United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2013 No. 136

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for the many mercies You extend to us each day. Lord, we are grateful for our law enforcement agents and first responders and pray that we may emulate their patriotism and self-sacrifice. May we go beyond applause in expressing our gratitude but make decisions that will ensure their timely and fair compensation.

Today, give our lawmakers the vision and the willingness to see and do Your will. Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism. Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

DECORUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the suggestion in the prayer of Admiral Black, I want to take a few minutes to talk about Senate decorum, Senate procedure. This is constructive criticism for the entire Senate and self-criticism for me.

I think we have all here in the Senate kind of lost the aura of Robert Byrd, who was such a stickler for Senate procedure. I think we have all let things get away from us a little bit. The Senate is a very special place with very particular rules. These rules help to keep debate among Senators civil, even when we are discussing matters in which Senators completely disagree.

One of those rules concerns how we address each other here in the Senate. The practice we observe is that when Senators speak, they address themselves only to the Presiding Officer, through the Chair to the Senator from Missouri, or whatever the case might be.

When Senators refer to other Senators—this is something we all have to listen to—whether those other Senators are in the Chamber or not, Senators must address and refer to each other in the third person and through the Chair. Thus, Senators should refer to the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Nevada or the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the President pro tempore or the manager of the bill.

Senators should avoid using other Senators' first names. Senators should avoid addressing other Senators directly as ''you.'' These rules are a little unusual, but they have been in place here for a couple of centuries. As people would generally talk directly to other people if they are in the same room with each other, they are a little unusual, because that is how we address one another.

But the Senate rules preserve distance—a little distance, not a lot of distance, but distance. So Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely to talk about personalities. I think all of us—that is why I said I am directing a little self-criticism here. I think we all have to understand that these rules create a little bit of distance so Senators are more likely to debate ideas and less likely talk about personalities. If we do that, we maintain more civil decorum as a result. So I bring this matter to the attention of Senators, because we have fallen out of this habit. It has gotten worse the last month or so. I will work harder. I hope my Senators will work their best to maintain these habits of civility and decorum going forward.

The Parliamentarians and Presiding Officers have all been directed to make sure we do a better job of following the basic rules of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every day Members of Congress come to work at the U.S. Capitol. I said some of this yesterday afternoon, but because of the melee, the death and destruction outside the Capitol, the sound system did not work, so I want to make sure that people understand a few things about how I feel about the Capitol Police force.

Members of Congress come to work here, and we come with 16,000 staff people. We are here with millions of tourists every year. These good men and women, most of whom are in uniform, but not all of them are, are here to keep us, members of our staff, and the public safe from harm.

Yesterday's events were a sobering reminder of that fact. I spoke yesterday afternoon, shortly after the incident, to Brian Carter, a 23-year veteran of the Capitol Police force who was hurt during yesterday's incident. I talked to police officers whom I came in contact with over the last 16 hours

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

or so. I said: Do you know Brian? Almost everyone knows him. Almost everyone said the same exact thing: What a fine man.

As I spoke to him yesterday—he is expected to make a recovery—I wished him and his family the best during this difficult time for him and for all of us. I wish a speedy recovery to the Secret Service agent who was also injured yesterday.

But I thought the most memorable thing we had in our short telephone conversation was, he said: My job is to keep you safe. He was not referring to me, even though he and I were on the phone. He meant his job was to make sure everyone is safe. That was something I will always remember.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day, Capitol Police, other law enforcement agencies who work here in the Capitol. Why do they do that? Because that is their job.

So my thanks go out to every Capitol Police officer. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. I want to remind everyone listening that yesterday and today, the Capitol remains closed to most business. The Federal Government remains closed. In the newspaper today, it lists all of the layoffs. Today it has a graph of those in the administration area—not the legislative or judicial but in the administration. We have tens of thousands of public servants who are not furloughed, but they are working, including law enforcement officials, without pay. A number of people yesterday were out there risking their lives without pay. There are hundreds of thousands more, such as intelligence officers, to keep the Nation safe, who have been forced to leave their jobs, forgo their paychecks altogether.

Because of these furloughs, the Capitol Police, the FBI, and other Federal law enforcement agencies face additional risk, as they are asked to do their jobs with limited manpower and without the support they can typically depend on.

Congress owes it to them and to every American family to get past our differences, work through our disagreements, and work toward reopening the Federal Government. It is hard to comprehend what is going on. This is all because of President Obama's signature legislative issue that we were so fortunate to pass, to allow all Americans to have health care, as is the case in every industrialized nation in the world except our Nation.

We have as many as 45 million or 50 million people with no health insurance. I would hope my Republican colleagues understand the bill is 4 years old, it has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, it is in effect. Millions of people have gone on line this week to find out what they can do to have health insurance.

Mr. LEAHY. Would the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

(Ms. HIRONO assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the leader has noted a number of times that a small group in the House of Representatives has held up and closed the government because they want to do away with what they call ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. So my question to the Senator is, in all of these discussions they have had, the 40 times they voted, have they ever once come up with an alternative piece of legislation that would provide for your children, if they are in college, to be on your health care policy, or if you have a member of your familiy with a preexisting condition such as diabetes or has gone through cancer, have they come up with any alternative or is it just: We want nothing?

Mr. REID. Madam President, to my friend, the most senior Member of the Senate, in today's newspapers and in commentary on television and radio, even Republicans, prominent Republicans, former chairs—I have in my mind, which I read today, two former chairs of the National Republican Party—said: We have got to be for something, not just against everything.

That is the problem we have. They are against everything. Against everything. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont said, what are they for? We know what they are against, but what are they for?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished leader, because I know in my State of Vermont, people are happy, if they have children going to college, that they can keep them on their health insurance. Or if they have a spouse who had breast cancer, for example, they can still get health care, or whatever—diabetes and so on.

I think the distinguished leader has answered, no, they want to do away with all of this, and nothing in return. That is a nihilistic approach that makes no sense.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, several people have spoken. I was touched so much by the Chaplain's prayer and by the words of the leader about our Capitol Police. The leader, in his young days as a student, served as one of the Capitol Police.

Because I am President pro tempore, I do have a security detail. But long before I had that, I made it a point to go—every time I would see a police officer on this campus, I would say: You keep us all safe. Keep yourself safe. We worry about you.

I am wearing this pin applauding them today. I think we have to know, tourists who come here, Members, staff—everybody is kept safe by these brave men and women. I asked those who are assigned to me to join me in my office for a silent prayer yesterday for the safety and the recovery of the officer injured, but also for the safety of all of those police officers.

They rush in. They rush in when there is trouble. They do not say: Oh, gosh, I am not getting paid. Or, gee whiz, I am supposed to go off duty in a minute. They rush in, no questions asked. They are extraordinarily well trained, one of the best trained police departments anywhere in the country. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude.

We have also heard a lot over the last few days here on this floor about the costly impacts of this needless government shutdown. It is needless. Of course, the solution to repoening the government is an easy one: the Senate has passed a resolution which would reopen the government while we work on a meaningful compromise to address our budget and our national debt. Because of a small radical group of tea party activists in the House of Representatives, they will not even vote on it.

The House of Representatives has decided on a different approach. The irony of their parochial, bit-by-bit funding proposal is not lost on the hundreds of Vermonters who were given furlough notices on Tuesday, or the veterans in Vermont and across the country who fear the long-term impacts of a government shutdown.

They are holding the government hostage, and with it the millions of Americans impacted by this shutdown. They wish to pick and choose little popular things and say: Here, we are for that. They don't want to stand and vote yes or no on actual appropriations, because if they do that they have to take a position. It is easier to vote maybe. If they vote maybe, they can go home and say: Oh, we are for medical research. We are for the veterans.

No, they are not. They voted to shut it down. We had a Member of the House of Representatives on television posturing to a group of veterans saying isn't it terrible the administration is closing off the veterans' memorial. One of the veterans caught them and said: No, it is not the administration that is closing it, it is you. It is you people, the small group of the House of Representatives that has closed it down.

Why don't they bring the Senate-passed resolution to the House floor for a vote? This vote would end the shutdown. Instead, a handful of extreme ideologues in the House are deciding—

arbitrarily—who is worth supporting in this crisis, and when. Bring it to a vote. Have all 435 Members stand and vote, yes, we will open the veterans programs, the medical research, and everything or, no, we will not. They have to be on record yes or no.

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony yesterday—the distinguished Presiding Officer is a member of that committee, the distinguished deputy majority leader is. We heard from the Director of National Intelligence about the danger to our country from the threat that increases every day because of all the people who had to be furloughed. Every day the shutdown continues, our readiness and preparedness declines.

That was evident on Tuesday when the Department of Defense released guidance to the National Guard that it would need to issue massive furloughs, even though the National Guard is essential in this country.

That included 450 technicians of the Vermont National Guard and an additional 100 Vermont Guardsmen who were recalled from Active orders—their weekend drills, cancelled. This is where 3,000 members of the Vermont Guard come together for joint training, so it results in a decrease in that readiness. This also impacts our national security just the type of scenario that Director Clapper mentioned.

Some of the 450 military technicians in Vermont who received furlough notices on Tuesday are at home without pay, after forfeiting 20 percent of their pay for six weeks this summer because of sequestration.

I know many of them personally. Some are neighbors of mine in Vermont. These are real people. I have heard from some of them. They have called and emailed my office. They are asking why their service to the country and their local communities, which is so essential to our military readiness and to our ability to respond to crises like natural disasters, can be so readily dismissed. I could not agree more with them. They are not getting paid every week as are the Members of the House of Representatives—the tea party group—who are holding them hostage.

I believe the number of furloughs in the National Guard was a misinterpretation by the Department of Defense. This week, the House and Senate adopted legislation to ensure that members of our Nation's military receive their pay, despite the government shutdown. I am the cochair of the National Guard Caucus. I supported this effort in part because the legislation specifically mentioned the Guard and reserves. Today, I have joined Senator MANCHIN and others in a letter asking the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the Department's interpretation.

The government shutdown also affects our veterans. There are nearly 50,000 veterans who call Vermont home. This shutdown is not how we thank our veterans and military members for their service. This is not how we show them our support.

I have received phone calls and emails from Vermonters about the impact of the government shutdown on services for veterans, but my distinguished colleague from Vermont, who is the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, has also heard from these people. These are real people. They showed up in support of this country when they were asked. Now they say: Why aren't you supporting us?

Veterans across the country know that while their benefits payments will continue in the near-term, furloughs within the Veterans Administration are unfair to our veterans who, after their service, were promised our support. Our veterans and military members, including those of our National Guard, should never question our commitment to their well-being, especially after all they have sacrificed to ensure ours. They now have a real question: what is our commitment to them? We didn't question their commitment to the country when they served, but now where is our commitment to them?

We are not going to solve this problem by adopting a piecemeal approach, meant to win headlines and promote the blame game. That is no way to run a government. The Senate already passed a bill, a clean continuing resolution, to keep our government running, and to fulfill our commitments. It's time to stop picking winners and losers. If we are serious about caring for our servicemembers and veterans, we need to get serious about moving beyond this shutdown.

The distinguished chair of the Budget Committee is on the floor. She got a budget through this committee. I remember passing the last vote—I think it was 5:30 on a Saturday morning after we had gone all day long. Then, when we wanted to go to conference to actually work out the differences with the House, oh, no, then they might actually have to vote on something. It is blocked by a Senator working with the tea party in the House, saying: Oh, no, we can't go to conference.

The same people are giving speeches saying: Why can't we have a budget? We passed a budget. Oh, no, now we might actually have to vote on something. We might have to vote yes or no instead of maybe. We are elected to vote yes or no, not maybe. Have the courage to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to thank the President pro tempore, as well as the majority leader for their comments this morning. I am wearing a button, as many of my colleagues are, that says thank you to the Capitol Police.

