare for farmers. Let me remind everyone, Mr. Speaker, that before we had the crop insurance program, farmers didn't have to have skin in the game. They have to pay premiums just like we have to do for life insurance, auto insurance and other types of insurance. This is what makes America work. This is why crop insurance is working.

Before this program, we would have supplemental, ad hoc disaster assistance, and Members of Congress who served before many of us would come to this floor and pass bills to fund disaster assistance. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that those weren't budgeted. At a time when decisions were made to basically put the financial future of our country in jeopardy decades before now, they were still passing disaster assistance bills that cost taxpayers billions. Crop insurance changed that. Farmers have skin in the game. They pay their premiums, and it stops us—it stops Congress right now—from spending beyond its means.

It has been said before that this farm bill is an example of how Washington begins to work once again. We are looking toward our financial future, and we are looking to balance our budget through bills like this farm bill. We are going to begin to put a down payment on the unsustainable $17 trillion of debt that your kids, Mr. Speaker, and my kids shouldn't have to pay.

With that, I yield to my friend from my birthplace State, the great State of Iowa. He is my good friend and colleague and a leader in ag policy, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for organizing this Special Order here today and for committing one hour of floor time to the discussion of the farm bill and the need to get one passed.

Mr. Speaker, we don't get very many debates on agriculture here in the House of Representatives, and fewer and fewer people actually represent agriculture districts. There has been not so much a migration of people from the farms, although that has happened, but a concentration of people in the cities, and they lose track of where their food comes from and what it takes to produce that food.

So we are here at this point, and I want to start off with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois with regard to crop insurance. I am going to pull these numbers from memory, and anyone can go back and check them, but they're going to be conceptually accurate and, perhaps, even precisely right.

If my memory serves me, back during some of those years when it couldn't rain—and that existed back in the eighties—it seems to me that, in 1988, we had 13 percent of the producers who actually had crop insurance. Since that time—from that time forward until this modern era—there were disaster payments after disaster payments. For any place that had a drought, for any place that had a flood, there was a discussion in Congress, and sometimes those disaster areas got rolled up together. Let's take a disaster out West and add that to a disaster in the Midwest and add that to a disaster in the South, and there might be a flood and two droughts packaged together with a disaster payment to bail people out.

I remember, when I first came here in 2003, there was a drought out West in Nebraska. And was there going to be disaster money? We looked at that, and we looked at aerial photos. Gee, it looked like here were these really beautiful, green circles from the air, and they were going to be in areas that got disaster payments. You all know what those are if you come from farm country. Those were the pivot irrigation systems. You're not going to have a drought if your irrigation system is running, but in the corners where they didn't have the boom to lay down and irrigate the corners, they were burned out. They said, Gee, we ought to get a disaster for the corner of our 160—the four corners of it—even though we've got a good crop, 200 bushels of corn, underneath the pivot system.

Those kinds of things were discussed here in this Congress, and I want to thank the Representative from Nebraska, Tom Osborne, who also was a pretty good football coach, for saying, This isn't right, and let's get that part correct.

We don't have those discussions anymore because, back in '88, there was the 13 percent who had crop insurance. It's back up to the point now where, I believe, the number is 88 percent due. We suffered through the worst flood in my lifetime in 2011 when the Missouri River ran hill to hill from mid-June until mid-September and flooded out, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, 500,000 acres. 500,000 acres were under water. Of course, all of that was a complete wipeout. You could fly over it, and you could see corn. As we say, you could row corn that was in 3 feet of water and corn that was about a foot and a half tall when it got covered by the flood. We didn't have a disaster payment for that because the crop insurance covered the flood out. In the following year of 2012, there was an epic drought. It was the same situation in that the crop insurance covered it.

In many of these States—and let's start out with my State, which I know—the premium reflects the risk. Now, it shifts from State to State and history to history, but it's hard to do that calculation. You can't do a snapshot of 1 year because, of course, 1 year might be a drought year, and the next year might be a flood year, and the next 25 years might be excellent, and I hope they are. So, if you look over a span of time—a decade is a minimum, and maybe a generation is a better way to look at this—and are able to frame the kind of experience we have with weather, the premium needs to be moved in a direction in which it better reflects the risk, but it has been a very good thing, the crop insurance piece of this.

Then, as I look at this farm bill, I want to remind the people, Mr. Speaker, that, for years, there have been direct payments, direct payments that went in to the producer who signed up per acre—roughly, a $20 per acre payment might be reflective of that era—and we saw this: we saw commodities prices going up, and we saw profitability in agriculture. When that happened, our producers came to us, people like the Farm Bureau, the Corn Growers, the Soybean Association, and they said the time comes when we need to just let go of these direct payments. They came forward and said, Here. Will you take my direct payments? I don't need them.

Hats off to anybody who has got Federal dollars coming into their operations. They gave up direct payments willingly. That's in this bill. It's in this bill, and it makes it permanent, putting an end to direct payments. By the way, in the last farm bill—the 2008 farm bill, it turned out to be—I tried to rename the direct payments then as

the ''conservation compliance payments'' because that's what they actually were. If they existed, I would say ''they are.'' It's a way to say to producers that all of us are invested in the future productivity of our soil. We are going to ask you to be good stewards of the soil, and this is, actually, in many cases, a token incentive that you do that. So that's going by the wayside.

This bill also eliminates several existing programs and rolls into two separate programs a shallow loss and a deep loss program that, I think, is a prudent use of the resources. We also said we are going to cut money out of this ag side, not just the direct payments, but we have dialed this thing down to the tune of $20 billion. There are $20 billion in cuts out of this bill on the agriculture side.

To draw a comparison, Mr. Speaker, one could think of the other part of this farm bill that is not much discussed—I don't know today—which is the jurisdiction of the subcommittee that I chair, the Nutrition Subcommittee. Now, the numbers were that about 78 percent of the previous farm bill went to nutrition and a little better than 20 percent went to agriculture and then some miscellaneous along the way. So we just rounded it. For easy talking purposes, it is 80 percent to SNAP—food stamps—nutrition programs and 20 percent to farmers. We call it the ''farm bill,'' but it is 4 to 1 nutrition. When I came to this town, there were 19 million people who were on food stamps, and we called them ''food stamps'' then. By the time Barack Obama became President, that number was about 28 million people who were on food stamps, and now that number is north of 47 million people—on its way to 48 million people—who are on food stamps. Now, it is partly because this administration believes and has said openly—in fact, I will just quote our Secretary of Agriculture:

> For every dollar that you hand out in SNAP benefits—that would mean food stamps, Mr. Speaker—you get $1.84 in economic activity.

I've heard STENY HOYER, the minority whip, say to us:

> The best stimulation that you can get—the quickest you can get in your economy—is food stamps and unemployment checks.

Now, that's an economic development plan for you, isn't it, Mr. Speaker, if you could just hand out more food stamps and hand out more unemployment checks? That's the best bump you can get to grow your economy? What kind of a country are we if they think that's what is going to drive our economy?

People on that side of the aisle resisted their reduction in the food stamp program, and we brought categorical changes into it. So, as it has grown into an over $800 billion program—that's over 10 years, roughly, a number that approaches about $83 billion a year—we have gone from 19 million people a year on food stamps to 28 million people when Barack Obama became President, up now to nearly 48 million people on food stamps, with millions of dollars being spent by the USDA to advertise food stamps in order to get more people to sign up on food stamps—millions—and minions are going out there who are, actually, physically signing them up. That's what is going on.

We don't need to be expanding the dependency class in America. We need to expand the independency class in America, and we want to make sure that we get those resources to the people who need them. That's what this bill does. It changes the categorical eligibility in such a way that those who need those resources still have access to them.

One of those categorical eligibility changes has to do with, if a child qualifies for a free and reduced lunch, it isn't automatic that the family gets food stamps any longer under this bill. People on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, have used that to argue that we are going to kick 120,000 kids off of food stamps. It is not true. That is the most extreme example they can come up with to embellish a number to try to scare people off of the reform that we need. What it really means is, if that number is right, they have to go reapply in a legitimate way. If they are eligible, they are eligible, and they will still get their food stamps.

□ 1630

But they found a little sliver to make an argument that is not the objective vision on what is going on.

We see that EBT cards, the Electronic Benefits Transfer cards, have been used for tattoos. They have been used at the massage parlor. You can see the neon signs that say, ''We take EBT.'' That is just straight up. That is not talking about the 50 percent discount that is the going rate for cash that you can get for your EBT card.

We need to be responsible with the taxpayers' money. We need to move these reforms in place. We have seen our agriculture producers step up and say, I am going to give up my conservation compliance/direct payments. And we reform some of the programs. We keep the pieces in place that we need so that there is a predictability in agriculture.

Our producers need predictability. There is no guarantee when it comes to agriculture. You are taking a risk. But at least we can predict the Federal Government's policy. We need to give 5 years of policy guarantee for our agriculture producers.

We need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class that has been a political calculation on the part of the administration. Do the responsible thing for the taxpayers. And, by the way, slow down on this burden that is being heaped upon those children yet to be born called our national debt.

That is the picture. There is an urgency. Let's get this done.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership here.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question, absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. As chair of the nutrition jurisdiction, are the school lunch programs within title IV of the farm bill?

Mr. KING of Iowa. In response to the gentleman's question, no, school lunch programs are not.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. That was my reading. I have read the farm bill, yet I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about the changes to the reforms.

As I mentioned in my remarks, and you reaffirmed, we are trying to preserve this program for people who truly need it who meet the eligibility by filling out an application. But I guess I get confused when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle use rhetoric that they claim that somehow school lunches are impacted or the school breakfast program is impacted by our work on the farm bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would say that there are times when people that are in the political business will intentionally conflate terms and arguments because it suits their agenda rather than informs their constituents, Mr. Speaker. That is what I believe is happening here.

If anyone is looking for proof positive that the school lunch program is not part of title IV—any part of this farm bill—all they have to do is look at the record of the committee and they can see that this person right here, STEVE KING, offered no amendment to the school lunch program that would have prohibited the Secretary of Agriculture from rationing calories to our kids in the school lunch program.

I wish we had that language for us here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We would have an engaging debate.

In fact, a year and a half ago, if I have got my dates right, the First Lady had an idea that she wanted a Let's Move program to go. The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act was passed during a lame duck session in 2010 by the then Speaker of the House Speaker PELOSI. They passed the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. That gave no authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to ration calories to kids in the school lunch program, which is not part of this farm bill, but they did it anyway. Now we are starving kids in school. That ought to be something that outrages the other side. But they will not show any outrage because they defend the First Lady's Let's Move, which, by the way, is a critical service and it was not shut down in the shutdown.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I love the discussion about school nutrition programs. I have spoken to many superintendents in my district who used to run programs in their cafeterias where kids would eat the school lunches. Now those once profitable programs are not profitable anymore. Some school districts are opting out because of the stringent rules and requirements to reduce calories and serve food that kids won't eat.

Let me also, for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, state that we are missing an important part of any equation in tackling childhood obesity, and that is exercise. Illinois, my home State, is the only State in the Nation that requires physical education in K–12. Maybe we make that part of the debate, too.

As I wrap up this Special Order, I want to thank everyone, all of my colleagues, for coming down and talking about the importance of this 5-year farm bill. It cannot be said enough that farmers have decided on their own to help us save billions in your tax dollars. Twenty billion dollars is what the farmers of this country have given up in direct payments to really allow us to balance our budget and put a down payment on the national debt.

There are some other crucial aspects of this bill, Mr. Speaker, that we don't talk a lot about in the ag sector, but it is about the rules and the regulatory process.

I was happy to introduce an amendment that actually gives the Department of Agriculture a seat at the table when those at the EPA decide to come up with rules like maybe treating milk spills like oil spills from the *Exxon Valdez*.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you one question: Which one of those spills could be cleaned up with cats? You know the answer and I know the answer, but when they come up with crazy ideas like this, we believe that the United States Department of Agriculture also deserves a seat at the table to say—in a good, commonsense, Midwestern way, Hang on a second here. Let's think about this. That is why an amendment like that is crucial to a farm bill like this, because it is crazy ideas like that that cost our farmers their livelihoods in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is going to save taxpayers billions. It is reforming crucial agricultural programs. It is putting us on a path to certainty for America's agricultural future.

There are some in this body, Mr. Speaker, that believe we shouldn't be involved in ag policy in this country. Well, my response to them is: Do you want America to be a food exporter, like we are now, or do you want to import our food supply?

We know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. The answer—the solution to make sure that doesn't happen—is getting this bill through a quick conference committee, bringing it back to the floor of the House, and ensuring that all our family farmers and all those who rely upon the ag economy for their livelihood are put first.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I thank everyone who has been involved in this process—my staff, many interns that have worked for me to put this Special Order in place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Speaker for his courtesies and thank my friends on the other side of the aisle who engaged in an hour-long discussion that I am sure many of my colleagues were certainly interested in.

I want to congratulate the organization in my constituency, Catholic Charities. Catholic Charities in Houston is 70 years old and has a storied history of service.

I had the privilege of being inspired by a wonderful mass led by Cardinal DiNardo that catapulted that special day into the understanding of who we are in this country and how our service is guided by the principles of our faith. I remember that, in his words to the congregation, he offered these phrases: ''The just live by faith,'' ''even a little faith can do great things.'' He added, ''When you are acting in faith, you are serving.''

I think those are powerful words for all of us, whether we are Republicans or Democrats or other in our political beliefs. That is what we are sent here to do. We are really sent here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, to speak for the vulnerable, and to ensure that the United States of America remains an umbrella on a rainy day, for our country's principles are vested in a wonderful Constitution that says that we all are created equal, with a number of rights that allow us the pursuit of great things, such as liberty and health—if we interpret the term ''happiness'' to mean that we have a variety of rights, certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

So where we find ourselves on October 10, in the midst of this government shutdown, the 10th day, does not comport with the very principles of this Nation and our Constitution that says that we have organized to create a more perfect Union.

As I listened to my friends have a long discussion, they had some very vital points about the importance of the farm bill, a bill that we have not been able to bring to closure because the government is shut down. But even more importantly, we have not been able to put the phrases of ''just'' and ''acting by faith'' in the midst of that legislative initiative.

Our friends did not take note of the fact that $40 billion was cut out of food stamps. They didn't take note of that—$40 billion for people who are hungry. Forty-six million Americans live in poverty. They are poor, but they are Americans. They deserve equality. Sixteen million of those are children. But yet someone says it is the dependency group. Maybe the 47 percent. I say those are the next astronauts, captains in the military, Presidents of the United States, teachers, inventors, scientists who may need food stamps.

So I would like to talk this afternoon in the short period of time that I have in finding the truth, also recognizing the difficulties that we are now in with the government shutdown.

Let me pause for a moment and say that I know, as I speak, Republicans are meeting with the President. We met yesterday and the President made it very clear and was very strong on wanting to see America move forward, but was very strong on the fact that we needed to come together around a clean bill, a bill that could be put on the floor with 200-plus Democrats here in the House and a sturdy amount of Republicans. That is just.

We know that Republicans were invited, the whole Conference. Of course, they decided that they wanted a few to come and meet with the President. Of course, it is their choice. In a sense of humor, I say there is an IOU to my other Republican friends that didn't make it to the White House today.

But I hope the discussion doesn't center around leaving the government closed. I hope it doesn't center around a 6-week raising of the debt ceiling, though I am open to any way forward; but I would hope in my discussion you would see why that is faulty thinking.

I do want to thank my original cosponsors who joined me today to introduce this very important legislation, H. Res. 375, which now makes a statement that this House will never—I want to say it again, never—I want to say it again, never—tie a nongermane legislative issue to the running and opening of this government.

What does that mean? We will never do what we have done, which is to defund a law approved by both Houses of Congress, the President of the United States, and the United States Supreme Court—the Affordable Care Act—and hold up the government while we are fighting against it because we don't like it.

H.R. 375 is legislation to have this House go on record to ensure that we do not ever do that and tie the government's hands and void the services that are relevant to my constituent who, again, I will call in a few moments, who is a cancer patient coming out of a hospital and is fearful of losing her disability checks because of the government shutdown.

□ 1645

We are getting any number of phone calls on that matter.

So here is why I hope many of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will support H. Res. 375, which will put us back in regular order and do things in the right way.

My friends, I will acknowledge that all States are hurting, but let me first of all just cite for you the State of Texas, one of the largest States in the Union, and show the faces of those who are looking to go to Head Start, our children. This is what they are facing. This is all over America; 57,000 Head Start seats are lost because of the shutdown, because of the furlough, because of sequester. And now we continue down this road. Sequestration cuts are forcing Marlen Rosas to defer her preschool dreams for her 3-year-old Hector, who may be the next captain in the United States military, who may be the next pediatric surgeon, who may be the next outstanding professor of law, who may be the next wonderful teacher in an elementary school. But right now the Head Start program for 3–4 year olds in Houston is being cut by $5.34 million, 109 employees, 699 slots for children. This is in Texas. This is in Houston, not even in the entire State. This is what we get when we begin to think of the dependency crowd, and it is important that we understand the results of what is happening.

So I want to keep this particular poster in mind. I just want you to look at those faces and what is going on across America. We have got the government shutdown. We can't fix the sequester, which by the way, the Van Hollen Democratic budget is not only growth for jobs, but it also fixes the sequester. It gets people back to work. It is well known that we are losing jobs here, and 1 percent of the economy is going down because of sequester. We can't fix it because the government is shut down.

Now, if you want to know what is happening across America, $2.24 billion in Title 1 grants have been cut, and so our young people who attend high-poverty schools and who need to be able to have Title 1 grants to help them in education, Mr. Speaker, it is simply gone. And Title 1 funding at current levels does not merely reduce the level of services to our poorest and lowest-achieving students, but would likely cause the elimination of services to millions of students. The teachers know that. They know what is happening by losing $2.24 billion. So Hector and Ms. Rosas don't get Head Start. Then we take it beyond the pre-K to the K–12 and to our high school where we are looking for these young people to take their rightful place in society, and here we are cutting them again. I guess it is the dependency crowd.

These cuts come after the number of children living in poverty has grown from 16.3 percent, as I said earlier. So let me update it to 21.9 percent—losing opportunities for our children.

Here is a more tragic feature. For our special needs children because the government is shut down, we cannot fix the $1.73 billion that we have lost out of for helping our special needs children, the very children who need a stair step to help them climb up and to be all they can be. Some parent is out there feeling the pain of not having the services for their special needs child because the government is shut down, and we cannot get back to the business of appropriations, fixing the sequester.

Child care and development block grant, another problem where we are losing dollars, $142 million in real per capita dollars. To be able to say that we don't have child care, developmental block grants, I just want to refer you to my good friend, Hector, and his mother. These are the problems that we are facing because we have a shutdown of the government.

A good friend, the Speaker, is meeting with the President as we speak. He is entertaining the idea of a debt ceiling increase to pay our bills, the full faith and credit, to save us from a mortgage collapse, to save us from our interest rates on credit cards shooting through the roof, to hopefully start small business loans and young families trying to get mortgages on their homes or get a home. What a country if that happens. But, Mr. Speaker, they are suggesting that, in fact, we will not open the government. How is that possible? How is that possible?

I see my good friend here, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY DAVIS), who has been a champion on childhood development, on dealing with the special needs child, on dealing with assisting in developmental issues of children, dealing with rehabilitating families, giving a second chance to some of our individuals who have found a different path. As I do that, I want to remind my colleagues that we are not too far away from Veterans Day. And as of October 15, and this is probably happening around America, veterans cemeteries will reduce their staff and reduce their burials. This is the friend that we talk about over and over again. In fact, we have heard a constant refrain: Why are you giving me accolades and you are cutting my veteran service centers? You are not allowing homeless veterans to be placed or get job training, and here we are telling families that there will be a slow process in burying and honoring your loved one because of the government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, let us unlock these doors and let the workers work. I have heard from them personally. They want to get back to work.

I now yield to DANNY DAVIS from Illinois, who served on the Ways and Means Committee, served on the Education Committee, and we have co-chaired a number of summits or seminars and sessions, brain trusts on the issue of childhood development.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me first of all thank you for the leadership you have provided and continue to provide. Those of us who know you well, we often joke and say we don't know anybody that has got as much energy as you have got. You are here this minute. You are someplace else the next minute. You were dealing with a group of ladies in the hallway the other day from Houston. They were the wives of ministers. One happened to have been a lady who had once lived in the community where my office is located in Chicago, and so I said, Hey, you went out to Houston and found yourself a minister who is a preacher and you have got a husband and so it must be a good place for people to go.

But I just want to join you in highlighting that we talk a great deal about low-income people, and we talk a great deal about the safety net; and it seems to me that our colleagues have decided to attack every safety net program that there is, no matter what it is. They believe that it is providing too much and that government really ought not be a government of service, that government should be a government of coordination and should just be a government of rules and regulations, but it should not provide any help, any assistance to those individuals who have fallen on hard times and tough times.

I have always believed you could measure the effectiveness of a government by how well it treats its young people, how well it treats its old people, and how well it deals with the needs of those who have difficulty caring for themselves.

But I represent a very diverse district, and so not only do I have all of these individuals who have all of the needs that we just mentioned, but I also represent the futures industry—the Board of Trade, the Mercantile Exchange, and the stock market. I was sitting beside a trader on the airplane last week, and he was moaning and groaning and talking about how devastating this shutdown is on the overall economy of our country. You know, you think in terms of the individuals who receive the benefits of a WIC program; but, guess what, if those who produce the food, if they can't sell it, if they can't move it, if they can't do anything with it, what is going to happen, it sits in somebody's warehouse and rots. It sits in somebody's warehouse and spoils. And so this slows down the economy. In order for the economy to get a lift, to pick up, people must be buying and selling, providing services, exchanging goods, exchanging ideas, moving money, moving money around, otherwise the economy goes flat. Nothing is happening.

So I don't know how we think that shutting down the government, and Chicago is a big town and of course it is a regional office town, and so there are a lot of government workers. We are the regional headquarters for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. A lot of government workers are there. Now, all of these individuals are laid off. They are not able to ride the CTA. That takes money out of the transit system. Them not having to

come downtown and park their cars, that takes money out of the parking garages, just like it is around here now. It is practically dead. All of things that people would normally be doing, the people who work in the cleaners, they can't work because there is nobody here to bring their clothes. The restaurants are practically empty. And so it seems to me that there is an effort not to move the economy, but to shut down the economy of our country. It makes no sense at all. None whatsoever. And so we have actually seen a shift now.

People are finally beginning to decide that, hey, ObamaCare, as they like to call it, but let me tell you, for me it is the best thing that ever happened to health care since the Indians discovered corn flakes. It provides an opportunity for millions of people to get care who never, ever had health insurance during their lifetime. Never, ever. And so now we see that that is going to stay. I mean, there are so many people signing up in Illinois, we can't even keep up with them. Our county government has signed up more than 100,000 people in one county, in Cook County alone. They started before we really started because they got a waiver and were able to do it.

I want to commend you again for the leadership and for the dynamic way in which you function, helping the American people know that we can't stand still, we can't stop, we have to keep moving and that struggle, struggle, strife and pain, as Frederick Douglass would say, are the prerequisites for change. So if we want change, we have to keep struggling, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

□ 1700

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What a significant, enlightened presentation by Congressman DAVIS, if I might summarize his very broad and effective presentation and the educating of our Members.

He has spoken about the collateral damage, and the collateral damage, Mr. DAVIS, is spreading like wildfire. You added that it is parking garages, it is the CTA or the MTA or the Metro. It is the restaurants. It is the District of Columbia that is collateral damage, a city that has to keep its doors open, but lo and behold, it is being impacted by the shutdown. Again, workers are shut out and shut down.

If I might ask the Speaker how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. DAVIS may want to comment as I proceed on some facts. I know that he has been a leader on some of these issues of SNAP and WIC.

Texas is just viewed as a well-to-do State and we don't need anything. Again, the previous dialogue and debate on the floor struck me that it talked about the dependency crowd on food stamps. I have already said that there are 46 million people living in poverty, and growing. I did not say they were nondeserving. I did not say that they were deadbeats. I did not say that they were making up their poverty. I didn't say they weren't working. I said there are 46 million people living below the poverty line, and large numbers of them are children.

It bothers me for individuals to talk about that we have got a dependency crowd and we have got to have these reforms, and what we are doing with reforms and sequester is we are taking food out of the mouths of children. We can't say it in any other way. So I just want some of our friends to know that even though there is a bemoaning about getting the agriculture bill passed—and I am out of Texas and have always voted for the agriculture bill because my district is surrounded by ranchers and others who need the farm bill. We have never separated on the farm bill in the State of Texas. We have had a lot of support. But when you cut $40 billion out of food stamps and you begin to talk about the deadbeats, that gets to be a problem.

With regards to SNAP and WIC, 47.8 million people are on SNAP and 8.6 million are women, infants, and children on WIC. Funding for these programs needs to be assured.

I have no problem with the documentation of everyone and ensuring that the one or two that are violating the requirements—nobody is arguing for maintaining those individuals. What we are saying is that there is collateral damage. Farmers are being impacted.

By the way, regarding Rural Development and Farm Service agencies, 99 percent of those employees are furloughed; and my good friend just got through talking about the commodities.

Let me just say these points. I am going back to Texas again, which is noted as a big and well-to-do State. In actuality, in a couple of days, Mr. DAVIS, we are standing to lose and have an impact or cutback of $64.7 billion. The government is shut down. $518 million of that is on Federal highways.

We were just in a meeting with the Texas Department of Transportation. We have got 1,200 people a day moving into Texas with $411 billion for interstate highways—shut down; $130 million in home energy assistance for the poor—shut down; $71 million in homeland security grants and our ports—shut down; our borders—shut down; $55 million in coordinated border infrastructure. When I say the border is shut down, what I mean is resources that they need. And $97 million is something very important that I have worked with Senator LANDRIEU on, Federal adoption assistance to help our children.

I started by saying that we organized to form a more perfect Union. I am aghast that the wheels of justice have come off. The Department of Justice is in a complete dilemma. There are people keeping the lights on and doing what is needed for the absolute necessity of making sure the principles of our Constitution are not destroyed, but we have lost 950 lawyers who have cases pending, 4,000 U.S. attorneys.

We are seeing immigration review cases where people are fighting to keep their loved ones who legitimately should be here and 950 are gone; in the environmental division, 350 lawyers; the tax division, 200. People are expecting their refund so they can pay their bills. The U.S. Marshals, what a disgrace, 500 are gone. Why? Because the government is shut down.

Before I close, if the gentleman wants to offer a word on this, where are we in this shutdown?

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me say one thing about the farm bill, because I am very sympathetic and empathetic with farmers.

I grew up on a farm, so I know a little bit about farming and how valuable. Of course, Illinois is a great farm State. But I am not in favor of all of these great big subsidies that we give to some people, like sugar growers that help to keep the price of sugar so high until the candy makers and the cookie makers and ice cream processors and all these people have serious difficulty making or producing the products that they sell.

There is a lot of give-and-take in these decisions that we make, and there ought to be enough give-and-take to know that it can't just be my way or the highway. It can't just be my thoughts and ideas. It is time to really put behind us all of the difficulty that we have had. I am hoping that the next time I go home that I can tell the people in my district, Yes, we have reached an agreement. The government is going to reopen. We are going to function, and America is going to move like we know it can, like we know it will. That is going to be the legacy of this shutdown, that we are going to cut it off and reopen.

I thank you for the opportunity.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank you so very much.

Let me just say that I am on the sugar farm side of the issue, but we are on the same side of the coin on opening the government. And I want to thank Congressman DAVIS.

I also want to make mention of my fellow Texas Democratic colleagues who stood together at 1 p.m. today, all of them calling for a bipartisan solution, actually calling upon our good friends, our Senators in the other body out of the State of Texas to come and stand with us and follow in the tradition of the Catholic Charities mission of helping our brothers and sisters, the most vulnerable, of the words of ''just live by faith,'' of the words that ''this government is an umbrella on a rainy day,'' cancer victims, children who need Head Start seats, the justice system of America, the interstate highway of America, sick patients in hospital beds needing disability checks,

veterans who need service centers and need the resources of hospitals, all of these and beyond; teachers who are living under the pressure of a sequester that cuts off the money for their impoverished students and the services for special needs children, all tied into the sequester, all at a standstill because of the shutdown.

What is our plea today? Our plea today is to recognize that we can't live in this world alone, and that it is imperative that we unshackle ourselves. I have even gotten a Koch brothers letter that was sent to the Senators. The Koch brothers, the Koch Industry, said, Don't blame us. We never tied defunding ObamaCare to the funding of the government. I consider that a get-out-of-jail card. I hope all the Senators are getting it. I hope all the Members of Congress here are getting it. It means that you can vote on a clean bill and lift the debt ceiling for a period of time that allows America to pay her bills, young couples to get mortgages, young families to get loans. That is what we should be doing, and I will take in the words of my good friend, We want a way forward in a bipartisan manner.

But what I would offer to say to you, that America, the greatest country in the world, has a Constitution that has said we are organized for a more perfect Union, and, in fact, we have that perfect Union if we can open this government. We all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak. I believe that tomorrow we may have something on the floor that opens the government. Vote. Put it on the floor, a clean bill, so that we can vote and open the government and that we have a method for lifting the debt ceiling.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1859

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 11, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3271. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's ''Major'' final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-Weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule (RIN: 3064-AD95) received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3272. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, Disabled Veterans, Recently Separated Veterans, Active Duty Wartime or Campaign Badge Veterans, and Armed Forces Service Medal Veterans (RIN: 1250-AA00) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3273. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals With Disabilities (RIN: 1250-AA02) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3274. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0216; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-17521; AD 2013-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3275. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mahmomen, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1283; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AGL-15] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3276. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Oceana NAS, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0038; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-2] 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. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3282. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster hazard mitigation program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to modernize and implement the national integrated public alert and warning system to disseminate homeland security information and other information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3284. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Mine Safety and Health Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H. Res. 375. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should refrain from conditioning the resolution of fiscal and budgetary disputes on the taking of action relating to non-germane legislative matters; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. Res. 376. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 233) to amend chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for an orderly process by which the debt ceiling is increased; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 377. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, most of which are already legally binding on them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

138. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 27 urging the Congress to reauthorize section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

139. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States Navy and United States Air Force veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

140. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Virgin Islands, relative to

Resolution No. 1794 urging the Congress to adopt H.R. 92; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce.

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. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 4 of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.J. Res. 93.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 292: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 411: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 494: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 541: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 649: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 669: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 676: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 713: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 855: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 962: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1010: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1014: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1094: Mr. CLAY and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1179: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1199: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1201: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1318: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1334: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1354: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1463: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1502: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1518: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. REICHERT, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1528: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1666: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1692: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1708: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1732: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1755: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1770: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1803: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1814: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 1875: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1921: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2001: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2027: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2037: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2101: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2134: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2178: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2179: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2187: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2199: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2203: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2247: Mr. RADEL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2302: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2315: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2328: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2409: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2415: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2426: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2536: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2541: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2692: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2697: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2734: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2791: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2807: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. REED.
H.R. 2818: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2839: Mr. YARMUTH and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2876: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2880: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2893: Ms. NORTON and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2925: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2956: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3024: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 3103: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3108: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3111: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 3121: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 3168: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3179: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3205: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3236: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3279: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ROKITA.
H. Res. 135: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 208: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 239: Mr. WALZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 281: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 360: Mr. FINCHER.
H. Res. 365: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ENYART.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

53. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Autonomous Municipality of Catano, Puerto Rico, relative to Internal Resolution No. 1 requesting the immediate and unconditional release of Oscar Lopez Rivera from prison; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013 No. 141

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal and wise God, may the memory of Your past mercies sustain us during these challenging times. As we have reached the 10th day of this Federal shutdown, strengthen our Senators with Your might, preserving them with Your grace, and instructing them with Your wisdom. Inspire them to take a step back from partisanship and to take a step forward toward patriotism, striving to strengthen and not weaken this land we love. Lord, make them alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of this challenging season. Direct their going out and coming in as You energize them with Your presence.

We pray in Your strong 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 10, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders and their designees.

At 1 p.m. the Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair for a special caucus meeting with the President.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 84, H.J. RES. 89, H.J. RES. 90, H.J. RES. 91

Mr. REID. There are four measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the measures by title for a second time.

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 fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for the 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. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The measures will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. The President issued a warning to Congress:

The full consequences of a default by the United States—or even the prospect of a default by the United States—are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar in exchange markets.

The President went on to warn of ''risks, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage'' of failing to avert such a default.

This is not Barack Obama; this was Ronald Reagan in 1983.

Four years later in 1987, Reagan again warned Congress about the impacts of a default on the economy. He said:

This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in the financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar.

Yet three decades later, an alarming number of Republicans have denied or downplayed the seriousness of a first-ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

To these default deniers, east is west, north is south, black is white, and right is wrong.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Let's talk about what raising the debt actually means. It simply means we are going to pay our bills. It is not a vote to spend more money to authorize new programs or to buy new things. It is a vote to pay the bills.

The Federal Government has already incurred these bills, bills for roads and bridges—we have already built them—the warships we have already commissioned, wars that have been waged and tax breaks that have been charged on a national credit card.

A vote to avert default is a vote to pay the bills for all these and more.

Many Republicans are in the press today, and have been for the past week or 10 days, arguing, Why worry about it? It will all work out.

These same Republicans who argue that we should default on the Nation's bills voted time and time again to spend borrowed money, and a lot of it, without any regard for the long-term effect it would have. These Republicans voted to sell government bonds to China, Saudi Arabia, and Japan to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Republican Senators have come to this floor and lamented raising the debt. We have to raise this debt because of two unpaid wars costing trillions of dollars; tax breaks for the wealthy costing trillions of dollars, all given to the rich with borrowed money; wars fought with borrowed money.

During the Bush administration, these same Republicans were happy to run up America's credit cards to the tune of trillions of dollars. Their theory was lower the taxes; it will be great for the economy. They are now howling about the debts they created, the debts they voted for. Never mind that with little help from Republicans in Congress, President Barack Obama has reduced the ratio of deficit to gross domestic product from 9 percent to 4 percent. This is very good, in spite of the debt he has been trying to get charge of; it wasn't his.

Now that the bill for the Republicans' excesses has come due, the bills for wars they supported and the tax cuts they have received, they are not willing to pay them. They want to walk out on that check.

Many of these same Republicans also say we can avoid default by prioritizing whom to pay and when we pay them. They say we should pay foreign debtholders first. They all agree with that. China would be first, then Saudi Arabia, and maybe Japan.

We shouldn't and couldn't pay Social Security recipients under that scenario, veterans or Medicare. No matter how much we would want to, we couldn't do it. There would be no money to do it. In addition to having shockingly skewed priorities, Republicans are also using very flawed logic.

Here is a real-world example. Let us say the Presiding Officer has a mortgage, car payment, and a cell phone bill. The Presiding Officer has to decide: Which one should I pay? I can't pay them all. Which one should I pay?

It doesn't matter if the Presiding Officer picks one of them because he has defaulted anyway. He can't pay his bills. He likely would never be able to buy another car, cell phone, certainly not a house. His credit would be ruined for the foreseeable future.

The same thing would happen to our country. One week from today—and that is not a definite time, it could be a couple days before or a couple of days after, but we are there; let's say a week from now and use that as a point of reference—the United States has no money. It can't borrow any money. The Federal Government paid China but failed to pay Social Security recipients, unemployment benefits or the salaries of our brave men and women fighting in uniform.

The damage not only to our credit rating, world credit rating, but also to our global reputation would be profound and irreversible. The risks, the costs, the disruptions and the damage would be incalculable. This is what President Ronald Reagan said.

Why don't they listen to this man they say is such a great leader—and was. I agree. He was a tremendous President. I didn't agree with him all the time, but he was a real leader. He, more than anyone else, is responsible for ending the Cold War. There are many who say he couldn't fit in the Republican Party of today.

Robert Dole, who was the majority leader of the Senate from the State of Kansas, a patriotic American, said himself he doesn't fit in the Republican Party today.

The stakes couldn't be higher. A global economic recession, and possibly even depression, face this great country. This is why President Obama reached out to House Republicans, inviting them to the White House yesterday afternoon for a serious discussion. Guess what they said. We are too busy. We will send a few of us, but we are too busy. Remember, the House is led by this same man who said he wanted to have a conversation, but they are unwilling to have one with him.

I was disappointed to hear that the same intractable Republican leaders who caused the current government shutdown were unwilling to even allow their Members to meet with the President for a constructive conversation. Again, they will send—I think they picked 17 out of the 232 they have. This great conversation is one they don't want.

They want to talk, but their actions tell another story. They have caused enough economic turmoil with the reckless shutdown of the Federal Government. If that is not enough, now we have the debt ceiling coming in about 1 week. If Republicans force default on the Nation's debt, it would be magnitudes worse than the damage they have already caused our great country with this senselessly created government shutdown.

Yesterday, Fidelity, the Nation's largest mutual fund manager, with $500 billion in assets, announced it would sell all of its short-term government bonds because of the threat of default. Today there will be more.