The one I am wearing is not one that was issued today but one I asked to be commissioned after 9/11 because I thought about the extraordinary courage these men and women showed that day when an imminent attack on this building was well known. Yet they did everything in their power to protect all of us who work here and those who were visiting. I give a special thank you to them.

Yesterday was a tragic day. A young woman—it is still unclear what motivated her—was involved in an incident at the White House, backing into a police vehicle and then trying to escape, followed by a Secret Service officer. She drove toward the Capitol Building and, sadly, her life was taken.

It is understandable. We live in an era where this campus, the U.S. Capitol grounds are carefully guarded for obvious reasons. It is a clear, visible target to those who hate the United States. Someone in a car is a threat. We know that because car bombs are so common in some parts of the world and we are wary of vehicles that may be used to harm innocent visitors or people who work in the U.S. Capitol Building.

It will be some time before we sort out all the details of what led to this incident yesterday, but there is something we know very clearly; that is, that the men and women in the Capitol Police stepped forward to defend this Capitol Building and all those who work and visit here. They did this risking their own lives.

This morning's Washington Post has a few paragraphs on this which bear repeating for the record:

> What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and probably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.
>
> Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.
>
> ''We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery,'' tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R–Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

How many times have we listened on the floor of the Senate as those from the other side of the aisle criticize federal workers, try in some way to demean the contribution they make to this great Nation, trying to find some way to lay them off, if not fire them, or to restrict their pay over and over; they are trampled on; they are political casualties time and again on the floor of the Senate.

Yet each and every one of us, every Member of Congress in the Senate and the House, our staffs and our families and those who visit are safe because of these men and women, these Federal workers. It is about time we realize when we shut down the government, it is the ultimate disrespect to these men and women who simply want to do their job to make this a safer and better nation.

It was very visible on the grounds right off the Capitol Building itself yesterday afternoon. While many of us were told to stay in our offices, don't move, for at least half an hour, these men and women risked their lives during a government shutdown when they aren't receiving a paycheck. It was very visible—and should have been visible to everyone—the irony of this situation that we shut down the government and yet ask them to risk their lives without promise of a paycheck.

I wish to mention one other thing that happened yesterday that may not have been noticed, where the impact of government shutdown is not quite as visible. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State, testified about the fear of Iran developing a nuclear bomb and sanctions imposed by the United States and the civilized world to persuade them not to develop a nuclear bomb.

She went on to say: The government shutdown that has furloughed 72 percent of the civilian intelligence employees in our government is not making this a safer country or giving us the eyes and ears around the world we need to make sure Iran does not develop a nuclear bomb, a nuclear weapon.

She added: Within the Department of the Treasury, 90 percent, 9 out of 10, of the people working in the agency which has the responsibility of specifically watching that the sanctions in Iran are enforced have been furloughed—90 percent of them.

It isn't only a matter of the visibility of Capitol Police risking their lives, despite this demeaning government shutdown, it is also that less visible, such as 72 percent of our intelligence workers charged with keeping America safe, avoiding another 9/11, have been sent home. Ninety percent of those who are watching carefully so Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon were sent home because of this government shutdown.

This is the third embarrassing, shameful day of this government shutdown. People say how could it possibly end? It could end very simply. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has on his desk in the House of Representatives a continuing resolution which is a spending bill which will reopen the government for at least 6 weeks. He should call that for a vote today. He will receive bipartisan support. He shouldn't fear that. He should celebrate it, bipartisan support to reopen this government.

Then I hope he will accept the invitation of Senator REID and others to meet with Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Budget Committee, sit down, plan the spending, plan the savings, and plan the important policy decisions—which we have for 6 months tried to bring to this floor—in a conference committee. Let's do it and do it today. Today should be the end of the government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from today's Washington Post and an article from The Daily Beast on Iran.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 2013]

ESSENTIAL WORKERS: THOSE DEDICATED TO SERVING THE PUBLIC DESERVE MORE THAN A BRIEF MESSAGE OF THANKS

The order went out to Capitol Hill personnel Thursday afternoon in capital letters: SHELTER IN PLACE. It was a terrifying moment for a community already on edge. The scare ended with less carnage than we have come to fear in such moments—but not before we were reminded again of the dedication of those who work for the government. Maybe that reminder will bring some politicians to their senses.

As we write this, investigators are trying to sort out the series of events that apparently began when a woman tried to drive her car through a security barrier near the White House and ended with shots fired near the U.S. Capitol. What the woman, who was killed, intended, whether police responded appropriately, what lessons may be drawn about the efficacy of security barriers: All of that remains to be examined.

What seems beyond doubt is that Secret Service personnel, Capitol Police and probably many others rushed toward, not away from, danger—as they are trained to do and as Americans expect them to do. Inside Congress, aides took cover, traded anxious text messages and then went on with their work.

Like hundreds of thousands of other federal employees, these are men and women whose contributions have been demeaned by the federal shutdown, who are being asked to work without, at least for the moment, being paid—and who are doing their jobs with considerably more dignity than the House of Representatives has mustered.

''We all owe the Capitol Police a debt of gratitude for their work every day; no finer examples of professionalism & bravery,'' tweeted House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio). That's true. But Mr. Boehner owes them, and the rest of the federal workforce, more than a 140-character message of thanks. He owes them a paycheck; he owes them a budget; he owes them an apology.

Beyond the shooting Thursday, Washington was full of the usual posturing, speculating, rumor-trading and jockeying for public relations advantage. Maybe the shutdown would be wrapped into the default. Maybe the Obamacare demands would be subsumed into ''grand bargain''demands. Maybe this, maybe that.

Meanwhile, there are mothers who depend on federal assistance for nutrition for their children. There are motel owners and workers on Skyline Drive whose livelihood is threatened because the national parks are closed in what should be their peak season. There are dedicated scientists and food inspectors and intelligence analysts who have been told by Mr. Boehner that he and his fellow Republicans do not consider their work all that essential to the nation.

Those scientists and inspectors and analysts are not the nonessential ones.

[From the Daily Beast, Oct. 2, 2013]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EMPTIES OFFICES ENFORCING SANCTIONS ON IRAN

(By Josh Rogin)

The shutdown has forced the Treasury Department to furlough most of the employees enforcing sanctions on Iran, just as the U.S. is beginning new negotiations. Josh Rogin and Eli Lake report on the potential fallout.

With the government shut down, most U.S. officials enforcing sanctions on Iran are not at work, potentially undermining pressure on Tehran as U.S.-Iran negotiations recommence, according to administration officials, lawmakers, and experts.

The Treasury Department has furloughed approximately 90 percent of the employees in its Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence (TFI), which is responsible for the monitoring of illicit activities and enforcement of sanctions related to several countries, including Iran, Syria, and North Korea, Treasury officials told The Daily Beast. The drastic scaling down of personnel working on those activities comes just as the Obama administration is engaging in its first set of diplomatic negotiations with the new Iranian government, led by President Hassan Rouhani (/articles/2013/09/26/what-hassan-rouhani-really-said-about-the-holocaust.html).

A subsection of TFI, the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC), which implements the U.S. government's financial sanctions, has been forced to furlough nearly all its staff due to the lapse in congressional funding, said a Treasury Department spokesman.

''As a result, OFAC is unable to sustain its core functions of: issuing new sanctions designations against those enabling the governments of Iran and Syria as well as terrorist organizations, WMD proliferators, narcotics cartels, and transnational organized crime groups; investigating and penalizing sanctions violations; issuing licenses to authorize humanitarian and other important activities that might otherwise be barred by sanctions; and issuing new sanctions prohibitions and guidance,'' the spokesman said. ''This massively reduced staffing not only impairs OFAC's ability to execute its mission, it also undermines TFI's broader efforts to combat money laundering and illicit finance, protect the integrity of the U.S. financial system, and disrupt the financial underpinnings of our adversaries.''

Two other subsections of TFI, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (OIA) and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), also are working with a skeleton crew. According to FinCEN's shutdown plan (PDF (http://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Documents/FinCEN%20Shutdown%20Plan__revised%20FY%202014__ Web%20Version.pdf), 30 of 345 employees were kept on after appropriations ran out Oct. 1.

Administration officials often tout the various rounds of sanctions (/articles/2013/09/23/lawmakers-set-a-high-bar-for-iran-to-escape-sanctions.html) passed by Congress and signed by President Obama as crucial to pressuring the Iranian regime to strike a deal to bring its clandestine nuclear program into accordance with international standards of transparency and convince the world it is not developing a nuclear weapon.

''If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves.''

''Because of the extraordinary sanctions that we have been able to put in place over the last several years, the Iranians are now prepared, it appears, to negotiate,'' Obama said Monday (http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/09/30/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-netanyahu-israel-after-bilate) after meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at the White House. ''But we enter into these negotiations very clear-eyed. They will not be easy. And anything that we do will require the highest standards of verification in order for us to provide the sort of sanctions relief that I think they are looking for.''

Pressures must be kept in place and even strengthened as new negotiations with the Iranians begin, Netanyahu responded. But the furloughs are making it more difficult to

enforce the sanctions during the budget stalemate.

FinCEN processes tips from banks about suspicious activity and possible money laundering, and shares the data with law enforcement. The network and OFAC are two of the most potent tools the U.S. government has used to pressure Iran.

''Given the fact that the vast majority of FinCEN employees have been furloughed, important pieces of financial intelligence will not be sifted through and analyzed by the agency charged with this task,'' said Avi Jorisch, a former policy adviser for the Treasury Department's TFI office. The government is shut down, Jorisch said, but ''money launderers are certainly not taking vacation.''

Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, said Iran could capitalize on the lack of monitoring and sanctions enforcement to replenish its coffers and advance its nuclear program while no one is looking.

''If the lights are not on, then the Iranians will engage in massive sanctions busting to try to replenish their dwindling foreign exchange reserves,'' he said. ''If you don't have the resources to investigate, identify, and designate the tens of billions of dollars of Iranian regime assets, then you've extended the economic runway of the Iranian regime and increased the likelihood that they could reach nuclear breakout sooner rather than later.''

In Congress, top Democrats blame House Republicans for failing to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government running.

''Today, we learn that the Republican shutdown is hurting the Treasury's efforts to implement sanctions against Iran to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon,'' Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) told The Daily Beast. ''This insanity has to stop. We must not allow a few extreme members of the Republican Party to threaten our national security any longer. Speaker Boehner should put a clean bill on the floor and allow an up or down vote on reopening the government today. Any further delay clearly threatens our national security.''

Top Republicans involved with Iran sanctions said the administration is to blame for not keeping the Treasury employees at their jobs.

''Enforcing sanctions and stopping illicit financial transactions are core national security missions,'' Sen. Mark Kirk (R-IL) told The Daily Beast. ''The administration should not be putting our national security at risk to score political points. All sides need to find common ground and do what's right for the American people.''

Treasury officials say they are implementing the shutdown guidelines given to them by the Office of Management and Budget and doing the best they can with limited resources.

''The House Republicans' decision to shut down the government has real consequences, and it goes to our ability to execute our mission, which is integral to protecting our country and advancing our interests,'' a Treasury Department official said. ''We are still enforcing our sanctions, we are still capable of taking action if necessary, but it's a hell of a lot harder and we can't be nearly as nimble and comprehensive as we could be if Congress would pass a clean CR.''

Meanwhile, the State Department, which has somehow managed to avoid any significant staff reductions due to the shutdown (/articles/2013/09/30/how-the-government-shut-down-hurts-national-security.html), is beginning a new round of negotiations with Iran in conjunction with its partners in the P5+1, set to take place later this month in Geneva (http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130930/eu-plays-down-deadline-iran-talks-0).

State Department officials told The Daily Beast on Wednesday that the shutdown won't affect those plans.

''Dealing with Iran's nuclear program is an absolute top priority for the State Department, and Undersecretary Wendy Sherman and the State Department team are working hard every day on this issue preparing for the next round of talks in Geneva with Iran and our international partners,'' said Marie Harf, deputy State Department spokeswoman.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I join with our majority leader who spoke just a moment ago, the majority whip who just spoke so eloquently, as well as our President pro tempore who just spoke, to thank our Capitol Police, Secret Service officers, and all those who responded so courageously yesterday to the situation in the Nation's Capital. We depend on them to be there to do their jobs for all of us. We need to be there to do our jobs as well today.

I thank all of them for doing their jobs, and I plead with our colleagues to do our jobs.

I am so disappointed that we find ourselves again in the morning waking up where the government is shut down, where families and communities across our Nation are feeling the impact today and worried about what the impact will be tomorrow.

I spoke to some small businessmen only a few days ago in my office from the construction industry. The impact on their contracts, lack of contracts or uncertainty about their contracts is affecting their ability—and they are now worried they are going to have to lay off some of their employees because they can't sign contracts when they are so uncertain whether our government is going to be paying our bills in the future.

I met with some Head Start moms a few days ago. I spoke with a young woman who told me this passionate story about being homeless and on the street with a brandnew baby because of an abusive spouse. The Head Start folks in her community found her, found her a shelter, placed her in some education courses about how to be a mom. In 2 years, she is now on her own, working, and back in school because of a government service that was there for her. She didn't plead to me; she pleaded for those other moms or dads who are out there who now face uncertainty and may not have that help in the future.

I have talked to veterans, as the President pro tempore knows, the former chair of the Veterans' Committee, about having worked so hard to make sure our veterans get the services they need as they come home. They are not here pleading for themselves, although they are very worried about whether, as this goes on, they will get the services they need. They are pleading, as veterans always do, so selfless in their service to our Nation, for us to get the government moving again so our country is back on track, this country that they have so proudly fought for and that people are now hurting.

Today, of course, we are hearing news of a storm, a tropical storm that is approaching our Nation as well.

Families across the South are paying attention to that and they are worried about what a government shutdown or impact might be to them as they face that news on their television and radios this morning. Of course FEMA will be there. They have told us they will be able to call back their furloughed workers. They are prepared to respond to this, as our great Nation always must. But we have to be very concerned about what happens in the future if this government remains shut down—whether there will be reimbursements in a timely fashion, whether cleanup will be able to move forward, and whether there will be an ability to pay for that.

Thousands of members of the National Guard, who have been furloughed, as this approaches us, will need to be called back to get ready for that emergency. Of course, if there is any significant damage—and we all pray there is not, but if there is—cleanup and recovery will likely be impacted because of furloughs at the SBA and at the Department of Transportation. All of our government agencies and government employees who are normally there to respond in a disaster are today not at work, not getting ready, not possibly there in the future, if this shutdown continues.

So I hope for the best for these communities as this storm is threatening. I know our Federal workers will do everything they can to protect these families. We owe it to these communities that are impacted by this storm and to communities across the country to get our government back up and running as quickly as we can, which can happen very fast.

And by the way, Madam President, I will be here later today to talk about the impacts on my State. The impacts of this shutdown are real, and as it continues, so is the uncertainty it produces. Our ability to respond as a Nation to any kind of disaster is a concern for every family.

But I am here today to say it doesn't have to be this way. The answer to this is so simple. As the majority whip just said, there is a bill in the House of Representatives right now, this minute, that is sitting there, and Speaker BOEHNER can simply bring it up for a vote. We know it has the votes to pass. It will say this government will continue to run until November 15, and it will give us the opportunity to then negotiate and to deal with the broader issues that we all know we need to deal with in terms of our budget. But we cannot hold our communities and the future of this country hostage while we negotiate those bills.

So it is so easy. The Speaker can take up this bill, put people back to

work—our government employees, who need to respond to any kind of emergency. Our National Guard will be back at work. Our veterans will not have to worry about payments coming for them, and this will be the country for our fellow countrymen as we always have been—all that, simply by Speaker BOEHNER bringing up a bill that would quickly pass. It would then go to the President, and then this would be over.

I know there has been a lot of talk the past few days about a grand bargain. No one on this floor has worked harder than I have to get us to a budget compromise so we have a path in the future to deal not only with our debt and deficit but also with our deficit in terms of transportation and education and our deficit in terms of our investments that we need to make as a country to be strong in the future. We all know what the sides are on that. We all know we need to come to the table and solve that—that is, the differences we as leaders of this Nation need to address.

I have worked extremely hard on that, and it is time for us to do that. As everyone on this floor knows, we were told by our Republican counterparts and told and told and told the Senate needs to pass a budget. I became budget chair at the beginning of this year. We did our job. Our committee passed a budget. We brought it to the floor. We lived through 5 days of amendments. We brought up every amendment possible and voted on over 100 of them and then we passed that budget. That was the time, 6 months ago, when we should have then said, the House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget, let's go to conference and figure out those differences so we don't end up in this crisis today.

That is the expectation people have of a democracy. Unfortunately, we were told time and again: No, we are not going to allow you to go to conference. So here we are in a crisis. Well, let's address this crisis first. First, let's put people back to work. Let's get our country and our economy moving quickly again, and then allow us to go to conference to deal with those issues that are so critical to this Nation in terms of our fiscal responsibilities and the investments and priorities we need to make as a Nation.

So my plea today is to the Speaker to take up the bill, to allow the country to work again, and then for us to take up our responsibility to find solutions to the disagreements we truly do have as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to urge the Speaker to allow the country to get back to work, and then let's get to the table and let's solve this.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I want to first thank the Capitol Police for their bravery and for the important work they do in protecting all of us in the Capitol. Yesterday really showed how important they are. So I want to thank them for everything they did yesterday to make sure people were protected.

This is day 4 of the government shutdown—a shutdown that did not need to happen. I had hoped when I came to the floor a couple of days ago, and when I heard congressional leaders were meeting with the President, at his request, that they would emerge from that meeting with a plan to end this impasse and get the government open again, to come to an agreement as to how we can responsibly fund the government and address the challenges we face as a Nation. But coming out of that meeting, what we got, of course, was a President who said he will not negotiate.

From the beginning, I have said this strategy was an ill-conceived strategy by some Members of my own party who thought that defunding ObamaCare—therefore, shutting down the government—would, No. 1, stop the exchanges from opening. But we knew that was not going to happen. In fact, it has already happened, even though we shut down the government. It was ill conceived because, again, we knew that with the President and the Senate Democrats in charge, they were not going to defund their signature piece of legislation.

As much as I support repealing that piece of legislation—because I have seen the impact already in my own State of New Hampshire, in terms of premiums and in terms of less choice for individuals, and I do believe there is a better way to address health care in this country—where we find ourselves right now is unacceptable for America. It is unacceptable as leaders elected by the people of this country. We owe it to our constituents to resolve this now. Both sides need to get together and we need to resolve this.

I would say to my Republican colleagues in the House and to some in this Chamber, it is time for a reality check. Defunding ObamaCare did not work as a strategy, so let's find common ground and work together, yes, to address the very legitimate concerns we have with this health care bill, but also to get this government funded. I would say to my Democratic colleagues here in the Senate and to the President, come to the table and negotiate. Let's work this out on behalf of the American people. I will say it again: I think where we are is the result of an ill-conceived strategy by many in my party, leading to an immature response that says we will not negotiate and talk and try to work this out on behalf of the American people.

We all know the American people are the ones suffering the most from this shutdown. I have heard it from our guardsmen in New Hampshire who have been forced to go to the unemployment office, Federal employees who wonder whether they will be able to pay their mortgages, furloughed civilian workers in New Hampshire at one of our proudest military installations in this country, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and small business owners who can't get the help they need from the Small Business Administration. They deserve better than this.

I hope, as we head into this weekend, the President, the leaders of the House, the leaders of the Senate will get together, and that we will get behind them on behalf of the American people, to get this government open, to resolve our differences, to find common ground and do the people's business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. First, let me also start, Madam President, by thanking the men and women of the Capitol Police and the District of Columbia and the Secret Service. It reminds us they are the thin blue line standing between us and danger. This is a moment to extend our thanks to all law enforcement and first responders around the country who, on a daily basis, are on that thin blue line as well. So we are all grateful for what you do for us and how you keep us safe.

I wanted to talk, of course, about this week. It has been an interesting week, to say the least, beyond the events of yesterday. When we turn on the cable news, it features these countdown clocks leading up to the government slowdown. Now, in the aftermath of it, we see the countdown about how many days we have been into this thing.

Look, there is no doubt this impasse we are at is a problem for the country. This is not the best way to run the most important government in the most important country in the world.

There are people around here who all they do is focus on politics. For them, every day is election day. They are focused on who is winning, who is going to get the blame, and who is this going to help in the next election. I suppose that has a place in politics and in the governing process. But let me answer the question: Who will get the blame? We all are. Every single one of us in the House, the Senate, and in the entire Federal Government will get the blame.

And let me tell you why. Because there are people who woke up this morning who didn't get enough sleep last night. Maybe they were up late helping their kids with their homework. They got up, guzzled a bunch of coffee and forced themselves to work. They didn't want to work. They were tired. But they had to. And they are going to work today, and they are going to get home and go through all that again. And they are wondering: Why can't you guys do that? Why can't you do your job? I think that is a very valid frustration that people have with this process and with those of us here today.

I am not happy about some of the things we have seen this week or over

the last couple of weeks. I think it is very unfortunate—some of the rhetoric that has been used around here, both in this Chamber and in the public domain. But each day that goes by, what I am more and more worried about may not be what everybody else, or at least too many people here, are worried about. See, I think it is wrong that those of us who stand on principle, who believe, for example, ObamaCare is going to badly damage our economy—I think it is wrong we have a Congressman from my home State who compares us to the Taliban. We have a spokesperson for the White House who says we are like people with bombs strapped to our chests. I think that is wrong.

I think it is wrong too by the way, that the President has used the megaphone of the Presidency not to bring Americans together but to deepen these divisions. Mr. President, you are not the chairman of the Democratic party. You are the President of the United States. Act like the President of the United States. Rise above that stuff. Your job is to bring this Nation together. I know people are going to say things about you that you don't like. It comes with the territory. You have to rise above it. And I hope he will.

But those are not the things that concern me the most. What I am most worried about is that this country faces a very serious crisis, and we are running out of time to fix it. There is no doubt this government slowdown is not good, but it is not the crisis I am referring to. This issue about hitting the debt limit is a problem, but that is not the most serious crisis we face either. The single most important crisis we face in this country is that for millions of Americans the promise of the American dream is literally slipping through their fingers. With all the focus around here on whatever the crisis of the day may be, I fear we are simply not spending enough time focusing on that reality.

It reminds me of a story I know. A few years ago, a friend of mine in Florida was on a twin-engine airplane flying from one part of the State to another. At some point during that flight, a fire broke out in the cockpit. That fire was a problem. But the bigger problem was that both of the pilots started to put out the fire, and no one was flying the plane. Within a few seconds, the plane began to plunge, and it lost hundreds of feet of altitude. Luckily, they figured it out quickly and were able to correct it. But they were so focused on the fire in the cockpit, they weren't flying the plane. Luckily, they realized in time if they didn't start flying that plane that fire was going to be pretty insignificant for them in just a few seconds.