Yesterday, government bonds were considered the safest investment in the world. Will they be so tomorrow? Time will only tell. If the United States fails to pay its bills, that safe haven will disappear very quickly.

We are going to vote Saturday on the ability to proceed to a clean debt ceiling. We will find out how Senate Republicans wish to proceed. Economists say the consequences of not paying our bills, not extending the debt ceiling, would be immediate and catastrophic. This isn't a bunch of Harvard left-wingers.

Even Republican economist Douglas Holtz-Eakin said debt deniers are dead wrong. He said a failure to raise the debt ceiling leads to very bad economic outcomes and chaos in financial markets.

Fidelity's move is only the first sign of economic chaos and will continue to spread the closer America comes to defaulting on its bills. With every day that passes, it is more and more important for Republicans to stop denying the reality of default and start working with us to find common ground.

All we have said is open the government. Let us pay our bills. We will negotiate with them on anything. We will have a conversation with them about anything. Open the government. Let us pay our bills. Then we will negotiate.

RECOGNITION OF MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to start this morning by quoting something my good friend the majority leader said back in 2007—back when Congress was weighing whether to raise the debt ceiling. Here is what the majority leader said back then:

> Until we change the policies that led down this path, we will be back year after year, digging the hole ever deeper.

And, of course, that is essentially what so many Americans are saying today: If we are going to address the debt ceiling, then let's also address the root causes of the debt. It just makes good sense.

One would think our friend the majority leader would continue to agree with this logic as well, but that is not what he has been saying lately. He is basically saying that it would be irresponsible for Congress to address the most pressing problem we face in the country, that it would be reckless to raise the debt ceiling if that also meant doing something about the debt. In other words, he now seems to think the best thing to do about our crushing Federal debt is to do nothing at all. That is why my friend the majority leader introduced legislation this week to now allow another $1 trillion to be added to the debt with no strings attached at all, none, just a $1 trillion

debt ceiling increase: Just keep raising the credit card limit and letting someone else deal with it later on.

We now have a debt close to $17 trillion—nearly double what it was in 2007. We are borrowing nearly $2 billion a day—$2 billion a day—and apparently our friends on the other side are fine with that. They want us to give Washington a free pass to borrow and spend $1 trillion more. He is so comfortable with all of this, my friend the majority leader rejected the President's own proposal this week to do a short-term increase followed by a negotiation on reforms.

Well, in my view, we were sent here to solve problems, not to defer them. We were sent here to confront the challenges of the moment, not ignore them. That is why the majority leader's proposal just won't fly, because it is completely at odds with the wishes of most Americans. And that is something the President and a lot of other Senate Democrats agreed with when a Republican President was asking for a debt limit increase. Of course, the problem is a lot more serious now than it was back then.

Here is something else. Neither side wants to default on our debts. Neither side will allow it. That is certainly the case, and people should know that. It is irresponsible to do nothing about the debt, and it is irresponsible to be stirring up anxiety about default, but that doesn't mean the American people are wrong to ask that a debt limit increase include reforms aimed at actually tackling the problems that got us in this position in the first place, especially since what our country has routinely done in the past is just that.

Going back to the Eisenhower administration, requests to raise the debt ceiling have often been tied to important fiscal reforms—nearly two dozen times going back to the Eisenhower administration. That is how we got the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reforms in the 1980s. That is how we achieved balanced budgets in the 1990s. That is how we secured significant spending reductions in President Obama's first term—spending reductions on which he later campaigned.

Now President Obama seems to think Congress should just increase the borrowing limit on his already maxed-out credit card without a single negotiation. He seems to think the representatives of the American people should just do what he says when he says it and because he says it, no questions asked—no questions asked. You know, that is not just irresponsible, it is not the way Presidents of both parties have dealt with this problem in the past. Reagan negotiated, Clinton negotiated, and if President Obama wants America to increase the credit limit, he will negotiate too.

I would also like to address one of the President's favorite talking points these days. He says he won't negotiate over ''the bills Congress has already racked up.'' Look, if the President actually believed his own talking point, he wouldn't threaten to veto virtually every Republican attempt to get spending under control. We have tried endlessly. The only times we can even get him to discuss sensible budget reforms is when he is absolutely forced to—when Washington has to deal with things like the debt ceiling. So let's drop the tired talking points and just get about negotiating.

I know the President doesn't like the fact that Americans elected a divided government, but they did. We have a divided government, and no matter how much he tries to divide us, at the end of the day he is going to have to deal with a Congress he doesn't entirely control.

The American people can be persuaded to raise the debt ceiling, but they are not in any mood to simply hand over a blank check. They are looking for sensible reforms. So if the President wants to increase his credit limit, let's get to the table and negotiate. He has been inviting Members of Congress to the White House this week. In fact, we were told earlier today that Senate Republicans have been invited to meet with the President tomorrow morning. That is a good start but only if it means he has decided to drop his refusal to negotiate on solutions. But if this is just a meeting where he simply reiterates that he won't negotiate, then it certainly won't be very productive.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I received an email this morning from an old friend. He is the father of a disabled veteran. This veteran is a quadriplegic—a victim of a roadside bomb in Iraq. He has gone through multiple surgeries. At some point most people would have given up on him. In fact, they even talked about, at the age of 24, his being sent to a nursing home for the rest of his life. His father said: No, we are not going to let that happen to our son. He brought him to Chicago, where he received extraordinary treatment at the Rehabilitation Institute, and he started his slow, steady climb back to life. He is home now. He is a father, married, has two small children, and his mom and dad live with him to help out. The people in the community he lives in—it is not in Illinois, it is in North Carolina—have been so generous, building the perfect home for him and his wheelchair and giving him as many opportunities as he could possibly enjoy in his life.

This is a great story of a great family and a great American hero. But his father wrote me an email today and said: We are worried. We are worried about the November disability check. Senator, we need it. We need that check.

I wrote back to him and I said: I will move Heaven and Earth and do everything I can to make sure that payment is made.

And I believe it will be made. Somehow, it will be made. But I had to tell him that we are facing an unnecessary crisis in America created by politicians on Capitol Hill.

Shutting down the government of the United States of America? What does that say about our Nation? What does it say about us in the Senate and the House that we have reached this point, that we are deciding today on the four or five bills that just passed the House? The House has decided what little agency of government, what little spending program they will approve each day—each day. It is estimated it will take them almost 2½ months to fully fund the government at this pace—2½ months of uncertainty as they decide day by day what little program, what little agency they will reopen. Well, that is just plain wrong, and every time they have offered that, we have said to them: Open the government. It is essential.

There was a story 2 or 3 days ago about five American families who were notified that they had lost their sons and daughters, who were killed in Afghanistan. Traditionally, the U.S. Government comes through quickly after that tragic information is shared with the family and gives them a financial helping hand to arrange for them to come to Dover, DE, for the arrival and return of their fallen hero. But because of the government shutdown brought on by the Republicans, there was a question as to whether we could even make that payment.

Luckily, a charity stepped forward—Fisher House. This is an extraordinary charity that does so many great things for veterans who are disabled and need help. They said: We are going to step in and help these families until the government gets its act together, until the politicians reopen the government.

Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced yesterday this new development. Well, God bless the Fisher House charity, but it shouldn't have been necessary. If we had done our job, it wouldn't be necessary; the government would be open; this family whom I love, with this disabled veteran, wouldn't be worried about that next check if we simply did the responsible thing and opened the government.

Then there is a second issue which, although hard to believe, is even larger in scope. The Republicans refuse to give us a chance to extend the debt ceiling of America. What is the debt ceiling? This morning I listened as the minority leader said it is raising the credit card limit. No, it isn't. That is not an accurate statement. It is raising the authority of our government to borrow money to pay for what we have already spent. Many of the same politicians who voted for the spending bills

now don't want to pay for them. They do not want to extend this debt ceiling—the credit of the United States. That is totally irresponsible. It is like ordering the biggest meal on the menu and then refusing to pay when the bill comes. That is where they stand. That is what they are arguing.

But it gets even worse. It will be the first time in the history of the United States of America that we will have defaulted on our national debt—the first time we have called into question the full faith and credit of the United States of America. How serious is that? Let me tell you how serious it is. Pick up the morning paper. ''World leaders fear a default by U.S.'' in the Washington Post. I read it, and it says:

> That default scenario is bringing increasingly urgent pleas from foreign leaders, some who describe their grave concern, others who chide the United States about the risks of political brinkmanship, beg its leaders to act responsibly and wonder whether the world's superpower is showing some cracks.

Now, are you ready for this? Do you know who was preaching to us yesterday about responsibility in governing the United States of America? Are you ready for this? This is a quote from Russian President Vladimir Putin:

> This is highly important for all of us. I am hopeful that all the political forces in the United States will be able to resolve this crisis as quickly as possible.

So now we are being preached to by President Putin about how to run a country. Well, that is embarrassing, and it is totally unnecessary. The failure to extend the debt limit of the United States is irresponsible and reckless.

It isn't only the Russians who are calling us to task but our closest ally, the United Kingdom. This is what an analyst in London's financial district had to say:

> The outlook for the British economy is decent but still fairly fragile. Anything like a U.S. debt default with significant global repercussions would be bad news for the U.K.

That is a quote from Howard Archer, chief UK economist at IHS Global Insight in London.

The Japanese, now emerging from a terrible economic circumstance, one of our greatest creditors, are worried about their debtor, the United States, paying its debts. Is anyone else embarrassed by this? We all should be. This is the creation of politicians in Washington.

The Republican shutdown, the Republican refusal to extend the debt ceiling is irresponsible and reckless. It will not only hurt these foreign nations, it will not only hurt the reputation of the United States as an economic leader in the world, it is going to hurt families and businesses all over the United States. But don't take the word of this Democratic Senator; go to the Business Roundtable, one of the strongest supporters of the Republicans in Congress. They sent us a letter last week and called the default on America's debt catastrophic, begging Republicans and Democrats not to do anything this senseless.

What impact will it have on families? Hold on tight. Watch what happens as we get up to this cliff or go over it when it comes to the debt ceiling. You can follow it every day. If you have a mutual fund, if you own a stock, if you have a savings account, or if you have a retirement account, you can watch it melt away as the politicians give their speeches on Capitol Hill.

It is totally irresponsible and reckless.

We need to open this government. We need to pay our bills. We can sit down and negotiate everything and anything—that is the offer that has been made—only after we have met our responsibilities.

Let me also add that Speaker BOEHNER said last week and some of us were relieved to hear it: There will never be a default on America's debt. He followed that up within 24 hours with a list of nonnegotiable conditions before he would agree to that. That is not responsible. It is reckless. It is reckless political conduct. How can we do this to the families, to businesses, to the farmers, and to our allies around the world?

It is time to say, as the Chaplain of the Senate did yesterday, enough is enough. It is time for grownups to stand up on the other side of the aisle and join grownups on this side of the aisle to do the right thing: Open the government, pay our bills, sit down, and honestly negotiate through these issues. We don't have much time. October 17 is the deadline. Today is October 10. We have 1 week before the bottom falls out of our economy and the economies around the world.

I listened to economists on the other side, the so-called really conservative economists, say: It really doesn't matter. We can default. We really don't need to extend our debt ceiling. These flat-earth economists are the same folks who are in denial when it comes to other scientific evidence in so many other areas, whether it is climate change or evolution—you pick it. They are entitled to their views, as fringe as they may be, as extreme as they may be. But to think that Members of Congress, Members of the Senate are buying this line of baloney is hard to understand and impossible to justify to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think one of the things we ought to be observing, here at least, is courteous rules among ourselves. This is meant to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. If we follow the rules, follow the regular order, follow the committee process, and follow the ways through the committee processes for resolving disagreements and disputes, I think we can get through this.

I believe on both sides of the aisle there are pragmatic people devoted to this country who want to solve the two major problems we have facing us right this minute; that is, to reopen government, because we are now in the 10th day of a shutdown; and, No. 2, to meet the debt obligations of the United States of America as mandated in the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the dome: Let's reopen government. Let's pay our bills. And let's get through the regular committee processes to solve our problems.

There are those on the other side of the dome in the House of Representatives that are proposing a new supercommittee. We have been there, and we have done that. After the 2011 crisis, when we faced our debt limit, there was a process put in place called a supercommittee. It went nowhere. This new idea will go nowhere as well. It is a new process that will only result in more delay.

I think we have two supercommittees. I call them supercommittees because they are great committees. They are wonderful committees. That is the Budget Committee chaired by Senator PATTY MURRAY and her ranking member Senator JEFF SESSIONS, himself a distinguished judge from Alabama, so he knows about conflict resolution. There is the Appropriations Committee that deals with discretionary spending, chaired by me and my vice chairman Senator RICHARD SHELBY, again a seasoned fiscal conservative who knows how to concentrate on the bottom line so we can be a more frugal government but also be an effective government. Let that committee do its job.

There is also the Finance Committee chaired by Senator MAX BAUCUS. I know the ranking member Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa is on the floor. He has an incredible history of being a compassionate conservative and he knows the Tax Code and knows the values of Iowa—which is, let's put country above party.

Instead of inventing new committees and new processes, free us up to do our job. Free us up to be able to do what the committee process is meant to be able to do.

For me and the Appropriations Committee, we moved all of our appropriations bills. We are ready to come to the floor. We are ready to go to conference if called up, if we have a method for being able to move. We are ready to do it.

Senator MURRAY on the Budget Committee is ready to go to conference with the House. But 21 times she was blocked by 6 naysayers primarily representing a tea party, small faction within the Republican Party.

The Republican Party, the Grand Old Party, has traditionally understood that you maintain the values of the country, that you are fiscally conservative, but you follow the rules that were established. The rules of the Budget Committee passed by the Senate in the Budget Control Act say they

were supposed to have their job done on April 15. Well, we moved the budget on March 23, over 200 days ago, and over 20 requests to go to conference with me, with Congressman PAUL RYAN, and with his House counterparts to work out what our discretionary spending should be. What should our revenues be? What should we evaluate in terms of our mandatory spending where we can take a look at it but not shrink those earned benefits like Social Security and VA benefits that people count on and work their whole life for and even put their life on the line? We have to be able to do our job.

I will tell you what has been the latest situation that has so shocked me. We are on the verge of being a deadbeat nation. We are on the verge of being a global deadbeat nation. What is a deadbeat? A deadbeat is someone who does not meet their financial obligations.

Over the last 3 days, we have heard about how the families of the men and women who died in the line of duty serving their country and are entitled to a death benefit were not going to get it because of the government shutdown.

The Fisher family—well known for serving military families, well known and so deeply cherished—offered to step forward to pay that. The philanthropy of the United States, instead of the public responsibility of the United States.

I want to thank the Fisher family for stepping forward. But, my gosh, what humiliation. We are the United States of America, with the strongest and best military in the world, and to honor its obligation to its own, the United States has to borrow money for a death benefit. That is deadbeat. I think it is humiliating. I think it is despicable. It shows just how low we have sunk.

We can get it back. It is in our power because this isn't being inflicted on us. This is what is being inflicted on us by other Americans sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. When they took that obligation, they didn't take that obligation to just uphold the Amendments they like—like the second one—but they took that obligation to uphold all of the Amendments.

Let's start with the 14th, which says that the debt of the United States of America should not be called into question. That is clearly in the Constitution. No matter what, America will pay its bills. The reliability of the United States of America to meet its debt obligations is the financial glue that helps to hold the global economy together.

I am not going to go into doomsday or Armageddon or whatever. But if you actually read what the ambassadors of China and Japan—one a great ally and the other a formidable competitor—say: We are holding your debt. Pay your bills, or a fiscal crisis will begin to unravel in your country and around the world.

We cannot be a deadbeat nation. If we are a superpower, we must first of all show our power by meeting our financial obligations. How we get our public house in order by reducing our public debt is the subject again of the Appropriations Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Finance Committee. We have the capability to do it. I am really calling upon my friends on the other side of the aisle—and there are many. And it is not that we are pals. It is because we have come together out of mutual respect to solve mutual problems, being of help to each other mutually, that we have been able to keep the government functioning and doing it in a way that is smart and affordable.

So I say, please, let's reopen government. I am calling upon the House to pass the Senate continuing fiscal funding resolution that would reopen government on November 15 and that process to lay the groundwork for resolving our appropriations bills and canceling sequester.

I call upon those six that are blocking us—meaning the Senate—from going to the Budget Committee to do this. Those are two simple acts within our power to do. I hope that we can do it.

I intended today to speak about how the shutdown is affecting Maryland. We are really being hard hit. Maryland and Virginia have the largest concentration of Federal agencies, both civilian and military, in America. And, gee, we are proud of that. We are so proud of the fact that we have the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which works with our private sector that enables us to sell products around the world.

We are so proud of the fact that we have the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to make sure that we are looking out for large and small, whether it is to make sure that our mattresses are not flammable or that our cribs and swimming pools are safe for our children. I am proud of those agencies.

I am sorry that my Federal employees are not working. It is having a terrible impact on the Maryland economy. Both our comptroller and our Governor are talking about the significant amount of lost revenue that we are having because people aren't working and they aren't buying. If you talk to small businesses where these agencies are located, it is just terrible.

I just want to tell one story. The Social Security Administration is headquartered in Maryland in a community called Woodlawn, a wonderful community with a vibrant, civic engagement. It is just great. Across the street from the Social Security Administration is a small business called the Salsa Grill. It is usually crowded with lunch hour people, early morning coffee, those little baby showers that we women like to have or a birthday party the guys are throwing for one of their pals at lunchtime. The Salsa Grill last Friday, instead of 30 customers, had 3. The owner was quoted as saying if the shutdown goes on much longer, he won't be able to hang on any longer. This is what makes our economy great.

I talked to one of the largest automobile dealers in Maryland. The showrooms were empty in the Baltimore-Washington corridor last weekend, even though they had wonderful cars, new cars. They were ready to do deals for the old 2013 models they wanted to move out—empty; empty. This ripples through our economy. This is not just, ''Oh, we are going to contain government.'' We are hurting ourselves.

The fight about ObamaCare is over. Let's say goodbye to that fight. Let's get on to the fiscal issues of the United States of America. I say here, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I am ready to negotiate. I am ready to meet, to compromise, to see how we can have our domestic and defense discretionary spending done in a way that begins to reduce our public debt but will also have a progrowth way of public investments, making sure our country is safe, that we are building roads, building the superinformation highway, educating our young people, and doing research and development.

I know my time is up, but I believe very strongly that we have to solve our problems. I am ready to say to the other side of the aisle that I am ready to work together. That is because I have done it in the past. We actually like doing it, for us pragmatists to get into a room, solve problems, give and take, and actually learn from each other. I could give many examples of that.

Right now we need to set the example for the world that we are the greatest deliberative body. We have to get back to deliberating instead of delaying.

Please, for the House, pass the continuing funding resolution. For the Senate, limit your objection to the Budget Committee going into conference. Let's reopen the government, let's pay our bills, and sit down and negotiate in a way worthy of a great country, and let's honor the Constitution of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments by the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee. As she said, she is ready to meet, ready to negotiate, ready to compromise, ready to work together.

I come today to say tomorrow Republican Senators are finally going to get a chance to talk with President Obama about reopening the government and dealing with the debt this Nation has, dealing with the debt limit.

Until very recently, President Obama has been far more interested in speaking with the press than in actually speaking with Republicans. Then we have this invitation to the White House. This morning in the Washington Post, what the administration

says—it is a front-page article and it continues over to page 4—it says the White House ''emphasized that Obama will not be negotiating.''

We have the chair of the Appropriations Committee saying she is ready to meet, negotiate, and compromise, and the White House says President Obama will not be negotiating.

The question is, why are we going over to the White House in the first place if the President is not interested in negotiating? Is it just to give him a photo op? I went to meetings like that during the health care debate more than 3 years ago. The President at the time would invite Republicans to a meeting and then he would reject every idea we would offer. If he had been more willing to accept Republican ideas, negotiate then, we would have had a bipartisan health reform bill that was accepted by the American people instead of a law that continues to have more people opposed than in favor of it.

That is going to be my message to the President tomorrow morning when we meet. This needs to be a real discussion, a real negotiation, when we agree on how we can reopen the Government, reduce our debt and help our economy grow. This is the sixth time in 5 years that President Obama has requested an increase in the debt ceiling. How much is he asking for? According to the majority leader, I understand it is $1 trillion to extend between now until after the 2014 election.

That is an incredible amount of money. Just trying to figure out how much money that is, it is over $1 million a minute. It is $1 million every minute between now and 14 months from now. The President needs to realize that is unsustainable. We have a $17 trillion debt. It is a debt on the back of our children and our grandchildren. We have families all across the country who have aspirations, anxieties, and anger about even the idea that their children and grandchildren will not be able to get careers, get jobs.

If we as a nation are going to incur more debt, we also have to find real savings. We cannot continue to increase our credit card debt, another new credit card after the President has maxed out the last one, and send this bill to the American people. It is time to set priorities. We want to get moving on real solutions, not just to our short-term problems but the long-term issues that face us as a nation as we try to work together in governing this Nation.

The House of Representatives has passed 12 individual continuing resolutions. These bills would open many different parts of the government right now, parts that we all agree should be kept operating. The House voted to pay for FEMA, Head Start, the National Institutes of Health, to open our national parks. Those bills have been sent to the Senate. They have been sitting here without action at all.

Here in the Senate I know a lot of Democrats are saying they support these functions. We see this picture on the front page of the Washington Post this morning with the mayor, Mayor Vincent Gray, the mayor of Washington, DC, on the steps of the Capitol, talking to the majority leader saying, ''Sir, we are not a department of the government. We are simply trying to be able to spend our own money.'' Yet the majority leader, who is blocking these votes to allow the District of Columbia to do what they are requesting and what the House has said yes, they should be able to do, the majority leader is saying, ''Don't screw it up, OK? Don't screw it up.''

The majority leader continues to object to votes on these bills. History supports bipartisan action of the House and not the stonewalling of the President and the Democratic leadership in the Senate.

In the middle of the last government shutdown, Congress passed and President Clinton signed laws to allow a wide variety of specific programs to function. It is a precedent we should be following today.

The President also keeps saying he will not negotiate on the debt limit. He tries to make people believe that never before has Congress included ''issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt''—this is the President's quote—in its negotiation over the debt limit.

The facts are not on the President's side. Even the Fact Checker in the Washington Post gave the President four Pinocchios on that claim, essentially saying it was completely not true. Negotiations have actually occurred many times on the debt limit.

From 1978 until 2013, the debt limit has been raised 53 times. Of those votes, the debt ceiling increase was linked to something else more than half the time. So more than half of the debt limit increase votes since 1978 carried other provisions. They were not, as the President claims, clean increases.

The President wants to ignore that history. The President wants to pretend that raising the debt limit is something that has to be done without any deliberations, negotiations, dissent, and on his terms alone. He says he will not negotiate at all.

It is strange to be coming from his mouth because that is very different from the position that came out of his mouth when he was Senator Obama. That was not that many years ago. In 2006, Senator Obama voted against a debt limit increase because he said it was a sign that Washington cannot pay its bills. Senator Obama complained that the Federal debt had increased by $5 trillion in 5 years. Under President Obama, Washington's debt has grown by more than $6 trillion in 4 years.

Senator Obama said, ''The more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours.''

Under President Obama, foreign holdings of Federal debt have increased by 82 percent.

Senator Obama said that, ''Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren.'' He said at the time, ''America has a debt problem, and a failure of leadership.''

A debt problem and a failure of leadership.

President Obama is now asking for his sixth increase in debt in less than 5 years. Why is this, then, not a debt problem and a failure of leadership?

Senator Obama was right to say at the time we have a debt problem. President Obama should remember what made him say that in 2006, and do something about it now. He should join Republicans willing to talk about real entitlement reform as part of negotiations over raising the debt ceiling. He should be willing and anxious to talk about his health care law and how it is going to become a major factor driving Washington's debt even higher in the future if we do not replace it with responsible reforms today.

The President should embrace bipartisan continuing resolutions passed by the House as a way of reopening as much of the government as possible while we have responsible and reasonable discussions, deliberations, and negotiations. President Obama should stop posturing, stop playing games, and stop punishing the American people as he has been doing under this current government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday we learned that for the remainder of the government shutdown one of America's great charitable organizations, the Fisher House Foundation, will provide survivor benefits to military families who have lost a loved one on the field of battle. Fisher House is really just almost too good to believe, a wonderful charity that has helped military families all across our country, including folks in seven different facilities in Texas, from the VA North Texas Health Care System to the William Beaumont Army Medical Center in El Paso, the Carl R. Darnall Medical Center, the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center, to the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, the Wilford Hall Ambulatory Surgical Center, and the South Texas Veterans Health Care System. I personally extend my thanks and express my gratitude to Fisher House for making such a tremendous commitment to our military heroes and making such a generous offer for the families of the fallen.

Secretary Hagel was quoted when he announced that Fisher House was going to fill the gap left by the cutoff of Federal funds, saying he was ''offended, outraged, and embarrassed that the government shutdown had prevented the Department of Defense from fulfilling this most sacred responsibility in a timely manner.''

I agree with his outrage and sense of offense and embarrassment. But I want to recall how we got here. If our friends across the aisle had simply agreed to delay the individual mandate and to eliminate the special congressional carveout under ObamaCare, this never would have happened.

We have now reached day 10 of the shutdown. Over the last week and a half, administration officials have done as much as they possibly can to make this shutdown as painful as possible. They made the decision to barricade the World War II memorials and monuments along the National Mall, hoping to keep out our veterans, many near the end of their lives, for whom these monuments were built as a way of honoring their sacrifice. They kept these barricades in their way to impede or perhaps prevent them from visiting things such as the World War II Memorial.

The Obama administration we know has temporarily closed or interfered with privately run parks and historic sites, such as the Claude Moore Colonial Farm in Northern Virginia.

Why would the administration, in order to turn up the heat or increase the pain of the shutdown, impose itself to shut down a privately run park? Well, there is a reason for that, and it is because this is a cynical game—not one designed to get to a solution but one to gain political advantage. It should be offensive, embarrassing, and outrageous—to use the words of Secretary Hagel—for a political party to try to use a shutdown for such craven political gain.

Meanwhile, our Democratic friends have refused to support legislation that would reopen our memorials and national parks and fund the National Institutes of Health. I heard the distinguished assistant majority leader come to the floor a few days ago and decry the fact that cancer research for children was being temporarily stopped because of the shutdown. We have come to the floor and offered a bill that would reopen it, along with clinical trials, and it has been refused by our Democratic colleagues. We have come to the floor—and the House has passed these bills—and said: Let's fund the Veterans' Administration to make sure the backlog of disability claims gets taken care of and so our veterans who have given so much and sacrificed so much don't have to wait on getting their disability claims processed. That was objected to by the majority leader. They also objected to funding our military Reserves. As I said, they seem intent on maximizing the pain in hopes of gaining political advantage. That is outrageous, that is embarrassing, and it should be embarrassing.

Before I conclude, I want to say to all the military families out there who have lost a son, a daughter, a husband, a wife, a father, or a mother on the field of battle—I want to leave you with the words of a great American President who said:

> I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Those noble and inspiring words in that prayer are the type of tribute we should be giving to those families who have lost loved ones on the field of battle, not the sort of shortsighted political treatment that has been given by the efforts across the aisle to shut down every reasonable opportunity to alleviate some of this hardship and to mitigate some of the pain.

We have done it together successfully when it comes to paying our uniformed Active-Duty military. We got a unanimous consent agreement between the parties to make sure our Active-Duty troops are getting paid. Why is it we can't do the same thing with the survivors of those who lost their lives on the field of battle?

When I asked unanimous consent yesterday for the majority leader to agree to that piece of legislation, he asked to delay consideration of that request until the Defense Department could announce its proposal with the Fisher House. Again, I commend the Fisher House for stepping up and trying to fill the void, but why should we not do our job? Why should Congress not act? We should act and I hope very soon. We can do our job and honor these fallen and their families in an appropriate way by coming together as Republicans and Democrats and making sure these survivor benefits to the families who have lost loved ones on the field of battle are paid on a timely basis without being caught up in the political games occurring inside the Halls of Congress.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, a colleague recently described on this floor his experience flying in a private aircraft when a fire broke out in the cockpit of the plane. He observed that putting out the fire distracted the pilots from flying the aircraft and that they precipitously lost altitude. This tea party shutdown and the tea party's threat to our country's credit, like that fire in the cockpit, are distracting us from flying the plane.

I dispute the notion that those who caused the shutdown have good standing to come to this floor and criticize the way the Obama administration is implementing a shutdown that we don't want on our side of the aisle and that the Obama administration does not want. The tea party and Speaker BOEHNER, for their insistence on lighting that fire in the cockpit, are answerable to history and their consciences.

In the spirit of getting back to flying the plane, I will talk about, as I usually do, a real and looming crisis—not the manmade fire the tea party has lit in the cockpit of our government. That tea party shutdown could end tomorrow if the Speaker of the House would simply call up the measure the Senate passed. He refuses to do so, and it is his continued indulgence that keeps this shutdown going.

Climate change is for real. It is not manmade, nor is it something the Speaker can turn off with a vote. It is coming at us, and it is time to wake up to what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and ocean.

Regrettably, one of the reasons Congress is still asleep is that the worst culprits—the big corporations that do the worst carbon polluting—are pretending it is not that bad, it is not that serious, and they should keep doing what they are doing; the status quo is fine. It causes me to wonder why it is that corporations seem never to admit they are wrong. Why is ''oops'' a word they can't seem to use?

When it turned out that people would be a lot safer with seatbelts, did the car industry say: Oops. We should have put those in and put seatbelts in the cars. No. They fought and they had to be defeated, and then we got seatbelts.

When cigarette makers found out their product made people really addicted and really sick, did they say: Oops. We better figure out a way to not kill so many people. No. They fought and they lied for decades.

When it turned out that lead paint damaged children's brains, did the lead paint companies say: Oops. We better warn folks about that and clean it up. No. They fought against protections and had to be defeated. Indeed, they are still fighting.

When it turned out that aerosol refrigerants and propellants were eating away at the Earth's ozone layer, did the manufacturers say: Oops. That is dangerous, and we better come up with a safer product. No. They fought the change, but they lost, and now they are making money making new safer products.

When acid rain was killing off the fish in the northeastern lakes, did the big utilities say: Oops. We better clean up our emissions. No. They fought the changes until they were forced to clean up.

When the flame-retardant industry found out its product was dangerous and ineffective, did they say: Oops. This flame-retardant stuff is hurting people and doing creepy things in nature, so we better knock it off. Nope. It is still fighting while whales turn into swimming toxic waste.

Now that carbon pollution has blown through 400 parts per million of CO_2 in the atmosphere—a first in human history—and launched the most rapid acidification ever seen in the oceans—and by that I mean going back to geologic time—are the polluters saying: Oops. We better take our billions of dollars in profit and trillions of dollars in capital and invest seriously in new fuels and power sources. Fat chance.

Corporations that are harming people never say ''oops,'' and for two big reasons. One reason is there is a lot of money at stake. They would not be in the business if they were not making money, and they don't want to stop. The other reason is that corporations don't have consciences, they have reputations. A reputation is something you can manage. Huge chunks of Madison Avenue and K Street are dedicated to managing corporate reputations. So with no conscience and only a reputation, you manage the problem that you are harming people.

By now, the strategy for managing a corporate reputation while hurting people is well developed. It is a common one across cigarettes, acid rain, lead paint, flame-retardants, refrigerants, and now carbon pollution. There is a playbook, and guess what. The big carbon polluters are following the playbook: one, pretend to care—that is important; two, attack the science, and if you can't attack the science, attack the scientists themselves; three, claim it will cost consumers a fortune; and four, make your goal not victory but doubt.

Pretend to care.

I don't know if you remember those phony-baloney Exxon ads that were all over the place a while ago with guys in lab coats, and they had these Lucite molecules floating around. They wanted you to believe they were out there looking for tomorrow's clean fuels. Well, you got had.

Since 2005 ExxonMobil has been making tens of billions of dollars in profit every year. It is hard to pick through their numbers, but sources report that over that same time it only spent tens of millions per year on clean energy—about what it spent on advertising. They spent as much advertising their clean energy, it appears, as they did investing in it, and it was a tiny fraction of their profits, let alone their revenues.

Remember BP and their green Sun baloney? BP pulled completely out of solar and completely out of U.S. wind investments once it had laid down a fat barrage of advertising about being beyond petroleum. Pretend to care.

Attack the science and even the scientists themselves.

The polluters have to do this through proxies. Nobody will really believe it if Exxon's fingerprints are all over the attack on the science, so others do the dirty work.

One example is Virginia's tea party attorney general Ken Cuccinelli, who attacked the top climate scientist at the University of Virginia. He used his powers of office—the special powers of office that are entrusted to attorneys general. Having been an attorney general, I know something about how precious and special those powers are. He used those powers to harass and subpoena a college professor. UVA's lawyers stuck up for the professor, and the Virginia Supreme Court threw that nonsense out. But for the polluters behind it, it was right out of the playbook.

You may remember the polluters whipping up a phony scandal called climategate, pretending that a group of climate scientists were doing dishonest work. The scientists had to endure audit after audit, every single one of which gave them a totally clean bill of health. It turned out it was the cooked-up, phony scandal that was dishonest, but the polluters had a field day in the meantime. It was right out of the playbook.

Claim it will cost consumers a fortune.

This is a playbook classic. The big polluters are always talking about how it will cost you to clean up their act. Implicit is that they are going to put all the costs on to you and that they are not going to eat any of it and that their shareholders are not going to bear any of it.

Let's get past that. What they conveniently overlook is that, for instance, under the Clean Air Act—yes, complying with the Clean Air Act did cost utilities a lot of money, but for every $1 that was spent cleaning up to comply with the Clean Air Act, Americans have saved about $40. They spend $1, you save $40, and they want you to believe that is a big problem?

The Office of Management and Budget does a little calculation called the social cost of carbon. The latest cost is $36 per ton of CO_2 emitted. For every ton of carbon pollution the polluters don't sell, we save $36. But they will never tell us that side of the story, nor that there are more jobs now in green energy than in the entire oil and gas industry, nor that we are in an international race for tomorrow's clean energy technology innovations. It is a race these big international corporations are perfectly happy to have America lose. It is no skin off their nose.

Last, their goal is not victory, it is doubt. They don't want to convince anyone that climate change isn't happening. They don't need to do that. Of course, they couldn't do that in any kind of a fair debate. All they need to do, the playbook strategy says, is to convince us, as we are driving down the road listening to the radio, that nobody is sure yet; that there is some doubt, but we don't need to do anything just yet; that people can move on to their next worry; this one is still up for grabs. They will keep trying to push action on carbon pollution over that horizon of doubt, never having to prove their case.

The American people are being played for chumps in this game. It is a racket, and we are the mark.

Even so, even with all of that, the facts around us—what is happening to our woods and shores and farms and weather—are becoming so clear that even with the playbook they are losing, just like they ultimately lost on cigarettes and seatbelts, on lead paint and acid rain and the ozone hole.

Here is what Americans are saying: 61 percent of Americans say the effects of climate change are already affecting them personally or they see it happening in their lifetime.

Fifty-eight percent said the country should do more to address climate change, including 51 percent of Independents, while just 14 percent—14 percent—said we are doing enough already.

Sixty-five percent of voters support ''the President taking significant steps to address climate change now''—65 percent. That number jumps up to 70 percent when looking at voters under 40 years old.

Sixty-six percent of young voters—two out of every three—say climate change is a problem to address, while just 27 percent say climate change is a natural event that humans can't affect, and only 3 percent don't believe climate change is happening.

Fifty-three percent of people say they would be less likely to vote for a politician who did not understand that climate change is a real problem.

Even in the red State of Texas, 70 percent believe global warming is happening, and more than half say more should be done about global warming at all levels of government.

Today is day 10 of the tea party shutdown. As we have pointed out over and over, it is a manufactured crisis. It goes away the instant Speaker BOEHNER stands in the House and calls the measure the Senate has passed, without amendments and without gimmicks, to the floor. It will pass. The crisis will be over.

This crisis is different. This is not a crisis of a fire in the cockpit that is being kept burning by Speaker BOEHNER who could stop it at any time; this is for real. This is Mother Nature—400 parts per million for the first time in 800,000 years is serious.

The tea party Republicans are wildly out of step with the American people on both issues, and it is time for them to wake up.

Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request, if I may ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to yield for one moment.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators on the majority side be limited to 10 minutes each until 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for up to 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QRM RULE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, on August 28 of this year, the six Federal regulators of the banking industry reported out on their charge to promulgate a rule required by Dodd-Frank known as the QRM rule or the qualified residential mortgage.

The qualified residential mortgage rule was a rule that Senator LANDRIEU, Senator HAGAN, and I put into the Dodd-Frank legislation to provide for a parameter for residential mortgage loans to be exempted from the risk retention requirements of Dodd-Frank if they met a certain standard. These regulators were charged with establishing that standard. That law passed over 5 years ago and we are just now getting the promulgation of the rule, but I am happy to say I rise on the floor of the Senate to memorialize my support for a job well done. The qualified residential mortgage rule, which is being circulated now until October 28, is the right answer for the requirement of Dodd-Frank and for the American housing industry.

For the education of the Senate and the public at large, the Dodd-Frank law, in its desire to make sure loans that were underwritten were better underwritten and loans that were made were better made loans so there would be less default and less problems in the housing industry, required the banking industry to make only qualified residential mortgages as defined.

The original discussions within the banking industry were that part of that definition would be a required 20-percent downpayment, which I and many people in America strenuously objected to, because a 20-percent requirement to exempt from risk retention would be far too great a downpayment for most American families to meet, would have probably meant a decline in the housing market, even greater than we experienced in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011, and would have had a negative impact on America's economy, unemployment, and America's health and well-being.

So the banking regulators did a great job in their rule which does the following: First of all, it equates QRM, or the qualified residential mortgage rule, with the QM rule, or the qualified mortgage rule, which Richard Cordray, the Director of the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau, promulgated 1 year ago. Mr. Cordray did an outstanding job of seeking input from people in the industry and the trades affected by the housing industry and wrote a rule that made sense. That rule required the following: It required good, solid underwriting. It required a maximum ratio of total debts to total gross income of 43 percent so we would not have somebody borrowing more than half of their take-home pay or their gross pay in order to service debts. That would mean people would have the money to pay their mortgage.

It required people to verify their income, credit, employment, the value of the property that is being purchased with the loan. All of those things are the standards that served America well for years until the subprime lending took place from 1999 until 2006.

So I commend Richard Cordray and the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau for defining a qualified mortgage as one that is well underwritten. A required downpayment is not necessary to have a qualified mortgage because underwriting is what led us into the difficulties of the past 5 years in the housing industry.

We went through a recession that was not a downpayment recession but an underwriting recession, and Congress itself was partially to blame when it mandated that Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae hold a certain percentage of their portfolios in what is known as qualified residential mortgages for the purposes of meeting the needs of underserved people in our society. Those underserved people in society ended up being credit risks or higher credit risks. They became known as subprime lenders. They got guaranteed by the government. They were sold in securities. When they defaulted, the securities went down, the American housing industry went down and the American Federal Reserve had to bail out people such as AIG and we went through the worst housing crisis in the history of the United States.

So the proposal of the six banking regulators to merge QRM and QM, they are recognizing that underwriting is the key to sound loans. By requiring good underwriting to exempt from the 5-percent risk retention required in Dodd-Frank, we are ensuring a robust housing market, robust and available capital through Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae, and private institutions, to ensure housing in America can return to the heights it has known in the past.

Quite frankly, we are never going to get below 7 percent unemployment, we are never going to get higher than 2 percent growth in America in our economy until we return to a robust housing market. We are not going to return to a robust housing market until we get liquidity in the credit markets for residential mortgages of a conventional nature. That is only going to happen when Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae can secure well underwritten loans and guarantee them so they can be sold in the marketplace.

The banking regulators who are now circulating the QRM rule for public comment did precisely the right thing by recognizing that underwriting was the problem and not downpayments.

Lastly, one of the things the regulators did put in their proposal for circulation for input was what if they did require a downpayment of 30 percent, would that be an exemption for the risk retention under QRM. I would implore the regulators not to consider doing that because a 30-percent downpayment would be even worse than a 20-percent downpayment. It would restrict even more Americans from becoming homeowners, and it would not address the problem. The problem was underwriting. The problem was not downpayment. Credit enhancements such as private mortgage insurance and things of that nature can supplant a downpayment requirement, but nothing can supplant quality underwriting.

Richard Cordray wrote a good rule, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is enforcing that rule, and I commend the bank regulators for merging the QRM rule with the QM definition to ensure that we return to a robust economy with a strong housing market, don't revisit the problems of the past with shoddy underwriting, and instead look forward to a brighter future for the American housing market.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, for nearly 2 weeks I have watched the debate on the Senate floor as well as on the House floor, and I have become more and more frustrated. My frustration is, in part—I would say in large part—driven by the contrast to what I see going on in my home State of Colorado.

During the past several weeks, Coloradans have come together in the wake of Biblical rains and beyond devastating flooding to begin the long process of rebuilding our State better and stronger. We in the West—and I think I can say we as Americans—are rugged cooperators. Sure, we are each strong individuals—and that is a strong point of view in the West; it is the core of who we are, that we are strong as individuals—but we know we are best when we band together, despite any political or philosophical differences, to face our shared challenges. I am doing my level best to bring that spirit to Washington, DC, especially now in this time of shutdowns and ultimatums and ideology that doesn't make sense to the people I represent in Colorado. I invite all of my colleagues to come to Colorado to see the collaborations occurring in these flood-ravaged communities such as Jamestown, Lyons and Estes Park and Fort Morgan. There are no games. There is no posturing. There is no politics. There is just a doggedness to make their communities better. I surely hope the strength and the focus of Coloradans could be an inspiration to all of us as we tackle what are very pressing policy issues.

On that note, I wish to speak about one of my constituents, someone I work for—Jeff. He is a Federal employee. He demonstrates the resilience, to me, of the people of Colorado. But his situation also typifies the worst of what this shutdown and this brinkmanship is doing to the real people, the good people of my State of Colorado.

Jeff is a Federal employee. He was trapped for 3 days in last month's flood. That flood cost him almost everything. He has very few possessions

left. Once he was free, he went immediately back to his day job. He was working for an agency that is integral to the flood disaster response. What happened? The government closed. So now he rents out an apartment. His home is inaccessible, literally, due to the flooding. He doesn't have a paycheck and he is being told he is not essential and he shouldn't come in to work.

There are a lot of reactions I have to that. There are a lot of reactions anybody who is paying attention would have to that. One is that now there is one less pair of boots on the ground helping with the flood response efforts in Colorado.

To a certain extent, politics is about finding the right strategy to advocate for what a person believes is right. But what is going on right now is shameful. What is happening to Jeff is flatout shameful.

What we are seeing is one faction of one party, in one Chamber, in one branch of government, holding this Nation's health, economy, and security hostage and, in the process, causing the Federal Government to shut down and threatening a government default on our obligations. By doing so, these individuals are holding our flood recovery hostage. It makes no sense.

I guess you have to ask yourself why. Why would a small group, a faction, be doing this? It strikes me that in part they are doing it because they are obsessed with undermining a law that is providing affordable health care to Americans, some for the first time in their lives, a law that is saving seniors hundreds of dollars a year on prescription drugs and is leveling the playing field when it comes to providing health care and putting consumers back in charge of their own health care.

I want to make this clear: After having legally passed both Houses of Congress, being affirmed by the Supreme Court, and then serving as a referendum in the just concluded campaign that overwhelmingly reelected President Obama, the Affordable Care Act is settled law. Let me say that again. The Affordable Care Act is settled law.

But describing it as settled law alone I know is not enough to resolve this latest crisis. So I would like to take viewers and my colleagues back a decade when the Presiding Officer was a Member of House at that time, when President George W. Bush pushed us to pass what was an unpaid-for Medicaid prescription drug benefit.

Members of my caucus over in the House felt that this massive unpaid law was thrust upon us without due consideration and at a time when we should not be racking up further debt. Many of us on my side of the aisle were literally reeling with anger after it passed. It also passed in ways with which we disagreed, in the middle of the night, literally. The desk in the House was kept open—I think the Presiding Officer knows—for close to 4 hours to find those last votes.

I was angry. I voted against that Medicare prescription drug benefit. I am sure I was as angry as some of my colleagues were when the Affordable Care Act passed over 3 years ago.

So what did I do? I took a lot of deep breaths. I listened to the counsel of people I respect, I listened to my own counsel, and I not only decided it was settled law, but I decided to start holding townhalls and listening sessions so I could help my constituents sign up for it. I knew it was the settled law of the land, just like ObamaCare is today, and I wanted my constituents to be best served by its implementation.

So I went out and spread the word about the benefits, figured out what questions my constituents would have. I wanted them to sign up. I wanted to make it a success. I wanted them to have those benefits.

So let's fast forward to today. Far from helping people, our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have relentlessly spread uncertainty about ObamaCare, attacking its implementation at every turn, and now to close down the Federal Government over their concerns about it.

We are in the 10th day of a government shutdown. Our national security has suffered. Seventy percent of the intelligence community is furloughed. We do not have enough food inspectors on the job. Our veterans are not getting the services not only that they need but that they have earned. Our national parks are closed, hurting economies like ours in Colorado. I mentioned Estes Park. Estes Park is the gateway to Rocky Mountain National Park. If Estes Park is going to recover from these devastating floods, Rocky Mountain National Park has to be open for business.

This is not how the greatest Nation in the world can go on doing business. I have said from the very beginning—I think the Presiding Officer agrees with me—the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. No mandate law is. As with every law, it will undoubtedly need some improvements and some constructive changes during its implementation. I am committed to doing that, just like we did after President Bush moved his prescription drug law to the finish line.

In the past few days we have seen statements indicating that some Republicans are starting to understand that this partisan focus on ObamaCare is futile. So as their next step they have seized on yet another destructive tactic, manufacturing a new crisis, an even more serious, potentially devastating crisis than shutting down the government. What have they done? They are threatening the full faith and credit of the Federal Government to push their budget demands. They have threatened to force us past the deadline, which is October 17—that is a week from today—when the United States will no longer be able to meet its financial obligations.

Grandstanding on funding the government is bad enough. If we do not agree on a way forward to reopen the government, but we also do not agree on a way to ensure that the Treasury Department does not default on our Nation's debt obligations, we will seriously damage global confidence in the United States, make no mistake. There are some voices in this building who think that will not happen. They are wrong.

If we damage the global confidence in the United States, we are going to hamper our economic recovery, we will slow job creation, and we will make borrowing costs more expensive for government and families alike. This is no way to win the global economic race in which we find ourselves. Coloradans are telling me in every way they can that they expect a lot better than this.

Ronald Reagan used to joke in only the way he could that he was not worried about the debt; it is big enough to take care of itself. But every American should worry if Congress refuses to meet the obligations we have already made.

I know many Americans are worried about our debt and our capacity to pay the bills we have incurred. I have been worried about this for a long time. I think if you would ask anybody around here, they would tell you I would vote in a minute for a sensible grand bargain. It is true. I have worked across the aisle and built a record of efforts to reduce wasteful spending and set our budget on a more sustainable footing. It should be one of our top priorities. It has to be one of our top priorities.

I have been a longtime supporter of the line-item veto. I supported the initial structure around which the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction commission worked. I called for an end to earmarks. I worked with Senator COBURN from Oklahoma on ending some wasteful public subsidies, including those for the political party conventions every 4 years. It is why I was the first Democrat to champion a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution in many a year. I am not the only Member, as well, of my party who has been fighting for commonsense reforms.

This is critically important work. I would love nothing more than to bring a serious deficit reduction plan to the floor and pass it along with raising our debt limit to avoid an American default.

But let me be crystal clear: To default on our debt because a grand bargain eludes us would make our debt and deficits even worse and thrust us into an economic tailspin. It is irresponsible to even suggest forcing America into default as a legitimate negotiating position.

Let's sit down and have a grownup discussion about these important issues, but not like this. Let's fund the government, let's pay our bills, and then let's sit down and negotiate again. Negotiation is good. Compromise is good. But we cannot have this important set of discussions with one party constantly threatening to shut down

the government or throw our country into default, each of which makes our deficits and debt even worse.

We have, literally, centuries of examples of a Congress collaborating, working together. We have done that for over 200 years. We can debate, we can have contentious back-and-forth, but in the end we need to compromise and agree. We need a comprehensive and balanced deficit reduction plan that can pass both Chambers and be signed into law.

No party gets to threaten the American economy and shut down the government when they do not get their way. No party gets to jeopardize middle-class families' 401(k)s or senior citizens' retirement savings or set our economic recovery back just because their positions are not strong enough to prevail on their own.

That just is not the way to address our Nation's shared problems. And trust me, our debt and deficits are a shared problem. We can do better.

I want to begin to conclude by again referring to the Coloradans I am so fortunate to represent, just like the Presiding Officer, I know, is honored to represent the good people of Wisconsin. Coloradans have shown the true strength of our State in the wake of this tragic flooding that literally has wiped communities off the map and destroyed thousands of homes. If we could have done anything to prevent that natural disaster, we would have.

We now face a potential manmade disaster. We have to protect Americans from a looming manmade disaster that is emerging right here. We have to bridge the partisan divide. We have to end this government shutdown. We have to stave off an American default. We have to pay our bills. We could do this today if Speaker BOEHNER would just allow the House to vote on a clean funding resolution that we have already sent to the House, with the House numbers in it, by the way. So let's just see a vote in the House. The continuing resolution would pass in the House today with Republican and Democratic votes.

So let's just vote. Let's hold the vote. The Presiding Officer and I served in the House. When we were eager to go to work we would shout: Vote, vote, vote; work, work, work. It is time for the House to go to work. Let's vote to end this debt ceiling crisis and make sure our Nation pays the debts it has already incurred.

These are the basic functions of Congress. If we fail to act, history will never forgive us—any of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the multiple issues that have now presented themselves to us in the Senate and to the U.S. Congress and, frankly, the American people.

I have been in several hearings this morning. The first was with Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew, where the Finance Committee discussed with him the pending expiration of our debt ceiling and what his understanding is of how that will impact the country. He raised a lot of serious concerns—very legitimate serious concerns—that others are raising.

We then followed that up with a hearing in the Banking Committee where we had representatives from a number of the various industries in the United States also discussing what is going to happen in the United States if the country does not increase the debt ceiling. And there are serious consequences that will happen if we do not do this.

But what I tried to do in both of those hearings—and I will refer to my conversation with Secretary Lew—was to focus us back on the broader, bigger threat. Secretary Lew basically said that we have a manufactured crisis in the United States because of our unwillingness at this point to face the debt ceiling and simply extend the debt ceiling without any kinds of conditions or negotiations.

I reminded him that the crisis we face—the big crisis we face—is the debt crisis, and it is very real. I guess in a sense it has been manufactured over the last 20 or 30 years by Congresses and Presidents who have refused to control spending and have put us into tremendous debt.

Our debt ceiling we are negotiating about right now—or I think wishing we could negotiate about right now—is $16.7 trillion. It has grown by trillions of dollars over the last 5 or 6 years.

What the President has asked us to do is to once again increase the debt ceiling by another $1 trillion or more with no reforms, no fiscal changes in our policies to deal with the mounting spending crisis we face. The President's position is: You give me this $1 trillion or more of new debt authority, and I will then talk to you about reforming our fiscal policy. The problem is we have been trying to negotiate over fiscal policy now and trying to get reforms put into place for years and we have not been able to get there.

When I asked Secretary Lew about this, he basically said: We have made progress on our overall debt crisis in the past few years, and I think we can continue to work on those kinds of steps if you will simply pass this clean debt ceiling extension and do so in a way that involves no negotiations from the President in any way.

I reminded him that a major part of the progress we have made in the last couple of years was made when we met the debt ceiling 2 years ago in 2011. It was the Budget Control Act that put into statute over $2 trillion of reductions in our spending path. That was attached to the debt ceiling as we moved forward. It was literally the debt ceiling negotiation that generated the only significant spending controls this Congress, this country, has seen for years and years. Yet the President refuses to take another step now that we have met the debt ceiling again and negotiate for further reforms.

By the way, there is another reason we have made some progress in the past few years. That is that we have implemented massive new taxes on the American people. The ObamaCare legislation itself contains nearly $1 trillion of new taxes, and although they were delayed for a few years, they are now beginning to fully hit the American people. Last January, the President was able to win his argument and succeed in getting the top income tax brackets raised, an impact on our Tax Code that I think was harmful rather than helpful and clearly was damaging to the creation of jobs and to businesses across the United States. But, nevertheless, another $500 billion to $600 billion of tax revenue was put into the mix there.

So what have we done? We have made a plan to control discretionary spending over the next 10 years and reduce it by about $2 trillion. If we stick to that, we will get $2 trillion worth of spending reductions. We have raised taxes by at least $1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, all of which, I believe, has been harmful to our economy, but has generated revenue to try to help reduce the debt cycle. But we have not addressed the two critical parts of reform that we must address in this country if we are ever going to get control of our spending excesses and stop the out-of-control spiral toward insolvency that we see; that is, reforming our entitlement system and reforming our broken Tax Code.

What have we seen there? Virtually minimal, if any at all, reforms of entitlements. They seem to be off the table. Yet they are the part of our spending problem that is the biggest and the most out of control. On tax reform, we have seen no reform of the Tax Code. We have a Tax Code that is the most unfair, the most complicated, the most expensive to comply with, and the most anticompetitive code we probably could have created if we did it on purpose. Yet we have no reforms of the code. Instead what we have done is add to the code another $1.6 trillion of new taxes on the American people.

What we are asking is whether we can move forward in trying to deal with our fiscal problems in this country by negotiating over entitlement reform and tax reform. I frankly believe we ought to be at the negotiating table talking about that. But what we have been told is: No, as soon as you raise the debt ceiling by—the amount we are hearing is somewhere in the neighborhood of $1 trillion—as soon as you raise the debt ceiling, then we can talk further about other negotiations, then we can get engaged in trying to deal with our debt crisis.

I pointed out, as I said to Secretary Lew, that the last major progress we made on spending reform happened in negotiations relating to our debt ceiling. Why cannot we negotiate now and

make significant fiscal reform in addition to dealing with our debt ceiling? It is that debt crisis that is the biggest problem.

I was on the Bowles-Simpson Commission, the President's own commission, that he put together some years back, 2 or 3 years now. We spent a full year studying the impacts on our economy of America's fiscal excess and what we needed to do. The Bowles-Simpson Commission came up with a plan. It was a proposal. We concluded that—this was 2 or 3 years back—we needed to reduce our spending path, our debt path in the United States by at least $4 trillion. We concluded we had to deal with that by reforming our entitlement system and we had to deal with it by controlling discretionary spending. We agreed to having some of that tax revenue the President was demanding. We also agreed that in the overall mix we would have about a 3-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue.

The President did not accept that recommendation. Many of us tried for months and months and months afterward to get that recommendation to the floor for a vote. But it has not made it to the floor for a vote.

My point is, negotiations have been under way for years and years. Significant plans have been developed that would help us move forward. We know what to do. We need to have the will to do it. So far, the only reforms we have been able to get in the last few years as a result of the debt crisis that we face have come when we have met these pressure points dealing with our debt ceiling.

We are not asking to shut down the government for the purpose of simply making a point. We are trying to get to negotiations. We want to see the government reopened. We are not seeking to have the debt ceiling expire. We want to have negotiations to be able to put together the kinds of fiscal reforms that should always accompany extensions of the debt ceiling.

I believe the reason Congress put a statutory debt ceiling in place in the first place was because it wanted to give America a gut check every so often about the spending problems we have. We have put almost half of the entire spending system of the government on auto pilot. We do not even have the opportunity to vote on it here in Congress.

Ultimately, we have to deal with the debt ceiling. Ultimately, we have to deal with the funding to keep our government operational. Let's not just move forward and accomplish those objectives, leaving in place the unrestrained fiscal crisis we are dealing with in this country. Let's use this opportunity to put together the kinds of fiscal reforms that should accompany decisions to allow our country to increase its debt.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Yesterday I came to the floor with the distinguished majority leader to raise the issue of survivor benefits to those who died in the line of duty. Reportedly, 26 servicemembers have died since the government shut down on October 1, including 5 in combat. Their families have been denied the basic survivor benefits, which include a death gratuity, $100,000 of life insurance, a housing allowance paid for a year, paid in a lump sum, as well as burial and other related expenses.

Yesterday I asked unanimous consent that we take up and pass the House bill. The majority leader and I entered into a conversation, and there was a question as to the intervening action by the Department of Defense to try to work around the lapse of the funding. Fisher House, which is a wonderful charitable organization, helps to operate and fund seven different facilities in my State alone. I know they are extraordinarily generous and do very good work. They offered to enter into a contractual agreement with the Department of Defense to fill the gap during the interim. But what I would like to do is ask unanimous consent that we take up and pass the House legislation, which would alleviate the need for Fisher House and the Department of Defense trying to figure a workaround. We would actually pass legislation that would reopen that stream of funding so that these families could get the benefits they deserve.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 216, 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; that the measure be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the senior Senator from Texas has always been very courteous to me. Yesterday was no exception in withholding his unanimous consent request when we discussed this issue. It was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, as he indicated.

I indicated that I thought that if we waited until 3:30 we would have this matter revolved, as that is what I had been told. In fact, it was a little after 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon that Secretary Hagel issued a statement announcing that the Department of Defense had entered into an agreement, as my friend said, with the organization my friend mentioned, and that would provide the family of fallen servicemembers—over the weekend, the Senator from Texas is correct, we had five soldiers killed, one of whom was a woman, four men and one woman. The agreement Senator Hagel came up with would give everyone—provide to family members of the military the full set of benefits they have been promised, including the $100,000 death benefit gratuity. So the death benefit issue has been resolved. The Department of Defense stepped forward and took care of everything, so this issue is largely moot. It is clear the action on this legislation is now just for show here.

We all agree it is bad that the government shutdown led to this added grief for the families who had suffered such a terrible loss. Now we need to do what we can to prevent any further bad results—and there have been plenty of them in other areas. The right thing to do is to prevent more of these in other areas, and the House should just vote to open the government. This issue has been taken care of, and it is terrible that we even got to this point.

We should not forget that as long as the government remains closed and the Republicans refuse to open the government, the military is unable to, for example, buy armor and equipment needed to prevent future deaths in the military. For the families of FBI agents killed in the line of duty, it is the same problem—they can't receive their death benefits. Veterans' benefits are delayed and disrupted.

As for this bill, the Secretary has now acted. We all agree the issue is taken care of. If my friend from Texas feels more comfort as a result of doing this, which I think is unnecessary, I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if I could respond briefly, I appreciate the majority leader not objecting to the consideration of this legislation. He believes this issue has been resolved by this contractual arrangement between Fisher House and the Department of Defense, but ultimately the Department of Defense would have to reimburse Fisher House under what I understand is the purported arrangement to be made. This obviates the need for any of that kind of workaround, together with any legal questions that might arise as to whether this is actually something the Department has the authority to do. I am not suggesting they don't; I am just saying this alleviates all those considerations.

So I am pleased we were able to come together in a bipartisan way, as we were on the military pay for uniformed military, and pass this narrow piece of legislation. I think maybe now that we have passed the pay for Active-Duty

military and we have passed the provision that provides for survivor benefits for the families of the fallen, perhaps that paves the way to be open for some other narrow bills until we can come together on a larger bill.

We have offered, for example, funding for the National Institutes of Health, NIH. A few days ago the distinguished assistant leader from the Democratic side gave a very eloquent speech about children's cancer research. Under the bill that was passed by the House on a bipartisan basis that we have called up here, that funding would be restored, as would funding for the Veterans' Administration so they can process disability benefits, which they are not able to do now because of the cutoff in funding.

There are a number of areas where I think we can work together constructively if we will do so. I am pleased we were able to take care of this one.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I would ask a question through the Chair.

I say through the Chair, I think what we did here was the right thing to do, and I am sorry, I am painfully sorry that this government shutdown is hurting so many innocent people. It could come to an end with one decision by the Speaker to call one bill on the floor of the House. He refuses to do so. So we are trying to put out these little fires and spare the American people the pain and injustice that is coming about as a result of this shutdown. But I would say to the Senator from Texas that even the Veterans' Administration bill passed by the House fails to fund some critical areas for veterans. It does not fund the appeals process for veterans disability claims. Those have stopped. Secondly, it doesn't fund the cemetery rights of veterans who are seeking to be buried in national cemeteries. While we pay for funerals, the people who prepare the grave sites and such are not being paid. It doesn't have the Department of Labor program to hire unemployed veterans coming home. That is not funded. The HUD program for homeless veterans is not being funded. The notion that we are somehow taking care of veterans with the House action is far from true.

The last point I wish to make is that over 500,000 Federal employees are actually veterans. Many of them are furloughed today. One-fourth of all employee veterans are disabled. Many of them are furloughed today.

If we really care about veterans, opening the government to make sure all of these agencies are serving our veterans seems to me to be a reasonable approach. I ask if the Senator agrees.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, responding to the question of the distinguished assistant majority leader, I would say that we would all like to try to find some way to get back to business as usual when it comes to funding the government through the regular appropriations process. We haven't done that for a long time, and so we have been operating not on individual bills—I think there are 13 separate bills as part of the appropriations process. So now we have unfortunately already degenerated to this continuing resolution process, which has its own problems.

I would say to my friend that for every one of the hardships we can mitigate through passing narrow legislation absent a global agreement on the continuing resolution, it seems to me we ought to be doing that. If there are other suggestions the Democratic side has about how we can do that, I think that would be a good thing to do.

The problem is that I know the majority leader—I will give the majority leader the benefit of the doubt. I hope he didn't really mean he thought this was a show process, trying to restore these survivor benefits through this unanimous consent request, and I will give him the benefit of the doubt.

I do think there are a lot of questions raised in the minds of the American people whether what is happening here is being done purely for political purposes. We have veterans of World War II and Korea who come to the World War II Memorial only to be met with barricades. I have met a number of the Honor Flights of the ''greatest generation'' at a number of these memorials, and they have basically decided to go around the barricades, as I believe is their right under the Constitution.

It seems as if there is an effort made to maximize the pain associated with the shutdown. We know 83 percent of the government is being funded. Why can't we try to chip away at some of these narrow provisions and mitigate some of the hardship that we can rather than getting in our corners, squaring off, and creating more and more problems? I think this is important. We ought to be doing this. We should have done this a long time ago.

I would say to my colleagues, there were reports that Secretary Hagel notified the administration of this lapse in survivor benefits before the shutdown even occurred. It took the President 9 days before he finally ordered the Department of Defense to come up with a workaround, thankfully with the help of the Fisher House.

I think there is an impression that a lot of gamesmanship is going on. I don't think it becomes the Senate. I think Congress's approval rating is in the toilet, and we ought to be doing everything we can to address the problems where we can.

Mr. DURBIN. Would Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I would make several points.

First, I was with an Honor Flight group at the World War II Memorial last week, a great bunch of World War II veterans who came in from Illinois, and it didn't surprise me one bit—there was no barricade stopping these veterans. They were on their way to their memorial, and they went.

The reason why there was any question about this memorial and access was because of the decision by the Republicans to shut down the government.

I was going to remind the Senator of Texas, who is a learned attorney and a former Texas Supreme Court justice, of the story we were told in law school. It was an anecdotal story, an apocryphal story of someone who killed both his parents, went to the courtroom, and then threw himself on the mercy of the court because he was an orphan. In this situation we have our Republican friends lamenting the impact of a government shutdown on World War II veterans coming to Washington, and on these tragic stories of families who have lost someone they love in combat. But all of this is unnecessary. All of it could have been avoided if the Republican Speaker of the House would call one bill for a vote which he knows will pass. It would open the government. That is the simple and honest answer.

This notion we are going to have a series of small appropriations to fund our government—all of the appropriations bills that have been called so far and passed the House amount to about 18 percent of the discretionary domestic budget. At this pace, the House only has to pass 79 more bills to open our government. We think at this pace it will only take them about 2½ months to do it. Is that any way to run a great Nation? It isn't.

We need to open our government, serve our people, spare them the injustice and pain which comes from this Republican shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, gave an analogy that applies to a lot of what my friend from Texas said. First of all, we haven't done appropriations bills. We haven't done appropriations bills because the Republicans won't let us. We can't even get cloture on a way to proceed to one of them.

But I want to be sure the record is clear that my friend from Texas doesn't have to give me the benefit of the doubt on what I said. If there were ever an example of this whole process being for show, it is this: We have a lot of things we should be working on. The country is within 1 week of defaulting on its debt for the first time in the history of this country. We should be focusing on that. The government should be open.

We had the unfortunate incident where we had five of our troops killed over the weekend in Afghanistan, and it brought to our attention they were not going to get their benefits because the part of the government that gives them that money is closed.

Now, we didn't close it. But Secretary Hagel, a former Republican Member of this body, worked it out so they are all taken care of. They are all taken care of. So this unanimous consent I agreed to is for show. It doesn't mean anything. They are being taken care of anyway.

So I appreciate the Senator giving me the benefit of the doubt, but he doesn't need to give me the benefit of the doubt. This whole thing is for show. This whole government shutdown is for show. It is a show that I don't quite understand the ending of, but that is where we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, may I inquire, under the previous order, how much time remains for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 8½ minutes remaining for the Republicans.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes be added to that total, for a total of 13 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, with all this focus on the fighting going on in Washington these days, I think we are losing focus on the biggest issue facing this country, and that is the pervasive and growing sense we are losing control of our country; that we are losing the American dream.

Why do people feel this way? Because millions of them have been out of a job for months, and maybe even years, and because millions more find themselves stuck with jobs that don't pay enough for them to live on or certainly for them to live as they used to.

When people hear news that the economy is recovering, that unemployment is down by .1 percent this week or this month, that the stock market is up and that the recession is over, it makes people angry. And rightfully so. Because the recession might be over on Wall Street, but it is not over for millions of people who are out of work or stuck with jobs that do not pay enough to live on.

What makes all this worse is that while their paychecks aren't growing, their bills are growing. Ask the young couples out there, the single parents, how much it is costing them every month or week to provide childcare for their kids. Ask the young Americans who are saddled with thousands of dollars in student loan debt.

How are people making it through these times? Well, I am reminded of a few years after we got married, when my wife and I hit a rough patch in our finances. What we did was we got rid of one of the cars and we moved in with her mom for 6 months. That is what many of us have had to do at some stage in our life, but it was usually temporary. Now people are doing that with the feeling it might not be temporary; that this might be the way it is for a while. And they ask themselves: Is this the new normal? Is this the way it is going to be from now on?

This is what millions of people across this country are feeling these days; that maybe the American dream—if you work hard, you can improve your life—isn't what it used to be; that maybe the American dream is actually even slipping away.

But why is this happening? Whose fault is this, is the normal reaction some people have. Well, there are a few reasons why this is happening. One is the economy has changed. The nature of our economy has changed. Globalization, for example, has sent thousands of middle-class jobs overseas. Information technology and advances have replaced many of our middle-class jobs with machines. Another reason why is that we simply have too many people who never get the education or the skills they need for the better paying jobs this new economy is creating. And we can't ignore, for example, the breakdown of our culture and our families and what that is doing. It is trapping people in a cycle of poverty and of dependence. These are all contributors to what we face today.

But one of the major reasons why this is happening, why so many people are trapped in dead-end jobs, why so many people have been unemployed for so long, is because our economy is not creating enough jobs to live off of. One of the reasons why that is happening is because our country is headed for a debt crisis. The real debt crisis is not the looming debt limit. The real debt crisis is that every year our government is spending more money than it takes in. And, by the way, one day we are not going to have to worry about raising the debt limit because no one will want to lend us money anyway.

Too often around here we talk about the national debt as if it is simply an accounting problem. The national debt is a lot more than that. How does the economy create good jobs? It creates good jobs in two ways: No. 1 is through innovation—when people invent a new product or service. The other is through investment—when people risk the money they have to start a new business or when a business reinvests its profits into the business to grow. The fact we are headed for a debt crisis and that we have no serious long-term plan in place to address it is discouraging innovation and that is discouraging investment.

Who wants to innovate in an economy that is headed for a debt crisis? Who wants to risk their money to start a new business in an economy that is headed for a catastrophic disruption? And who wants to reinvest their profits to grow their business in a country where the government is going bankrupt?

Having people trapped in low-wage jobs, having people unemployed for months or years at a time, having people unable to afford to get married or start a family doesn't have to be the new normal. It doesn't have to be this way forever. We can turn this around. But to do so we have to stop chasing all these temporary gimmicks that promise us some sort of momentary boost to our economy. We have to stop ignoring the problems headed full speed at us. We have to return to the basics—to the basics that made us such a prosperous nation.

Our national debt today stands at close to $17 trillion. In the last 5½ years alone it has grown by over $6 trillion. So when you hear the President or the Democrats here in the Senate say they want us to pass what they call a clean debt limit increase, here is what they are really asking for: They are asking us to borrow another $1 trillion but not do anything meaningful to slow the growth of that debt.

Why would we continue to do this? When are we finally going to get serious around here about putting in place a serious long-term plan to bring this debt under control? In order to do that, the first thing we have to understand is what is causing this debt.

Look, we have a broken Tax Code. It is full of all sorts of special-interest loopholes. But the reason why we have this massive debt isn't because rich people aren't paying enough in taxes. Even if we taxed every millionaire every penny they made this year, it wouldn't make even a small dent in the debt. Yes there is some serious waste going on throughout our government. For example, we have to reverse the changes the Obama administration has made to these welfare programs that basically gut the work requirement and leave people dependent on government. We need to reform the way we give foreign aid. We must and should do all of these and even more. But even if we did all that, it is still not enough.

What is driving our debt is the way we spend money on two very important programs: Medicare and Social Security. They are spending more money than they take in, and that gap is growing rapidly every single year.

I warn you, anytime anyone talks about making changes to these programs, you get accused of trying to hurt the elderly. So speaking for myself personally, let me set the record straight. I come from a State with millions of people—millions of retirees—who depend on these programs, and one of them is my own mother. She worked hard for her entire life and paid into these programs so they would be there for her when she retired. I would never support any changes to these programs that would hurt my mother. But these programs are going bankrupt, and anyone who is in favor of doing nothing about them is in favor of bankrupting them.

The good news is this: The good news is we still have some time to save Medicare and Social Security, and we still have time to do these changes without making any changes to the benefits of seniors such as my mom. But to do so is going to require younger workers, like myself, to accept that

when we retire, our Medicare and our Social Security is going to be different than our parents.

So instead of spending all of our time around here trying to figure out how to raise the debt limit, we need to spend more of our time trying to figure out what we can do to put in place a serious long-term plan to bring this debt under control so that our economy can start creating more of those good-paying, middle-class jobs, so that people can start building for themselves the better future they always dreamed of.

The American dream is under assault. That is the real crisis. When are we going to get serious about solving it? This dream of earning a better life is the universal hope of people everywhere. But we are reminded that for much of human history most people found themselves trapped by the circumstances of their birth. That meant no matter how hard they worked, no matter how talented they were, they were only going to go as far as their family went. They could only do whatever it was their parents did. One of the things that made America so special is that here that has been different. Here, through hard work and sacrifice, people from all walks of life, from every corner of the world, have had the real opportunity to earn for themselves a better life.

This is what we call the American dream. As Americans, that is our identity. It is what holds us together as a nation. It is what holds us together as a people, and it is what has made us exceptional.

I know people are discouraged about how tough times are. I know some people are very disappointed about how the last election turned out. I know many people are angry and, quite frankly, disgusted by the way this process is working or failing to work these days. But no matter how bad things may seem, we cannot give up on America and we cannot give up on the American dream. We have to do everything we can to make sure this country remains a place where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything.

So despite how ugly Washington looks right now, I actually remain confident that, in the end, that is exactly what we are going to do. I have no doubt that, in the end, our children will grow up to be the most prosperous generation that ever lived. Despite all the challenges we face right now, when all is said and done, I believe with all my heart we will still go down in history as the generation that saved the American dream and left our children what our parents left for us—the single greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, mindful of the hour and that the Senate is about to recess, I want to say to my colleague from Florida, who is my friend, that I have optimism and I have faith in our country as well.

I think it is interesting that the stock market, the Dow Jones, has surged 243 points—I just checked it a couple of minutes ago—on just the rumors that the debt ceiling will be lifted and we will not go through this crisis. But I am told at the other end of the Capitol, the House of Representatives is going to have difficulty in getting any agreement to stop the shutdown of the government and pass a continuing appropriations bill. So here we are, back in the soup again.

If we do just a short-term debt extension, lifting the debt ceiling, then for however long it is—5, 6 weeks—come Thanksgiving we are going to be back in the soup again.

There has got to be a change in attitude, and the attitude has got to be I respect the other fellow's point of view, I respect his difference of opinion, now let's work it out together. And it is only then we are going to solve this problem.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair until 4:04 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and that the Democrats be limited to 10 minutes each. Basically, the reason is we have lots of speakers on this side. I need not say more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we are hearing a lot of discussion right now about the role of government and the role of the public sector.

We know there is a minority in the House of Representatives who ran on shutting the government down and think they have achieved something as we see the economy teetering now, as we see people who have been put out of work, who have mortgages, car payments, and concerns about their children and so on, and all the services that are in jeopardy, from food safety to law enforcement to what happens in the case of an oil spill and all of the things in between.

I found it interesting with our colleagues who have embraced the idea that in the greatest country in the world and in the greatest democracy in the world there is no need for the public sector. No one else is having this debate around the world. They are embracing every tool of the public sector to embrace their private sector to try to beat us by outeducating and outinnovating us in a global economy, as the distinguished Presiding Officer understands. So we are in a global race where everybody understands it is all in. We use all the tools that we have.

We have the greatest private sector, the most robust private sector entrepreneurs that can beat anybody in the world. But we also have a public sector that creates the framework and support for that by having a rule of law, by having basic protections in place for the public.