So we have a government slowdown, and this government slowdown is a problem, yes. We have the upcoming debt limit issue, and that is a problem, yes. But the fire in our cockpit and the one we need to address is the erosion of the American dream.

If we think the slowdown of government is problematic, that is a vote away from being solved. All we have to do is take a vote in either Chamber and we can solve that problem. But the slowdown in government is going to be a big problem when this government no longer has enough money to pay its bills, and if we keep doing what we are doing now, that is going to happen.

We think this debt limit situation is a problem? That is one vote away from being solved. When it is going to be a real problem is when no one wants to buy our debt anymore because they don't think we can pay them back.

We think all this division and dysfunction in Washington is bad for our economy? Yes. But what is worse is a tax code that kills jobs, regulations that on a daily basis are killing jobs, and a national debt that is killing jobs. By the way, one of the greatest destroyers of jobs in America today is ObamaCare, and that is why we are so passionate about it.

The American dream—which people throw around so loosely as a term—is basically the notion that no matter where you start out in life, no matter how many obstacles you have to overcome, you have the God-given right, through hard work and perseverance, to achieve a better life and leave your children better off than yourself. But it is being eroded on a daily basis, and not nearly enough attention is being paid to that. I don't see any countdown clocks on cable television about the American dream.

The most dangerous thing happening in Washington today is that everyone is so busy fighting about the problems before us today that there doesn't seem to be enough focus on the crisis we are headed to pretty soon; that we are on the verge of losing the American dream. I say that because, to one extent or another, we are all guilty of misplacing that focus.

So my speech here today as much as anything else is a reminder to me of why I wanted to serve here. The reason I wanted to serve here is because I know—I don't think; I know—that America is special. I know this partially because I was raised by and around people who know what life is like in places other than America. In places other than America, you can only go as far as your parents went. You are trapped. Whatever your family did is the only thing you are allowed to do by those societies.

But we have been different, and I have seen it with my own eyes. Both in my neighborhood and in my family, I have seen people who came here with little education and no connections and through hard work and perseverance achieve a better life, achieve a meaningful life, and leave their kids better off than themselves. I also see how every single day there are millions of people out there now trying to achieve the same thing, and they are finding it harder and harder to do that. We are on the verge of losing that. If we lose that, every day that is eroded, so too is the exceptionalism of this country. People love to use that term, an ''exceptional nation,'' and I believe it is exceptional, but it is exceptional primarily because of the American dream.

Many countries in the world have powerful militaries. Every country in the world has rich people and big companies. What makes us different is that here, if you are willing to work hard, if you have a really good idea, you can be rewarded for it with a better life. That is eroding. If we lose that, we lose what makes us special and different, and no one seems to be fighting enough about that.

The only reason all these other issues matter is because they relate to the American dream. The reason the debt really matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason our Tax Code, which is broken, matters is because it undermines the American dream. The reason I am so passionate about ObamaCare is because for millions of people it is undermining the ability to achieve the American dream.

The reason I ran for office is because as a country we are headed in the wrong direction because we are losing the American dream. We still have time to fix this, but we don't have all century. We don't even have all decade. We have to begin to take these issues seriously or we will be known as the first generation of Americans who lost the American dream and left our children worse off than ourselves.

We still have time to refocus ourselves. With all this noise about politics and who gets the blame and who is responsible for what, I hope we can use these challenges before us as a catalyst to begin to focus on these issues and why they matter. They matter because they are hurting people, and they are hurting people who are trying to achieve a better life. If we do that, if we focus on that and if we solve the problems before us with an eye toward that, then I think we will have the real opportunity to do what every generation of Americans before us has done: to leave our children better off than ourselves and to leave for them 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 New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor again today to talk about the effects of this government shutdown that are being experienced in New Hampshire. As I begin, let me start where a number of my colleagues have this morning, and that is by thanking the Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police for the great job they did yesterday, and particularly the Capitol Police, who are willing to put their lives on the line, as we say frequently, every day to protect us, but in this case where they are doing that and they are not getting paid, that is certainly a tribute to the commitment

and the dedication they have to this Congress and to this government.

I hope that as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, we will take inspiration from that dedication and recommit to trying to end this government shutdown and end the negative impacts it is having on people across this country. We are just 4 days into the shutdown—this is day No. 4—but every day we see more and more of the effects it is having across the country and in my home State of New Hampshire.

My colleague Senator AYOTTE was on the floor earlier talking about some of the frustrations people are experiencing as a result of the shutdown. As I said earlier this week, hundreds of Air National Guard civilian employees have already been furloughed. We have Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers who are facing furlough. We have new SBA loan originations that have come to a halt, so businesses aren't able to get the capital they need. So many other important services and so many other people are being affected.

I really wanted to talk today a little more in-depth about the effect of the shutdown on one of New Hampshire's national treasures, the White Mountain National Forest.

This time of year the Kancamagus Highway in the White Mountains really starts to see bumper-to-bumper traffic. You might not expect traffic jams in a remote location like that in the middle of the mountains, but when tourists come in to see the beautiful fall foliage in New Hampshire, it really is a boon to New Hampshire's economy, and they are everywhere.

New Hampshire's director of travel and tourism, Lori Harnois, estimates that about 7.8 million people will come to New Hampshire between September and the end of November, which is 2 percent higher than last year. According to Lori, more than spending time, these visitors will spend over $1 billion, which is about 3 percent more than was spent last year. That is why this season is so critical for the small businesses in New Hampshire that depend on the tourism industry. This is really about the economics of New Hampshire and the ability of so many of our small businesses and their owners and employees to survive throughout the year. Local stores, restaurants, and attractions rely on this season to meet their bottom lines.

Many tourists coming to New Hampshire visit our Federal forest lands in the White Mountain National Forest. Those lands are administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The White Mountain National Forest stretches over 800,000 acres in New Hampshire and Maine, and it is one of the most visited outdoor recreation sites in all of United States, with nearly 6 million visitors a year. More visitors than go to Yellowstone or Yosemite Parks come and visit the White Mountains of New Hampshire. For everyone who has been there or visited one of the many landmarks in the forest, it is no surprise because its natural beauty has kept visitors coming back for centuries. Given its proximity to cities such as Boston and Montreal, it is a great place to bring families. Nearly 60 million people in the United States alone live within 1 day's drive of the White Mountain National Forest.

Unfortunately, this year, during the busiest few weeks of the year, tourists are going to be shut out of important services because of this unnecessary government shutdown. Restrooms for families in bumper-to-bumper traffic will be closed along the highways and trails in the national forest. Garbage collection is going to be suspended. Campgrounds will be closed starting over the next few days. Families looking to camp in the White Mountains will have to find new lodging or change their plans.

Ongoing repairs to bridges and roads in response to Hurricane Irene—we are still cleaning up as a result of the damage from Hurricane Irene—those projects are going to be put on hold, and only a few staff members are going to still be there to respond to emergencies, conduct repairs, and help direct people.

This is leading to a frustrating experience for tourists, and it is frustrating for all of the businesses that depend on the people who come to visit. The shutdown could really hurt a very important industry in New Hampshire at a critical time.

All told, about 120 employees for the White Mountains have been told to stay home until Congress reaches a budget agreement. And as we have heard here in Washington, as we know from our own staffs, these employees have done nothing to deserve these furloughs. They have worked hard, they have been dedicated, but they are going to have to try to make ends meet because Congress can't get its act together. No wonder people are outraged.

Our Federal forest lands are not only critical drivers of the tourism industry, they support New Hampshire's timber industry. If this shutdown continues, the Forest Service will have to determine whether to suspend existing contracts for timber-harvesting on Federal lands, and these companies will have to shut down their operations at one of the best times to harvest timber. So the impact will also be on all of those people who work in the timber industry and depend on that industry for their livelihood.

I wish to highlight some of these effects because we need to remind ourselves just what this government shutdown means for the people who are being hurt, what it means for the small businesses and their employees, and what it means to the economy in my State of New Hampshire and the economy across the country. We are clearly seeing the effects of the shutdown in New Hampshire. If we don't act, these effects will become more and more severe every day.

I hope we can begin to see talks going on between Members of the House and Senate. I hope those who are holding up the continuing resolution in the House—the legislation that would get this country operating again—will reconsider. All it takes is the Speaker to bring that legislation to the floor. He keeps saying we haven't negotiated. In fact, we have negotiated. We negotiated for over 1 year before we passed the Affordable Care Act. We negotiated before this continuing resolution was agreed to, and the Senate, in fact, accepted the numbers, the cost of that continuing resolution to keep the government open. We thought our numbers were better, but we accepted the House numbers because we wanted to try to negotiate and reach an agreement. Unfortunately, what we have seen is that the House has reneged on that agreement.

It is now time to bring that legislation to the floor, to get this government operating again, and to end the negative impact and the real hardship so many people across this country are experiencing.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, in Vermont and all over this country there is profound anger and disgust at what is going on here in Washington. The reason is that today we remain in a significant and very serious economic downturn. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent. Over 20 million workers are unemployed. And what the American people are saying as loudly and as clearly as they can is, Congress, we want you to create millions of decent-paying jobs. All over this country, people are struggling with wages of $9 or $10 a hour. What the American people are saying to Congress is: Congress, Mr. President, we want you to raise the minimum wage.

In the midst of a serious economic crisis, the American people want us to act to improve the economy, to create jobs, to raise wages. But what are we doing today? We are saying to 800,000 hard-working Federal employees: Don't come in to work. We don't know when and if you are going to be paid. We are saying to 1.2 million other Federal employees who are at work: Thank you very much for coming in to your job today. Thank you for your work as a Capitol Hill police officer or FBI agent or somebody in the CIA or somebody working at Head Start or somebody delivering meals to low-income senior citizens, thank you all very much for your work but we don't know when and if you will be paid.

What we are doing right now is the exact opposite of what the American people want. They want us to create jobs and raise wages. What we are saying to 2 million American workers is: You are not getting paid. Some of you are furloughed. Some of you are coming in.

These Federal employees are not millionaires. They are hard-working, middle-class Americans. They are struggling as is everybody else in this country to pay their mortgages, to send their kids to college, to afford childcare, to do what other middle-class families need to do. We are putting all of them under extreme anxiety today. In an unstable, volatile economy, that is not what we should be doing.

In addition, this shutdown is having a very negative impact on the entire economy. The estimate is that we are losing about $10 billion a week as a result of the government shutdown, according to Goldman Sachs. If the government is shut down for 3 weeks, the economy will lose over $36 billion. Moody's has estimated if the shutdown lasts 4 weeks, it will drain $55 billion from the economy.

Does any sane person believe that when our economy today has so many problems—when we are just beginning to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month, when we are trying to get our feet on the ground economically—does anybody think it makes sense to not be paying over 2 million workers and to be losing billions and billions of dollars in the economy as a result of the shutdown?

This is the start of the flu season. Every fall the Centers for Disease Control closely monitors the spread of flu and directs vaccines to where they are needed the most. But because of the shutdown, the CDC is today unable to support the annual seasonal influenza program. Does that make sense to anybody? We are endangering the health and the lives of millions of Americans because of the shutdown of the CDC.

During the shutdown the Food and Drug Administration is stopping most of its food safety operations. We have seen over the years outbreaks of salmonella and other types of food problems. Does anyone think it makes sense to shut down the FDA?

Most of the Department of Labor is closed. Ironically, we are supposed to be receiving a report from the Department of Labor telling us what kind of unemployment rate we now have, but we cannot get that because they are shut down.

The WIC Program, Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program, is being shut down. This is a program that provides good nutrition to low-income pregnant women and their babies so that the mothers and the babies will be healthy in these critical times in their lives. We want healthy children in this country. We don't want to see children die at birth. That is what the WIC Program is about.