As I had the opportunity to listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the House, it seems every time there is a story—a salmonella outbreak—gosh, we had better bring some folks back. We have veterans hurting so we had better bring something back. We have women and children not getting baby formula through the WIC Program so we should do something about that. We have concerns about national safety so we should do something about that. It is almost as if we are educating these Members about the role of government in this process as they go. I didn't realize we did that. So maybe that function ought to be working. It is a chaotic way for the greatest democracy to operate, but that seems to be what is happening right now.

I remember in my times traveling to China, the last time I was there, where they said to me: Oh, you are here in Beijing on a great day; you can see across the street.

We are lucky. We can see across the street almost every day because we collectively have decided that one of the things we need to do to be able to breathe the air is to have certain rules, certain protections and standards in place so we can breathe the air. That is important to do through the public sector. We can't say: I will do the air in front of this desk, and you do the air in front of this desk, and somebody else will protect the air over here. It doesn't work that way. We do it together. So we don't have to worry about saying: I am in D.C. on the 2 days a year we can breathe the air and look across the street. We have the confidence of knowing that we have a quality of life, including the ability to see across the street and breathe the air, because in a civilized society, the greatest democracy in the world, we have made sure that those standards are there for our citizens.

I remember on a trip to Russia a few years ago they were talking about wanting to get more private sector investment into Moscow in Russia. I came home talking to our businesses and they said: The problem is they don't have a rule of law. We don't trust how we can invest there because we are not confident in their government, their rule of law. We don't have that problem here. We have the epitome of a

system with checks and balances, a rule of law. Up until all of this had begun, we have had the confidence available in the private sector on how to invest and know that there is a system in place.

I had the opportunity, with my agriculture hat on a few months ago, to be in Haiti where we see a great desire, meeting with the Haitian president, to bring in more business and investment from the United States. The problem is, you bring a shipload of cargo into the harbor, and you can't get it off the ship without paying bribes. They have no law enforcement system, judicial system, rule of law.

That is not true in our country. We do it through something collectively that we call government, that creates a way for us to make sure we can drink the water, breathe the air, see across the street, drive on the roads, have the opportunity for education for all of our children, and know that we can walk into a restaurant and have some level of confidence that the food is safe or go into the grocery store and know that.

We have research institutions that suddenly, after our colleagues in the House have been saying—and for years I have had personal debates with folks who said: We don't need a National Institutes of Health. Let the private sector do it. Yet we know collectively we are willing to share a risk of basic research to try to find cancer cures, to go over and over again on research until they get that one that may be able to move forward and be successful, in which case the private sector comes in and takes it from there. But we have done it together and shared the risk because we know it is in all of our interests to save lives—- in our own, our family Members, and others—whether it is Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, juvenile diabetes, cancer. All of those things are done collectively through this thing that we call government. That is why we have the best standard of living in the world. We are the wealthiest country in the world. We are the envy of the world. People want to come here and invest. They want to be a part of the opportunities in this country. And now we are debating whether or not, literally, there should be a public sector. Should we fund the police and the firefighters and the judicial system? There are those on the other side of the aisle who would say: We don't mean that. Every time we bring up something: We didn't mean that. I am not sure what they mean then in a civilized society.

We know we have challenges around issues of finance and debt. As chair of the Agriculture Committee, I am proud of the fact—and I have said so many times on the floor—that we are the only committee on a bipartisan basis that has actually brought a deficit reduction bill to the floor that has passed in the Senate. So I take a backseat to no one when we are looking at ways to cut duplication, to cut things that aren't important, to strengthen those things that are, and to save money.

But we do not do it by destroying our economy, by shutting down the services we all count on to protect us as consumers, to make sure our children have opportunities, to make sure we are safe and secure in this country. Obviously, that makes no sense. It is totally irresponsible.

What we are not talking about enough is that we have begun to see things happening in terms of the debt and deficit. We can continue to do that. In fact, the yearly deficit has been cut in half. I don't hear people talking about that, but the numbers say that.

A few years ago we set a goal of $4 trillion in debt reduction over 10 years. We are more than halfway there—not all the way there, but we have put in place a mechanism through cuts, through new revenue, through interest savings yielding $2.5 trillion in debt reduction out of the $4 trillion.

What is happening by shutting down the Government and threatening a default? That debt is going to go back up. We are going to undermine the work we have already done by adding increased costs through interest payments and delays that will actually increase the debt. We saw that in the last go-around in 2011. Even though there was not actually a default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America, we saw it because of exactly what is happening now. We had a lot of talk—in my judgment some very irresponsible talk—and posturing back-and-forth instead of working together in a reasonable way. We saw the markets affected, a drop of 2,000 points in the market, $800 billion in retirement savings of folks who worked hard all their lives and maybe are still working and cannot figure out why in the world we cannot work together in a reasonable, rational way to solve problems. There was $800 billion retirement savings gone. During that time in 2011, that summer, July and August, anyone who was signing up for a new mortgage is paying on average $100 more a month in payments because the interest rates were higher.

Instead of building on what we have already done together or even acknowledging it—it may not make good politics to acknowledge folks on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, it seems they certainly do not want to give credit to the President or give credit for anything we have actually been doing together. But the reality is the deficit has been cut in half and we are more than halfway to the goal that was set for savings over 10 years.

There is nothing that has been happening in the last few days—shutting down the government, threatening possible default on the full faith and credit of the United States—that is helping us reach that goal. It is actually going in the opposite direction. As interest rates go up, billions of dollars will be added to the debt.

We have tried to figure out over the last number of months how to continue bringing down the debt and tackling long-term challenges while, by the way, creating jobs. The best way to get us out of debt is to create jobs so people can go back to work and be part of the economy. That is the best thing, and we are sure not hearing enough talk about that.

I am very proud to come from a State that makes things and grows things. It is manufacturing that is bringing us back, that is driving the economy, and it is agriculture where we have the biggest exports, in terms of export surpluses, in the country. We need to make things and grow things, focus on that. That will bring down the debt as we create more opportunities and more jobs.

In the last 6 months we have tried to go to a conference committee, a negotiating team, a formal negotiating process between the House and Senate on a 10-year budget that will bring down the debt, create jobs, do things in a fair and balanced way that puts middle class families first. We have tried to do that, as of today, 21 times. In fact, the chair of the Budget Committee has come to the floor and moved that we get to that process 21 times, joined by distinguished Members of the Republican caucus in the Senate who have come to say the same thing, let us go to a budget negotiation, a formal budget negotiation. Over 21 times the same folks who shut down the Government, the same folks who say it doesn't hurt anything if we default as a country, even though every economist, every business leader is begging and pleading and providing facts and information as to why it would be a complete disaster—the same people who are saying defaults don't matter, government doesn't work, except when they are reading something in the paper and somebody is saying there is a problem—they, those same people have, 21 times been able to block the Senate from going to a formal negotiation with the House on the budget.

We are in this crazy place where, on the one hand, when we step back we are actually seeing the economy slowly moving forward—of course until now, when it is beginning to be stymied by all of this. But the economy has been moving forward. The yearly deficit is coming down. We have been tackling the long-term debt. We are coming out of this. Then we have a group of folks who have decided in the big picture that there is no value in a democracy, in the greatest country in the world, in government. They don't seem to care about what it takes to provide an economy and so on.

Now they are saying they are willing to jeopardize the faith and credit of the United States of America, have America default on our bills and potentially send us not only and probably into a great recession similar to the one we just came out of, but economists tell us it could send us back even further, into the thirties or forties. They just do not know.

We are in a global marketplace right now where we don't know what happens when we default on our bills, when we lose the confidence of the world to invest in America or to even purchase our debt. We don't know what happens when small businesses see all their capital dry up and people are not able to get mortgage loans again or they cost much more than they did before and all the other ramifications of our not paying our bills.

There are colleagues who say the Secretary of the Treasury—who, by the way, came down and did an excellent job in the Finance Committee today. It was very serious. It was very sobering, but I thought he was clear and he was factual and I very much appreciate his coming to the Senate Finance Committee. But there are those who say he says October 17 is the last time extraordinary measures can be used to stop us from falling off the cliff and going into default and losing the full faith and credit of the United States—except, no, it could be the next day, it could be the day after.

Coming from a car State it reminds me of someone who is driving in their car and they look and it is on empty. You may have a little bit more. Sometimes they say you have 5 miles more, you have 10 miles more, maybe you have 30 miles more, but you are on empty and you are going to stop—the car is going to stop. The question is how often do you want to risk that and play that game when you know the car is going to stop.

That is, in my judgment, the kind of absurd and irresponsible debate going on right now—about whether the car stops immediately or in 2 miles or 3 miles or 30 miles. Why in the world would you want to put yourself in that position? Lord knows, defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States of America is much more serious than running out of gas in your car.

There is no reason for this—none, zero. This is a manufactured crisis. Do we need to continue to work together to tackle the long-term debt of this country? Absolutely. Count me in. Do we need to focus on what is happening to middle-class families who are getting squeezed on all sides and have a hard time just holding on? Do we need to focus on jobs in this country, making things and growing things and outeducating and outinnovating the world? Absolutely. Count me in. Count me in at the head of the line on that.

We in Michigan right now, in terms of our hard work and ingenuity, take a backseat to nobody. But to find ourselves in this craziness is beyond my understanding. I know people at home are going: What in the world is going on here? Can't you guys just come together and figure this out and quit making up crises and quit creating artificial deadlines and get things done?

I think it is important at this point in our history that we remember President Ronald Reagan said: ''Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations.''

We are the greatest country in the world. Others look to us. They want to be like us. They want a vibrant middle class like America has had. We need to fight hard to keep ours and keep it growing. We need to make sure we do not fail to honor the financial obligations of this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I just listened to my colleague from Michigan talking about the need to reopen the government and the need to deal with the debt. Of course, I agree with that, as do my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We also heard discussion about the fact that we should not be manufacturing crises. Unfortunately, we have a crisis on our hands; that is, the crisis of debt at record levels, so I wish to talk about that a little today and talk about why this discussion is so important, particularly on extending the debt limit because that would be the place naturally for us to deal with the problem that faces this generation and certainly future generations reaching this historic level of debt.

In a matter of days, we are told, our Nation is going to be reaching this debt limit which is $16.7 trillion. Think about that. That is sixteen thousand billion dollars. It is impossible to comprehend that number, but let's try: $16.7 trillion would produce a stack of $1 bills 1 million miles high. That is enough, by the way, to go to the Moon and back. It is now bigger, by the way, than our entire economy. Only once in our history have we had debt as a percent of our economy so large and that was after World War II. We were able quickly to address that. We didn't have the long-term liabilities we have now, and we had very high defense spending from World War II we were able to reduce. But other than that, we have never been here before. I would say we are in uncharted territory.

By the way, it is not just that we have this huge level of debt and deficit and the overhang on the economy, but it is the fact that the economy is also weak. I think they are related. I think this huge level of debt and deficit is akin to a wet blanket over the economy.

Here is an interesting chart. It shows the debt limit rising twice as fast as the economy has grown in the last 2 years so the debt increase has gone up by about $2.4 trillion and unfortunately our GDP increase has been less than half of that. That is the problem we are trying to face. It is a lot of back-and-forth.

I know for some people it looks as if this is politics. It is not. It is about a fundamental issue. There are fundamental disagreements, and I respect those disagreements, but we have to address this problem and we have to do it in the context of the debt limit. If we do not, we will simply be kicking the can down the road again and letting down the people we represent. If you divide that debt among the American people, each of us—every man, woman, and child in America—owes around $50,000. By the way, of course, that is far more than the annual per capita income for that man, woman, and child in America. If you think about that, it is about $140,000 to $150,000 per household on average. That is where we are today.

I don't think it is constructive to be pointing fingers of blame because, frankly, for decades Republicans and Democrats alike have spent more money than the government takes in. There have been more promises made than can be kept, and we have gone through a process of mortgaging the future of our kids and grandkids as a result. Here we are. In some respects, the greatest single act of bipartisanship here in the Congress has been the overspending. The question is not how we got here but what we are going to do about it. Where are we going?

Yesterday the President said that raising the Nation's credit limit by another $1 trillion really pays for last year's deficit spending, not next year's spending. I guess we could have that debate. I would say it is about the future because we are borrowing more money to pay the bills of the country going forward, and that is what many of us want to talk about—how, going forward, we can reduce those bills.

The truth is that whether you say you are paying for the past or paying for the future, it really doesn't matter to the American people and it doesn't matter to our children and grandchildren who end up paying the bill. Long after we are gone, this huge level of debt and deficit is going to be something they are going to have to deal with.

We all know the consequences if we don't raise the debt limit. Without a debt limit increase, the Federal Government will be unable to borrow to meet its expenses. We are borrowing 20 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends, so the government would be unable to meet all of its obligations.

There has been discussion about meeting the interest on the debt, and that is only about 8 percent of revenue coming in. I assume that could be met, but it is true that there are other obligations that can't be met if the government can't borrow because the government is spending more than it takes in and needs to borrow to make up the difference.

The deficit, some have said—including some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle today—is lower now, and somehow that is an indication that we are OK in terms of the deficit. I would remind folks that the deficit this year is the fifth largest deficit in the history of our country—in our entire history. It is over $640 billion. More

significantly, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the nonpartisan group around here that analyzes this stuff, says it is temporarily lower than $1 trillion. In other words, they say that within a decade it will get back up to $1 trillion. Whether it is $640 billion or $1 trillion, it is way too high.

Entitlement spending, by the way, will then push these annual deficits up to the equivalent of $3.4 trillion a year—five times what they are today—within a few decades. That is based on the Congressional Budget Office. At that point, the national debt would be 2½ times as large as the entire economy. Today it is about the size of the economy; it is a little bigger. It would be 2½ times as large as our whole economy. I saw one CBO report recently that simply stops calculating the interest cost at that point because they cannot foresee our economy functioning under those kinds of conditions. Think about your own family budget or think about your business. You could not function either. The bank would not be able to lend you any money.

Both of these outcomes—default today and bankruptcy in the future—are unacceptable. That is why it is time for us to work together to try to do something about them. As the debt ceiling is raised, it is time to address the underlying problem. That is what we are saying.

By the way, the American people are saying that too. Based on the polling I have seen this week, the American people by better than a 2-to-1 margin are saying: Don't raise the debt limit without doing something about the spending. They get it because for them it is like the credit card—when you reach the limit, you realize you have to do something about the underlying problem, which is how much you are spending.

The President says: ''Pass the debt limit increase now and we will address the spending later.'' I wish it were that simple, but I think he knows, as well as everybody in this Chamber and every person who is watching at home today, that Congress simply doesn't reduce spending unless it is forced to do so. If you don't think that is true, let me remind you of what the history is here. In the past three decades—I have gone back and looked at all of these deficit reduction plans that did get through Congress, and there were not many, but there were some. In every single instance where there was any significant deficit reduction, it came as a result of what? A discussion about the debt limit because that is the time in which there is some pressure here in Congress to actually do something about it. I found one in 2005, which was a relatively small reduction in spending, but otherwise every single one of them—the Gramm-Rudman rescissions in the 1980s; the 1990 Andrews Air Force Base agreement that the first President Bush conducted with Democrats; the 1993 balanced budget talks; the 1997 balanced budget agreement Bill Clinton negotiated with Newt Gingrich—a Democratic President and a Republican Speaker; and, of course, the pay-go rules that many Democrats are fond of, those pay-go rules came out of a debt limit discussion; and finally, we only have to look back a couple of years ago to the Budget Control Act. As my colleague has said on his side of the aisle, there have been some successes in reducing spending on the discretionary side of spending—which is about one-third of the budget that is appropriated every year—that came out of the Budget Control Act, which is a result of what? The debt limit. In other words, Members listening to the folks back home.

I am listening to my constituents back home in Ohio right now, and they are saying: Don't max out the credit card again and go over the limit unless you do something about the problem. It is little wonder that the American people, by this margin of 2 to 1 that I talked about, are saying: Don't do it without the spending reductions. They know that is the only way the spending cuts are likely to happen.

Why is it that any increase in the debt limit should also include progrowth provisions? Well, because one way to get at the debt and deficit is spending restraint. We talked about the discretionary spending being about 35 percent of the budget, and we made progress there. The other 65 percent of the budget is the mandatory spending side, and we have not made progress there. The other part would be revenue, and on the first of this year taxes were raised by $620 billion. What we have not done is deal with the mandatory side.

Finally, of course, economic growth helps. As we are extending the debt limit, we should also look at how we can help give the economy a shot in the arm. Tax reform is the way to do that, and I think there is a consensus in this body that we need to do it. That would seem to make sense as well.

We have already made progress on one of the three legs of the stool, which is dealing with the discretionary spending. It has been pretty much flat for the last couple of years. By the way, for the first time since the 1950s there has actually been a reduction in spending for 2 years in a row, but that is only 35 percent of the budget. The fastest growing—again, 65 percent of the budget—we have not dealt with. That 65 percent grows to 76 percent of the budget in the next 10 years based on the Congressional Budget Office.

On the tax side, the same Congressional Budget Office tells us that starting in 2014—that is next year, around the corner—taxes as a percentage of our economy will be above the historic level. In other words, there will be more taxes coming in from the tax increases that, in part, we passed earlier this year, but the part we have not dealt with is mandatory spending. It is the biggest and the fastest growing part of our spending. Let's face it. It is politically difficult to deal with, but that is what we were hired to do, and that is what the President was hired to do in terms of providing leadership.

With ObamaCare, of course, we added a new health entitlement program to this part of the budget—the 65 percent. These health entitlements were already growing more quickly than the rest of the budget, even the rest of mandatory spending. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that in the next 10 years the health entitlement programs grow by over 100 percent. These are vital programs—Medicare and Medicaid—but they have to be reformed so they are sustainable in the future and are there for our kids and grandkids. With 10,000 baby boomers retiring every day and health care costs continuing to rise, we have a real problem, and we have to address it. All of us know that—Democrats and Republicans alike, as well as the President and the Congress. Again, history tells us the best way is to link this with the debt limit because that is the opportunity and has traditionally been the opportunity to make progress.

By the way, over the long term, overall revenue is projected to increase and discretionary spending is projected to be flat. The entire increase in our deficit—these huge debts and deficits going forward that I have been talking about—is due to the mandatory spending. Again, that is the Congressional Budget Office, not me.

A good place to start, of course, would be some of the mandatory spending reforms the President has proposed. That would seem to be less controversial. If they are in the President's budget, that means he supports them. The President sent up a budget this year, and he included over $700 billion of spending reforms on the mandatory side of the budget. That is why what I have been advocating is, let's start there. Let's look at the President's own proposals. These are not the proposals that all Republicans support, but after all we should have a negotiation.

This notion that the President says he refuses to negotiate has never been true. Every President has negotiated. I think the American people are confused by this. How could the President of the United States say in the context of this debt limit discussion that he refuses to even talk to the other side? That makes no sense. The first President Bush rolled up his sleeves; we talked about the 1990 agreements. President Clinton rolled up his sleeves; we talked about the 1997 balanced budget agreement he negotiated with then-Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. That is what Presidents do. We need them to lead, particularly on these tough issues.

As we talked about earlier, these are politically tough issues. The President says he doesn't want to be held hostage over the debt limit. He is not. He has been given the opportunity to lead using his own proposals—at least that is my suggestion.

We can also take a very simple step as we are going through this to be sure that this newest health care entitlement, which is the Affordable Care Act, which is a new entitlement program, doesn't become even more of a deficit driver than many of us on this side fear it will already be. The Affordable Care Act includes a provision that requires that when you get your subsidies under the exchanges, you have to verify your income. That makes sense. You have to verify your income between 100 percent of poverty and 400 percent of poverty. Below that it would be Medicaid, and above that it would be the subsidies under the exchanges.

Under a final regulation the administration put out, they said: We know you should verify your income, and that is what the law says, but we are going to give all of the exchanges another year to do it—not until 2015. Well, obviously the concern there is that will be an invitation for fraud, waste, and for big new expenses.

As a result, the Federal Government body in charge of this, the CMS, came out and said: No, for Federal exchanges, we will require people to file their income, but not for State exchanges. There are about 17 States and the District of Columbia that have State exchanges. They said to them: You guys can wait—in fact, not just until 2015, but there is no date certain.

That is something we in the Congress should deal with. The Democrats here in the Chamber who voted for the Affordable Care Act certainly should support that because the intent of the bill when they signed up for it and when the President supported it was, of course, that you would verify your income. That is an example of a simple step we could take to prevent the distribution of subsidies until we have a system to verify those subsidies are going to the right people.

Finally, let's give the economy a shot in the arm. As part of this process, let's take a step forward and say: Let's reform the Tax Code. We are going to differ about the details, but let's get started on it.

So my proposal would be, as we have a vote on extending the debt limit, let's do these important reforms we talked about on the monetary side, but let's also commit to tax reform. Let's force the process. Let's facilitate it. Let's expedite it.

The American people are not looking for us to just get the spending under control; they want to see this economy grow. Again, they are not happy with this, where the debt is increasing at twice the rate of the economy. They want to see opportunities for their kids to get a job. They want to see the opportunity to have the dignity and self-respect that comes with a job.

We know that tax reform, done properly, will promote growth, it will create jobs. Again, we are going to differ on some of the details, and that is OK. Let's get started on it.

Perhaps the President doesn't think that spending and the deficits are a real problem. If he thinks that, he should say it. He says just the opposite. He has said he does think it is necessary for us to address these problems. In fact, in his own budget, he sent proposals forward. So what we need to do is get together and negotiate and talk and deal with this underlying problem. A debt that is nearly $17 trillion is unacceptable to everybody, I hope, and I would think we would welcome the sign that Republicans are giving now that we want to negotiate, we want to talk.

Negotiations, by the way, I don't think are a sign of weakness. I don't think coming to the table is a signal of a failure of leadership. I think just the opposite; I think it shows strength and shows leadership. Again, I can promise my colleagues Republicans don't support all of the President's suggested savings in his budget, and a purely Republican agenda would look very different from whatever might emerge from bipartisan negotiations. But, again, the American people sent us here to get this done.

Using President Obama's own proposals, let's take that first step toward entitlement and progrowth tax reform and onto some common ground to break the gridlock in DC and finally do something positive about that underlying problem we all acknowledge.

Yes, we face serious problems, real challenges, but we also have an opportunity to do something positive, to deal with the problem we all acknowledge—something that will not only prevent a debt limit crisis today but a debt crisis tomorrow.

I hope to move forward on this important project. I think we owe it to the people we represent.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, October 1 was a significant day. Two things happened to the constituents in my State. The first we talk a lot about here, and that is basically the shutdown of the government, the failure to pass a continuing resolution that would keep the doors of government open for the thousands and thousands of Americans, and North Dakotans, who depend on government services. This horrible impasse continues to have a horrible impact and continues to have consequences that people didn't foresee.

The second thing that happened, which hasn't gotten a lot of attention, is the expiration of a long-term farm bill. After negotiating in this body, and with a large bipartisan vote, we were able to accommodate concerns. We came together after negotiating, and we came up with a package that included real reforms, eliminated direct payments, included real reform in SNAP, streamlined conservation programs, and basically offered $25 billion of debt relief to the country. It was a great package.

We sent it over to the House and waited for the House to pass their farm bill. They initially couldn't pass a farm bill. Then they decided to divide the farm bill, pass part of the farm bill, pass the other part of the farm bill with nutrition, now have a vote to bring them back together, and we are patiently awaiting the appointment of a conference committee.

The passage of the farm bill has never been a partisan issue. In fact, it is a regional issue. Things that are good for North Dakota may not be good for the Presiding Officer's State of Delaware, but we all work together, we all compromise, and we all come together.

This past weekend South Dakota and southwestern North Dakota were hit with a terrible snowstorm. Over 2 days that region was blanketed with anywhere from 2 feet to 7 feet of snow and contained winds over 70 miles an hour. Because of the early storm, tens of thousands of cattle died because they were suffocated, mired and drowned in stock dams or dropped in exhaustion. The pictures and the stories are devastating.

This image is one that is all too common after the recent blizzard in the Dakotas. These cattle that died over the weekend near Hettinger, ND, were owned by the Christman family. As is the case with many North Dakota ranchers, this hard-working family lost many cows and calves during this surprise fall storm.

What people may not understand about the cattle industry is they might think one cow is like the next cow; people can just replace them. These herds are the product of years and years of selective breeding, years and years of working to improve the quality of their herd and to meet different specifications in the market. They are more than cows. They contain an intellectual property component that is not easily replaced.

This is where the crisis of the dysfunction that is Washington, DC, meets natural disaster. When livestock die from a natural disaster, farmers report the number of cattle that died to the Farm Service Agency—the FSA. However, because the doors are closed on the Federal Government, North Dakota ranchers, South Dakota ranchers, anyone who is experiencing livestock losses, have no place to report those losses. And even worse, they have no one at USDA to consult with about the information they need to collect to eventually report their claims. This is critical information. If farmers aren't collecting the information they need to make disaster claims in the future, the safety nets put in place to provide some support to these hard-working ranchers may be denied simply because of a paperwork error.

Unfortunately, this is an avoidable problem. As has been the case with so many in recent years, it is the product of congressional dysfunction. Because we haven't passed a new farm bill, the livestock program that helps ranchers withstand losses to livestock herds due

to extreme weather events—the Livestock Indemnity Program—has expired, and the emergency assistance for livestock and honeybee producers program, which is in the stalled farm bill and which helps producers stay in business after they experience significant losses because of natural disaster, isn't available to the ranchers and the beekeepers who were hit the hardest by the storm. Until Congress passes a farm bill, livestock producers are in danger of losing their business, and they will not be eligible for support.

These ranchers and the farm bill are more collateral damage of the government shutdown. Because we are debating whether to fund the Federal Government, Congress isn't able to work on a farm bill. We have been waiting and waiting and waiting for the appointment of conferees. The chairwoman, I think, intends to make a floor speech about the farm bill yet today. She has been working very hard to encourage the collection of information and to encourage the appointment of conferees to the conference committee and get focused on this issue. Unfortunately, it is not happening until next week, if it even happens then.

In addition, the lack of assistance for ranchers in the aftermath of this devastating storm as a result of the shutdown is hurting farmers and agricultural industries, which is a key piece of North Dakota's economy.

Here are some additional examples of where the shutdown is hurting our farmers. Frequently, because farmers who use FSA loans have a joint obligation with FSA, when they receive their checks after they sell their products, the checks are frequently made out to both the Farm Service Agency and the farmer. Consequently, the farmer cannot cash the check unless he can get an endorsement from the Farm Service Agency. Guess what. They go, knock on the door, and no one is there to cosign their check. So that money in their hand that they need to make the investments for next year, that they need to pay the person who maybe supplies the feed, that they need to pay the fuel bill—that money is not available to them, even though they have earned it and they have sold their products. So the government shutdown prevents FSA from cashing these checks and from signing these checks. This is money the farmers have earned and they deserve, and denying them their income is outrageous.

What is worse, farmers and ranchers enrolled in the loan programs are new and beginning farmers, farmers who are just starting. It is a great thing that is happening in the Dakotas and all across farm country as we look at the increasing commodity prices and we look at a farm program that for the last 5 years has been stable and provided risk management. As a result, our farmers are getting younger and younger. The people who are going to feed the world and continue to develop our rural areas are younger and younger. They cannot withstand cashflow problems. They cannot withstand this loss.

Another impact of the shutdown: Agricultural reports from the National Agriculture Statistics Service aren't available to farmers. These reports are crucial resources that farmers need to make decisions such as how to price crops, which commodities to grow, and when to sell those commodities, and the reports enable farmers to track cattle auction prices. Not only has NASS stopped putting out new reports about demand and supply, exports, and prices, but all Web sites with past information have been taken down because of the government shutdown.

Farmers aren't receiving assistance from farm programs. The Department of Agriculture's local farm services offices have been shut down because of the shutdown and, as a result, farmers can't apply for new loans, sign up acreages for farm programs, or receive government checks for the programs they are already enrolled in. Devastating to so many of our people living on fixed incomes in North Dakota, who have engaged in and basically put their land into the conservation reserve program, is conservation reserve checks are not being issued. That has a huge impact, particularly on those ranchers and those landowners who use CRP payments to supplement their Social Security.

The list goes on and on. As time continues, this list will only get longer and longer.

I understand the strategy, perhaps, in the House is to—whatever is the headline of the day, whatever becomes the issue of the day, we will simply write a little mini CR to take care of that, and say, see, we are dealing with that issue. But we know it is only a slice. It doesn't take care of those small businesses that have applied for small business loans and maybe got this close to being able to realize their dream and now have it delayed. It doesn't deal with the critical functions of government in its entirety. Instead, it picks and chooses the winners and losers. Let me tell my colleagues, these ranchers who have experienced this loss are the losers under this system.

It is time for this Congress to begin to do the responsible thing, which is open government, fund all of government, and start telling the American people that their interests are paramount. Start telling farmers and ranchers in the Dakotas who have experienced this tremendous loss that we care about their loss, that these programs have to work for them, and we have to do everything we can to make sure America is working again.

I wish to close with one thought. In the great recession, one place where we have experienced a tremendous amount of opportunity and support has been in agriculture. Those States that had a good agricultural base had some of the lowest unemployment numbers in the country. Sixteen million jobs depend on agriculture in this country, and all they ask for in return is a little bit of help, a little bit of a safety net for guaranteeing a food supply in this country. But we can't seem to even deliver that obligation. We can't seem to deliver that promise. We have to tell the American people that their interests are ahead of any petty or partisan interest in this body and in this Congress. We have to get the Congress back working for the American people, particularly for the hard-hit ranchers and farmers of southeastern North Dakota and West River, SD.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Here we are again at the same crossroads. We know the landmarks. We know the signs. We have been here before. We negotiated in good faith to avert the last shutdown, the last default threat. We opposed the sequester, but that wasn't enough. So here we are, once again, and here we will be again in a week, a month, 6 months, a year, being asked for more concessions to a minority of extreme Republicans who seem to have forgotten that we operate under the rule of law. They simply have chosen to ignore it.

The fact is we passed the Affordable Care Act. It went through the legislative process, was signed by the President, tested in the Supreme Court, but so what, they say. It does not count. Similar to the schoolyard bully, they want a do-over or they will take over your lunch money.

The rightwing Republican minority claims to love the Constitution, adheres to the strictest interpretation of its tenets but apparently is not interested in living by it or by the rule of law that this Nation stands for and lives by.

They say Democrats have failed to negotiate in good faith and voted against trying to reach a compromise. The fact is for 6 months Senate Republicans have stood in the way of budget negotiations—what they want, negotiations—by blocking requests for Budget Committee members to conference with the House of Representatives. They have objected over 20 times to those budget negotiations.

The Senate followed regular order and passed a budget resolution for fiscal year 2014 on March 23 of this year. Our budget resolution provides just over $1 trillion by replacing the irresponsible sequestration cuts while following the spending limit imposed by the Budget Control Act. The House wants to keep sequestration cuts by funding the government at $976 billion or about $80 billion less than the Senate. The fact is we have already compromised with the House by agreeing

to a continuing resolution at a level of $986 billion—much closer to their numbers than to ours. If you ask me, that is more than $70 billion in compromising. But they simply will not take yes for an answer.

What the past weeks have shown us is that this is not even about budget numbers. They just want to make a political point, and they are holding the country hostage in order to make it. They simply do not want either the Affordable Care Act or, for that fact, this President to succeed. But that train has left the station. The President is already turning the economy around from the massive deficits he inherited when he took office, and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land.

Make no mistake, it is not a coincidence that we are here again doing the same thing much like ''Groundhog Day.'' Mark my words, we will be here again tomorrow and in the future if the Republican shutdown strategy continues.

We are being asked to capitulate yet again at the threat that Republicans will keep the government shut down, that they will force America to default on its obligations and risk a global consequence and America's leadership role in the world.

It is a deliberate, if fatally flawed, Republican strategy. One might go so far as to call it a conspiracy—adopted to achieve through bullying what they cannot achieve at the ballot box.

We know it is a deliberate effort hatched many months ago. In fact, it goes back to 2010 when the House Republicans threatened to push the Nation into defaulting on its obligations and shut down the government unless we agreed to aggressive and deep structural cuts that met their political objectives in the midst of one of the deepest recessions in our history, a recession President Obama inherited when he took office.

Then, in November of 2010, the antitax, antigovernment, antispending, antiprogress side of the Republican Party exercised their newfound power and hamstrung their leadership into rejecting any kind of compromise, forcing the House Speaker and majority leader to reject any grand bargain proposed by the Democrats. They did it gleefully. It was part of their strategy to block any successful effort to actually govern. They chose instead to fuel the rightwing flames, burn down the house, and bring government to a halt until they achieved their objectives.

From December 2 to December 21, 2010, we enacted four separate continuing resolutions to keep the government open—four of them—to keep the government functioning until March 4. Let's not forget that these appropriations actually cut the Congressional Budget Office's projection of discretionary spending from 2013 through 2022 by $400 billion. But that was not enough. They wanted more.

On March 2, 2011, as the new deadline approached, we passed another short-term CR, taking us to March 18—just 16 days—that cut spending by yet another $4 billion. Still not enough.

On March 16, the deadline approaching once again, we passed another continuing resolution, taking us to April 8, with another $6 billion in spending cuts. Was it enough? Of course not.

On April 4, House Republicans applauded the Speaker's announcement to begin preparations, for what, yes, a shutdown of the government. Clearly, nothing is enough.

On April 14, just before midnight, the Speaker agreed to the seventh short-term extension with more cuts that analysts said would amount to an additional $350 million in that year alone.

All in all, we agreed to $40 billion in total cuts, and we have cut even more since then, including the current Senate-passed clean funding bill that would reopen the government today if the House would just pass it.

They say we have not taken votes. We have taken a bunch of votes on what they have sent us. They have not taken one vote on the one resolution we have sent them.

It is a clear pattern, a clear strategy. They will not stop. They will not take yes for an answer, and they clearly will not govern until they achieve their political and ideological goal to end government as we know it. That has been their plan all along.

In fact, last Sunday the New York Times reported that after the President was sworn in to his second term, a coalition of top conservative activists, including former Attorney General Ed Meese, along with the Koch brothers, devised a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy to derail health care by shutting down the Federal Government. Now we are being blackmailed again. As further proof of this take-no-prisoners strategy, Jonathan Chait of New York magazine recently reported on something called the Williamsburg Accord. Mr. Chait wrote:

> In January, [this year], demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. . . .

They called it the Williamsburg Accord. He said:

> If you want to grasp why Republicans are careening toward a potential federal government shutdown, and possibly toward provoking a sovereign debt crisis after that, you need to understand that this is the inevitable product of a conscious party strategy. . . .

His article goes on to say:

> The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda, without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

That is not negotiation. We saw the implementation of that strategy beginning early in the spring when we did exactly what Republicans wanted. We passed a budget in the Senate, and the House passed a budget, and we attempted to go to conference to work out the difference between the two. Actually, we have attempted to do that more than 20 times now, and every single time Republicans have blocked action.

For 6 months they have refused to talk, they have refused to negotiate, they have refused to have a conversation. As we now know, this all was planned out from the beginning, going back to their January Williamsburg Accord.

They have intentionally driven us to the edge of the cliff to serve their own political interests at the expense of the Nation's economy, the jobs of working families, and the retirement savings of our seniors.

Now the GOP's solution to get us out of this Republican shutdown is the equivalent of Whac-A-Mole. It is their form of governing. Whatever issue pops up that they see a problem with as a result of their shutdown, they draft a bill to address a single issue. Last week it was national parks. This week it was death benefits for soldiers. What will it be next? Anyone who has ever been on the boardwalk and has played that arcade game of Whac-A-Mole knows you can never quite get ahead of those pesky moles that keep popping up. How long do they plan to govern in this way?

Bill Moyers recently wrote in an essay:

> Despite what they say, Obamacare is only one of their targets. Before they will allow the government to reopen, they demand employers be enabled to deny birth control coverage to female employees; they demand Obama cave on the Keystone pipeline . . . they demand the watchdogs over corporate pollution be muzzled and the big bad regulators of Wall Street sent home. Their ransom list goes on and on. The debt ceiling is next. . . .

At least let's name this for what it is: sabotage of the democratic process.

Kevin Drum of Mother Jones wrote:

> How do you get across how insurrectionary this is? Raising the debt ceiling isn't a concession from Republicans that deserves a corresponding concession from Democrats. It's the financial equivalent of a new nuclear bomb.

Warren Buffett used equally stark terms when he said in Fortune magazine:

> It ought to be banned——

Referring to defaulting on the Nation's obligations——

> It ought to be banned as a weapon. . . . It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use.

Clearly, in the name of some misguided allegiance to an extreme ideology, a handful of ultraconservative extremists in the Republican Party are putting at risk the rule of law. They are putting at risk the full faith and credit of the United States, America's influence—as well as our obligations—around the world, and our national security, embassy security, intelligence collection apparatus, and American diplomats, Foreign Service officers, and contractors serving in posts around the world.

This is not a game. Real people are already being hurt by these tactics. I find it pathetic that some Republicans are willing to risk the full faith and credit of this Nation and inflict unnecessary harm on hard-working families and put the very principles of this democracy on the line all just to show how ideologically pure they are.

It is one thing to come to Washington wanting to destroy your government. It is quite another to destroy our economy in the process.

If you want to negotiate, let's negotiate. Let's do it constructively, in good faith, and without threats. Let's try, as we have tried over 20 times, to get to that moment. Let's reopen the government, let's pay our bills, and then we will negotiate.

It is time to reject the schoolyard bully political strategy that Republicans hatched months ago, ratchet down the rhetoric, and do the hard work of solving problems together.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 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 Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I heard the previous speaker plead for a solution. I think we are all pleading for that. We are now in our 10th day of a government shutdown—quite frankly, one that did not have to happen.

To some extent, it seems that this administration—meaning President Obama's administration—is going to great efforts to inflict as much pain through this shutdown as possible.

Mr. President, the administration went to great lengths to try to keep World War II veterans from viewing the memorial dedicated to their service, the World War II Memorial. It is an open-air memorial. It likely took more effort and personnel to close and barricade the memorial than it does to keep it open. It is one of those memorials where 24/7/365 you can go there. There is no reason it could not have been the same way during this recent period.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the majority and its unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over proposals to amend ObamaCare or any other legitimate issue of dispute. With regard to ObamaCare, not to defund or delay it is something that is not right in a body that is a deliberative body. You ought to consider all issues.

Instead of wasting a lot of time being in quorum calls or days of not voting, there could be legitimate discussions of pieces of legislation, and in the process maybe reach some sort of conclusion through what we call ''regular order.''

The House has passed and the Senate has defeated three different continuing resolutions. Each one of those would have kept the government open and prevented a shutdown. That looks like that is something that was debated here and decided here. But it was decided in a manner that was not debatable, a motion to table the House amendments. These three offers from the House of Representatives were rejected by the Senate majority. We are in this position because the Senate 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 when it comes to Federal employees and officials being covered by health insurance.

In addition to negotiating an end to the government shutdown, Congress now needs to deal with the approaching debt limit. This will be the sixth debt limit increase in President Obama's 5 years in office. During President Obama's term in office thus far, the United States has added $6 trillion to our national debt.

We had 4 consecutive years with annual deficits above $1 trillion. Federal debt held by the public is now 73 percent of our gross domestic product. The historical average has been about 40 percent of GDP. This unsustainable debt path is threatening our economic growth and our stability.

This administration is quick to point out that the deficits have fallen faster than at any point since World War II. They fail to mention, however, that the deficit remains over $600 billion this very year from highs near $1.4 trillion. Remember to compare the $600 billion for this year with the largest annual deficit under President Bush of $458 billion.

Much of the recently improved deficit picture is also due to the spending cuts imposed by the Budget Control Act of August 2, 2011, that was enacted as part of the last debt ceiling increase. There is no better time to negotiate policies to address our fiscal problems than when debating debt ceilings.

But the President and the Secretary of the Treasury maintain that they will not negotiate on the debt limit. There happen to be families all over this country which, because of the slow economy and unemployment, are being forced to make tough decisions to make ends meet.

A lot of those families are looking at their budgets, looking right now trying to determine which expenses can be cut. Maybe they will try to reduce their cell phone bill or perhaps they will cancel a newspaper or a magazine subscription or perhaps eat at home instead of eating at restaurants.

The point is, when families face tight budgets and increasing debt, they look for ways to cut spending and get their fiscal house in order. That is the prudent thing to do. When bills come due, families make tough decisions on where to trim the budget. That is a family example of the Federal Government's legitimacy for looking at our spending.

At the very same time we are trying to increase the debt limit, we need to consider possibilities and make compromises to get our budget deficit down. Why can't the Federal Government then do the same? Why can't we use this opportunity to put our Nation on a sound fiscal course? Why can't we work right now to enact policies that will hopefully then negate the need to take on more debt.

This seems to be a reasonable proposition, to do this when you are talking about increasing the federal debt. Treasury Secretary Lew and his boss, President Obama, have repeated the talking points that negotiating deficit reduction policies on a debt ceiling increase is unprecedented. They claim that now is not the time to negotiate our budget and fiscal problems.

The President stated last month:

> You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt being used to extort a President or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.

The President just does not understand history or even recent history when he makes such a statement. President Obama and Secretary Lew can make this claim as much as they want, but it does not make sense. It is not true. The Washington Post fact checker gave this exact quote from President Obama four Pinocchio's, which rates the statement as a ''whopper.''

The Post indicated that since 1953, Congress at times has used the debt limit as a way to force concessions by the executive branch on spending. It also states that the Congress has used the debt limit on many occasions to force changes in unrelated laws.

At least four major pieces of deficit reduction policies were enacted as part of a debt limit increase: Gramm-Rudman, 1985; the Budget Enforcement Act, 1990; the Balanced Budget Act, 1997; the Budget Control Act, 2011. So the facts are very clear. The debt limit has been used in the past as a means to enact different deficit reduction policies and other reforms. Surely the President knew these facts when he made that statement that the Washington Post fact checker rated as a ''whopper'' with 4 Pinocchio's.

According to the Congressional Research Service, since 1978, Congress has voted to raise the debt ceiling 53 times: 27 of those times or 51 percent of the time the debt limit increase was tied to reforms. I questioned Secretary Lew on this point this morning during our Finance Committee hearing. Unfortunately, I got the same tired talking points that have been proven time and again to be wrong.

It is difficult to understand how an administration can expect us to take them seriously on the offer of future negotiations when they misrepresent such simple facts. The President and Congress must come to the table and negotiate policies to get our fiscal

house in order. Does that put everything on the shoulders of the President of the United States? Absolutely not. It is just a fact that in this town, with our form of government, for over 225 years Presidential leadership is a very important part of the legislative process.

We have taken steps to address discretionary spending. We did that in 2011 with the Budget Control Act. Now it is time to tackle entitlements. Without reform, entitlement spending will continue to consume our budget. They will begin to squeeze out spending on discretionary spending, such as defense, education, and infrastructure. According to the CBO, spending on entitlements will double as a percentage of GDP from the historic average of 6.9 percent to 14.2 percent by 2038.

What does this mean for our economy? It means we will need to borrow more and more to fulfill our obligations. That will crowd out money that would otherwise be loaned in the private sector. This will lead to slower growth, less prosperity. It means that future generations may be less well-off than previous generations. The longer we kick the entitlement can down the road, the bigger the fiscal problems become and the harder the solutions will be.

It is time to make tough decisions and once and for all strengthen and secure these programs for future generations. These reforms will not take place without presidential leadership. The President must now demonstrate courage and the political will to put our Nation on a sound fiscal course.

That is not just the President's responsibility. That is a shared legislative responsibility between that end of Pennsylvania Avenue and this end. But it requires leadership that will bring people together. It requires compromise. It requires concession. Most of all, we need to get back to basics. We have to be sitting at a table across from each other negotiating. We will not be able to address those looming fiscal problems if President Obama is refusing even to sit across the table from Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats.

So I hope he will reconsider his ''no negotiation'' strategy so that we can reopen the government, deal with the debt ceiling and begin to address our unsustainable long-term fiscal challenges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 7 p.m be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators on the majority side limited to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have heard a number of speeches from my colleagues on the floor today, both while presiding and in the last few moments, that call on President Obama for Presidential leadership to help us reopen the government, address our serious long-term fiscal issues, and move us forward.

I want to note for the folks who might be watching that the President is at this very moment sitting with the leadership of the Republican caucus in the House of Representatives. Tomorrow morning, I believe, he has invited the Republican Members of this body to the White House for conversation.

I think we agree. One of the core challenges we face as this Federal shutdown goes into, I believe, its 10th day is discerning exactly why the Federal Government is still shut down. When initially taken over the cliff into the shutdown, it was to prevent the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That is what a number of Senators said on this floor was their purpose. Now, many days and many unintended and unexpected harmful consequences later, we are told what this was really all about was to force the President to negotiate.

I serve on the Budget Committee. We passed, more than 200 days ago, more than 6 months ago, a budget on this floor, and we have tried to go to conference on that budget now 21 times.

Yet each time it was blocked, objected to by a small number of Senators from the other party.

Frankly, my expectation, my hope is that we will return to a rational rules-following process here, reopen the government, not default on our national debt, and begin those serious negotiations, those Budget Committee negotiations that are long overdue to deal with the very real challenges that are facing our country.

I wanted to speak today about one of the consequences of shutting down our Federal Government. We see new ones every day, and we hear about them on the Senate floor. As the days drag on, we hear more and more about the impacts of the shutdown, sometimes with surprise, sometimes with regret, sometimes with outrage.

There is a lot on the line, and we have heard a lot about what the shutdown means for the various functions of the executive branch and of the legislative branch. I have heard colleagues come and speak about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, about the FDA, about its impact on higher education, its impact on families, and its impact on small businesses. I have heard many folks come to this floor and comment on how the executive branch and its functions that affect communities and families all over this country are affected by the shutdown.

We have heard from our constituents who are trying to reach Senators and are trying to seek our help with a variety of Federal services. They are frustrated that the legislative branch is largely shut down, but there is another branch to our three-branch coordinate government. Absent from this debate and discussion is how the shutdown is affecting the judicial branch of our government.

When the Federal Government shut down 10 years ago, the Federal court system was initially seemingly largely unaffected because they had enough funds in reserve to remain open for 10 business days—a period that will come to an end early next week.

On Tuesday the Federal judiciary of the United States will run out of the reserve funds it has been using to stay open. The big question is, What happens then?

The chief judge of the bankruptcy court for the District of Delaware, my home State, told me:

> We are really in an uncertain situation, particularly when it comes to employees. I am fearful for them and how they are going to be able to pay for rent and mortgages, and provide food and day-care for their families.

This is uncharted territory for our Federal judiciary. When the money runs out, Federal, circuit, and district courts will each be on their own, much like each Senator who has to choose which of his employees or her employees are essential, deemed vital, and need to stay, and which should be furloughed and stay home, uncertain whether they will be paid. Each district court and circuit court will figure out on its own how to keep the lights and which employees will keep working without a salary.

As the chair of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, I have heard from a number of Federal judges this week who are frustrated by the amount of time they are spending trying to figure out what the shutdown means for their courts and their employees rather than doing the job for which they were confirmed, which is to judge cases.

This is an enormous distraction, a profound waste of time. This is not advancing our core objective, which should be growing our economy, strengthening our country, confronting the fiscal challenges in front of us, and working together to achieve some principled compromises in the Congress of the United States. In my view, Federal judges should be deciding cases, not deciding how to keep their courthouses running during this Federal Government shutdown. This needs to end. It could end literally today in a matter of minutes if Speaker BOEHNER would bring to the floor and allow a vote on a bill sent over from this Senate more than 10 days ago that would allow the Federal Government to reopen.

The judicial branch is not another Federal agency. It is not a program that can be suspended or a benefit that can be delayed. It is a branch. The Federal court system was created in our Constitution as the third pillar of our democracy. It is an independent branch of government whose fundamental mission is being undermined by folks, some of whom claim to love and to rigidly interpret the Constitution. Yet the consequences for our constitutional order of this senseless shutdown, I am

afraid, will soon become clear in the days ahead.

The subcommittee has heard from a number of Federal judges and clerks this week. I must warn you there are a lot of unanswered questions there. The path forward is murky. The central question in the courts—as it was here in Congress and in the executive branch—is who is considered ''essential.'' Is it the people directly involved in the resolution of cases or are the staff who support that process also expected to work without pay?

Here is the type of question our judiciary was dealing with today instead of resolving disputes or working on long-term cost-saving measures. Evidence in our Federal courts these days is typically presented electronically to jurors rather than handing out photocopies, which is great as long as the technology is working in the courtroom. Case files are processed electronically these days as well. But what if there is a problem? What if the technology doesn't work and a trial is disrupted? At what point does a technological glitch become a legitimate due process issue? If the courtroom technology can't get an upgrade to fix a bug, will it result in a costly mistrial? The Constitution and the Sixth Amendment guarantee criminal defendants a right to a speedy trial. What happens when our courts can't live up to that Sixth Amendment guarantee because of this ongoing Federal shutdown?

The problem is equally severe in civil and bankruptcy matters. With the DOJ's Office of the U.S. Trustee in shutdown status, the number of trustee attorneys in Delaware has been cut from seven to two. This can dramatically slow the bankruptcy process and leave real jobs and real lives hanging in the balance as cases are unresolved and as resolutions don't move forward.

This raises another fundamental question. At what point in this ongoing senseless shutdown does our civil justice system fail to live up to America's promise as a free market economy grounded in the rule of law?

When an investor anywhere in the world looks to make a bet on a new company, a new idea, that investor will obtain certain rights in exchange. Those rights may include a share of equity or a priority right in the event of liquidation. What gives those rights meaning is ultimately a highly functioning, impartial, and reliable court system. That historically has been one of our great advantages competitively in the world economy. Our courts, even while plagued by persistent vacancies, lack of new authorized judgeships, and the sequester, continue to perform this vital function. Without these courts, these rights mean nothing. Without the reliable enforcement of these rights, there is no more new investment, no more new job creation, and no more new ideas successfully brought to market. We are not the only country in the world competing for investment capital and for ideas. When we undermine our civil courts, we are being hostile to those very investors who could help get our economy back on track.

The Federal shutdown is already slowing the resolution of civil cases involving the Federal Government. Clerks at district courts around the country have confirmed to my subcommittee that the Department of Justice is requesting continuances broadly and across-the-board and trying to juggle the demands of their caseloads with the constraints of this reckless shutdown. Think about it. Social Security appeals, civil forfeiture cases, business disputes, consumer protection cases, Medicare fraud cases, incidents of employment discrimination—they are all being pushed to the background. This shutdown is bringing new meaning to Dr. King's famous words: ''Justice too long delayed is justice denied.''

Only this morning I heard from the head of Delaware's district court, chief judge Gregory Sleet. He said, in essence—no insult intended, but his observation was that Congress is letting our country down. The subcommittee also spoke with a district court clerk yesterday who said—and I thought this was particularly striking—he was glad he was nearing retirement so he could escape the dysfunction of the Federal Government and our ongoing, seemingly routine manufactured crises.

This shutdown is exacerbating what is a more profound problem—a disregard for the upkeep of our Federal judiciary. More than 90 Federal judgeships are vacant. There are 39 vacancies that are deemed ''judicial emergencies.'' We need to do more to support and sustain the staffing, quality, and future investment that is required to make our Federal courts work as well as they possibly can.

I wish to make a point or two in conclusion. First, one of the essential questions every district court and circuit court will face is which of its employees are essential. After all of the cuts of the sequester and all of the burdens and challenges facing our Federal Government, aren't all the employees of our Federal judicial system, this separate branch, essential? The chief judge for the Third Judicial Circuit of the United States believes so, and I agree with him. This morning he announced that nearly ''all functions, with few limited exceptions, are essential . . . .'' I join the chief judge of the Third Judicial Circuit and urge other circuits to follow suit and to recognize that this independent third branch of our constitutional order is essential.

Last, this shutdown has dragged morale in our courts and our court system to a new low. We in Congress are blessed with a record number of attorneys who serve in Congress. It is my hope that this body recognizes the unique value of our Federal court system. Our democracy cannot afford to furlough justice. We cannot shut the doors to our courthouses. It is my hope that Speaker BOEHNER, following the conversation unfolding at the White House, will come back and put to the vote an action that will allow the courts and this country to get back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I understand that the order of the day is that time is divided equally until 7 o'clock, with the majority setting a limitation of 10 minutes but no limitation on the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COBURN. I rise to speak about the issue in front of us. I want to spend a few minutes putting things in context. I won't repeat things I have said routinely on the floor, but I think it is important for the American people to understand where we are in our country.

Using generally accepted accounting principles—these aren't my numbers—we have almost $126 trillion in unfunded liabilities and we have $17 trillion worth of debt. We have a lot of obligations in front of us. If we add up every asset in the United States—all the bank accounts, all the lands, all the possessions, everything we own, plus what we own outside of the United States—it comes to $94 trillion. In essence, we are almost $50 trillion in the hole. That is called a negative net worth.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Delaware. I have the greatest admiration for him. I am not one of those who think we should be in shutdown. I also am not one of those who think we should just, without any solution to our problem, raise the debt limit.

I would also note that we don't have to have a budget right now in the Senate because we agreed to the Budget Control Act, which sets the discretionary spending levels for the next 10 years in this country. They are set by law. What is important is that appropriations bills come through the committees—the House first and the Senate second—so that we can address the issues. We didn't do that in the Senate. They did about half of them in the House. We wouldn't have a continuing resolution—which, by the way, I think all of us agree is very difficult for our Federal employees to operate under.

But I wanted to make a couple of points. One is that in July of 2011, after 7 years of oversight, I put out $9 trillion of what I think are commonsense eliminations and changes we could make that today would put us at a $200 billion surplus instead of a $750 billion deficit. Those savings were $3 trillion total in discretionary spending, $1 trillion in defense spending, $2.7 trillion in terms of modernization of our health entitlement programs, and $1 trillion from the Tax Code. We actually have earmarks in the Tax Code for those who are well-heeled and well-connected—a benefit—and the average American gets nothing. There are interest payment savings of $1.3 trillion

and a 75-year solvency for the Social Security. That was put out 2½ years ago. Very little of it has been used. As a matter of fact, most people haven't read it. It was put out in a binder. We didn't print many binders because I am so tight, I don't want to print that many binders, but this is what it looks like. It is online. People may read it and see if it makes common sense. Most people won't.

I am going to spend some time outlining some of the things that came from that and some of the excesses of the Federal Government.

Most Americans know we are not efficient. They understand that we are not doing a good job spending their money, but they have no idea how bad it really is. I have actually spent the last 9 years in oversight of almost every segment of the Federal Government. None of us can be proud of the way we spend the money. Most of it is very well intentioned, honorably intentioned, with minimal oversight, minimal control, with over $150 billion of fraud every year, and I am talking pure fraud, and with $250 billion of real duplication—programs that do exactly the same thing, run by different agencies, with no consideration to streamline those. None of those things have been considered.

We won't even do tax reform to get rid of unemployment for millionaires. What people don't realize is we paid $60 million out over the last 2 years to people who were making $1 million a year. We are paying them unemployment. They hardly need the unemployment check. Yet we won't even regulate those kinds of things.

I think we have failed to do our job, and that is a Republican and Democratic thing. That is us. That is not a partisan statement.

The last time the President signed an individual spending bill into law—an individual appropriations bill—was 4 years ago. Four years ago was the last time he signed an independent appropriations bill into law. That tells you Congress hasn't done its job. We haven't passed them.

According to studies, if you poll the American people in terms of the sequester, less than one in four felt any impact at all from the sequester. And I think the sequester is a terrible way to determine spending. I voted against the Budget Control Act for that very reason, because we are not responsible enough to do the management and the oversight. But most Americans see no impact from it, and that is because in what we do there is so much waste and mismanagement. There is so much duplication, there is so much error that we could easily take that out and most people wouldn't notice it. They haven't noticed it.

Some of our Federal employees have noticed it, but the average American, 76 percent of them have never felt any impact from it whatsoever. They do not even know it happened. There has been no impact on their daily life. Increasing the debt limit and passing another CR isn't going to do a thing to eliminate government waste, fraud, or duplication.

It is time we kind of reassess where we are. One of the reasons I am against a debt limit increase is because it takes the pressure off Members of Congress to make the hard choices. If we raise the debt limit, that means we don't have to make the hard choices and we will run a deficit again and again. Toward the end of this decade, just 7 years from now, the deficits start climbing well above $1 trillion again—$1 trillion a year. Our deficit is growing twice as fast as our economy is—our debt is. It is growing twice as fast as our economy is. So we are going down in a hole.

We ought to be about—Democrats and Republicans—holding hands and saying let's stop this nonsense. Let's put some brakes on ourselves. Let's put in some limitations so we don't continue to fall prey to ducking the very difficult decisions facing this country. Households do that, businesses do it all the time. They assess where they are, they assess how deep the hole is, because nobody gives them the ability to say: You don't have to make those hard choices, we will give you more borrowing power. What they do is make those hard choices. We refuse to do so.

Another example. We just finished year end and there is this syndrome in Washington called ''use it or lose it.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post with the lead-in ''As Congress fights over the budget, agencies go on their 'use it or lose it' shopping sprees.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 2013]

AS CONGRESS FIGHTS OVER THE BUDGET, AGENCIES GO ON THEIR ''USE IT OR LOSE IT'' SHOPPING SPREES

(By David A. Fahrenthold)

This past week, the Department of Veterans Affairs bought $562,000 worth of artwork.

In a single day, the Agriculture Department spent $144,000 on toner cartridges.

And, in a single purchase, the Coast Guard spent $178,000 on ''Cubicle Furniture Rehab.''

This string of big-ticket purchases was an unmistakable sign: It was ''use it or lose it'' season again in Washington.

All week, while Congress fought over next year's budget, federal workers were immersed in a separate frantic drama. They were trying to spend the rest of this year's budget before it is too late.

The reason for their haste is a system set up by Congress that, in many cases, requires agencies to spend all their allotted funds by Sept. 30.

If they don't, the money becomes worthless to them on Oct. 1. And—even worse—if they fail to spend the money now, Congress could dock their funding in future years. The incentive, as always, is to spend.

So they spent. It was the return of one of Washington's oldest bad habits: a blitz of expensive decisions, made by agencies with little incentive to save.

Private contractors—worried that sequestration would result in a smaller spending rush this year—brought in food to keep salespeople at their desks. Federal workers quizzed harried colleagues in the hallways, asking if they had spent it all yet.

''The way we budget [money] sets it up,'' said Sen. Tom Coburn (R–Okla.). ''Because instead of being praised for not spending all your money, you get cut for not spending all your money. And so we've got a perverse incentive in there.'' But, Coburn said, ''nobody's talking about it but me and you.''

Coburn said he had meant to mention it in his floor speech Wednesday. Then, when he got to the podium, he forgot.

''Use it or lose it'' season is not marked on any official government calendars. But in Washington, it is as real as Christmas. And as lucrative.

And—it appears—about as permanent. ''We cannot expect our employees to believe that cost reduction efforts are serious if they see evidence of opportunistic spending in the last days of the Fiscal Year,'' President Lyndon B. Johnson wrote to underlings in May 1965. Even then, Johnson said an end-of-year binge was ''an ancient practice—but that does not justify it or excuse it.''

Today, government spending on contracts still spikes at the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30.

In 2012, for instance, the government spent $45 billion on contracts in the last week of September, according to calculations by the fiscal-conservative group Public Notice. That was more than any other week—9 percent of the year's contract spending money, spent in 2 percent of the year.

Much of it is spent smartly, on projects that had already gone through an extensive review.

But not all of it.

In 2010, for instance, the Internal Revenue Service had millions left over in an account to hire new personnel. The money would expire at year's end. Its solution was not a smart one.

The IRS spent the money on a lavish conference. Which included a ''Star Trek'' parody video starring IRS managers. Which was filmed on a ''Star Trek'' set that the IRS paid to build. (Sample dialogue: ''We've received a distress call from the planet NoTax.'')

''That is a major problem,'' acting IRS commissioner Daniel I. Werfel told Congress in June, explaining the role of ''use it or lose it'' in that debacle.

Other end-of-year mistakes are less spectacular—but they still cause problems. One recent study, for instance, found that information technology contracts signed at year's end often produced noticeably worse results than those signed in calmer times.

And late-September waste also weighs on its witnesses, federal workers. After President Obama set up an online suggestion box for federal workers, many asked to get rid of the ''use it or lose it'' system. They suggested ''rolling over'' money for use in the next year. And they listed dumb things they had seen bought: three years' worth of staples. Portable generators that never got used. One said the National Guard bought so much ammunition that firing it all became a chore.

''When you get BORED from shooting MACHINE GUNS, there is a problem,'' an anonymous employee wrote.

''People want to do the right thing,'' said Dean Sinclair, a former State Department employee who is crusading to change the system. ''It's not that the federal workforce is filled with bad people. The system sort of forces them to make bad decisions.''

He suggests giving bonuses to managers who return leftover money to the Treasury at year's end. ''It takes time and effort to waste money,'' Sinclair said. ''Remember that.''

Obama, like presidents before him, has exhorted agencies to plan better and avoid rushed decisions at year's end. But the White House says Congress is making that job harder.

''Twenty-five percent of my business, right, will happen in this month. Twenty-five percent of my year,'' said Art Richer, the president of ImmixGroup, a contractor in Tysons Corner that helps software and computing companies seeking government business.

September in Washington used to be a time for selling face to face. Contractors visited the Pentagon. Small-town mayors queued up in the hallways at the Commerce Department, waiting to make a late-night pitch for grants.

But those buildings are off-limits now. So you sell from your desk. You sell with your voice. You sell with empathy, for the poor harried bureaucrat on the other end of the line. ''Answer the phone smiling,'' Richer tells his people.

Of course, the feds were stressed.

''We see them in the hallway, and you go, 'How much money are we going to lose?' '' one Army officer said this past week. That officer was involved in setting budgets for future years, and the meaning was clear: How much money are you not going to spend? Whatever that number was, it would be taken out of budgets for fiscal 2015, too.

This is not normal math. But this was not a normal time in Washington: You didn't save money to spend it later. You spent now, to spend later. ''They know they're under the gun,'' the officer said, who spoke anonymously to talk about internal budgeting discussions.

On Monday, Immix began bringing its sales team three catered meals a day. If workers walked to Subway, they might lose a sale. On that day, Immix handled $16 million in business. A normal Monday is about $2 million.

Across the government, agencies were making big-ticket purchases—buying things with this year's money that could be used next year.

On Monday, VA paid $27,000 for an order of photographs showing sunsets, mountain peaks and country roads. They would go into a new center serving homeless veterans in Los Angeles; a spokeswoman described the art as ''motivational and calming, professionally designed to enhance clinical operations.''

On Tuesday, the USDA bought $127,000 worth of toner cartridges (''end of year,'' the order explained). VA spent another $220,000 on artwork for its hospitals.

On Wednesday, the Coast Guard paid $178,000 for cubicle furniture, replacing high-walled cubes with low-walled ones to improve the air flow in a large office area.

''Other higher-priority projects were not able to be executed, so they moved [money] to this lower-priority project'' before the year's end, said Coast Guard spokesman Carlos Diaz. ''The money was going to be spent anyway.''

On Thursday, VA was buying art again. It spent $216,000 on artwork for a facility in Florida. In all, preliminary data showed that the agency made at least 18 percent of all its art purchases for the year in this one week. One-sixth of the buying in one-52nd of the year.

On Friday, the end was in sight.

''I feel good. Four days, right?'' said Corey Forshee, a contracting officer at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland. Forshee was part of a team at Andrews that had done its best to beat the September rush.

The commander, trying to avoid a last-week rush, set his own deadline of Sept. 20. The pizza came early. The chaplain's office visited early (''use it or lose it'' season is traditionally stressful enough to get the chaplain involved). The buying was nearly done.

Now, they had to wait for the last act of the last act: the ''fall-out money.''

This was cash that other parts of the Air Force had not been able to spend. It would be redistributed to this office at the last minute.

''We're waiting for money for that,'' Forshee said, going down a list of unfunded projects. A roof for the workout area. A bathroom renovation. ''Just waiting for money,'' he repeated.

Across Washington, everybody had to wait.

''It's going to come down to Monday,'' said Richer, at ImmixGroup. On Friday, he said his sales had been about equal to last year's, despite worries about sequestration.

On Monday, Richer's people will sell until midnight. Then they will keep selling. ''Money rolls across the continent,'' the feds say. Cash not spent in Washington might be spent by federal offices in California in the three hours before it is midnight there.

When it is midnight in California—3 a.m. in Washington—they will keep on. There are federal offices in Hawaii, after all. And it will still be three hours until midnight there.

Mr. COBURN. Let me give the American people a little taste of what we spent in the last week.

In the last week, the State Department spent $5 million on new glassware for all our embassies. Was that something we needed to do? No. Was it an absolute requirement that we couldn't operate our embassies without another $5 million worth of glassware? No. The State Department had $5 million, and if they didn't spend it, they would be accused of not needing all their money. So they spent $5 million on something that was not absolutely necessary.

In the last week, VA spent more than $560,000 on artwork. As a matter of fact, in the last 2 days. I mean, we are bankrupt. We are running three-quarters of a trillion dollar deficit and we are going to buy a half million dollars worth of artwork because if we don't spend it on something we won't get it next year? Where does that fit in with any common sense? Where does that fit with the integrity or the honor that will preserve the future of our country? It doesn't. We have to change that.

We have not done things that incentivize Federal employees not to spend it and we will give you part of it next year for your budget and the rest of it against the debt our kids will have.

The Coast Guard, in the last day, spent $178,000 on cubicle furniture rehab. They signed a contract on the last day and sent the check out the door. It may be it needed to be rehabbed, but they made sure they got it in this year to consume the money.

The Agriculture Department, in 1 day, spent $144,000 on toner cartridges. Think about it—$144,000. These are all small amounts relative to Washington numbers, but the principle is exactly the same.

On the night before the government closed, the last day of the fiscal year, the Pentagon awarded 94 contracts right before midnight. I can't get the information on what they were yet, but I will. I will find out if they were necessary, if it is something that we needed to have in light of our debt and our dysfunction.

They also spent $5 billion on everything from robot submarines, Finnish hand grenades only hours before the closing of the fiscal year. So they spent the money, not saying it was a priority, other than it was a priority to spend all the money we have because we are afraid we might not get enough money next year.

The Defense Logistics Agency spent $65 million for military helmets on the last day, $24 million for traveling wave tubes to amplify radio signals.

How do we think the hundreds of thousands of people who are furloughed right now feel about us spending money that way when that could be paying them and they could be working?

We are sick. We need a wakeup call.

Let me cite a couple others from the Department of Defense just to show you how parochialism plays into this. Twelve brandnew—brandnew—airplanes, C–27J Spartans, were delivered right before the end of the year. Guess where they are. They are in mothballs in Arizona in the desert because we don't need them. But we spent $567 million for something we didn't need. So what do we do? We store them in the desert because the humidity is so low. So we take them right off the manufacturing line and fly them right to storage. They are not needed.

We have the same problem on the C–27As in Afghanistan. We spent $596 million for those. We finally canceled the contracts because the supplier couldn't supply the spare parts. And you know what the military is getting ready to do, rather than bringing them home or giving them to somebody else? They are getting ready to cut them into pieces in Afghanistan—$½ billion worth of airplanes.

Where is common sense in this country? Why wouldn't we think about maybe selling them to somebody else and getting some of our value back? But we are thinking about cutting them up.

Then there is the M1A1 Abrams tank. We had testimony from Secretary of the Army John McHugh saying this is the most modern piece of equipment the military has. Its average age is less than 2½ years old. We don't need any more M1A1 Abrams tanks, but they are still being produced this year to the tune of $3 billion so we can keep people employed in a factory making something we don't need.

Isn't that wonderful? Isn't that a great way to steal the future of your kids? But I am sure the politicians where they are made are very happy we are continuing to buy something we don't need because it helps the economy in their area.

Despite the sequester, the National Science Foundation is still funding

hundreds of products and studies that do not fit with common sense or a priority. Even if they fit with common sense, they do not fit the priority of where we find ourselves financially.

The Department of Agriculture grants that were announced in the last week before we shut down, before we went to the next fiscal year and don't have a continuing CR—let me read this and see if you think this is how we should be spending our money: 35 wine-tasting projects, wine trail smart phone apps. We are going to supply the money for these. The Federal Government is going to supply the money for these so you can have a good time when you go to whatever vineyard it is. We are going to take Federal taxpayer money.

Those are private businesses. Yet we are spending our grandchildren's money on that?

Four Christmas tree initiatives: Virginia Christmas trees, Michigan Christmas trees; training seminars on how you sell Christmas trees.

You know, Christmas trees are in pretty good demand around Christmas. I am not sure you are going to markedly increase the demand for Christmas trees by learning how to sell them better.

The USA pear road show to China; social media for apples, radio advertisements—paid for by the Federal Government—for blueberries from New Jersey, strawberries, organizing a maple weekend in the state of our Presiding Officer—Massachusetts.

We are spending our grandkids' money, money we are borrowing, to do things that are not a priority. They may be a priority to those folks who get the money, but in terms of our national priorities, they are not anywhere close.

Other examples of ongoing government waste and duplication not eliminated but instead funded by the CR: $30 billion for 47 job training programs that aren't working. They are not working. The GAO says they are not working, we know they are not working, and all of them duplicate one another except for three. But we are continuing to spend $30 billion a year on them.

The House has passed a skills act which consolidated all of them. We won't even take it up over here. We won't even look at it. It would save us about $7 billion or $8 billion a year. They read the GAO report, they acted on it, but we won't.

We have 20 Federal programs across 12 different Federal agencies and offices for the study of invasive species. I think we ought to study invasive species, but I don't think we need 12 different Federal agencies involved in it. And I don't think we need 20 programs on it.

I mentioned the unemployment for millionaires. That is in the CR. We didn't do anything to fix that.

There is $30 million for 15 different financial literacy programs at 15 different agencies. We just created a new one at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Rather than eliminate the ones that are not working, we are creating more of them.

There is $947,000 in the NASA budget to talk about foods that can be eaten on Mars. We are 30 years away from going to Mars. Yet we are going to spend $1 million of taxpayer money we don't have to think about foods we might eat 30 years from now on Mars? I don't think that is a priority for us right now.

There is $3 billion on 209 science, technology, engineering, and math programs at 13 different agencies. Think about that. We all know we need to get it together when it comes to education in our technical and scientific areas. But why would we have this many—209—programs, with 209 different sets of administrators and 209 sets of reporting?

There is billions of dollars in bonuses and Federal payments to contractors who fail to pay their own taxes. We have tried to pass in here multiple times that if you are a contractor with the Federal Government and you are not paying your taxes, you are either going to lose your contract or that tax debt is going to be reduced from what we pay you. But we can't get that through. So people who aren't carrying their fair share are still reaping the benefits of contracting with the Federal Government even though they are tax cheats.

Here is one small one, but this one really gets me. It is bigger than you would think. We have an agency that spends $66 million a year. It is the NTIS. I asked GAO to study them. They studied them. In their report this year, GAO explained there is an office in the Department of Commerce, which is this office, that sells reports to other agencies.

When we had GAO study this, we found 74 percent of the reports they sell to other agencies you can get from this one Web site for free. Their budget hasn't gone down, it has expanded. But the need for the agency is going away. So why are we continuing to spend $66 million—which is what we directly spend and doesn't count what they collect from all the other agencies—for only 26 percent of the information that is not available other than at Google? It makes no sense. It is called the National Technical Information Service, and it was established in 1950, tasked with collecting and distributing certain reports.

GAO noticed this 10 years ago; they noticed it again now. Congress has done nothing. What GAO estimates is 621,917 of the 841,000 reports this agency puts out are available for free on the Internet. Go to Google and every American can find it for free. All the agencies that are paying can find it for free. But we haven't eliminated this agency.

I will stop with that, and I will make a couple points.

It is wonderful that we have a difference of opinion in the Congress, but we can't have a difference of opinion about where this country is headed. We are bankrupt. People don't like to say that word. This is America; we couldn't be bankrupt. But from a balance sheet standpoint and from an income sheet standpoint, we are bankrupt.

So what are the American people to do about this? Are we to continue to spend money every year to the tune of $500 billion to $1 trillion and not make the tough choices or should we do something about it? Should there be a resolution to this addiction of spending money we don't have on things we don't need?

As a physician, for every person I have ever encountered who had an addiction, the first step in confronting that addiction is to recognize the reality of the addiction. Quite frankly, Members of Congress haven't done that. The American people have. They are figuring it out.

The reason I know we haven't recognized the addiction and we are not worried—we can say our debt can be such a percentage of GDP. We don't have to live within our means. We can handle it as long as we don't get above a certain percentage. That is the rationalization of an enabler in a family who allows somebody to continue to be addicted.

Every addiction needs a 12-step program, and the first step is recognizing that we are addicted. And we are. So one of the things the American people are starting to ask about us, given that we can't even pass a CR—and we are going to pass a debt limit increase and not make any of the hard choices. They won't be made this year. They won't be made next year. The only time we are going to make the hard choices is when the international financial community forces us to make those.

But what Americans are asking now, the confidence is so low, is who decides? Do we really represent their thoughts about spending, about priorities, about waste?

If we recognize that all this is there—these trillions and trillions of dollars over 10 years that could be changed without any marked impact on America, and we don't do anything about it—what they are asking is who is deciding? Who decides? Do I represent my constituents if I won't try to change these things?

The confidence level in us, as reflected in the polls, and when you talk to anybody, is they don't have any confidence in us because we won't admit to our addiction, come together, get on the wagon and solve the addiction.

A long time ago in this body I said there was a rumble out in America. It wasn't long after that the tea party came along. I know they are thought about with some disdain. They are not crazy. What they have done is lost confidence and they want something changed. But it is not just the tea party anymore. It doesn't matter your

political persuasion. They think we don't get it, that we are not willing to make the sacrifices of our own political careers to solve the problems. What we need to be doing, in my opinion—and my prescription for us is, American people, don't let us get out of the box by letting us raise again the shackles that are going to be increased by increasing the debt in this country. Because if we do—and we will—what will happen is we won't perform. We won't make the tough decisions. We won't make the sacrifices. There will be no sacrificial leadership on the part of Members of Congress. Their sacrifice will be, How do I get reelected, rather than I don't care if I lose; our country needs to be fixed, and we need to be about addressing that even if it costs me a political position.