Social Security services are being delayed. In Burlington, VT, where I live, there was a rally yesterday. Social Security workers are being furloughed. Others are working without pay. We owe it to the seniors in this country that when they are eligible for Social Security and they apply for Social Security their papers are processed in a timely manner. That is what they are due.

Head Start Programs for thousands of lower income kids are starting to close. Today Head Start provides education, health, nutrition, and other services to roughly 1 million children throughout our country. The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday on the impact the shutdown is already having. Four Head Start Programs that offer preschool activities for 3,200 children in Florida, Connecticut, Alabama, and Mississippi have closed and officials said 11 other programs would be shut down by week's end if Federal funding is not restored. Does any sane person believe we should be shutting down Head Start Programs at a time when preschool education is so important? We all understand that.

And it is so hard to come by. What we are telling parents today is next week you may not be able to bring your kids into a Head Start Program. How does that impact your employment? What do you do with your kid? Does anybody around here care about that?

The United States is the only nation in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care to all people. Today we have about 48 million people with no health insurance. ObamaCare, to my mind, is not a solution to the problem but it is a step forward. We are talking about 20, maybe 25 million people who are in desperate need of health insurance being able to get that insurance; others who are paying more than they can afford perhaps getting insurance that is more affordable to them. We should be going farther in terms of health care, but for rightwing Republicans in the House of Representatives to be saying we are going to keep this government shut down until we deny millions of people the health care based on legislation that we passed is inexcusable. It is not acceptable.

The point I think many of my colleagues made and everybody agrees with now—this is not in debate and the American people have to understand this—No. 1, the Senate passed a continuing resolution that in my view simply underfunds many of the programs out there. I am not happy about that bill. It should be much higher than that. It is not a good bill, but it was passed. Everybody understands that if Speaker BOEHNER chose to be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and not the Speaker of the Republican Party, and if he brought that bill that we passed here in the Senate on the floor this morning, there is no debate, they have the votes. The Democrats and moderate Republicans and maybe more would vote for that legislation and government could be reopened this afternoon. The Speaker there has an issue he has to deal with. He has to understand that he represents all this country and not just an extreme rightwing faction.

I hope very much the Speaker will do the right thing, bring that to the floor, and reopen the government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I want to follow up briefly first on the comments of Senator SANDERS. We have a continuing resolution over there. The annualized cut is $70 billion. Usually when you compromise, one side gives a little, the other side gives a little. On this continuing resolution that passed out of this body, we took their numbers. Compromise means you take a little bit from both sides. We took 100 percent the numbers from the House, a $70 billion annualized cut. That is what we took. So to people who keep saying we are not negotiating, we did. As a matter of fact, we went much farther than many of us wanted. We did it because we wanted to keep the government open.

So let's not get fooled by some of the political speeches they are making on the floor or over there, outside in the courtyard. We met their annualized reductions—they wanted $70 billion—with this continuing resolution. When they sent bills over here we have voted on them. They have not prevailed on their side, but we have voted on them.

We sent the bill over there. It is sitting. We know by public statements by many Republicans and Democrats over there, they are ready to vote on this bill, a clean CR, continuing resolution, to keep the government open.

What is amazing about this is we are debating this. What we should be getting back to—I know the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, would—as a member of the Appropriations Committee we would like to get back to appropriations, annual bills. Then we would not be in this start-and-stop deal that I think the American people are fed up with, this manufactured crisis that a few over in the House used to set us up in a situation where we create more uncertainty in the family, more uncertainty with small businesses, more uncertainty with individuals in the Federal Government on furlough. Eighty percent of my staff is on furlough. Every day they are on furlough I donate my salary. I am doing my part because we should not be exempt from this situation. But at the same time we have to recognize the impact it is having to our economy.

I get it; they are passionate about their view on the Affordable Health Care Act. They do not like it, some of them over there. Some of them also said we should work to fix it. I proposed multiple solutions and ideas how we can move forward on that. But to hold up the economy, hold up the budget over this issue is ridiculous. I don't like No Child Left Behind. I hate it. For Alaska it doesn't work. It destroyed many efforts in our rural communities. But to hold up the government over that? I am going to work to fix it, and if I can't fix it I am going to

vote against the reauthorization. That is the right that we have here. But they are playing, as I called it last night, Russian roulette economics, and the American people are on the back end. It is shameful.

We have to get back to doing what we should be doing, annualized appropriations bills, create certainty in our economy, create certainty in our government, focus on this economy that has moved, for 4 or 5 years now, from this recession, a great recession. It is a slow climb out, but it is in the right direction. Let's keep it moving in that direction with the right kind of policies.

In my State, winter is setting in. The Low-Income Housing Assistance Program is critical for Alaskans who are living in areas where their income is not able to purchase the energy they need to supply their house with winter heat, and they depend on the Low-Income Housing Assistance Program. It is not about some fluff program or some luxury program. It is for them life or death. If you cannot heat your home in Alaska when it is 30 below, you may not survive. It is that simple.

I said earlier I think the Members on the other side clearly understand that we have to get the government running, and there are Members on both sides who are ready to do that over there if the Speaker would just put it on the table so people could vote on it. If it fails, we go back to negotiations. My bet is it will not fail. Because it passed here. People forget the cloture vote here, the vote to move the bill forward here in the Senate passed 99 to 0. I am not sure when that happened recently around this place, but we did it—after great passionate speeches by some, but we did it. We debated it, we moved the bill over because it was the right thing to do. Again, reminding people, we met the House numbers. We didn't lift our numbers up or down, we went all the way down to their number—$70 billion in cuts in annualized savings—annualized cuts to the Federal budget on this 6-week or so continuing resolution.

In Anchorage—a columnist just wrote about it—we estimate about 13,000 Federal workers are in some form impacted by this, laid off or impacted because they are working longer hours with no pay.

I want to detail a couple of examples in Alaska where it is impacting. Take this Federal worker who has now been furloughed. They are in the midst of remodeling their home. I got this call. Everything stopped. The contractors who are expecting to get paid are not getting paid. The contractor working for the employee who was remodeling their home—that will not happen because of the uncertainty. His comment was, I thought, pretty clear: Life doesn't stop just because Congress says you can't come to work anymore.

Life continues, and these costs pile up.

In my State, the Bering Sea crab fishery—many people see this on the TV show the ''Deadliest Catch''—is worth about $80 million a year. The amount of crab they can catch is determined by NOAA Fisheries and the State of Alaska.

Crab season starts October 15. If they do not have these quotas set, then making sure that the process is safe and the product is exactly what people expect when they get it on their plate to eat or at the grocery store—the problem is those employees are furloughed, so the quota will not be set. As a result, the permits they need to catch the crab will not happen, and the end result is a multimillion-dollar hit—and not to some government employee.

I heard people criticize the bureaucrats. Well, not only are 1 million or so employees furloughed across this country, but now it is affecting second and third options. In this case it is the crab industry, which will affect people all over this country and people all over the world. Again, we have delay after delay.

Alaska receives about $1.2 billion from the Federal payroll every single year. A lengthy disruption will have an incredible fiscal impact to our State and will trickle out because these folks travel. I see my colleague from Washington State. We have lots of people who go to Seattle, WA. They may not take that trip and spend in that economy because they are afraid of what might happen with this stop-and-go situation.

We are now about to move forward—after decades of waiting—on the National Petroleum Reserve for oil and gas exploration. What does it take? It is a Federal Reserve so it takes Federal permits. Without the Federal permits, it cannot happen or it gets delayed, and it is costly.

When we look at the issues and the calls I have received, it is all the way from an elder in the Artic Circle who said: Please, get the people back to work. It has a direct impact, not only on Alaskans, but on people all across this country.

There has been a lot of great debate. Yesterday, I saw a press conference given by a small group of the minority over there who said they were concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I am concerned about the National Institutes of Health. I can tell you story after story of how those medicines are critical for young people and adults. What they failed to mention was the billions they have already cut. They forgot that little detail. Amnesia is like a prerequisite for some Members around here, and they forgot that little detail. It's amazing to me.

I will mention again—because I believe the public has not heard this enough because they say over there that we are not negotiating—we have negotiated with them. We have taken their numbers and have gone down by $70 billion in annualized cuts. We have taken them for this continuing resolution. Every time they sent something over here, we voted on it. They may not have liked the vote outcome, but we voted on it.

We sent one continuing resolution over there. We also have the farm bill, the immigration bill, and the WRDA bill. It has not piled up over there because they have not taken action. They would rather play party politics and figure out what elections they can win or lose rather than focus on what is important for the American people, and for my constituency, specifically, in Alaska that I represent.

I hope we end this debate, get on with business, and re-open the government. Let's negotiate. They have some ideas to fix the health care act. I am happy to talk with them. I have several bills I have introduced, but I never have heard from them over there. As a matter of fact, I know they mentioned my name over there quite a bit. I have seen it on TV. The House somehow recognizes that I have some influence, and I do in some ways. If they want to have a conversation, I'm game. Pick up the phone or walk across the Capitol.

Let's be real: The continuing resolution is about managing our budget and putting people back to work so we can keep this economy moving and get on with the big issues that we have to deal with. If they want to fix the health care act, I am happy to sit down with Members. If they want to move the immigration bill, I am happy to work with folks. We can go through the list.

Let's not hold the American people hostage for a simple situation. If they were to put it on the floor, it would pass. I would bet on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows. We had testimony by Secretary Sherman as to the enforcement of sanctions against Iran in order to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon state, which would be a game changer.

During the course of that hearing, it came out that as a result of the government shutdown, we are not as effective as we could be. There is always more that can be done in working with other countries, and the shutdown is affecting our full preparedness for enforcing the sanctions internationally against Iran.

One of my colleagues started to challenge the representative from the State Department as to why they couldn't do more. Of course, it was the Treasury Department's budget that was primarily affecting the attention to this. The Secretary assured us that we are enforcing our sanctions.

Senator KAINE made the observation—and the right observation—don't blame the administration; blame the Congress. It is the Congress that has the responsibility to make sure the government is functioning with all cylinders. This tea party shutdown is

jeopardizing our national security. It is not putting us where we should be as far as taking care of the needs of the people of this country.

I was on the floor a couple of days ago, and I quoted from the Baltimore Sun as to the responsibility for the shutdown, and I'm going to quote a little bit more from that article. It said:

> It would be tempting, of course, to write that this impasse—the inability to agree on the continuing resolution to fund government past the end of the fiscal year—was the fault of Democrats and Republicans alike. But that would be like blaming the hostages for causing the perpetrator to put a gun to their heads.
>
> As President Obama noted, he and congressional Democrats put forward no agenda other than keeping government operating temporarily at the current levels.

I want to review how we got here on October 1. It was 6 months ago that the Senate passed the budget. It was different than the House budget. Then, we, the Democrats said: Let's go to conference. That is what we should do, negotiate a budget, so that when it comes to October 1, we have a budget in place to fund government at the levels we agreed to—Democrats and Republicans. The Republicans refused to go to conference.

Fast forward to October 1. We didn't have a budget, and, therefore, it was necessary to pass a continuing resolution. That is what you do. When we can't pass a budget, we keep government operating at the current levels until we can agree on a budget. So that is what we decided to do, but we went further. The majority leader met with the Speaker of the House, and rather than negotiating about what level we thought should be in the continuing resolution—what the Democrats and the Republicans thought—we went along with the lower number. We negotiated the continuing resolution at the lower level, and that is what we passed.