When it is all said and done and America has blown through and we see the real results of our profligate spending and the hyperinflation and the marked decrease in the standard of living in this country, what they are going to remember about us is there was a challenge and we didn't rise to it. We didn't rise to the occasion. We saw short term and we forgot and ignored the long-term consequences of our actions.

My hope is that will change on both sides of the aisle; that we would truly embrace a long-term picture and recognize the tremendous difficulty. We have heard all this talk about how we have to raise the debt limit; otherwise, we are going to default. We are not going to default on our bonds, ever. It requires less than 7 percent of our total cashflow that comes into this country. We use that as a scare tactic.

I am not saying we should necessarily not increase the debt ceiling, but we sure shouldn't increase it until we have made a commitment that we are going to solve the problem, because we will be back here in 1½ years doing exactly the same thing with exactly the same excuses that say why we can't.

What America is wanting to hear from us is why we can. They are not wanting to hear about division. They are wanting to hear about unity. They are wanting to hear about what pulls our country together rather than tear it down. The best way to show them is that we are serious about solving this problem. I hope that is so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this past weekend I was with a group of heroes from the ''greatest generation.'' These men and women faced some of the biggest challenges our Nation has seen. They put aside their own needs to make the country and the world a better place.

These World War II veterans from Arkansas were flown in on an Honor Flight to see their memorial. They didn't have much to say to me personally about the shutdown. We talked about it, but talked more about the branch of the service they were in, what they did during the war, and the various things that happened to them during that period—and, of course, about Razorback football. We didn't have to spend and take time to visit a great deal about the shutdown for me to know their thoughts. Their presence alone was enough of a reminder that we need to solve this issue.

As the shutdown drags on, it spills into the debt ceiling discussion. These are two major issues with very serious impacts if left unresolved.

To everyone outside of the Beltway, it seems both sides are digging their heels in deeper, both sides are ratcheting up the rhetoric, and nothing is getting done. The American people are tired of this. Dismissing the other side's offers without consideration and trading barbs do not help out one bit. No one is being asked to abandon their principles. What needs to happen, however, is both sides must respect the will of the American people.

We must find a way to do what the public demands—reopen the government and get our spending under control. The President and the Senate majority want to say that their health care law is an entirely separate issue from this debate. That is simply untrue. It is not the way Americans see it. One major reason the American people are rejecting it is because of its budget-busting pricetag. We have a budget that can't be strained any further. Our debt stands at almost $17 trillion, and $6 trillion of that has been added on President Obama's watch. You can't take on that much debt and pretend it is not a problem. Americans do not have the luxury of telling their credit card company to stop calling because they do not want to pay the debt that they racked up.

This mess could be avoided if we simply followed regular order here in Washington, but we have not done that in 10 years. What I mean by that is during my time in the Senate we have passed one individual appropriations bill prior to the end of the previous fiscal year. We didn't consider a single appropriations bill on the Senate floor last year. Let's return to regular order by passing an annual budget and the accompanying spending bills, not one large bill.

The good news is that many Members on both sides believe we simply need to get that done. But that doesn't get us out of our current mess. We have to get the government operating again, and we have to avoid a default.

Impassioned debates on major decisions like raising the debt ceiling in the past have resulted in positive policy changes. In fact, half of the 53 times Congress has agreed to raise the debt ceiling since 1978, they have attached conditions to it. The Gramm-Rudman act is a perfect example. We talked a lot about the need to cap spending in Washington. Gramm-Rudman actually did that, and it lead to a balanced budget. Even the situation we are currently in with the Budget Control Act was born out of this type of constraint. Some in the Chamber still are not happy with that, but the Budget Control Act is the first time in a long time that we have managed to curb the growth in Washington spending.

Anyone who has ever bought a house or a car can tell you that it takes some time to reach a mutually beneficial agreement. There is lots of haggling involved. The owner says here is what it costs. The consumer makes an offer in return. This brings a counteroffer and so on. This continues until both parties reach an agreement where everyone is satisfied.

But the key to this process is that both parties have to engage in the discussion. Everybody needs to come to the table. It is simply not enough to say this is where I stand and I will not take any other options into consideration. I am fairly certain you will never buy a house with that approach.

The good news is it seems we are heading in a positive direction. I believe there is movement toward a consensus. At the very least, both sides seem to be coming out of their respective corners and discussing their options. We need everyone to come to the table, to develop a way forward that puts us on the path to fiscal responsibility. These discussions serve as a starting point for how to rein in reckless spending so we can eliminate the blank check, the philosophy that has become so pervasive in this town.

If we need inspiration to solve this problem, the men and the women I visited with at the World War II Memorial this past weekend are a perfect place to look. They have accurately been named the ''greatest generation'' in part for their willingness to take on enormous challenges because it was the right thing to do.

We have an enormous challenge in front of us now. Let's follow the inspiration of the ''greatest generation.'' Let's put our country before ourselves and solve this problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with the Presiding Officer's permission, I ask the clerk to report the cloture motion I have filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Udall, Bill Nelson, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Maria Cantwell, Tim Kaine, Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAVY CELEBRATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on October 13, 1775, Congress enacted legislation providing for the outfitting of America's first two warships, manned by crews of 80, to be sent out on a 3-month cruise. Their mission was to intercept transports carrying munitions and supplies to the British army in America. Navy missions have evolved significantly over the last 238 years; however, the essential role America's maritime forces play in defending our Nation and allowing prosperity to flourish is unchanged. The United States Navy has the finest men and women in uniform on, above, and below the high seas safeguarding America's interests at home and around the globe.

This Sunday we celebrate the U.S. Navy's 238th birthday. We remember the great sacrifices made by sailors who came before, we mourn those we lost along the way, we celebrate their successes and we applaud the new generation of sailors serving our great Nation today. The United States Navy is comprised of over 323,000 active duty sailors, over 109,000 on ready reserve, and a civilian force around 201,000. The United States Navy cannot exist without the commitment of its active duty, reserve and civilian forces, in addition to the support of Navy families. The sacrifices made by over 630,000 proud men and women serving the Navy provide the freedoms all Americans enjoy daily; freedoms paid for by those in uniform, many who are aboard the 102 ships deployed around the world as I speak right now, serving on the front lines in defense of freedom.

There are no finer men and women in uniform anywhere in the world than those who serve the United States Navy. Today, the value of having a strong naval power cannot be underestimated; 70 percent of the Earth's surface is covered by water and 90 percent of international trade travels by the sea, which means our sailors need to be 100 percent on watch. No other branch of the military conducts missions on all fronts like the Navy does. The seas are America's lifeline; our Navy protects vital shipping lanes ensuring prosperity and free trade for our Nation and our friends abroad. The Navy is essential in protecting our Nation's cyber security at a time when, according to former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Gary Roughead, 95 percent of digital information is traveling on cables at the bottom of the seas. Our national security is ever-dependent on our Nation's sea power. For each of these reasons and more, the United States Navy deserves our thanks and admiration.

I must also pay tribute as today marks the 168th anniversary of the United States Naval Academy. When Secretary of the Navy George Bancroft founded the Academy in Annapolis, MD, I think he could only dream that it would continue to inspire and help create the high caliber graduates it does today. I truly must commend those graduates and their brothers and sisters serving in arms. The incredible flexibility and can-do attitude of the Navy were instrumental to the withdrawal of military forces in Iraq and the drawdown of military forces in Afghanistan. From the Seabees to the Navy Seals, the entirety of the Department of the Navy is integral to securing our national defense around the world.

Artfully inscribed above the chapel doors at the Naval Academy are the Latin words ''non sibi sed patriae.'' Though the Navy has no official motto, these words, translated as ''not for self but country,'' encapsulate the sacrifice and dedication of our amazing Navy Men and Women serving across the globe today so that our society may be free. The real strength of our Navy is not the ships or weapons or technology at our disposal, but the highly trained, motivated, and professional sailors who make our Navy the envy of the world. For 238 years, the U.S. Navy has witnessed many changes in missions, in geopolitics, and in technology. But in all that time, the one thing that has not changed is the importance of quality people, for it is the sailors who make it all happen, and who make the real difference in a Navy's effectiveness. To all who serve: thank you for your continued vigilance. Let us remember our Navy sailors and Naval Academy midshipmen for their historic achievements in defense of our Nation and in defense of freedom, and wish them a happy birthday.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR CHARLES H. CANNON

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to my constituent MAJ Charles H. Cannon for his exemplary dedication to duty and his service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America. Major Cannon will depart from Active military duty in 2013 but will continue to serve in the National Guard in our great State of Georgia. He has served for the last 2 years as a congressional budget liaison for the Secretary of the Army.

A native of Moultrie, GA, Major Cannon left his family's 2,000-acre farm to become a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1997. While there, Chas played for the Army football team and earned a bachelor's degree in systems engineering. He was commissioned as a field artillery officer in June of 2001, just 3 months before the horrific attacks on September 11 that would shape the rest of his active duty career.

Major Cannon's assignments have been diverse. While a lieutenant, he served in C Battery, 1–10 Field Artillery Battalion as a fire direction officer, platoon leader, and executive officer. His first deployment was with them during the ground invasion of Operation Iraqi Freedom. After promotion to captain, he served in 2–69 Armor Battalion as a staff officer during his second deployment to Diyala, Iraq. Eleven months later, as part of the surge, Chas returned to East Baghdad, Iraq for a 15-month deployment as the commander of A Battery, 1–10 Field Artillery Battalion.

After returning from his third deployment, Major Cannon earned a master of professional studies in legislative affairs from The George Washington University. He was then assigned as a congressional fellow in my office with a subsequent assignment as a legislative strategist in the office of the Chief of Legislative liaison and then as a budget liaison officer in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, where he was tasked with managing the Army's wheeled and tracked vehicle portfolio.

Major Cannon's leadership throughout his career has positively impacted his soldiers, peers, and superiors. As a budget liaison officer he worked directly with the Senate and House Appropriations Committees to educate and inform Senators, Representatives, and staff about many diverse and important procurement initiatives of the U.S. Army.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending MAJ Chas Cannon for over a decade of active service to his country. We wish Chas, his wife Beth, and their two little girls, Allie and Catherine, all the best as they continue their journey of service in the Georgia National Guard.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 6:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has signed the following enrolled bill:

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.

The enrolled joint resolution was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

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.

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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 120. A bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1570. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution to amend the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 to make continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased members of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1564

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2000. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2001. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.

SA 2002. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

SA 2003. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2000. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NO BUDGET, NO PAY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''No Budget, No Pay Act''.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Member of Congress''—

(1) has the meaning given under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

(c) TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

(d) NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury of the United States for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e).

(2) NO RETROACTIVE PAY.—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e), at any time after the end of that period.

(e) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) SENATE.—

(A) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraph (B) (i) and (ii).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Senators may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraph (B) (i) and (ii).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on February 1, 2015.

SA 2001. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.''.

SA 2002. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appropriations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39).

SA 2003. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. 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 10, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Impact of a Default on Financial Stability and Economic Growth.''

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 8 a.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Debt Limit.''

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURITY CLEARANCE OVERSIGHT AND REFORM ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 199, S. 1276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1276) to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and so forth and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Security Clearance Oversight and Reform Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. OVERSIGHT OF THE REVOLVING FUND OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

Section 1304(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', and for the cost of audits, investigations, and oversight activities relating to the fund and the functions financed by the fund, conducted by the Inspector General of the Office''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following: ''Each budget submitted under this paragraph shall include an estimate from the Inspector General of the Office of the amount required to pay the reasonable expenses to adequately audit, investigate, and perform other oversight activities relating to the fund and the functions financed by the fund for the applicable fiscal year, which shall not exceed 0.33 percent of the total budgetary authority requested in the budget estimates submitted to Congress by the Office for that fiscal year.''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the Carper title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1276), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The amendment (No. 2001) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.''.

CONTINUING RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS AND FAMILIES OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Levin amendment to the concurrent resolution, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that a Levin amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2002) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolution)

On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appropriations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39).

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2003) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 58

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 58) entitled ''Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.'', do pass with the following amendments:

(1) Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

(2) On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appropriations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113–39).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, October 11, 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 Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a Republican special caucus with the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 11, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. SANDY COLVIN ROY

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Sandy Colvin Roy for her many years of public service to the citizens of the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis and to congratulate her on her receipt of an award of Lifetime Achievement from the National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment (NOISE).

Ms. Colvin Roy has represented the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis on the Minneapolis City Council for the last 16 years. As a member of the council, Ms. Colvin Roy has been a vocal advocate for the health and well-being of communities located near airports and other noise-polluted transportation centers. While Ms. Colvin Roy has spearheaded efforts at the federal level to reduce the impact of aviation noise, she has also led local efforts to protect funds that support the abatement of aviation noise pollution.

The National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment seeks to honor elected officials who have firmly supported their constituents' concerns regarding noise impacts. They have chosen Ms. Colvin Roy to receive their Award of Lifetime Achievement for her steadfast commitment to the reduction of aviation noise in the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis.

I congratulate Ms. Sandy Colvin Roy on her Lifetime Achievement Award and thank her for her dedication and service to the citizens of the Twelfth Ward, the City of Minneapolis and the great state of Minnesota.

HONORING MIKE SUTFIN'S LEADERSHIP IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Sutfin for his impressive leadership in floodplain management and his exemplary service to the City of Ottawa, Illinois and the State of Illinois.

The City of Ottawa sits at the confluence of the Illinois and Fox Rivers which makes it one of the most flood prone communities in the State of Illinois. In 2008, the City of Ottawa was impacted by a devastating flood as part of the Hurricane Ike storm system. The flood damaged homes beyond repair, and also caused an Ottawa Elementary school to close for nearly two years.

In an effort to reduce or avoid future disastrous floods, Mike Sutfin and the City of Ottawa developed a floodplain management plan that has since received state and national recognition. Mr. Sutfin has worked tirelessly to raise public awareness of the river valley floodplain through public meetings, maps, and an informative website. At his recommendation, the Ottawa City Council has incorporated better floodplain management regulatory standards into the City's ordinances. Additionally, he has helped reduce reoccurring flood loss through a major City of Ottawa buyout program and other mitigation initiatives.

In recognition of his diligent work, Mr. Sutfin has received the 2011 Floodplain Manager of the Year Award from the Illinois Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Managers (IAFSM). Additionally, he recently received the 2013 Community Rating System (CRS) Award for Excellence from the National Flood Insurance Program. Currently, the City of Ottawa is rated at Class 5 under the CRS, but with Mr. Sutfin's leadership the community will likely be upgraded to Class 2. This would make it one of the best rated communities in the State of Illinois and across the United States.

Mr. Sutfin has accomplished a great deal as Ottawa's Floodplain Manager and the resulting benefits, such as increased public safety, peace of mind, and reduced damage to property, are priceless to his community. His expertise is clearly put to good use in the City of Ottawa as well as at the IAFSM where he serves on the Board of Directors and chairs the Floodplain Management Committee.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Mike Sutfin for his leadership in floodplain management and his diligent work for the City of Ottawa.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL GATHERING OF THE MACON-THOMAS CHAPTER OF THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN INC.

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen as its members and the Greater Detroit community gather to honor its founders and celebrate another successful year.

As the end of the 1930s approached, America faced unprecedented challenges in our nation's history—recovery from the Great Depression and the looming specter World War II—which threatened the values that all of us hold dear. The greatest generation responded to these threats with selfless sacrifice and unwavering determination to protect our country. The Tuskegee Airmen are a shining example of our greatest generation, rising above the divisions of that time to answer the call to serve their fellow citizens. The Tuskegee Airmen fought with the honor and valor becoming of any soldier in the United States Armed Forces and demonstrated that our differences pale in comparison to our shared ideals of equality and democracy. The record of the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II is exemplary and they were often on the front lines protecting American bombers to ensure they would be able to complete their missions.

The Tuskegee Airmen were at the forefront of so many important events in our history—as fighter escorts for American bombers, as trailblazers in the efforts to integrate the United States Armed Forces, and as leaders in the Civil Rights movement that followed their return from World War II. Their determination and hard work paved the way for great steps forward in the endeavor to ensure that all Americans are treated and protected equally under the law.

In the Greater Detroit region, our local chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. is named after Captain Richard D. Macon and Lieutenant Colonel Donald C. Thomas, Jr.—two men who embodied the courage and tenacity of the American spirit. Their bravery not only secured our nation from harm and precipitated an incredible expansion of rights in our nation, but their determination to ensure continuing progress has led to a strong local chapter that has preserved the history of their achievements and inspired future generations of Americans from every community and ethnicity across our land to pursue a future in aviation and aerospace industries. Furthermore, the Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen undertakes many programs that also help youth develop and hone their leadership skills to empower as a force for positive change in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the bravery, courage and sacrifice of the Tuskegee Airmen are an inspiration to all of us who heed the call to serve our country. Their actions paved the way for great steps forward in our country's history and I am proud to honor the local Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen in West Bloomfield, Michigan. I congratulate its members and supporters on another year of great accomplishments and wish them continuing success in their future endeavors.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF THE DEERFIELD BANNOCKBURN FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT AND RECOGNIZING COMPLETION OF THE DEERFIELD BANNOCKBURN FIREFIGHTER MEMORIAL

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District on its 100th anniversary and on the completion of its Firefighter Memorial.

We can never fully express our gratitude for our nation's first responders and emergency personnel for the work they do and the dangers they willingly face. Our communities rely

upon and look up to these brave men and women.

Mr. Speaker, in my home town we are most fortunate to be under the watchful eyes and extraordinary service of the Deerfield-Bannockburn Fire Protection District. This May marked 100 years of firefighting in the Deerfield, Bannockburn and Riverwoods area.

Its mission is simple: ''With pride, integrity, and professionalism the members of the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District will provide emergency response, education, and quality service to all who call upon us.''

The Deerfield Volunteer Fire Department was originally organized under the leadership of Lincoln Pettis, with a single two-wheeled, horse drawn cart. Today the Deerfield-Bannockburn FPD is a team of over 40 highly trained professionals. Each and every day, these heroes utilize the most modern techniques and technologies to provide fire protection and emergency services, as well as dealing with hazardous materials and technical and underwater rescue and recovery.

This centennial gives us the opportunity to recognize the profound courage and inspiring achievements of our community's firefighters and emergency personnel.

This centennial also allows for us to recognize the dedication and contributions of firefighters past. The Deerfield Bannockburn Firefighter Memorial will be opened on October 19, and it will be dedicated to former Chiefs Jack Gagne and James Quinn, who combined to lead the Fire District for more than 80 years. Their example is legendary, and their work will never be forgotten.

I congratulate the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District for 100 years of brave service to our community, and I thank all past, current and future firefighters for being a part of this legacy.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF CROWN POINT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and profound respect that I recognize First United Methodist Church of Crown Point as its congregation and church leaders join together in celebration of its 175th anniversary. Bishop Michael Coyner, Reverend Mark Wilkins, Senior Pastor, Reverend Tom Shanahan, Associate Pastor, and the congregation will be commemorating this momentous milestone with a celebratory church service and reception on Sunday, October 13, 2013.

First United Methodist Church of Crown Point was founded in 1938 by Isaac Stagg. The first church services were held in log cabin homes. In 1887, the first church building was completed in Crown Point and became the place of worship for parishioners for many years. By 1957, a new church building was completed and remains the home of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point today. Throughout the years, more than seventy ministers have served as leaders of the church, and the devoted congregation has grown to over 800 members. With the increase in membership, the church has been able to organize numerous programs that have played a major role in the church's success. These remarkable programs include the United Methodist Women's Group, the Epworth League, a teen-age youth group, Methodist Men, Caring Cooks and the Older Adult Ministry.

The leaders and parishioners of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point touch the lives of countless individuals through their compassionate service, especially to those most in need. Over the years, they have come to the aid of many through their selfless support to various charitable organizations, including Meals On Wheels, Saint Jude Home, Adopt a Family at Christmas, and Adopt a Highway. The church has also supported missionaries both nationally and abroad, and is currently raising funds to help build a church in Roatan, Honduras.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring the church leaders and congregation of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point for their exceptional community service and congratulating the church on its 175th anniversary. The outstanding work of this truly admirable congregation continues to touch lives in Northwest Indiana and far beyond, and for their selfless service, the leadership and members at First United Methodist Church of Crown Point are worthy of the highest praise.

IN HONOR OF JESSE CARSON HIGH SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jesse Carson High School. This school, established in 2006, has been awarded the Wells Fargo Conference Cup for overall interscholastic athletic performance within its individual conference.

Last year, the school's volleyball team won the Western Regional Championship, and the baseball and softball teams were also tournament champions.

These accomplishments exemplify the hard work and dedication of the students, teachers and mentors of Jesse Carson High School.

Principal Kelly Withers is dedicated to her students and believes that with the right opportunity and environment, each student can achieve his or her goals.

I believe that a strong athletic program teaches students the importance of teamwork and how to overcome challenges. Along with a strong academic background, these skills will help our students in future endeavors.

Jesse Carson High School has made the Eighth District of North Carolina proud, and its success serves as an example to other schools in North Carolina and across the nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 102ND ANNIVERSARY OF DOUBLE TEN DAY FOR THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the upcoming celebration of the 102nd anniversary of ''Double Ten Day.'' Double Ten Day traces its roots to the Wuchang Uprising that occurred on October 10, 1911. The Wuchang Uprising signaled the end of the Qing Dynasty and the start of a democratic movement that we continue to celebrate and recognize. Double Ten Day is a celebration of the birth of democracy and the Republic of China.

I want to especially recognize the people of Taiwan on this important occasion. The strength of the relationship between the people of Taiwan and the people of the United States is strong. I look forward to continue working to expand business opportunities as well as deepen our mutual appreciation for each other's unique cultures. Exchange of our cultures is clearly evidenced on Guam, which is home to many people of Chinese ancestry. Guam continues to benefit from their cultural contributions to our community and the promotion of trade and economic opportunities.

Again, I congratulate the people of Taiwan on the 102nd anniversary of Double Ten Day. We celebrate this historic occasion with them and we honor their friendship with the American people.

HONORING THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER AT CANISIUS COLLEGE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Women's Business Center at Canisius College on the occasion of its tenth anniversary.

The Women's Business Center at Canisius College is a comprehensive resource for small business owners and professional women providing training and networking opportunities to empower women with the critical skills necessary to develop their business.

The Center gives participants access to the college's business courses, counseling, advice from business coaches, forums and an annual Women's Leadership Conference that featured ''Creativity and Innovation'' as one of its themes.

The Center not only benefits women in business but also benefits the Western New York economy. Bolstered by an initial federal grant from the Small Business Administration, the Center has served over 21,000 participants, helped start over 200 businesses, and created 290 jobs since opening in September of 2003.

The Women's Business Center at Canisius College, one of 28 Jesuit universities in the nation, also deserves recognition for the link it continues to provide between the local educational institutions and the economic centers of our community. The success of small businesses is crucial to the prosperity of our region and nation and we are fortunate that for

the past decade this group has worked to leverage funds and build new private-public partnership and establish unique and nurturing mentoring relationships that have ensured women have equal opportunity to start their own business.

The success of the Center is realized in the economic gains and confidence generated by its many participants and program graduates. Yet, for every success, there is a daily reminder that the Center's work is not complete as our region's entrepreneurs and small business owners remain in need of the valuable resources, experience and support needed to strengthen our economy and to create equal opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with appreciation and acknowledgement of their important contributions, that I rise to congratulate all those responsible for achieving this milestone as the Women's Business Center celebrates its 10th anniversary in the Montante Cultural Center on the campus of Canisius College.

RECOGNIZING CHRIS COX, AN AMERICAN PATRIOT AND ONE-MAN MEMBER OF THE MONUMENT MILITIA

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an American who has shown enormous commitment to our country and veterans during this stalemate in Washington. In response to the partial government shutdown, Chris Cox, a resident of South Carolina, travelled to Washington to assemble the Monument Militia—a one-man mission to maintain the National Mall.

As some of our leaders in Washington, D.C. are unwilling to negotiate with members of the opposite political party to devise a solution to re-open the federal government—something the American people want and deserve—our national monuments and museums remain closed and National Park Service employees normally tasked with keeping the Mall clean remain furloughed.

Therefore, Mr. Cox took it upon himself to ensure the lawn of the iconic Lincoln Memorial was mowed and kept tidy for the thousands of veterans who will descend on our nation's capital this weekend for the Million Vet March.

When Mr. Cox was asked why he travelled from South Carolina, armed with just a chainsaw and lawn mower, to clean up our National Mall, he responded, "These are our memorials. If they shut down our memorials, we're still going to take the trash out, we're going to clean the windows, we're going to cut the grass, we're going to pull the weeds, we're going to do the tree work."

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Cox just this weekend when riding my bike around the monuments—surveying how the shutdown has impacted our National Mall. Mr. Cox, carrying his state flag of South Carolina, expressed his sincerest hope that he would be able to clean the area around the Lincoln Memorial to the World War II Memorial because our veterans dedicated their lives and fought for us so we should fight and honor them, even if the government is shut down.

This is the American spirit. This is the attitude and perseverance our Founding Fathers demonstrated in the face of adversity. Patriotic acts, like the ones recently displayed by Mr. Cox, serve as a great reminder of how Washington should conduct itself in this frustrating time.

I again offer Mr. Cox my sincerest and humble gratitude for his service and commitment to our nation and its veterans, as well as the passion and conviction that led him to Washington to make sure our National Mall looks its best for our heroes.

HEAD START CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, after months of refusing Democratic calls to negotiate a replacement to the sequester that slashed over $400 million from the Head Start budget this year and eliminated slots for 50,000 children, I'm pleased to see some of my Republican colleagues acknowledging the importance of this early education program. However, to truly serve these kids and their families, we should pass a clean CR that will immediately send funding to those centers that did not receive their payments last week and then we should work together to replace the damaging sequester cuts.

A clean CR would reopen all programs for vulnerable children and their families. It would provide funding for the Community Action Agencies that represent one-third of all Head Start grantees. It would fund child care programs that help parents find affordable and safe places for their children when the Head Start day ends. And it would fund the Social Services Block Grant that helps fill gaps in services to help low-income families get back on their feet.

All of these vital programs are ignored in the resolution on the Floor today. I urge the Speaker to let the House vote on the Senate-passed CR and reopen the government now.

RECOGNIZING THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY AND CONSERVATION TRUST

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust (River Parkway Trust) in celebration of its 25th anniversary. The land around the San Joaquin River is protected due to the efforts of the River Parkway Trust, and we must thank them for all of their hard work.

The formation of the River Parkway Trust began in 1988 when citizens, landowners, and agencies joined together to outline their goals. Over the past 25 years, the River Parkway Trust has worked with 18 land owners to protect almost 3,000 acres of land. In addition to the number of land purchases made by associates of the San Joaquin River Conservancy and the California Wildlife Conservation Board, the total amount of protected land has increased to over 4,000 acres.

The protected land provides individuals with a place to enjoy outdoor activities. One of the signature attractions of the River Parkway Trust is the Lewis S. Eaton Trail. The trail is used daily by bikers and hikers. It truly is a gem in our Central Valley.

A priority of the River Parkway Trust is to encourage young people to visit the river. Many school districts participate in field trips, so thousands of students have the opportunity to view the beautiful nature and landscape. In addition, the River Parkway Trust has a summer youth program that provides children with a week full of fun river activities. Each year, more than 1,000 youth visit the camp.

The River Parkway Trust also serves as a "natural defense" to floods. It keeps pollution from flowing into the water; therefore, preventing our drinking water from becoming contaminated. The River Parkway Trust has contributed to restoring the area's cultural past so that symbolic structures like the Riverview Ranch on Old Faint Road do not disappear. Maintaining structures that are significant to the area is important for the 20,000 visitors that go to the parkway each year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust as they celebrate 25 years of preserving the invaluable land around the San Joaquin River. Their outstanding commitment to protecting the Central Valley's natural resources must be commended.

IN HONOR OF TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Taiwan in celebrating its National Day.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy a long, enduring relationship. Our partnership, codified in the Taiwan Relations Act, has been of great benefit to both our nations. Earlier this year, I was pleased to support legislation which, was signed into law, that encourages Taiwan's participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

To further our relationship, I support more bilateral exchanges between our two nations and would encourage my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the cultural and economic benefits that this relationship has produced.

Once again Mr. Speaker I rise to congratulate Taiwan on its National Day and I am confident that the close relationship between United States and Taiwan will continue for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT TO REAUTHORIZE THE PRE-DISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce a bill to amend to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program.

First authorized in 2000, the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program has a proven history of saving taxpayer money by investing in cost effective projects that are designed to reduce injuries, loss of life, and damage and destruction of property in the event of a disaster. As the old adage goes: an ounce of prevention is worth its weight in gold.

This is true for the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program. In 2005, the Multi Hazard Mitigation Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences found that for every $1 spent on mitigation, $4 was saved in potential disaster costs. Other corollary benefits and indirect savings at the local level and within the business sector were also identified. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed the cost savings of the program. Using a different analysis, the CB0 found in 2007 that for every $1 spent on mitigation, $3 was saved in potential disaster costs.

But it is not just empirical studies that have confirmed the benefits of this program. There are numerous examples of flood control projects, voluntary acquisitions of real property located in flood zones, and the construction of safe rooms that have saved lives and prevented future damage. Areas that have experienced flood damage in the past, and have flooded again, experienced reduced or no damage thanks to effective mitigation. For instance, in Iowa, pre-disaster mitigation funds were used to purchase riverfront homes from homeowners that had suffered flood damage and then converted to green space. When the area subsequently flooded again, there was no new damage, thanks to the pre-disaster mitigation efforts.

With today's ongoing fiscal challenges, increasingly severe storms, and escalating effects of climate change, it makes sense for our country to prepare for these disasters now in order to prevent or reduce damage. Smart planning to mitigate the adverse impact of disasters not only saves lives, but saves money—especially over the long run.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy when there were initial damage estimates in the billions of dollars, many Members from both sides of the aisle streamed to the floor to express sympathy to the victims, as well as decry the extent of the damage and large costs. This program represents an opportunity to curb similar costs in the future while also saving lives and protecting property.

It is time to reauthorize the Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Program at a sufficient level to make an impact. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF JOSE ALVAREZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Jose Alvarez, Commissioner for the City of Kissimmee, for his outstanding career and service to the community.

Mr. Alvarez was born in Cuba, and moved to the United States in 1971. He was raised in Miami, where he worked for the Bridge and Road Engineering Department of the Florida Department of Transportation, before relocating to Central Florida.

Mr. Alvarez has tirelessly served the Hispanic community in Kissimmee, Florida while also achieving success in the local real estate market. He has held many positions both in the public and private sector including the Board of Directors for League of United Latin American Citizens, the Board of Directors for National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals, and the Board of Directors for Osceola Association of Realtors. He has demonstrated a thorough understanding of both the business and real estate market.

In 2012 Mr. Alvarez was elected to be Commissioner for the City of Kissimmee. He has developed a flourishing career and earned the respect of his constituents for his dedicated service to the community. Mr. Alvarez is happily married to his wife Darlene, with whom he has five daughters and two grandsons.

I am happy to recognize Mr. Alvarez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his proven commitment to his community and leadership in Osceola County.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF JONATHAN EVANS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Jonathan Evans for his commitment to public service.

Jonathan possesses a Bachelor's degree in Social Work, and a Master's Degree in Public Administration, both from the University of Central Florida. He is currently working on another Master's Degree in Business Administration from Saint Leo University.

Jonathan has worked as a public servant for several Central Florida communities including the City of St. Cloud, the Town of Celebration, the City of Largo, and Haines City. Jonathan was hired as the Haines City Assistant City Manager on July 16, 2012, and was appointed as Acting City Manager on May 16, 2013. Prior to his work in Haines City, Jonathan worked for the City of Largo for nearly 6 years as the Assistant to the City Manager.

Jonathan is a full member of the Florida City and County Management Association, FCCMA, and has served on numerous boards for the organization. He is also a member of the International City/County Management Association, ICMA, and is taking the required steps to become an ICMA Credentialed Manager.

Jonathan has a strong grasp on municipal government, and a great work ethic that has not gone unnoticed. He has received numerous awards including the United Gold Award, the Children's Empowerment Award, and was named the Employee of the Month by the City of St. Cloud.

I am happy to honor Jonathan Evans, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his outstanding leadership and public service.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ELLEN OCHOA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the inspiring career of Ellen Ochoa, astronaut, engineer, and Director of NASA's Johnson Space Center.

Ellen Ochoa received a Bachelor of Science degree in Physics from San Diego State University in 1980. She then went on to attend Stanford University, where she received a Master of Science degree and Doctorate in Electrical Engineering.

She was selected by NASA in January 1990 and became the first Hispanic female astronaut in July 1991. Her technical assignments in the Astronaut Office at the Johnson Space Center included crew representative for flight software, computer hardware and robotics, Assistant for Space Station to the Chief of the Astronaut Office, lead spacecraft communicator (CAPCOM) in Mission Control, and Acting Deputy Chief of the Astronaut Office. As a veteran of four space flights, Ellen has logged nearly 1000 hours in space.

Ellen is a pioneer of spacecraft technology. She is a co-inventor for three patents for an optical inspection system, an optical object recognition method, and a method for noise removal in images. At the NASA Ames Research Center, she led a research group working primarily on optical systems for automated space exploration. She has received numerous awards for her accomplishments including NASA's Exceptional Service Medal, Outstanding Leadership Medal, and four Space Flight Medals.

Since 2007, Ellen has served as Deputy Director of the Johnson Space Center, helping to manage and direct the Astronaut Office and Aircraft Operations. On January 1, 2013, Ochoa made history again by becoming the first Hispanic and second female director of NASA's Johnson Space Center.

I am happy to honor Ellen Ochoa, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her exceptional career, numerous accomplishments, and contributions to the Hispanic community.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JOSE FELICIANO

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Mr. Jose Feliciano, a Puerto Rican musician whose international success is a true testament to his amazing talent.

Mr. Feliciano was born in Lares, Puerto Rico. At the age of five he immigrated with his parents and siblings to New York City. Due to congenital glaucoma, he was left permanently blind at birth. However, his disability has not hindered his passion for playing music. Mr. Feliciano's love for music began at the age of three, when he first accompanied his uncle on a tin cracker can. By the age of six, he had taught himself to play the concertina simply by listening to records and practicing. When Mr. Feliciano received his first guitar, he spent hours practicing each day and started taking classical lessons with a guitar instructor.

In 1963, Mr. Feliciano signed a contract with RCA Records. Over the course of his career he has had numerous chart-topping singles in multiple countries. His famous single, 'Feliz Navidad,' tops the charts every year during the holidays. The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers named 'Feliz

Navidad' one of the top 25 most frequently played and recorded Christmas songs worldwide. Mr. Feliciano has received numerous awards over the course of his career including nine Grammys, a star on Hollywood's Walk of Fame, and the Hispanic Heritage Foundation's Lifetime Achievement Award. The City of New York also honored him by renaming Public School 155 in East Harlem, ''The Jose Feliciano Performing Art School.''

Mr. Feliciano is not only a talented musician, but also a humanitarian. He serves as the International Immigrants Foundation's Honorary Ambassador and Official Delegate before the United Nations. He also serves as a board member for New Hampshire's Association for the Blind. The Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre, an ancient and prestigious Papal Order of the Catholic Church, knighted Mr. Feliciano at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He also received a Doctorate Degree in Humane Letters from Sacred Heart University for his musical and humanitarian contributions to the world.

I am happy to honor Mr. Jose Feliciano, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his many contributions to music and humanity.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DENISE DIAZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize a hard-working community organizer, civil rights activist, and working mother of two.

Originally from Puerto Rico, Denise Diaz's parents raised her and her brother on the northwest side of Chicago. Her parents worked hard in the airline catering industry to provide a better life for their children. As union members, they instilled Denise with a strong sense of collective action and a passion for justice.

Denise Diaz received her BA in Political Science from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her activism began in organizing on the South Side of Chicago. She later became a tenant rights organizer in immigrant communities outside of Washington, D.C.

In 2007, Denise moved to Central Florida to raise her two children and continue community organizing on workers' rights issues. Denise can often be seen picketing in front of major employers, meeting with workers, and leading community events with the support of her husband Mark and her two children, Zoe and Zion.

For over five years, Denise has served as the Executive Director of Central Florida Jobs with Justice. She is also a National Jobs with Justice board member and a board member of the Florida Institute for Reform and Empowerment (FIRE).

Denise's work with the Central Florida Jobs with Justice, a coalition of unions, community based groups, faith based and student groups that work together on economic justice campaigns, has empowered and improved the lives of working families in Orlando.

I am happy to honor Denise Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her incredible accomplishments on behalf of the working families in Central Florida.

RECOGNIZING JOSE F. MENDEZ FOR 40 YEARS OF EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the inspiring career of Jose F. Mendez. He has committed the last 40 years to expanding educational opportunities both in Puerto Rico and the United States.

Mr. Mendez has served as President of Ana G. Mendez University System (AGMUS) since 1974. In 1978, Mr. Mendez advocated for the creation of a Televised Study Center to make university education accessible to students who could not attend a traditional style university. Through his efforts, a televised education program was created and has since been utilized by thousands of students and the prison population of Puerto Rico. In 1985, under Mr. Mendez' stewardship, AGMUS founded Channel 40 (today, Sistema TV), Puerto Rico's first privately operated television station affiliated to PBS.

Mr. Mendez formed partnerships between universities in the United States and Puerto Rico to spark an interest in science and technology among minority groups. Under his leadership, AGMUS has grown to become the second largest private university in Puerto Rico. AGMUS also has three campuses in Florida, including one in my district, and one in Maryland.

Mr. Mendez has held various positions in educational leadership and received numerous awards. One of his crowning achievements was the creation of AGMUS's Permanent Fund for scholarships which provides education to talented students from low income areas.

Mr. Jose Mendez has focused his efforts on education because he believes that our ability to learn and to contribute to human progress is our greatest gift. I am happy to honor Jose F. Mendez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his unwavering commitment to expanding educational opportunities for all.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BETSY FRANCESCHINI

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the career of Betsy Franceschini. Mrs. Franceschini is a leader in both the Central Florida and national Hispanic community.

Mrs. Franceschini has a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work and a Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling from the Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico. She has received multiple awards and recognitions, including Magellan Media Corporation's Businesswoman of the Year Award in 2001, the Dove of Peace International Award in 2006 for her outstanding community leadership, the Hispanic Business Initiative Fund—Success Story Award, and the Entrepreneurial Excellence Award in 2008. Mrs. Franceschini was also recognized in 2012 as one of the Top 25 Most Influential Hispanics in Central Florida by Vision Magazine and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Mrs. Franceschini has been extremely active in the community since moving to Florida in 1985, focusing on issues affecting minorities. In 2003, Mrs. Franceschini was appointed by Mayor Buddy Dyer to serve in the City of Orlando's Strategic Team and Transportation Committee. She also served on the Board of the Hispanic Initiative Business Fund from 1999 to 2006 and headed the Hispanic Task Force for the Census 2000 in Orange and Seminole Counties. Just before that, she served as President of the Asociación Borinqueña (Puerto Rican Association of Central Florida), from 1997 to 1999.

In February 2011, Mrs. Franceschini was one of 15 Latino leaders selected by the White House to meet with President Obama to discuss issues important to the Hispanic community. In addition, she successfully organized and executed the first ever White House Hispanic Summit in Central Florida. In March 2011, she was appointed as the first Hispanic Outreach Director for the Florida Democratic Party and successfully accomplished the goal of increasing Hispanic voter participation in Central Florida.

Mrs. Franceschini recently worked as the Deputy District Director and Hispanic Outreach Coordinator for my office in Orlando. On July 1, 2013, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Alejandro Garcia Padilla, appointed her as the Florida Regional Director for the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration. Over twenty-eight years of dedication and commitment has earned her a high level of respect, support, and admiration as a national Hispanic leader in public service.

I am happy to honor Betsy Franceschini, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her outstanding accomplishments and service to the Hispanic community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GREAT LAKES REGION CHAPTER OF B'NAI B'RITH FOR 170 YEARS OF ADVOCACY FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as B'nai B'rith International celebrates 170 years of advocacy and leadership in support of the security of Jewish people around the world, including the Jewish State of Israel, and to recognize its local chapter for the Great Lakes region.

When it was founded in 1843, the members B'nai B'rith set out to create a support network for newly arriving Jewish immigrants in the United States. Among its first actions, B'nai B'rith created an insurance policy to provide members' widows with resources to cover the cost of funeral services and a weekly stipend for the remainder of their lives. It also provided a stipend to each member's children and assured male children that they would be taught a trade. From these initial programs, which were an immediate response to the living conditions of Jewish immigrants in New York, B'nai B'rith rapidly grew, with many fraternal lodges and chapters in the United States and around the world.

As it grew, B'nai B'rith quickly became involved in international affairs which became necessary to respond to rising anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe. As part of its response, the United States opened its first Consulate General in Romania, expanding the reach of American diplomacy. From this initial foray into foreign policy, B'nai B'rith has developed into a global voice for the safety and security of the Jewish people and their homeland.

In addition, to its international initiatives, B'nai B'rith has cultivated and maintained a number of programs to address the changing needs of the Jewish American population. As the Jewish population in the United States has aged, B'nai B'rith has responded to the needs of seniors, opening its first senior residence in 1971 which has grown into an international network of forty residences worldwide. The

array of services offered by B'nai B'rith now includes programs for youth, seniors, humanitarian aid and young professionals, as well as programs that are designed to foster cross-cultural dialogue.

In the Great Lakes region, we are fortunate to have an active and dedicated local chapter of B'nai B'rith which is celebrating its 156th year of service to communities across the upper Midwest. Among the local programs it supports are scholarships for college-bound students, Project H.O.P.E. to provide special kosher food to seniors and community members in-need during Passover, and countless cultural events that share the richness of Jewish traditions with the community at-large.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the outstanding advocacy and leadership that B'nai B'rith has displayed in the last 170 years on behalf of the Jewish people and the Jewish State of Israel. I am further pleased to congratulate B'nai B'rith's local Great Lakes chapter for its incredible work, not only as a leading voice for the Jewish community of the Greater Detroit, but as an important partner that enables cross-cultural dialogue that strengths the region. I congratulate all of my friends in the Great Lakes chapter of B'nai B'rith and I wish them success as they continue to be a clear and passionate voice for the Jewish communities in the Midwest and around the world.

CONGRATULATING 2013 HONOREES OF THE TOLEDO AFRICAN AMERICAN LEGACY PROJECT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate fifteen individuals who were recently recognized for outstanding achievement by the Toledo African American Legacy Project. The Toledo African American Legacy Project is dedicated to bringing together people to document and preserve the history of Northwest Ohio's African American communities and to celebrate their impact and influence upon Toledo and the greater world community. The organization honored six people, as well as two posthumously and eight up-and-coming residents during its ninth annual celebration.

The six people receiving honors this year were: Myra Waters, who graduated from Toledo's Libbey High School and is now the Director of the Counseling Center and Adjunct Faculty Member at the University of Baltimore. Samuel L. Price, a Scott High School graduate, is a respected businessman and restaurateur. Joseph Sommerville is a Professor Emeritus in the University of Toledo's College of Education. Lola Glover is a champion for our region's marginalized residents and founder of the Coalition for Quality Education. Dr. Crystal Ellis, a Springfield High School graduate, is an educator who became the first African-American superintendent of the Toledo Public Schools. Wilma Brown, also a graduate of Toledo's Scott High School and the first African-American to become president of the Toledo City Council, served the citizens of Toledo in elected office.

The Toledo African American Legacy Project also posthumously recognized Daniel Mack, who owned and operated the highly regarded Candlelight Café and Robert Powell who owned Toledo's iconic Powell's Beauty and Barbershop.

In addition to honoring current leaders from northwest Ohio's African American community, the Toledo African American Legacy Project also highlights young, emerging African American leaders from the region. This year, eight people were recognized for their efforts: Kenyetta Jones an autoworker from Toledo who last year introduced President Obama in Ohio and later addressed the Democratic National Convention; Alicia Smith, an educational coordinator at Toledo's Padua Center; Hope Bland, a field instructor at the University of Toledo and Wayne State University School of Social Work; Merdia Allen, Associate Director of the Office of EXCELlence and Multicultural Student Success programs and part-time instructor at the University of Toledo; Joshua Peterson, an associate at Eastman & Smith Attorneys at Law; William Pierce, Interim Director of Undergraduate Admission at the University of Toledo; Rodney Eason, Jr., Director of Human Resources at The Andersons; and Keith Jordan, President of the Toledo Board of Community Relations.

I join our community in congratulating this year's African American Legacy Project honorees. Each person's contributions have made us stronger and bettered the lives of many in our region. We salute the efforts of each honoree.

IN MEMORY OF FIRST LIEUTENANT JENNIFER MORENO AND HER SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of First Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno who died on October 6, 2013 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Lieutenant Moreno died of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near her dismounted patrol. Lieutenant Moreno was a member of the Cultural Support Team supporting a Joint Special Operations Task Force for the U.S. Army Special Operations Command. Born and raised in San Diego, Lieutenant Moreno graduated from San Diego High School and went on to receive a bachelor degree in Nursing from the University of San Francisco. She was commissioned to the U.S. Army as a Nurse Corps Officer where she served as a Clinical Staff Nurse on a medical surgical unit. The Commander of the Ranger battalion, Lt. Col Patrick Ellis, said: "She was a talented member of our team who lost her life while serving her country in one of the most dangerous environments in the world. Her bravery and self-sacrifice were in keeping with the highest traditions of the 75th Ranger Regiment." Her awards and decorations are numerous, including being awarded the Bronze Star posthumously. Mr. Speaker, I know we all extend our deepest condolences to her family and friends who have suffered this tragic loss. Her loved ones will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING RONALD D. MCINROY AND THE NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL–CIO

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ronald D. McInroy, Director of the United Auto Workers (UAW) Region 4, on being named the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor's Person of the Year, and also to recognize the positive impact and advocacy of the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO.

Director McInroy was elected in 2010 by his peers to lead UAW Region 4, which includes many of the Great Lakes and Great Plains states. He was chosen on the basis of more than 30 years of active membership and leadership in the union. From his earliest affiliation with UAW, dating back to his membership in Local 838 as a John Deere employee, Director McInroy has been a strong and effective advocate for his fellow workers and his union.

Today, Director McInroy services more than 180 locals and 200 collective bargaining agreements within Region 4. The Region is committed to maintaining and strengthening the system of checks and balances that has defined our economy following the labor movement, empowering both employers and employees to create the most dynamic and productive economy the world has ever known.

Through more than classic advocacy, Region 4 and Director McInroy have demonstrated a commitment to improving the lives of its members and their families. Region 4 is the country's only UAW Region with a free-standing education center, which I am proud to say is in my great state of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Director McInroy for receiving this great honor, and I would also like to recognize the entire Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor for the outstanding and important work it does. In a democratic society, the interests and views of all people must be heard and considered. The Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor works tirelessly to improve the lives of working families and ensure their voices are heard loud and clear. I thank the members of the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor for their advocacy, for their dedication, and most of all, for the good they have done on behalf of working people everywhere.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, once again we are considering a piecemeal bill to fund just one part of the federal government while ignoring every other priority. Speaker BOEHNER continues to prevent this House from working its will and passing a clean CR that

would open the FAA and every other agency in our government. That is undemocratic and, in the face of increasing negative impacts from this government shutdown, unsustainable.

Of course we all want the Federal Aviation Administration to open. But there are many more transportation safety programs that the House Republican leadership is ignoring by failing to bring a clean CR to the Floor. Just this weekend, there was a terrible accident during track work on the DC metro system. But 95 percent of the National Transportation Safety Board's employees are furloughed, so they can't investigate. 94 percent of the Federal Transit Administration's employees are furloughed, preventing them from fully implementing the new safety oversight responsibilities that so many of us worked hard to include in MAP–21. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has had to suspend investigations into safety defects in cars.

We need all of our transportation systems to be safe. Let's vote on a clean CR today and put all federal employees back to work.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ARNOLD L. MITCHEM

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Arnold L. Mitchem, the founding president of the Council for Opportunity in Education. On October 1, 2013, Dr. Arnold L. Mitchem stepped down and assumed the position of President Emeritus.

Dr. Mitchem has been a voice for low-income, first-generation students, individuals with disabilities, adult learners, and veterans throughout his entire career. The mission of the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) is to advance and defend the ideal of equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education. COE is the core advocacy and professional group for the federal TRIO programs, which consist of nearly 2,800 federally funded college opportunity programs at more than 1,000 colleges and universities nationwide.

Dr. Mitchem's knowledge of grassroots organizing and understanding of the political landscape at the local, national, and international level has propelled COE to become the ''voice for college opportunity.'' He introduced the concept of ''first-generation students'' through his Congressional testimony in the late 1970s—and the term was incorporated into the Education Amendments of 1980. Dr. Mitchem has testified before Congress more than a dozen times to share his expertise on education reform, the importance of a quality education, and student loan issues.

Dr. Mitchem is a member of the Executive Committee of the European Access Network and serves on the Board of Trustees for Marquette University. He is a former trustee of the College Board; past president of the Committee for Education Funding, a Washington, D.C.-based coalition of national education associations; and served on INROADS, Inc.'s first national board. Dr. Mitchem is also the recipient of both the 2013 Award for Advocacy of Independent Higher Education from the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities' Award of Excellence (2013).

Because of his tireless advocacy for underrepresented students, Dr. Mitchem was awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, and honorary doctorates from 10 universities. His writing has appeared in The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Forbes.com, The Huffington Post, and numerous other print and online publications.

Dr. Mitchem began his career on the history faculty at Marquette University, where he was later named director of Marquette's Educational Opportunity Program. Dr. Mitchem served in that role until 1986, when he moved to Washington, D.C. to assume the presidency of the Council for Opportunity in Education. He holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Southern Colorado, did graduate work in European history as a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at the University of Wisconsin, and earned a Ph.D. in foundations of education from Marquette University.

Mr. Speaker I am honored to recognize Dr. Mitchem for all he has done to improve the life outcomes of disadvantaged students. He has left an indelible mark in the lives of so many, including my own. I feel blessed to call him my mentor and my friend.

COMBAT PAPER PROJECT

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the incredible work done by the Combat Paper Project in California, New York, New Jersey and across the globe in helping combat veterans transition into civilian life.

Having served 24 years in the United States Army, one of my most profound responsibilities as a commander was to help my troopers readjust when we returned home from combat deployments and assist in their transition to civilian life after leaving the Army. Since retiring from the Army and becoming a United States Congressman, I have been proud to support the countless public and private sector groups, businesses, organizations, and individuals who are also dedicated to this mission of assisting our veterans.

The Combat Paper Project is an outstanding example of this effort. Founded by artist and papermaker Drew Matott and Iraq War veteran Drew Cameron, this organization seeks to assist in the veteran's transition by turning the uniform of the soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine into a piece of unique art. Notably, this is a collaborative process with the veteran helping to make the transition, breaking down the uniform and personally turning it into a unique piece of art that captures their own interests or life experiences, made up of the fabric in which they served their country.

I recognize the difficulty in finding ways to acclimate our uniformed men and women back to. civilian life. Combat Paper is a unique way to do so and I thank its founders, supporters, and participants for its success to date. I wish this organization continued success and I and my colleagues in Congress will continue to work alongside them in repaying these men and women who have sacrificed so much.

ROSIE THE RIVETER

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, seventy years ago this year, an iconic image of American strength, perseverance and sacrifice splashed across the front page of The Saturday Evening Post. The cover soon found its way to immortality, embedded by Norman Rockwell into the spirit of America. As much message as art, it featured a strong armed, can-do, hard working warrior in laborers clothes. It was the symbol of a nation's fierce determination, a reminder that every ounce of American life and family was mobilized in war. Seventy years ago, America met Rosie the Riveter.

But the introduction wasn't really needed. We already knew her. The cover was at long last recognition of what had happened all around America. A showing of homefront strength that had already sent so many sons and daughters to war.

When I was growing up, my Grandma told stories of how, in the early 1940's, she and her husband left Colorado in desparate search of work. Leaving the landlocked high plains and heading west to the shipyards of Oregon in a beat up old car, she and Grandpa left behind generations of family and familiarity. To pay for the trip's final-stretch tank of gas they sold the headlight off the car somewhere in Idaho, eventually finding work in Portland. There, Grandma became a welder, building liberty ships and making the machines of war and commerce.

They lived in a one room apartment above a grocery store, their only meal a daily serving of Dinty-Moore stew prepared in a kitchen that consisted of an electric burner. Grandma cannot look at that red stew can to this day.

In Oregon, a lady from the plains of Colorado learned to weld on the deck of a ship in drydock. There, drawing a bead with sparks flying, heat and sweat, smoke and steel filling the air, she went off to war. Nearly dying after falling from the top deck of a ship to the deck below, she became an equal partner in the fight for our nation's freedom. She and her coworkers never sought recognition, but a future. And Rosie the Riveter spoke for them all.

Decades later, she would share her welding skills with her astonished grandson's, staring wide-eyed as Grandma showed us up.

Everyday we come face to face with the blessings of our great nation, made possible not by men, but by all. Seventy years ago, Rosie helped America welcome my Grandma, and women across the country, in the fight for freedom.

So to let us give thanks to her, Rosie, and everyone like her who pioneered the way.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUBY'S PLACE

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tenacious and courageous survivors of domestic violence as we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month. In particular, I would like to recognize a special organization in my district that makes life possible again for these survivors and their families.

Ruby's Place in Hayward, formally known as the Emergency Shelter Program, has helped hundreds of survivors throughout my district and across the East Bay. It is more than just a support system, it has proven to be a lifeline for so many in need.

The organization's namesake, Ruby, a survivor, serves as a beacon of hope to many who have faced the pain of abuse by someone they love.

Domestic violence impacts so many lives. While the wounds may heal, scars are left behind. Domestic violence affects the whole family and, sadly, all of our communities. Support services and resources are crucial to the survival of many of these individuals. That is why we are so fortunate to have Ruby's Place.

Domestic violence must stop, and with strong, courageous, and passionate advocates like those who grace Ruby's Place, I know that message is being heard loud and clear. Change will come if we all take a stand together.

I offer Ruby's Place my heartfelt gratitude and my support as it continues to provide critical services to my constituents and people throughout the East Bay.

COMMEMORATING TAIWAN'S 102ND DOUBLE TEN DAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, October 10, Taiwan celebrates their National Day. This is Taiwan's 102nd anniversary and it is known as Double Ten day because it occurs on the tenth day of the tenth month. Their national birthday, they celebrate it with the same passion and pride with which Americans mark the Fourth of July.

Taiwan has many reasons to celebrate their nation's history. Our friends in Southeast Asia excel in a number of areas, one of the most important being their national healthcare system. Taiwan has an effective single payer system, the National Health Insurance Program (NHI), which provides healthcare for virtually all Taiwanese citizens.

I have been fighting for a similar program in the United States of America for the last 10 years. In February, I reintroduced H.R. 676, "The Expanded and Improved Medicare For All Act," which would create a similar program of high quality coverage for all Americans.

Taiwan also has a leading education system, which reflects the important investments that the nation has made in their children's futures. I too hope that Americans can learn from their example, and begin to invest similarly in the talents and capacity of our next generation.

I congratulate my friends across the Pacific, and I wish them a very happy 102nd Double Ten Day. May they have as much to celebrate next year as they have today.

LETTER TO NASA CLARIFYING CONGRESSIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON BILATERAL RELATIONS WITH CHINA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter I sent to NASA Administrator Charles Bolden on Tuesday clarifying the statutory restrictions on bilateral cooperation with China, which were misrepresented by NASA Ames Research Center staff and reported in a recent article in the Guardian newspaper. I expect NASA to immediately correct the record on its policies and await a response from Administrator Bolden.

In the letter, I also raised the rationale for congressional restrictions on additional collaboration with the Chinese government, including its abhorrent record on human rights abuses and its continued cyberattacks, espionage campaigns and development of space weapons to use against the U.S.

I also challenged Nobel Prize nominee Dr. Geoff Marcy, who made public comments disparaging statutory and NASA policies, to advocate for the 2010 Nobel Prize winner Liu Xiaobo, a Chinese dissident who has been jailed by Beijing since 2009, saying "It's an ethical breach that is unacceptable. You have to draw the line."

Will Dr. Marcy similarly "draw the line" regarding China's deplorable human rights record and join the Nobel Committee in speaking out for Liu Xiaobo? The Nobel Committee took the unprecedented step of holding Liu Xiaobo's ceremony with an empty chair on stage because he and his wife were not allowed to leave China to receive the award. Whether Dr. Marcy receives the award or not—and I hope he does—he and the other Nobel nominees should speak out for Liu Xiaobo. This will be a real test for the science community.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OCTOBER 8, 2013.

Administrator CHARLES F. BOLDEN, JR.,
NASA,
Washington DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR BOLDEN: Earlier this year, I invited you to meet with an impressive group of Chinese human rights activists in my office. I appreciated your willingness to sit with them and hear their stories. As you witnessed, to a person, each loved their country and were rightly proud of their heritage. But all sought fundamental change. They longed to live in a land where they could worship freely, speak openly and enjoy the basic protections of a constitution grounded in rule of law.

Their quarrel—and mine—is with the thin layer of leadership at the helm of the Chinese communist party that rules by fear and oppression. China's repression knows no boundaries: the government has been a major arms supplier and source of economic strength to the regime in Khartoum, Sudan, headed by an internationally indicted war criminal and architect of the genocide in Darfur. The Chinese people know that such leadership is destined for the ash heap of history, and they long for the U.S. government, to find common cause with the Chinese people not with those who persecute them.

Few in Congress have done more to advocate for the Chinese people than me.

As co-chairman of the House's bipartisan Human Rights Commission, I have worked closely with many victims of repression. I have spent hours with countless Chinese dissidents ranging from legal advocate Chen Guangcheng, who escaped from house arrest seeking asylum in the U.S. embassy, to Uyghur Muslim activist Rebiya Kadeer, herself a political dissident, to house church pastor and advocate Bob Fu, to former laogai prisoner Harry Wu. I have traveled to China to meet with human rights and religious freedom activists oppressed by Beijing. In 1997, I slipped into Tibet with a trekking group to meet with Buddhist monks and nuns living under the repressive watch of Chinese security agents. They showed me forbidden pictures of the Dalai Lama. In 2008, I returned to China the week before the start of the Olympics to meet with a group of activists and pastors—all but one was arrested on their way to the meeting.

The Chinese people are good people who yearn for freedom and the same universal human rights that we in the West enjoy, including freedom of speech and religion. In contrast, the Chinese government is fundamentally corrupt and systematically abuses the basic human rights of its own people. We only need to ask the Catholic bishop under house arrest, the house church pastor languishing in prison, the Tibetan monk willing to set himself aflame in desperation at the abuses suffered by his people to know this is true.

Consider that at the same time that the 2010 Nobel Prize recipient Liu Xiaobo, a Chinese dissident, was jailed, the 2009 Nobel Prize winner, President Obama, was hosting a state dinner for Chinese premier Hu Jintao. No such welcome was afforded to the Dalai Lama during his first visit to Washington during Obama's presidency. Much like Solzhenitsyn before him the Dalai Lama was denied an audience with the president because the White House didn't want to there to be any impact on the president's trip to Beijing the next month.

These events, coupled with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's comments during an early visit to Asia, in which she famously said that U.S concern with human rights issues in China "can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis, and the security crisis," have sadly set the tone for this administration. Too often, the Obama Administration has willfully turned a blind eye towards human rights abuses as well as systemic Internet censorship, crackdowns on free speech and protestors and prolific theft of intellectual property all in the name of currying favor with the Chinese government.

In light of these realities, I have supported efforts to limit new collaboration with China until we see improvements in its human rights record, as well as a reduction in its well documented cyberattacks and espionage efforts against the U.S. My record on this has been clear and well publicized, especially with regard to language I have included in legislation affecting NASA and other agencies. However, I was concerned to read an October 4 article in The Guardian that reported on poor guidance about these policies with regard to restrictions on Chinese nationals

attending a conference next month at NASA Ames Research Center. Unfortunately, the article is riddled with inaccuracies, as is, it appears, the guidance provided by NASA Ames staff to the attendees.

According to the article: ''Chinese applicants were told they could not attend the conference in an email sent by Mark Messersmith, a Kepler project specialist at Nasa Ames. 'Unfortunately . . . federal legislation passed last March forbids us from hosting any citizens of the People's Republic of China at a conference held at facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Regarding those who are already working at other institutions in the US, due to security issues resulting from recent Congressional actions, they are under the same constraints' according to the email, seen by the Guardian.''

As you know, the congressional provision—which has been in place since early 2011—primarily restricts bilateral, not multilateral, meetings and activities with the Communist Chinese government or Chinese-owned companies. It places no restrictions on activities involving individual Chinese nationals unless those nationals are acting as official representatives of the Chinese government. As such, the email from NASA Ames mischaracterizes the law and is inaccurate.

I believe what Mr. Messersmith may have been referring to was a temporary restriction on Chinese nationals that you put in place earlier this year after serious security protocol flaws were brought to your attention by some in Congress, including me, specifically regarding violations at Ames and Langley Research Center. You indicated at the time that security policies for foreign nationals for particular countries of concern would be reevaluated and new accreditations would not be approved until the security process was vetted. However, any restriction against Chinese nationals on NASA centers is entirely an agency policy and not covered under the statutory restriction. Furthermore, it was my understanding that NASA's temporary restrictions had been lifted after a review of security protocols for foreign nationals at all NASA centers.

As you know, NASA's inspector general recently produced a report documenting the serious failures in the security process that led to violations involving a Chinese national at NASA's Langley Research Center. I hope a copy of this report will soon be made public. For these reasons, I supported NASA's policies that were put in place earlier this year to ensure that these security flaws had been dealt with. I continue to support every effort you deem appropriate to ensure that NASA centers are fully compliant with laws and regulations governing security.

However, it is clear the NASA Ames guidance provided to conference attendees was inaccurate and not reflective of the statutory restrictions enacted by Congress. NASA headquarters needs to send updated guidance to both the conference attendees and to the press to correct this misconception.

That said, I was struck by comments from individuals quoted in the Guardian article who indicated their intent to boycott this conference. How many of these same people are all too willing to participate in science conferences in China that are hosted and paid for by the autocratic Chinese government, with its clear and undisputed record of abuses and censorship? Which begs the question, where then was their righteous outrage?

According to the article, ''Geoff Marcy, an astronomy professor at the University of California, Berkeley, who has been tipped to win a Nobel prize for his pioneering work on exoplanets, or planets outside the solar system, called the ban 'completely shameful and unethical.' In an email sent to the conference organizers, Marcy said: 'In good conscience, I cannot attend a meeting that discriminates in this way. The meeting is about planets located trillions of miles away, with no national security implications,' he wrote. 'It is completely unethical for the United States of America to exclude certain countries from pure science research,' Marcy told the Guardian. 'It's an ethical breach that is unacceptable. You have to draw the line.' ''

Again, while the conference guidance provided by Ames was inaccurate, I hope Dr. Marcy will draw a similar line when it comes to cooperation with Chinese government funded agencies and programs due to their systemic human rights abuses. In fact, as a Nobel nominee himself, has he publicly advocated for the 2010 Nobel Prize recipient Liu Xiaobo who to this day languishes in Chinese detention?

In the powerful words of the Nobel Committee which asserted, in awarding the prize to Liu, that ''there is a close connection between human rights and peace . . .'' The Committee continued, ''The campaign to establish universal human rights also in China is being waged by many Chinese, both in China itself and abroad. Through the severe punishment meted out to him, Liu has become the foremost symbol of this wide-ranging struggle for human rights in China.'' Will the international science community stand with those who are struggling for human rights in China? Will they take a similarly public stand against the ''shameful'' and ''unethical'' activities of the Chinese government which our own State Department characterizes as an ''authoritarian state'' which routinely engages in ''repression and coercion'' and resorts to ''extralegal measures such as enforced disappearance, 'soft detention,' and strict house arrest, including house arrest of family members, to prevent the public voicing of independent opinions''?

Given the attention raised in the Guardian article about the statutory restrictions on bilateral relations with the Chinese government, it is worth recalling why the Congress has deemed it appropriate to put these provisions in statute since 2011. In addition to the myriad human rights and religious freedom abuses described above, there are serious concerns about widespread espionage against the U.S., including NASA, as well as recent developments in China's space warfare program.

Over the last year, there has been much discussion about the unprecedented espionage campaign run by the People's Liberation Army (PLA) against the U.S. government—including NASA—and industry. The director of National Security Agency recently described Chinese espionage of U.S. technology as ''the greatest transfer of wealth in history.''

Other senior U.S. military and intelligence officials have become increasingly vocal about their concerns about the scope of Chinese espionage and cyberattacks. Defense Intelligence Agency chief General Ron Burgess testified last year that ''China has used its intelligence services to gather information via a significant network of agents and contacts using a variety of methods . . . In recent years, multiple cases of economic espionage and theft of dual-use and military technology have uncovered pervasive Chinese collection efforts.''

The evidence of prolific Chinese cyperattacks and espionage have become increasingly clear with the release of the Mandiant report in February as well as the newspapers that have come forward to report targeted attacks from China based on reporting critical of the Chinese government. Then, in April, Verizon released its annual cyber report which found that ''96 percent of recorded, state-affiliated attacks targeting business' trade secrets and other intellectual property in 2012 could be traced to Chinese hackers.'' These are just the latest reports in a series of official documents that have built a damning case against Chinese cyber espionage against the U.S. government and industry.

In late 2011, the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive released a report for foreign spies in the U.S. Not surprisingly, much of the report focused on China's espionage operations. According to the report, Chinese espionage efforts ''combine collection of open source information, [human intelligence], signals intelligence, and cyber operations'' to ''develop a competitive edge over the United States.'' The report also explicitly notes that China views itself as a ''strategic competitor'' of the U.S. and is one of the ''most aggressive collectors of U.S. economic information and technology.''

It is particularly notable that the president's strategy on mitigating the theft of U.S. intellectual property specifically singled out core technologies that NASA develops, including ''unmanned aerial vehicles, and other aerospace/aeronautic technologies'' and ''civilian and dual-use technologies in sectors likely to experience fast growth'' as information of the greatest interest to Chinese espionage.

In response to the public attention to the Chinese espionage threat, earlier this year the White House released a white paper detailing its strategy to mitigate the theft of trade secrets. Notably, of the 19 trade secret espionage cases that have been brought under this administration, 16 of the 19 cases involved Chinese nationals spying for Chinese institutions. That's 85 percent of all DOJ espionage cases that have involved Chinese espionage.

At the same time, the PLA—which runs China's space program—is developing space weapons to use against U.S. satellites. According to a recent article from respected national security reporter Bill Gertz, ''China last week conducted a test of a maneuvering satellite that captured another satellite in space during what Pentagon officials say was a significant step forward for Beijing's space warfare program. The satellite capture took place last week and involved one of three small satellites fitted with a mechanical arm that were launched July 20 as part of a covert anti-satellite weapons development program, said U.S. officials familiar with reports of the test.''

The article continued: ''The official said the satellites are part of China's 'Star Wars' space weapon program that has been largely ignored by the Obama administration over concerns that pressing China to explain its space weapons program would upset U.S.-China relations. The ASAT program is a 'real concern for U.S. national defense,' the official said.''

There is good reason Congress is concerned about providing the Communist Chinese government with additional opportunities to work with the U.S. on space given their continued cyberattacks, espionage campaigns and development of space weapons to use against the U.S.

Returning to Ames, the misrepresentation of NASA policy quoted in the Guardian article is the latest in a series of questionable actions taken by the Ames center leadership that have resulted in criminal investigations of export violations and inspector general reviews of illegitimate contracts issued by the center. I believe the center has become a rat's nest of inappropriate and possibly illegal activities that appear to have occurred with the concurrence of the center's leadership.

In one troubling example, last month, The Wall Street Journal reported on a Space Act Agreement between Ames and Google's executives to use taxpayer-subsidized airplane fuel intended for military aircraft for personal travel by Google's leadership. A dubious scientific data collection scheme appears to have been developed as an excuse for this preferential treatment for these executives.

According to the article, ''The main jets in the fleet—a Boeing 767, Boeing 757 and four Gulfstream V's—have departed from Moffett a total of 710 times since 2007, FAA records show. The most frequent destinations were Los Angeles and New York, but the planes also flew 20 times to the Caribbean island of Tortola; 17 to Hawaii; 16 to Nantucket, Mass.; and 15 to Tahiti.'' It would be difficult for anyone to make the case that these taxpayer-subsidized trips provided any credible scientific value to NASA.

The article continued: ''In total, [the Google aircraft holding company] has bought 2.3 million gallons of jet fuel since early 2009, according to Pentagon records viewed by The Wall Street Journal, paying an average $3.19 per gallon. 'I don't see how in the hell anybody can buy it that cheap,' said Fred Fitts, president of the Corporate Aircraft Association, a nonprofit that negotiates discounted jet-fuel prices for 1,600 corporate flight departments at airports around the U.S. Mr. Fitts provided figures showing that CAA members paid an average of $4.35 a gallon across the U.S. over that period.''

Although the article noted that this arrangement was recently terminated, the fact that Ames leadership approved this sweetheart deal for the Google executives and allowed it to continue for six years knowing that there was no serious scientific merit is unacceptable.

In addition to this troubling relationship, I also have been outspoken about my concerns that a number of Ames staff were investigated for a number of years by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the NASA Office of the Inspector General and other law enforcement agencies relating to the alleged illegal transfer of ITAR-controlled technology by individuals at the NASA Ames Research Center. It is my understanding that this illegal technology transfer may have involved classified Defense Department weapons system technology to foreign countries.

According to whistleblowers that contacted Congress, large numbers of foreign nationals were invited to work at NASA Ames over the last six years and that federal information and physical security safeguards may not have been used or may have explicitly been ignored on multiple occasions. Additionally, my colleagues and I were informed that Ames staff may have traveled to foreign conferences and disseminated information about ITAR-controlled technologies in public forums, with Chinese and other foreign officials present.

In correspondence that I have seen, the FBI believed it had a solid case that was ready for prosecution and referred it to the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California. However, after a series of unexplained delays and the removal of at least one assistant U.S. attorney working the case, the charges ran up against the statute of limitations, and the first charge expired on December 15, 2012. The case was ultimately declined by the Justice Department for reasons that have never been explained to the Congress or federal law enforcement. I believe these inexplicable delays and ultimate declination was a product of politicization within the Justice Department, and I have included language in the FY 2014 Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill further addressing this matter.

Nonetheless, it appears that federal law enforcement felt there was a solid case against certain Ames staff members involving export violations. Yet there has been no accountability at Ames for these alleged criminal violations. This is inexcusable.

Again, I hope you quickly correct the record and take appropriate action to inform the conference participants of NASA's actual policy regarding foreign visitors. I look forward to your prompt response.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DEAN AND JEAN NICHOLSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dean and Jean Nicholson for their years of dedication and service to their community. Sanger, California is a better place today because of the Nicholsons' positive influence and compassion.

Dean and Jean met at Nebraska State Teachers College in Kearney, Nebraska. Dean was raised in Superior, and Jean grew up in Fairbury. In 1941, Dean joined the United States Military, and served in the Army for two years. After Dean completed his service, the Nicholsons moved to Sanger.

Dean was hired at Sanger High School, and taught algebra, geometry, and trigonometry for 38 years. Students and faculty admired Dean and his ability to teach, and for 20 years he served as Chairman for the Math Department. When Dean was not in the classroom, he could be found on the court. He was the head varsity basketball coach for 23 years. For five of those years, he led his teams to the championship. Dean also coached varsity golf and tennis. In addition to his notable career at Sanger High School, Dean also taught advanced algebra and trigonometry for 42 years at Fresno City College. Coach Nicholson had thousands of students in his classroom during his long career as a teacher and he had a profound influence on all of them.

Dean and Jean raised three children: Bob, Cindy, and Tom; and they have six grandchildren. Jean was a stay-at-home mom with three children, but most would agree that she was a mother to countless individuals throughout the community. Her kind and loving character makes it easy for people to go to her when they need to hear caring words or sound advice. Family and friends who are close to the couple often say that, ''you can hardly say Dean without Jean.'' They are an amazing team who exemplify the meaning of true love.

Teaching and coaching have always been important aspects of Dean and Jean's lives but above everything else is their faith. Since 1954, they have been members of the Presbyterian Church of Sanger. For 20 years, Dean and Jean played a prominent role in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and for the last several decades they have both taught Sunday school. Dean and Jean have positively impacted the lives of hundreds of students with their guidance and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dean and Jean Nicholson for their years of service to the community that they love so dearly.

RECOGNIZING THE POSITIVE COMMUNITY IMPACT OF PADS LAKE COUNTY AND WISHING CONGRATULATIONS ON THE OPENING OF ITS NEW FAMILY CENTER

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate PADS Lake County on the grand opening of its new Family Center and to recognize the incredible impact PADS has on our local community.

PADS has been battling homelessness in Lake County, Illinois for more than 25 years, and in that time, they have offered a hand up and a path forward to countless individuals and families who fell on hard times. PADS' mission can be summed up simply by their guiding phrase: ''Helping the Homeless Find a Way.''

Through a broad variety of services, including those specifically for veterans, families and children, PADS Lake County not only offers temporary support and shelter, but helps guide their clients to a long-term, positive path forward.

With the opening of this new Family Center, PADS will be able to reach even more people who are suffering from homelessness, particularly important just a few years removed from one of this country's most severe economic meltdowns. Just last year, PADS saw a 20 percent increase in the services it was able to offer.