The Republicans in the House decided they would not go for that, and they attached their changes in the health care system as a condition to passing a continuing resolution. Make no mistake about it; it is a tea party shutdown.

Now the Republicans are saying to us: Why aren't we negotiating? Well, let me quote from this morning's editorial in the Baltimore Sun. I think this morning's editorial really captures where we are as far as negotiations. The headline says:

> There is no room to ''negotiate'' when extremists take the federal government hostage—and threaten to do the same to the economy.
>
> How can the tea partiers in the House expect to be offered anything for doing the equivalent of strapping C–4 and a detonator to their chests and holding the government hostage?

The editorial goes on to say:

> Reward these tactics and you'll only see more of it in Congress. And that's critically important given that the stakes are about to rise. Should Republicans engage in similar behavior with the debt ceiling, they risk not only the health of the U.S. economy but the global economy. To default on the debt—to refuse to pay bills already incurred by the federal government—has the potential to pull the nation back into recession and put thousands, if not millions, of people out of work.

It is very clear: We have compromised, and the tea party Republicans have shut down government. We can't negotiate with a gun to our head. It reminds me of a football team that played a game and didn't like the results, so they say: Let's just play that game all over.

Last Sunday the Baltimore Ravens didn't play a very good game. They lost. They didn't say: Let's play that game over. They are going to be here this weekend playing again and trying to improve their record.

I heard one of my colleagues use another sports analogy. He said we could do a mulligan on ObamaCare. We are the big leagues. There are no mulligans at the U.S. Open. There are no mulligans in golf. Let's use the regular order.

Yes, we want to negotiate a budget for the next year, but we can't do it with a gun at our head and say: Open government and pay our bills.

Then the Republicans are saying: Well, let's do this piecemeal. Why don't we just take up small provisions.

This is another quote from this morning's Baltimore Sun:

> Even the little fixes the GOP is offering is outrageous if they slow down the return of a fully-funded government. Reopening parks would be great, but what about cancer patients denied treatment? And for every National Institutes of Health reopened, what about the funding for inspectors that are making sure our food isn't tainted, or intelligence officers monitoring the next al-Qaida attack, or FDA scientists reviewing the next miracle drug? It's impossible to even keep track of all of the hardships the shutdown has created, and why do so when the solution is at hand?

This shutdown is hard on our country. My colleagues have talked about it. It has affected our welfare, it has put our Nation at risk, and it has hurt our economy—including my own State of Maryland. Senator MIKULSKI is here, and she will be speaking as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The State of Maryland loses $15 million every day in our State economy.

We literally have over 100,000 workers who are on furlough and not getting paid, and it is costing the taxpayers money. The last shutdown in 1995 cost $2 billion. What a waste of taxpayers' resources.

Let us put an end to this tea party shutdown. Let us also assure those who are on furlough that they will get paid. I have introduced legislation in this regard. I believe the House is going to be passing that legislation. Let's make it clear that our Federal workers—who have endured 3 years of pay freezes, furloughs under sequestration, and have been asked to do more with less—will be made whole when this shutdown ends.

Let's put an end to the shutdown and make sure we pay our bills. Let's meet together to work out a budget for the coming year, as we should.

The tragedy here is that the votes are in the House of Representatives to pass the Senate continuing resolution. If Speaker BOEHNER would just vote on the resolution we sent over, the shutdown would end and we could get on with the business of this Nation.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I intended to give remarks and then promulgate a series of unanimous consent requests. However, the majority leader requested, for purposes of scheduling, that I begin with the unanimous consent requests, which I am happy to do to accommodate his schedule. I ask that at the conclusion of these unanimous consent requests, I be given 20 minutes to speak to lay out the reasons why I believe the majority should cede to these unanimous consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 72

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for the fiscal year 2014, which was received from the House.

I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas has offered a unanimous consent request that we take care of veterans in this shutdown of government. I would note that there is no Senator or Member of Congress who does not care deeply about making sure our veterans are taken care of, including this Senator from the State of Washington.

As the Presiding Officer knows and our colleagues know, I have spoken often of my own father who was a World War II veteran and who spent most of his life in a wheelchair and received a Purple Heart. I know the sacrifices our veterans make.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee previously, I fought to make sure every veteran had what they need, to make sure we said more than just thank you but provided them what they need. So I know our veterans well.

What I also know about our veterans is that they, above everyone else, are suffering. They went to serve our country and said we will take care of the rest of you at our own personal sacrifice. They would be the last to come before us and say, Take care of me before everyone else. They would say to

us, Take care of our fellow man and leave no one behind.

So I am going to ask that the Senator modify his request and do what our military has always asked their fellow man to do and leave no one behind. Our request will ensure that everyone who fights for our country, takes care of our country, works for our country in emergencies, depends on our country to make sure they have the opportunity every one of us has here is able to have that opportunity and they are not held hostage to a government shutdown, so we can get back to work and solve our country's problems. We need to end this tea party shutdown and we can do it with the request I will ask right now.

I have a modification to suggest to the request of the junior Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that this request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and it is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly now has the support of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, I thank my friend from Washington State. I know she talked about leaving no man or woman behind. I would note the continuing resolution the House has passed to fully fund the Veterans' Administration treats our veterans the same way the House and Senate have already treated active-duty military.

Just a few days ago, this body unanimously passed a bill that said the men and women of the military would be paid. Unfortunately, it seems to be the position of the majority in this body that veterans should be treated not as well as our active-duty military and, in particular, that the full funding of the VA should be held hostage to every other priority the Democrats in this Chamber must have.

I understand the Democrats in this Chamber are committed to ObamaCare with all of their hearts, minds, and souls, but the veterans of this Nation should not be held hostage to that commitment. It is likely, given the majority's refusal to negotiate, refusal to compromise, refusal even to talk to find a middle ground—it is likely that this shutdown, instigated by the Democratic majority, will continue for some time, and during that time we ought to be able to find common ground that, at the very minimum, our veterans shouldn't pay the price.

If moments from now my friend from Washington simply does not object, by the end of the day the VA will be fully funded. If, as we all expect, she does object—if she repeats the objection her majority leader and her party have made throughout the course of this week—then much of the VA will remain shut down because of that objection.

She has asked if we can reopen the entire Federal Government. If the request is not granted to refund every single priority in the Federal Government that the majority party wants, then the VA will remain without sufficient funds.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object on behalf of all Americans who should not be left behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3230

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the second unanimous consent request I will promulgate:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which was received from the House; I ask further unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas launched this government shutdown with a 21-hour presentation here on the floor of the Senate. It is clear from the actions of the House and his actions today that he is starting to try to reconcile in his mind all the damage which this government shutdown, which he inspired, is causing across the United States.

This particular unanimous consent request relates to National Guard Reservists, a group which we hold in high esteem. But if the junior Senator from Texas is really focused on veterans and those who have served our country, he should take into consideration the 560,000 Federal employees who are currently facing furlough or are on furlough, who are veterans, a fourth of whom are disabled veterans. So what the junior Senator from Texas is doing is picking and choosing who he will allow in the lifeboat. At this moment, it is National Guard and Reserve, while leaving 560,000 veteran Federal employees out in the water thrashing for themselves. That is not the way we should manage or govern this country.

I can understand the anxiety the Senator feels about the problems he has created, but trying to solve them one piece at a time is not the American way. I object. And I ask unanimous consent, though—before I object, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the bill be amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, including the National Guard, Reserve, VA, NIH—all of them. It is something that is already over in the House of Representatives and reportedly has the support of a majority of Democrats and Republicans and could pass today.

I ask for that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, no one watching these proceedings should be confused. We are in a shutdown because President Obama and the majority leader of this body want a shutdown, because they believe it is in the partisan interests of their party to have a shutdown.

Four times the House of Representatives has come to us, four times the House of Representatives has endeavored to meet a middle ground, and four times the majority leader and every Democrat in this body has said, No, we will not talk, we will not compromise, we will not have a middle ground, and 100 percent of the priorities of the Democrats in this body must be funded or they will insist on a shutdown.

I thank my friend from Illinois for making clear that the members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces, in his judgment, are not worthy of being paid during the shutdown that the Democrats have forced. I could not disagree with that judgment more strongly. Let us be clear.

This bill that has passed the House doesn't mention ObamaCare; it has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It simply says the exact same thing my friend from Illinois already agreed to, which is that the active-duty men and women of the military would not be held hostage and would be paid if it so happened that the Democrats forced a shutdown.

Apparently, the position of the majority of this body is that we have a double standard, that Reserve members are not treated as well as active-duty members; that Reserve members will not get their paychecks.

Let's be clear that this bill could be on the President's desk for signature today if my friend from Illinois would simply withdraw his objection. Unfortunately, in a move I think reflects a level of cynicism not befitting of the responsibility all of us have, my friend is prepared to object and to say that

not just veterans but Reserve members shall be held hostage in order to force ObamaCare on the American people; that that is the objective. I guess now the Democratic Party has become the party of ObamaCare, by ObamaCare, and for ObamaCare all of the time, and every other priority recedes. So veterans are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you to force ObamaCare on the American people. Reserve military members are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you as a hostage to force ObamaCare on the American people. That is cynical. We ought to take these individuals off the table.

I note my friend from Illinois spoke of the great many Federal employees who have been furloughed. I would be very happy to work in a bipartisan manner to cooperate with my friend from Illinois to bring a great many of those Federal employees back to their vital responsibilities. But, unfortunately, the position the Democratic Party has taken is that not a one of them will be allowed to come back until this body agrees to force ObamaCare on the American people, despite the jobs lost, despite the people being forced into part-time work, despite the skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and despite the millions of people who are at risk of losing their health insurance.

I find that highly objectionable and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would say to my colleague from Texas, some of the language which he has used in this debate relative to impugning motives of Members may have crossed the line. I am not going to raise it at this point, but I ask him to be careful in the future.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

For the edification of all Senators, rule XIX reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any forms of words, impugn to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I now promulgate my third unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, which was received from the House; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will object, but let me say a couple of things here.

First, in reference to the colloquy the Senator from Texas had with my good friend from Washington State, he noted that the Senator from Washington talks about leaving no man or no woman behind. She does, indeed, and that is one of the reasons so many of us oppose this piecemeal approach. It is leaving lots of people behind.

The bottom line is, the junior Senator from Texas is advocating shutting down the government and now he comes before us and says, Well, why don't we pass the parts of the government I want to open? No one would want to do that. It makes no sense: Let's shut down the government and then I will come to the floor and be magnanimous and offer a few places where the government opens.

I note that no other colleagues are standing here on the floor with him. I note that, at least according to press reports, most of the many conservative colleagues in this body reject this approach. And I note that it makes no sense to pick a few—to shut down the government and then pick a few groups to reopen.

Who wants to shut down the government? In my view, it is the tea party. They have said it all along. They have advocated for it.

There are countless instances where even in 2010 tea party folks said: Let's shut down the government. Then it is said, after the government is shut down, that President Obama or this side or the Senator from Illinois caused it, when we had a bipartisan resolution, with a majority on this side? There was an opportunity. I believe the junior Senator from Texas urged his colleagues to vote against that resolution, but 25 of them did not, and that kept the government open in the Senate.

There were many—everyone on this side. The other side of the aisle opposes ObamaCare, but the majority did not want to use a bludgeon and say: Unless you reject ObamaCare we are going to shut down the government or, for that matter, not raise the debt ceiling.

We are not in an ''Alice in Wonderland'' world, where those who advocate shutting down the government then accuse others of shutting down the government. That is not washing with the American people, and it will not wash in this body with the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would say to my colleague, if he wishes to have debate on what parts of the government should be funded and at what level, it is wrong, in my opinion, to say: Shut down the government and then we will decide piece by piece which we open. That is ''Alice in Wonderland,'' in my judgment.