Those numbers translate to real families and real lives touched—improved. Since 2009, PADS increased the number of individuals served by 96 percent. There are people who need the assistance PADS offers, and through the heroic work of its staff, the commitment of its volunteers and the generosity of its supporters, PADS can reach further than ever.

This new Family Center will expand PADS' reach in the area and create a refuge for even more struggling families in the community.

PADS stands for Providing Advocacy, Dignity and Shelter. Through their hard work, they have achieved these aims, and through their example, they have inspired the community.

I congratulate PADS Lake County on this ribbon cutting, and I thank them, the entire community thanks them, for the work they have done and will do.

HONORING SENATOR ROD GRAMS

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and colleague, long time Minnesota Senator Rod Grams, who passed away Tuesday night losing his fight against colon cancer.

Rod Grams and I came to Washington at roughly the same time. He served on the Banking and Finance committees while I served on the Agriculture and Government Operations committees.

Everyone knew Senator Grams as being a conservative member of the Republican Party.

He was often times juxtaposed against the other Minnesota Senator, Paul Wellstone on the extreme left. Early on we discovered that we were both fiscal conservatives and almost immediately found common ground on economic issues.

Although conservative, Senator Grams was always searching for common ground and had a willingness to discuss his position with folks. Known for his humble demeanor, Rod Grams quickly became known for one of his greatest achievements, the passage of a $500-per-child income tax credit that he shepherded through Congress and into law in 1997.

I was struck by his dedication to serving others even in remote parts of the State. I remember during the 1997 floods in the Red River Valley, although he showed up in a finely pressed suit and dress shoes, Senator Grams quickly threw himself into the East Grand Forks flood recovery, mud and all. From that day on he had a constant presence in my District and also realized he doesn't need to wear a suit everywhere.

Senator Grams was a distinguished public servant and a true model of what serving means. He knew when to hold the line and when to work with others. He is a true example of leadership. Senator Grams will be missed in Minnesota politics and I extend my deepest sympathies to the Senator's family and friends.

IN HONOR OF SAUL LANDAU

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend who spent his life trying to educate people about America's role in the world in an effort to make that world a better place.

Saul Landau passed away last month at the age of 77 after battling cancer for almost 2 years.

Saul was not only a very close friend of mine and my wife Cynthia's. He was a constant mentor, educator, and agitator. He was one of the smartest and hardest working people I have had the pleasure of knowing, and he was one of the funniest.

Saul will be remembered as an award winning documentary filmmaker, an author, an investigator and a columnist. Upon his death, his friends and colleagues and family were treated to a collection of obituaries across the country that paid tribute to his exhaustive body of work, his infectious personality, and his deep caring and passion for his country and the world around it.

I am including here for my colleagues' benefit just two of those remarkable pieces so that others may benefit from reading about this one man's extraordinary life.

To Saul's family, I extend my sincere condolences for their loss. But I offer to them as well a deep appreciation from the halls of Congress of the work and thought that Saul Landau contributed to our public debate.

One of the obituaries carries this quote from Saul. "You want to do what you can while you're on this earth." Saul should rest easy knowing that he did that and more.

I will miss my friend.

Following are obituaries that appeared in the New York Times on September 11, 2013 and in the Los Angeles Times on September 13, 2013.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 2013]

SAUL LANDAU, MAKER OF FILMS WITH LEFTIST EDGE, DIES AT 77

(By Douglas Martin)

Saul Landau, a determinedly leftist documentary filmmaker and writer whose passion for asking what he called ''the most intrusive questions'' yielded penetrating cinematic profiles of leaders like Fidel Castro and Salvador Allende, died on Monday at his home in Alameda, Calif. He was 77.

The cause was bladder cancer, his daughter Julia Landau said.

Mr. Landau aspired to marshal art and literature to illuminate social and political problems, and his point of view was almost always apparent. In the 1980s, he wrote essays berating the administration of Ronald Reagan for trying to depose the leftist government in Nicaragua, and recently he urged the United States not to become involved in Syria.

He said he saw no difference between documentary and fictional films. In both, he said, a director manipulates light and sound to put across a vision. ''One has to simulate reality,'' he said in 2005 in an interview with The Capital Times in Madison, Wis. ''The other one says, 'Here's reality,' whether it is or isn't.''

Mr. Landau emerged from the roiling New Left politics of the 1960s to make more than 40 documentaries, including six about Mr. Castro. One of them, ''Fidel,'' released in 1969, was a rare intimate look at the Cuban leader. It shows him arguing with a finger-wagging peasant woman, visiting his nursery school and playing baseball and striking out.

''I found Fidel a sympathetic figure and a hell of a good actor,'' Mr. Landau told The Washington Post in 1982.

His most acclaimed film was ''Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang,'' which he directed with Jack Willis in 1980. With cinematography by Haskell Wexler, the documentary, broadcast on PBS, told of the cover-up of health hazards from a 1957 nuclear-bomb test in Utah. The film won an Emmy Award and a George Polk Award.

The title referred to Mr. Landau's friend Paul Jacobs, a journalist who died of cancer—believed to have been caused by radiation exposure—before the film was completed.

Other films by Mr. Landau portray poverty in big-city slums, the destruction of indigenous Mexican culture, the inner workings of the C.I.A., torture in Brazil and life inside a San Francisco jail. Most have a leftist political edge that some saw as propagandistic, but Mr. Landau characterized the films as educational.

''All my films try to teach people without preaching too hard,'' he said. ''I try not to be too tendentious.''

Mr. Landau released two films relating to Mr. Allende, the Chilean who had become Latin America's first democratically elected socialist president the year before. One was an interview with Mr. Allende.

The other film, ''Que Hacer!'' (1970)—the title is a translation of the title of Lenin's book ''What Is to Be Done?''—is a fictional movie, a playful spy story with music concerning a C.I.A. case officer in Chile. There are two casts: a Chilean one directed by Raul Ruiz and an American one directed by Mr. Landau and Nina Serrano, his wife at the time. Country Joe McDonald performed and produced the music. The film won awards at film festivals in Cannes, Venice and Mannheim, Germany.

Orlando Letelier, Chile's ambassador to the United States, invited Mr. Landau to screen it at the Chilean Embassy in Washington, and they became friends. A few years later, Gen. Augusto Pinochet overthrew the Allende government and imprisoned Mr. Letelier.

Mr. Landau worked with other international supporters to win Mr. Letelier's release and to arrange a job for him at the Institute for Policy Studies, a left-wing research organization in Washington Mr. Landau had joined in 1972. In 1976, Pinochet agents used a car bomb to kill Mr. Letelier and another institute worker. In 1980, Mr. Landau and John Dinges published a book about the case, ''Assassination on Embassy Row,'' documenting the Pinochet government's ties to the killings.

Mr. Landau was at least as prolific a writer as he was a filmmaker. He wrote 14 books and thousands of newspaper and magazine articles and reviews.

Saul Irwin Landau was born on Jan. 15, 1936, a few blocks from Yankee Stadium in the Bronx, and grew up playing stickball in the streets. His father was a pharmacist who had fled pogroms in Ukraine to come to New York in 1920. His mother was a teacher.

As a youth, Mr. Landau once abandoned school to hitchhike across America. When he returned, his mother urged him to take the test for the academically elite Stuyvesant High School. He passed, and went on to perform brilliantly there.

The summer after he graduated, he met Ms. Serrano at a camp in the Catskills, where he was the fry cook and she the drama teacher. Ms. Serrano, who became a published poet, encouraged his interest in leftist politics and a bohemian lifestyle, according to their daughter Valerie Landau.

Ms. Serrano also accompanied Mr. Landau when he went to the University of Wisconsin. When a dean found out that they were living together, he threatened to expel Mr. Landau (Ms. Serrano was not a student then) if they did not marry. They did.

At Wisconsin, Mr. Landau got involved in a so-called Joe Must Go club, which advocated the recall of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin over his demagogic attacks on people he accused of being Communists.

After earning bachelor's and master's degrees in history at Wisconsin, Mr. Landau became a researcher for C. Wright Mills, the sociologist, traveling with him to Western Europe, the Soviet Union and Cuba.

Moving to Northern California with Ms. Serrano, he worked toward a doctorate at Stanford but did not complete the studies. In San Francisco, they gravitated to the Beat poets and the emerging New Left movement. Mr. Landau joined Students for a Democratic Society and helped organize the leftist magazines Ramparts and Mother Jones.

He also joined the San Francisco Mime Troupe, for which he wrote, with R.G. Davis, a parody of a minstrel show, ''A Minstrel Show, or Civil Rights in a Cracker Barrel.'' Performers in the show, which satirized racial perceptions, appeared in blackface. The show traveled to New York and elsewhere.

''Through the entire evening there is really nothing to laugh at, no matter how funny it is,'' Richard F. Shepard wrote in The New York Times. ''There is the ominous theme of what hypocrisy and oppression breed.''

In 1966 Mr. Landau got a job as a reporter at KQED–TV, San Francisco's public television station, and a year later went to Cuba to make a news documentary. Mr. Castro liked it, and invited Mr. Landau to return to do an in-depth documentary about him. Mr. Landau's marriage to Ms. Serrano ended in divorce. Besides his daughters Valerie and Julia, he is survived by a son, Greg, and two other daughters, Carmen and Marie; his second wife, Rebecca Switzer; a sister, Beryl

Landau; seven grandchildren; and four great-grandchildren.

''You want to do what you can while you're on this earth,'' Mr. Landau said in 2006. ''Otherwise the alternative is to go shopping.''

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

CORRECTION: SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

An obituary on Thursday about the documentary filmmaker Saul Landau omitted a survivor. Besides his wife, children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, Mr. Landau is survived by a sister, Beryl Landau.

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

CORRECTION: SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

An obituary on Sept. 12 about the documentary filmmaker Saul Landau omitted a writing credit for the San Francisco Mime Troupe production ''A Minstrel Show, or Civil Rights in a Cracker Barrel.'' It was written by Mr. Landau and R. G. Davis, not solely by Mr. Landau.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 2013]

SAUL LANDAU DIES AT 77; LEFTIST WRITER AND DOCUMENTARY FILMMAKER

SAUL LANDAU WAS BEST KNOWN FOR DOCUMENTARIES, INCLUDING 'FIDEL' AND 'PAUL JACOBS AND THE NUCLEAR GANG,' WHICH WON A GEORGE POLK AWARD

(By Daniel Miller)

Saul Landau, a leftist writer and filmmaker best known for the documentaries ''Fidel'' and ''Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang,'' died Monday at his home in Alameda, Calif. He was 77 and had bladder cancer.

His death was confirmed by John Cavanagh, director of the Institute for Policy Studies, a Washington, D.C.-based think tank where Landau had been a fellow since 1972.

In a prolific career that spanned nearly 50 years, Landau wrote 14 books, directed or produced 10 film or television documentaries, and worked as an investigative journalist. His 1979 political documentary ''Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang,'' about the coverup of health hazards associated with atomic bomb testing in Nevada in the 1950s, won the George Polk Award for best documentary in 1979. The filmmaker and his partners—who included Oscar-winning cinematographer Haskell Wexler—also won an Emmy Award for best documentary.

Cavanagh, who collaborated with Landau on film projects, said his documentaries were meant to be educational, ''but with the very explicit intent to mobilize people to work for social justice.''

In 1968, nine years after the Cuban Revolution, Landau was invited by Castro for a tour of Cuba and an in-depth interview. The filmmaker turned footage from his time with the Cuban strongman into the PBS documentary ''Fidel,'' with premieres set for New York and Los Angeles in 1970.

But New York's Fifth Avenue Cinema was bombed before ''Fidel'' could be screened, and an office building in Los Angeles that housed leftist groups and was slated to show the picture was burned down before it could be shown there.

The filmmaker's daughter Julia Landau said her father was affected by the bombings, which she attributed to an anti-Castro Cuban faction.

''Throughout his life he felt threatened by zealots like this,'' she said. ''He was really on the hit list for a while.''

Landau made five other films about Cuba. The most recent, ''Will the Real Terrorist Please Stand Up?'' was released in 2010. Julia Landau collaborated on the project, which focused on anti-Castro militants. Several of the filmmaker's five children worked with him on various movies over the years.

''It really brought us close together,'' Julia Landau said.

Besides his children Julia, Greg, Valerie, Carmen and Marie, Landau is survived by his wife, Rebecca Switzer, as well as seven grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

Born in New York to Leon Landau and Sadie Frishkov on Jan. 15, 1936, Saul Landau grew up in the Bronx and went on to attend the University of Wisconsin.

He studied U.S. history there, obtaining an undergraduate degree in 1957 and a master's one year later.

''I came out of Madison with a passion for social justice and the idea that you only get one shot at participating in the history of the world and that you have to make the most of it,'' Landau told Madison's Capital Times in 2006, the year he donated his papers to his alma mater.

He moved to San Francisco in 1961. Around that time, Landau began traveling to Cuba, a place he'd visit frequently over the years.

''He described it in his later years as a marriage he couldn't break free from,'' Julia Landau said. ''He was incredibly supportive of the ideals of the Cuban Revolution, and he was also critical of the Cuban government for its censorship.''

Landau also had a deep connection with Chile, making films in the early 1970s about the democratic election of President Salvador Allende. Landau became friends with Chilean ambassador Orlando Letelier, who was imprisoned after Augusto Pinochet overthrew the Allende government.

Landau and others worked to free Letelier, who was later assassinated by agents of Pinochet's government. Also killed was Ronni Karpen Moffitt, who worked alongside Landau at the Institute for Policy Studies.

With the backing of the Institute for Policy Studies, Landau investigated the killings. In 1995, he published a book about them—''Orlando Letelier: Testimonio y Vindicacion.''

Landau, who from 1999 to 2006 taught a variety of subjects at Cal Poly Pomona, had eclectic interests: In addition to filmmaking, he was a member of the San Francisco Mime Troupe in the 1960s and published a volume of poetry, ''My Dad Was Not Hamlet.''

At the time of his death, Landau was working on another documentary about Cuba. The project, about the fight against homophobia there, will be completed by filmmaker Jon Alpert, codirector of the film.

''I think my work holds up with relevance to today,'' Landau told the Capital Times. ''The headlines in the mainstream media come and go every day, and there is a trivialization of what is happening. So you try to make a movie of what makes people pay attention in larger context that will endure.''

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 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 $16,747,409,787,772.33. We've added $6,120,532,738,859.25 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.

HONORING BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR DAVID GUINN

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Baylor University Professor David Guinn. Professor Guinn was recently named the 2013 Baylor Lawyer of the Year. Mr. Guinn serves as the Lyndon L. Olson and William A. Olson Professor of Local Government and Constitutional Law and Master Teacher at Baylor, where he has taught for nearly half-a-century. The Waco Campus refers to Professor Guinn as ''the Godfather,'' a tribute not only to his long tenure at the University, but also the wide influence he has had on state policy and generations of Baylor Lawyers.

Professor Guinn attended Baylor University and majored in Political Science. He received his J.D. from Baylor School of Law in 1963. Following Law School, he worked for the United States Securities and Exchange Commission for two years. He then attended the University of Michigan Law School where he received his LL.M. in International Law in 1966 and returned to his alma mater soon after. During his long tenure at Baylor Law, Professor Guinn has assisted in the drafting of the Texas Administrative Procedures Act and has served on numerous advisory bodies in the State Bar and on numerous committees at Baylor University. In addition to constitutional law, he teaches courses in the area of civil rights and local government.

Professor Guinn has also been involved in the redistricting process at the state and local level. After the 2000 Census was released, he helped redistrict cities, counties, and school districts throughout Texas. Professor Guinn served as Faculty Representative to the Southwest and the Big XII athletic conferences from 1986–2001. He also served on the first Division I Management Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1997 and has continued to work with the athletic program since that time.

Aside from his teaching and redistricting work, Professor Guinn spends time traveling, reading, and exercising. He estimates he has run 28,000 total miles, and currently averages 15 miles a week. Each year he travels to South Texas and Mexico with friends, colleagues, and former students to hunt pheasant and white-wing.

Professor Guinn has two sons, David, Jr., and John, who graduated from Baylor Law School and a daughter, Catherine, who is a graduate of Baylor University.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TAIWAN ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR NATIONAL DAY

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on their upcoming National Day on October 10th.

Through three decades marked by momentous social, economic and political transformation, Taiwan remains to be a strong and

trusted ally of the United States and shares with us the ideals of freedom and democracy. I still remember in 1996, when I first came to Congress, Taiwan held its first democratic presidential election in history. Today, Taiwan has emerged as a beacon of democracy and free enterprise in East Asia and our peoples have enjoyed a close friendship forged by our political, economic, cultural, and strategic ties.

The U.S. Congress has continuously played a unique and important role in supporting U.S.-Taiwan Relations. The Taiwan Relations Act passed by Congress in 1979, remains to be the cornerstone of our bilateral relations. It codifies America's commitment to support the people of Taiwan as they seek a safe and secure place in the world. Earlier this year, Congress passed a bill (H.R. 1151) in support of Taiwan's participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Subsequently, Taiwan has been invited as a guest to the ICAO assembly this year.

Looking forward, I believe that our government should further strengthen this important partnership by sending Cabinet level officials to Taiwan, as well as welcoming high-level officials from Taiwan to meet with their American counterparts, so that the Administration can witness first-hand the strategic and economic benefits this relationship has produced.

I am confident that our relations with Taiwan will continue to grow and flourish, and I heartily congratulate the people of Taiwan on their 102nd anniversary.

HONORING LISA MAKI

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Lisa Maki, who will be honored with the 2013 Inspiration and Impact Award presented by Imagine LA.

Imagine LA's unique program pairs individuals exiting out of homelessness with mentors to provide critical support as these people enter the next chapter of their lives. As a board member with a personal experience overcoming homelessness, Lisa has taken a leadership role to ensure Imagine LA achieves its mission—to empower families to transition from homelessness to self-sufficiency.

Immediately after being admitted to the California State Bar in 1992, Lisa opened her own legal practice dedicated to protecting consumers and enforcing our State's civil rights law. Lisa currently serves as the President of the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA) because of her unceasing advocacy to protect our citizens' rights.

For her tireless work, Lisa has received countless awards and titles that highlight her expertise and character and further emphasize her prominent standing among top attorneys across the State. Her accolades include the 2006 Orange County Trial Lawyers' Association's Employment Lawyer of the Year, the Consumer Attorneys of California's first ever ''Street Fighter'' Award and nominee as Trial Lawyer of the Year by the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles for four consecutive years.

I am delighted to congratulate my friend Lisa, on this most recent accomplishment as the recipient of the 2013 Inspiration and Impact Award. I am confident that she will continue to be an active and effective leader in the discourse of civil rights and a champion in the struggle to combat homelessness in California.

ON RECOGNITION OF THE WEST BLOOMFIELD TOWNSHIP PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE TO ITS COMMUNITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to once again recognize the West Bloomfield Township Public Library, this time on the occasion of its Seventy-fifth Anniversary of service to the residents of the Greater West Bloomfield community. Just two years ago, I was honored to recognize the Library as it was awarded a National Medal for Museum and Library Service from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, an award given to only five libraries each year and which is the top honor that can be bestowed upon a public library.

The residents of West Bloomfield Township and its neighboring cities are fortunate to have access to this great educational and community resource. What began as a small project by the Keego-Cass Women's Club in 1934 has grown into a library system with a 63,000 square feet state-of-the-art main branch and a satellite branch in the Westacres subdivision that serves residents in the northern area of the township.

Public libraries occupy a vital function in our communities; they equalize the access to information, making it accessible to everyone in the areas they serve. The West Bloomfield Township Public Library is an exemplary institution that embodies this important role—providing computers to assist residents with job searches, helping seniors with Internet access, implementing outreach programs that provide residents with opportunities to build important life skills, and creating programs that foster a lifetime of literacy and love of reading in our children.

For the Greater West Bloomfield community, its library has been an important part of its residents' lives—providing programs that help them attain the American Dream. For children, the Library has created its Grow Up Reading program, which works with youth from birth to the elementary school years and partners them with a family member, childcare providers or educators to cultivate literacy skills that will assist them later in life as they grow and join the American workforce. As part of its commitment to the newcomers to our nation, the Library offers English as a Second Language discussion groups that assist them on their journey to become Americans. For students, the library assists them with preparation for SAT, ACT and AP exams by providing physical and electronic study materials. And to help all residents, the Library offers career empowerment classes that help them hone their job skills and increase their ability to obtain employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to celebrate and recognize this award-winning community institution that continues to make a positive impact on the lives of all residents in the Greater West Bloomfield community. Seventy-five years is a great milestone in the Library's service to its community and I congratulate its staff and trustees on all of the accomplishments they have made in fulfillment of its mission. I know their passion, their advocacy and their determination to will continue to result in future generations of West Bloomfield residents that possess a lifelong love of reading and I wish them success in the Library's future endeavors.

FARM BILL

HON. TED S. YOHO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, farmers and ranchers all over this country need certainty. Each year, farmers put their property on the line in order to feed our nation and the rest of the world.

Agriculture is a unique enterprise, affected by both market and weather conditions. That is why we need to pass a 5 year farm bill and we need to pass it before the year is out.

I represent the 3rd district of Florida, with thousands of acres of farmland with millions worth of production each year. This farm bill will ensure that those farmers can continue to produce the safest, most affordable food source in the world.

Let us not forget, that a nation is not truly a nation unless it has a secure and abundant food supply—that has been the reason for the existence of the farm bill since the 1930s and it is still the reason we need a farm bill today.

I urge all my colleagues in the House and the Senate to begin a conference so that American farmers and ranchers have the security they need for the next 5 years.

RECOGNIZING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PETER'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, PHOENIXVILLE, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania, on the occasion of its 175th anniversary.

St. Peter's Episcopal Church, boasting a rich history stretching back to February of 1838, is part of the Phoenixville Historic District and is particularly famous for its 19th Century Gothic Revival architecture. St. Peter's is also well-known for providing a home for The Clinic, a free-service medical facility for the uninsured located in the former rectory next to the Church. The St. Peter's Food Pantry, sponsored by Church volunteers, feeds more than 80 people every other week from its Prospect Street entrance. These are just two programs sponsored by St. Peter's that have had an enduring, positive impact on the Phoenixville community. Since the day the

Church doors opened 175 years ago, St. Peter's has always been a place that the Phoenixville community could look to for support and assistance in times of need.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of its 175th anniversary, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and its long and storied heritage of worship, fellowship, and community service.

IN TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SHARP

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Harold Sharp for his 44 years and 3 months of dedicated government service. Arizona is in sincere gratitude for the assistance, guidance, and leadership you have provided for the Federal Aviation Administration for so many years.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of 102nd anniversary of National Day for the Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan.

October 10th, or Double Ten Day, as it is better known in Taiwan, commemorates the first day of the Chinese Revolution, which overthrew the Qing Dynasty and lead to the founding of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912.

National Day is celebrated throughout the island of Taiwan and in many Chinese-American communities here in the U.S., including in my hometown of Houston, Texas. National Day is commonly celebrated with large parades, entertainment and folk performances, fireworks, and recognition of Sun Yat-sen, the first president and founding father of the Republic of China.

It is important that this chamber and American people join the Republic of China and the Chinese-American community in celebrating this day. The Republic of China was an important ally to the United States in World War II and the Cold War and has continued to be one of our country's biggest partners in peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific Region.

Today, Taiwan and the United States enjoy a dynamic trading relationship in both goods and services. Taiwan was the 11th largest U.S. trading partner in 2012 and is a major innovator and producer of information technology products. Taiwan is an important market for our Nation's agriculture, chemicals, and semiconductor industries.

In 1996, Taiwan became the first Chinese democracy in the world when it held its first direct presidential elections and had held successful presidential elections every four years since then and acts as an important example that democracy can flourish for the Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Straits.

America should continue its strong support for the people of Taiwan and we can do this by supporting Taiwan's entrance into international and multilateral organizations and agreements. Earlier this year, this House passed legislation supporting Taiwan's entrance into the International Civil Aviation Organization. Mr. Speaker, I encourage this chamber to continue to vote on similar legislation, voice the American people's support for a prosperous and democratic Taiwan, and congratulate Taiwan on its National Day.

HONORING THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF I.C. NORCOM HIGH SCHOOL IN PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Centennial Celebration of I.C. Norcom High School, located in Portsmouth, Virginia. This weekend, members of the I.C. Norcom High School Alumni Association, Inc. are gathering for a parade and banquet celebration honoring their alma mater's 100th anniversary.

I.C. Norcom High School was founded as the High Street School in 1913 as the first high school for black students in Portsmouth. The school was originally located in the True Reformers Building at 915 High Street and graduated its first class of just nine students in June 1915. After the end of World War I, the school was relocated to a facility at the corner of Chestnut and South Street and again in 1920 to the corner of Chestnut and Clifford Street. In 1937, the school relocated to a larger building nearby, sharing the facility with George Peabody Elementary School. Sixteen years later in 1953, a new facility was built at the cost of 2 million dollars on Turnpike Road, to honor the legacy of its first supervising principal, Israel Charles Norcom. In 1998, the school relocated to its present location, a new, state-of-the-art facility located at 1801 London Boulevard.

The school carries the name of the pioneer educator Israel Charles ("I.C.") Norcom, who was born in Edenton, North Carolina on September 21, 1856. Norcom attended Yale Preparatory School in Connecticut, graduated from Andover Preparatory School in Massachusetts, and studied at both Yale and Harvard Universities. He also took courses at Howard University, Hampton Institute (now Hampton University) and the University of Virginia. Norcom taught for several years in Bedford County, Virginia before relocating to Portsmouth in the 1880s. Norcom served as a teacher and supervising principal until his death in 1916. Norcom was described as a pioneer educator, civic leader, churchman, businessman, fraternalist, guidance counselor and an outstanding citizen. It has been said that Norcom guided with unmatched intelligence, wisdom and greatly expanded the educational opportunities for young African Americans in Portsmouth.

Norcom's successors have faithfully carried on his tradition. William E. Riddick served as principal of the High Street School until 1942. William E. Waters followed Mr. Riddick as principal from 1942 to 1966. Mr. Waters built on Norcom's educational methods and tailored the school's operations to meet the special needs of its students. Waters was so proud of I.C. Norcom High School that he often claimed that it was the best high school in the South. Albert T. Edwards succeeded Waters as principal in 1966 for 14 years. By then the school's total enrollment exceeded 1,900 students for a facility built to only accommodate 1,400 students. Since Edwards' retirement, many more have committed themselves to enhancing the educational opportunities of I.C. Norcom's students. These principals include Mr. Eugene Blair, Mr. Lindell Wallace, Mr. Vernon Randall, Dr. DeWayne F. Jeter, Jr., Mr. Walter Taylor, Jr., Mr. Timothy E. Johnson (acting) and Ms. Lynn F. Briley. It was under the tenure of Ms. Briley that I.C. Norcom's basketball team won both the 2010 and 2011 AAA Virginia state championship—something I remember fondly having personally attended many of those games. Today, Dr. Rosalynn Sanderlin serves as principal of I.C. Norcom High School and continues the tradition of excellence set by her predecessors.

The world has changed dramatically since I.C. Norcom High School's founding in 1913. But one thing has not, and that is the commitment of the faculty and staff to ensuring that every student that enters the doors of I.C. Norcom has every opportunity to succeed, graduate and go onto college or into the workforce. I commend the Mighty Greyhounds on their Centennial Celebration and 100 years of educating the young men and women of Portsmouth. They have so much to be proud of and so much to celebrate.

HONORING AN AMERICAN HERO: SFC CEDRIC KING

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of North Carolina's most heroic sons: Airborne Ranger SFC Cedric King of The United States Army.

On July 25, while out on patrol during his third tour, SFC King nearly lost his life in an IED explosion in Azickzia Afghanistan. After losing both of his legs and sustaining numerous other life-threatening injuries, Cedric has in so many ways come back from the dead. In just a few months, he has come so far and so fast it is beyond words. With the help of his lovely wife Khieda, and his two beautiful daughters Amari and Khamya, he charges forward each day towards recovery. He is also an instructor and pathfinder graduate Ranger.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this poem, penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

IF I WERE KING

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

If . . . I were King . . .
I'd be one splendid thing!
I'd be the one to freedom bring!
If I were King!
I'd wear that uniform . . .
of such brave hearts who walk with hearts so very bold and warm!
Who are Airborne!
And I'd be a Ranger who freedom so forms!
As over the enemy I so swarm!
If I were King . . .

To bring hailing down upon our enemy,
such a most magnificent deadly force all at light speeds!
And if I were King,
I'd be an American Hero from who freedom so breathes . . .
All with that is so inside of me!
And so live by such a creed,
and so march off to war to such places where angels so fear to be!
To so say what must so be said!
To do what must so be done!
If I were King!
I'd so sing what must so be sung!
If I were King
I'd be a United States Ranger . . .
Who would so laugh at danger . . .
Who mountains can so climb!
All for love of country so sublime!
For only the few can so say!
That they so wear that beret . . .
Who with all of my most courageous Brothers In Arms,
have so watched our Brother's blood so run as they died that day!
With tears in eyes as their fine lives are now so done,
as he'd kneel and pray!
And if were King,
as an Airborne Ranger over evil I would so reign!
For Rangers lead in all things!
And if I were King,
all for God and Country I would have so bled!
For in history Rangers have always led!
As its life and death in what is said!
And if I were King,
I would have given up my two strong legs,
as from out of the darkness armed but with only my courage and faith!
To so awake from such harm!
As my tears so brake,
as my heart so tells me to somehow move on!
As with each new day,
I.must wade through such pain and heartache formed . . .
With the help of a great wife Khieda who stands by her man so very warm!
And my two beautiful daughters Amari and Khamya,
who lovingly call out my name each morning . . .
If I were King!
And though my task is great . . .
These new giant steps I would now so take . . .
For time for no man so waits . . .
And pity will only weak hearts so create!
So wipe all of your tears away . . .
As I stand here much more than a man on this very day!
As my strides have gotten stronger and much more great!
Look at me,
because I'm Airborne as it's up out ahead you'll find me leading the way!
To So Teach You!
To So Beseech You!
To So Reach You and All Of Your Hearts This Day!
As Hero I was not trying to be,
but this is what my Lord God has so made me . . .
So get out of my way!
For I've got mountains to so climb!
And hearts to so heal all in my time!
And I've got Blue Skies up ahead of me . . .
When, I go back home to my most beloved Carolina someday!
If I were King how proud I would so be . . .
In life,
most people never reach so high!
And jump so heroically from the skies!
Who are Rangers who are Airborne,
all so selflessly to so live and die!
And so live by such a heroic creed,
ith but such tears in eyes!
And so bury their dead up on high!
For its far . . . far better to live a noble life . . .
Than, just to do the ride!
Better, to give up your strong fine legs . . .
Then, in the end so wish somehow better choices you had made!
And die with such regret as you so ask yourself,
what did I do all in my life?
For I'd much rather live like a King,
and know that my life had meaning in every way!
Then die just marking time day after day!
If I were King!
I'd hold my head up high until my dying days!
Knowing full well,
what to this world I gave!
For in life,
only a few Kings so lead the way!
If I were King,
heaven would me await.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, COMMONLY KNOWN AS TAIWAN

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Day of the Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan. National Day commemorates the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising in 1911, which led to the establishment of Taiwan.

Taiwan has been a friend of the United States and a shining example of democracy in the Asian-Pacific Region. They share our values and respect for human rights, freedom, and a market-based economy. Taiwan is a key trading partner and trusted ally. The relationship between our two countries continues to grow along with the cultural and economic benefits it creates.

I am pleased to recognize Taiwan's National Day and voice my support for our nations' continued friendship.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, **Pages S7357–S7388**

Measures Introduced: One bill and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1570, and S.J. Res. 24. **Page S7386**

Measures Reported:

S. 120, to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7386**

Measures Passed:

Military Death Gratuities and Related Survivor Benefits: Senate passed 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. **Page S7368**

Security Clearance Oversight and Reform Enhancement Act: Senate passed S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S7387**

Reid (for Carper/Coburn) Amendment No. 2001, to amend the title. **Page S7387**

Religious Services to Members of the Armed Forces: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7387–88**

Reid (for Levin) Amendment No. 2002, to amend the resolution. **Page S7388**

Reid (for Levin) Amendment No. 2003, to amend the preamble. **Page S7388**

Measures Considered:

Default Prevention Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014. **Pages S7357–85**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Saturday, October 12, 2013. **Pages S7384–85**

Messages from the House: **Page S7386**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S7357, S7386**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S7386**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions

Additional Statements: **Page S7385**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7386–87**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7387**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, October 11, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7388.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing 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, who was introduced by Senator Hoeven, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FINANCIAL STABILITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the impact of a default on financial stability and economic growth, after receiving testimony from Frank Keating, American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C.; Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr., Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Houston, Texas; Gary Thomas, National Association of Realtors, Orange County, California; and Paul Schott Stevens, Investment Company Institute, New Orleans, Louisiana.

DEBT LIMIT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the debt limit, after receiving testimony from Jacob J. Lew, Secretary of the Treasury.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 3 public bills, H.R. 3282–3284; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 93; and H. Res. 375–377 were introduced. **Pages H6492–93**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6493**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bentivolio to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6455**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Pages H6460–61**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Guillermo Maldonado, King Jesus International Ministry, Miami, Florida. **Page H6461**

Congressional Award Board—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Democratic Leader, in which she appointed Mr. Mitchell Draizin of New York, NY to the Congressional Award Board. **Page H6466**

Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Representative McCarthy (NY). **Page H6466**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:25 p.m. and reconvened at 1:35 p.m. **Page H6471**

Border Security and Enforcement Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 79, making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 249 yeas to 175 nays, Roll No. 540. **Pages H6466–74**

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Shea-Porter 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 226 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 539. **Pages H6472–73**

H. Res. 371, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution, was agreed to on Friday, October 4th.

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in memory of Rod Grams, former Representative and Senator. **Page H6474**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H6471.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6472–73 and H6473–74. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7 p.m.

Program for Friday: To be announced.

Committee Meetings

THE INTERPRETATION OF PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled "The Interpretation of H.R. 3210: 'Pay Our Military Act' ". Testimony was heard from Jessica L. Garfola Wright, Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness,

Department of Defense; Robert F. Hale, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Department of Defense; and Robert S. Taylor, Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Department of Defense.

DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION OF AIR/SEA BATTLE STRATEGY, GOVERNANCE AND POLICY INTO THE SERVICES' ANNUAL PROGRAM PROCESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a 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. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Upper Half James G. Foggo III, USN, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations, Plans and Strategy) (N3/N5B), Department of Defense; Major General James J. Jones, USAF, Director of Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations Plans, Department of Defense; Brigadier General Kevin J. Killea, USMC, Director of the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory, Department of Defense; and Major General Michael S. Stough, USAF, Vice Director, Joint Force Development, J7, Department of Defense.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3212, the "Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

EPA VS. AMERICAN MINING JOBS: THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S REGULATORY ASSAULT ON THE ECONOMY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled "EPA vs. American Mining Jobs: The Obama Administration's Regulatory Assault on the Economy". Testimony was heard from Edmund Fogels, Deputy Commissioner, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska Representative, Interstate Mining Compact Commission; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a 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. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUNGLING BUNDLING: HOW CONTRACT BUNDLING AND CONSOLIDATION REMAIN CHALLENGES TO SMALL BUSINESS SUCCESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled "Bungling Bundling: How Contract Bundling and Consolidation Remain Challenges to Small Business Success". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FUNDING THE NATION'S FREIGHT SYSTEM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Panel on 21st Century Freight Transportation held a hearing entitled "Funding the Nation's Freight System". Testimony was heard from Sean T. Connaughton, Secretary, Virginia Department of Transportation; Leif Dormsjo, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

FACING THE DANGERS OF VA'S SKYROCKETING USE OF PRESCRIPTION PAINKILLERS TO TREAT VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Between Peril and Promise: Facing the Dangers of VA's Skyrocketing Use of Prescription Painkillers to Treat Veterans". Testimony was heard from Steven G. Scott, M.D., Chief of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Service, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Robert L. Jesse, M.D., Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a meeting on Member Access Requests. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security, 1 p.m., SR–253.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled ''Biodefense: Resources and Priorities within the Department of Defense'', 10:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

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, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Friday, October 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Following any Leader remarks, Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a Republican special caucus with the President.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 11

House Chamber

Program for Friday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1472
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1483
Carson, André, Ind., E1474
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1482
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1478
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1473, E1480
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E1471
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E1484
Flores, Bill, Tex., E1482
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E1477
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1483
Gibson, Christopher P., N.Y., E1477
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1474
Green, Gene, Tex., E1484
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1472
Holding, George, N.C., E1473
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1472
Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E1473
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1476
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1471
Miller, George, Calif., E1481
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1477
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1471, E1475, E1483
Peterson, Collin C., Minn., E1480
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E1471, E1476, E1480
Schweikert, David, Ariz., E1484
Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'', Va., E1484
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1485
Stockman, Steve, Tex., E1482
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1478
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1473, E1476
Vargas, Juan, Calif., E1476
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1472
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1478
Yoho, Ted S., Fla, E1483

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.