It makes much more sense to have the government open and then have the debate in the proper place—a conference committee that decides future funding, in an omnibus appropriations bill—what level of funding, if any, each part of the government should get.

So to first deprive our national parks of dollars by advocating shutting down the government and then accuse others who do not want to leave 98 percent of the government behind and the people who work there behind and the American people who depend on so many other programs, whether it is student loans or feeding the hungry, is wrong.

So I ask consent that the request be modified as follows: that an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, actually leaving no man or woman behind, and is something that is already over in the House and has the support reportedly of a majority of the Members of the House, including Members of both parties.

Would the Senator agree to modify his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from New York for his heartfelt concern for the Republican Party. I note that the Senator from New York stated that I ''have advocated shutting down the government.'' That statement, unfortunately, is a flatout falsehood, and I know the Senator from New York would not do so knowingly, so it must have been a mistaken statement. Because throughout the course of this debate I have said repeatedly in every context we should not shut down the government, a shutdown is a mistake, and I very much hoped that the majority leader would not force a shutdown on this country. We are in a shutdown because the Democrats in this body have refused to negotiate, refused to compromise.

I would note as well, I am quite grateful for the majority leader's admonition this morning toward civility on the floor and the admonition from the Senator from Illinois toward rule XIX. That is an admonition well heard. Indeed, it was quite striking. It has been several days since I have been to the floor of the Senate, and yet I feel I have been here in absentia because so many Democrats have invoked my name as the root of all evil in the world. Indeed, the same majority leader who gave an ode to civility just a few days ago was describing me and anyone who might agree that we should stop the harms of ObamaCare—describing us as ''anarchists.'' So I think the encouragement toward civility is an encouragement that should be heard across the board.

I would note also that my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have

described what they claim to be as the piecemeal approach as following my priorities. Several Democrats have used that language publicly. I must note, I find it quite ironic because if I were to stand here and say it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund veterans, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund the National Guard, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund our national parks, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund research for health care, they would, quite rightly, be able to rise and claim under rule XIX that I was impugning their motives.

I cannot imagine a greater insult than to claim it is not the priority of Members of this body to treat fairly our veterans, and yet what I find so striking is that so many Democrats go out publicly and embrace that. They say: Funding the veterans is CRUZ's priority, not ours.

Yet I will note, even on that front, the funding proposals the House of Representatives has passed are not even the House's priorities—although under the Constitution they have a legitimate role laying out their priorities for funding—they are President Obama's priorities.

Just a few days ago, the President gave a speech to this country, a speech that all of us watched closely, in which the President said if a shutdown occurred ''veterans who've sacrificed for their country will find their support centers unstaffed.''

The President also said, with regard to parks, as we are discussing now, and memorials: ''Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty immediately closed.''

To the credit of the House of Representatives, they listened to the President's speech, they listened to President Obama's priorities, and the House of Representatives acted with bipartisan cooperation. They said: Mr. President, we have heard your priorities. Let's fund them. Let's work together.

I would note my friend from Maryland a moment ago gave a speech about how important it is, he thinks, that we should fund food inspectors in the Department of Agriculture and also our intelligence community. I would note to my friend from Maryland, I fully agree with him and, indeed, would be happy to work arm in arm and to fund the intelligence community, fully fund them today. The only impediment to that happening is that the Democrats in this body are objecting, and that is what should be abundantly clear.

When it comes to parks, when it comes to memorials, we have all read about World War II veterans being turned away from the World War II Memorial. We have all read about Mount Vernon, which is privately owned—the Federal Government blocking the parking lots.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask permission to direct a question through the Chair to my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question from the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my question is that I was under the assumption that my friend would offer the consent requests, as we do here with brief responses in the competing consent requests, and then the Senator would speak for 20 minutes. My only concern is this: one, two, three—I have five or six Senators over here wishing to speak. So my question is this: Does the Senator wish to take 20 minutes following this in addition to what time he has taken now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the majority leader for his question. At his request I began with these unanimous consent requests. It was my intention to give my remarks at the end. But I would note, in each of the objections, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have chosen to stand and give their remarks. If remarks are to be given by the Democrats, then it is certainly appropriate that some response be given. So if the courtesy the majority leader was asking was that none of the remarks that his friends and colleagues make have any response, that was not a courtesy I was prepared to give. I was prepared and am prepared to work and cooperate on timing but not to allow only one side of the discussion to be presented.

Mr. REID. Further, Mr. President, I propound a unanimous consent request, and the request is: When the Senator from Texas finishes his consent that he is asking—and there is one more, as I understand it—then I ask permission that the next Senators to be recognized be Senator MIKULSKI for 10 minutes, the Senator from Florida—so it is not bad. Only a couple speakers. So we have Senator MIKULSKI, who will be recognized for up to 15 minutes. I apologize for the interruption. The floor is the Senator's from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. CRUZ. The modification——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the request of the Senator from Texas by the Senator from New York?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, the modification that the Senator from New York has suggested is that he is unwilling to open our national parks, to open our memorials, unless every other aspect of the government is opened immediately and ObamaCare is forced upon the American people. That is, quite simply and directly, saying that the Senate will not respond to President Obama's priorities.

President Obama gave a speech to this country saying we should open our parks, we should open our memorials. The House of Representatives said: Mr. President, we, the Republicans, will work with you to do that, and today the Democrats in the Senate are objecting and saying: No, we want every park closed, every memorial closed. All of that will be held hostage until ObamaCare is forced on every American.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, and I will be brief——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just want to make this point: The junior Senator from Texas has said it is President Obama and the Democrats who are shutting the government down. My modification, which he just objected to, would open the entire government. We put it on the floor. We are all for it. He objected to it. Therefore, I object to the proposal of the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 73

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the fourth unanimous consent request that I would promulgate: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 73, making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014; I ask further consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to my responding to my friend, I would use just a few minutes of leader time—I will be very brief—with permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Here is what I am going to say.

Mr. President, we have heard this back-and-forth stuff about veterans. But in addition to what the Senator from Washington said, let me read one paragraph from the RECORD of yesterday:

> I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for

the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

I reserve the right to object to the request of my friend from Texas.

I object, as do most Americans. There is no reason for us to have to choose between important government functions, as has been said by my three colleagues so brilliantly this morning. But I guess my objection is best paraphrased by reading a column from the Washington Post by Dana Milbank. Here is what he said:

House Republicans continued what might be called the lifeboat strategy: deciding which government functions are worth saving. In: veterans, the troops and tourist attractions. Out: poor children, pregnant women and just about every government function that regulates business. . . . Here are some of the functions not boarding the GOP lifeboats: market regulation, chemical spill investigations, antitrust enforcement, worksite immigration checks, workplace safety inspections, the Environmental Protection Agency . . . communications and trade regulation, nutrition for 9 million children and pregnant women, flu monitoring and other functions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and housing rental assistance for the poor.

I spent, 1 month ago, a day at the National Institutes of Health. I remember so clearly one Institute I went to where this young girl, about 12 years old—she had come back for her second visit. She has a disease that they do not know for sure what it is. But they were trying to figure out what she had, and they felt they were on the cusp of being able to figure that out. Her parents, of course, were very happy.

We know how important it is that little children, babies, adults be taken care of, especially toward the time when they have no hope. That is what NIH is about: hope.

I truly believe we should open the government, all the government. This is a trip down a road that is so foolish. We need not be there. If people have a problem with ObamaCare—and I know my friend, the junior Senator from Texas, does not care for ObamaCare—let's do it in a context that is reasonable and fair, not have all the people in America who are so troubled with this——

I heard an interview with the Governor of Maryland this morning. They are losing $15 million or $20 million a day because of the government being closed in Maryland. I would ask my friend to accept a modification. It is a modification that is so well-intentioned. What it would do is open the government. It would take care of the National Institutes of Health, it would take care of the veterans, including all the stuff that is left out of the consent we have here before which I read into the RECORD a minute ago, it would take care of the national parks, and in Nevada we are really desperate to have those open. We have one 70 minutes outside of Las Vegas where 1 million people a year visit. We have one about 12 miles outside of Las Vegas where we have 600,000 people a year visit, Lake Mead. The other is Red Rock, and others. We have a Great Basin National Park. We want to open that. That would solve this problem.

So I ask unanimous consent that the consent of my friend from Texas be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of Members of the House.

Finally, the statement I made, if that little girl came back there now for her clinical trial, likely she would not be able to have any help, just as we learned earlier this week there were 200 people who were turned away from clinical trials, 30 of whom were babies and children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would note that the majority leader made a plea for compromise. I think most Americans want to see a compromise. The House of Representatives has repeatedly compromised already.

It is the view of every Republican in this body and, indeed, every Republican in the House that ObamaCare should be entirely and completely repealed. Nonetheless, the House started with a compromise of saying not repealing ObamaCare but simply it should be defunded. They funded the entire Federal Government and defunded ObamaCare. It came to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Democrats voted in lockstep to say: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise.

The House then came with a second compromise. They said: Fine. If the Senate will not agree to fully defund ObamaCare, then let's all agree to a reasonable 1-year delay.

President Obama has already delayed ObamaCare for big business. Let's treat hard-working American families at least as well as big business. Let's have a 1-year delay, because we are seeing how badly this thing has worked. Now that is a big compromise from defunding.

It came over to the Senate. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: No, absolutely not. We will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down.

The House came back a third time and said: Okay. How about we simply delay the individual mandate, one small portion of ObamaCare, and we revoke the congressional exemption that President Obama illegally gave Members of this Congress to exempt us from the burdens of ObamaCare that are inflicted on millions of Americans.

That offer represented an enormous compromise from the view of Republicans that ObamaCare should be repealed in its entirety. What did the Senate say? Did the Senate say: Let's sit down and work something out? Did the Senate say: Let's meet and find a middle ground? No. The majority leader and 54 Senate Democrats said: Absolutely not. No, we will not talk. We will not compromise. Shut the government down. That is why the government is shut down right now.

Just a moment ago, the majority leader gave his latest offer. It was: Give us everything we demand, 100 percent, no compromise, no middle ground. That is the position of the Democrats in this body. That is not a reasonable position. That is not the way people work together to find a middle ground.

You know, it was reported that the majority leader urged the President not even to talk to congressional leaders. The President apparently had a change of heart and sat down with congressional leaders and had what, by all accounts, was an extraordinary conversation, where President Obama told Congressional leaders: I called you over here to say I am not going to talk to you. I am not going to negotiate. I must admit, that is a remarkable conversation, to call someone over to say: Hi, good to see you. We are not going to talk.

If this matter is going to be resolved, we need to see good faith among Members on both sides. Republicans have repeatedly been offering compromises to resolve this shutdown. Unfortunately, the behavior of the majority party in this body has been my way or the highway.

One can only assume their stated public belief, from a senior administration official from the Obama administration who said: We think we are winning politically.

I am paraphrasing.

But we don't care when the shutdown ends.

That is a paraphrase. That is not exact. But that was certainly the thrust of the statement by what was described as a senior administration official. I think that is cynical. I think that is partisan. I do not think that is what we should be doing. So I wish the majority leader and the Democrats would accede to what should be shared bipartisan priorities. But it appears right now that they are not, that their position is: Give us everything. Fully fund ObamaCare and force it on the American people. That I cannot consent to. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, still reserving my right to object, my friend from Texas—and I have developed a relationship with him—talks about a meeting

that he did not attend. I was there. I was one of five people, the President, Speaker BOEHNER, Leader MCCONNELL, Leader PELOSI, and me—the Vice President was also there. I am sorry.

I attended that meeting. The President did not say: Come on in, I am not going to talk to you, I have nothing to say, words to that effect. The meeting lasted an hour and 20 minutes. There were a lot of things said. But one thing that was not said is this ''Alice in Wonderland'' what took place in that meeting, when someone talks about the meeting who was not there.

Let's talk about compromise. My friend brought up compromise. We have before us a continuing resolution. My friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, called me and said: We have got to work this out. We have got to get this done quickly.

I thought: So how are we going to get it done? This was on September 9 after our recess ended. He said: We have got to have the 988 number for this year.

I said: I cannot do that. I cannot do that. Chairman MURRAY's number is $70 billion above that that we passed here in the Senate. We passed that. I cannot agree to 988.

He said: You have got to do it. I do not want to be fighting. I want to get this done.

So I talked to Chairman MURRAY, Chairman MIKULSKI, and others. Even though it was desperately hard to do—because we do not like the number 988, we do not like it. It is not our number—we agreed to do it. That was a compromise. I have been in Congress 31 years. That is the biggest compromise I have ever made. My caucus did not like it, but we did it in an effort to have a clean CR.

You talk about compromise, that was big time. But, Speaker BOEHNER, I am sure, was well intentioned. He could not get it done. He could not get it done. It was his idea how to get it done.

Then, talking about further compromise, one of the last things we had walked over from the House is: Go to conference. So I thought: I have something. It is an offer so good that he cannot refuse. What did I do? With the cooperation of all 53 Democratic Senators, here is what we agreed to do: Open the government. What we will do is go to conference. Not on little select areas. We will go to conference on a list of everything. I listed everything—not everything, but everything I could think of. We listed agriculture, we listed discretionary spending and, yes, we listed health care.

I gave the letter to the Speaker. I talked to him 45 minutes later. He said: I can't do it.

Wow.

I know what legislation is all about. It is the art of compromise. I understand that. We have compromised in big-time fashion. The problem is that the Speaker and some other Republican Members of Congress are in a real bind because the only thing they want to talk about is the law that passed 4 years ago, which the Supreme Court declared constitutional. This is a little unusual, I would think, in my experience here.

So we are where we are because we not only have the government shutdown, but we have the full faith and credit of our Nation before us in a week or 10 days.

I suggest, I do not want anyone to say I have not compromised. All one needs to do is talk to any Member of my caucus and they will talk about how difficult it has been for us to accept that number, and agree to go to conference on anything.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. If my friend would yield, following his statement of 20 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized: MIKULSKI already has 15 minutes; MURRAY, I ask unanimous consent that she follow MIKULSKI for 10 minutes; HEINRICH, 10 minutes; SCHUMER, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are those the next Senators in order or on the Democratic side?

Mr. REID. If some Republicans want to come and talk, my friends, I would be happy to yield to any of them. But we have not had a large number of people over here this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Bismarck famously talked about legislation being like making sausages. There are aspects of both that are not pretty. I wish we saw our elected leaders in both parties working together to listen to the American people.

You know, the majority leader talks about a meeting at the White House. I will note, he noted that I was not at that meeting. That is certainly true. But the statement that the President said he would not negotiate came directly from Speaker BOEHNER who was at that meeting, who came and gave a press conference immediately thereafter.

I know the majority leader is not impugning the integrity of the Speaker of the House or disputing that that is exactly what President Obama said and what the position of the Democrats is. Their position is: Give us 100 percent of what we want or the government stays shut down. That, quite simply, is not reasonable.

I would like to address for a moment a few of the arguments that have been raised against these very reasonable bipartisan proposals to fund essential priorities in our government because I think the arguments do not withstand scrutiny. There are some on the Democratic side of the aisle who have said: We are not going to pick and choose. Indeed, the majority leader said: There is no reason to have to choose between government priorities.

Let me suggest that is the essence of legislation. We have a $17 trillion debt, because far too many people have said, as the majority leader just did, there is no reason to choose between priorities; we should spend on everything.

I would note also that what the Democrats in this Chamber deride as a piecemeal strategy is the traditional means of appropriating and legislating. The only reason we have this omnibus continuing resolution is because Congress has failed to do its job to appropriate on specific subject matters.

So we should be considering the VA on its own merits. I would note, the majority leader is right, that the House bill funded the most critical components of the VA: pension, home loan, GI bill, and disability payments. But I would readily accede to the majority leader that if he would like a continuing resolution that funds the entirety of the VA, including the elements he laid out, I think we could reach a unanimous consent agreement on that within hours.

The traditional means of legislating is one subject at a time. It is not typical when considering funding for the VA that the argument be about unrelated matters, whether it is the Department of Agriculture or ObamaCare. The way this body has always operated is it has considered one subject matter at a time—except when Congress has failed to appropriate, and then everything has gotten lumped together in a giant omnibus bill. But there is no reason for that.

Secondly, every bit as critically, we have done it already. This is not theoretical. At the beginning of this proceeding the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill saying: Let's fund the men and women of our military. When it came over, a great many people expected the majority leader to do what the majority leader just did—to object to funding the men and women of our military. Indeed, some 20 Republican Senators came to the floor prepared to make the argument that we shouldn't hold the men and women of the military hostage. Yet, much to our very pleasant surprise, the majority leader reconsidered. He decided, one must assume, that it was not defensible to hold hostage the paychecks of the men and women of the military. The majority leader agreed, and this body unanimously passed funding for the men and women of the military. He said: Regardless of what happens with a government shutdown, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines should not be held hostage. They should get their paychecks.

Indeed, I rose on the Senate floor. I commended the majority leader for doing the right thing and for acting in a bipartisan manner. Yet, sadly, that was the last of that behavior we were to see. I hope that majority leader returns. I hope the majority leader who said we are going to fund the men and women of our military returns to say the same thing to our veterans. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our National Guard. I

hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to our parks and war memorials. I hope that majority leader returns to say the same thing to the National Institutes of Health and to say the same thing to children who are facing life-threatening diseases such as cancer.

We may not be able to resolve 100 percent of this impasse today; there are differences. To resolve those differences will take sitting down, talking, and working through the matters of this disagreement. One side of this Chamber is prepared to do this. The Democrats are not. In the meantime, it ought to be a bipartisan priority to fund our veterans.

A second possible objection—I can see some watching this debate who think, well, OK, but if you fund the VA, doesn't that mean the Democrats have given in on ObamaCare? Somehow it has to be connected to ObamaCare, right?

As every Member of this body knows, the VA is totally disconnected. The VA bill that passed the House doesn't implicate ObamaCare, doesn't mention ObamaCare, and does nothing on ObamaCare. We have a disagreement on ObamaCare. Part of this body thinks it is a terrific bill. Part of this body thinks it is a train wreck, a disaster that is hurting millions of Americans. That is an important debate. Whether our veterans get their disability payments shouldn't be held hostage to resolving that debate. It is exactly like the bill my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle already voted for to fund the men and women of the military. It is exactly the same. They have done it once, and yet, for whatever reason, they have made a decision that certainly appears to the public to be cynical and partisan.

There should be no confusion. The House of Representatives has overwhelmingly voted to protect our veterans and fund the VA, and 35 Democrats joined Republicans in the House to do that—35. It was bipartisan legislation. It came over here. Every Senate Republican agrees we should fund the VA, we should pass this bill. There is unanimity. Indeed, the President, when he addressed the Nation, said his priority was to fund the VA. We have Republicans and Democrats in the House agreeing we should fund the VA. We have Republicans in the Senate and a Democratic President of the United States agreeing we should fund the VA. Sadly, we have Democrats in the Senate and a majority leader in the Senate objecting and stopping the VA from being funded.

If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood right now and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day the VA would receive its funding. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply stood and withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our friends in the Reserves would receive their paychecks or have the paychecks and the funding returned. If my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle withdrew their objection, by the end of the day our national parks and memorials would have their funding and we would be able to open our Statue of Liberty and open our war memorials. By the end of the day we could restore the funding to the National Institutes of Health.

Let me note that there are many other priorities. My friend from Maryland, when he was talking about other priorities, said there are a great many aspects of government. For example, earlier this week the Director of National Intelligence and the head of the NSA testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee. The head of national intelligence said that some 70 percent of civilian employees in the intelligence community have been furloughed and that represents a real threat to our national security. If that is right, where is the Commander in Chief? Why is the President of the United States not saying: Regardless of what you do in the rest of the budget, don't expose us to national security threats. Let's fully fund the Department of Defense. Let's fully fund our intelligence agencies.

Indeed, I would note that one Senator, the junior Senator from Arizona, asked the head of national intelligence: Have you advised the President that Congress should pass a continuing resolution funding the intelligence community as we did for the members of the Armed Forces?

The answer from the head of national intelligence, appointed by President Obama, was this: Yes, Congress should do it, and, yes, I will advise the President.

Now we have Senate Democrats who are not listening to the testimony and advice of the members of our intelligence community who say there is a grave national security threat against which we are not adequately prepared to defend ourselves. Surely partisan politics should end. Surely at that point we should be able to come together and say: We can keep fighting on ObamaCare. We may have disagreements, and eventually we will work it out, but surely we shouldn't expose our national security to threats from terrorists or attacks on our homeland in the meantime. That ought to be 100-to-0.

At the end of the day, there is only one explanation that makes sense for why you saw one Democrat after another standing up and objecting: No, don't fund the VA. No, don't fund the Reserve members of our military. No, don't fund the parks. No, don't fund the memorials. No, don't fund the National Institutes of Health.

The only explanation that is at all plausible is that many Members of this body agree with some of the pundits that this shutdown benefits the political fortunes of Democrats. I hope people are focused on things other than political fortunes and partisan politics because I know each one of us takes seriously the obligation we have to our constituents back home. I hope that is not going on, but it is hard for the American people not to be cynical when they read about Mount Vernon—which is privately owned and operated and doesn't get its money from the Federal Government—being effectively forced to shut down because the Federal Government blocked the parking lots and put up barricades to prevent people from going to Mount Vernon. It is hard not to be cynical when we read about what my friend Senator JOHN THUNE told me about Mount Rushmore. The Federal Government erected barricades on the roads leading to Mount Rushmore—spent the money to do it, mind you. There is a shutdown. They spent the money to erect the barricades. The problem is that those aren't Federal roads, those are State roads. The Governor said: Take them down. The only conclusion that is possible there is that we are seeing cynical, partisan, gamesmanship—a decision by President Obama and, unfortunately, by Democrats in this body that inflicting maximum pain on the American people will yield political benefits.

We ought to be able to agree that our veterans are above politics. We ought to be able to agree that our war memorials are above politics. We ought to be able to come together and agree that defending national security and defending against terrorist threats is above politics. Everyone in Congress is prepared to do so except for the majority leader and the Senate Democrats who are insisting that everything be shut down.

If a Federal Government worker is at home today furloughed, you should know that the reason is in large part because the Senate Democrats refused to let you come back to work, because we could agree, for significant portions of the Federal Government, to come back to work Monday morning if, simply, the Democrats would stop objecting and stop insisting that they get everything on ObamaCare.

Let me note that the issue on ObamaCare is very simple. Is there a double standard? President Obama has exempted Big Business and has exempted Members of Congress. Yet he has forced a government shutdown to deny that savings exemption to hard-working Americans, millions of hard-working Americans who are losing their jobs, being forced into part-time work, facing skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and losing their health insurance.

Let me remind this body of the words of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters: ObamaCare is destroying the health care—he used the words ''destroying the health care of millions of working men and women in this country.'' If you don't believe me, perhaps James Hoffa—who put it in writing that it is destroying the health care of millions of men and women—will underscore what this fight is about. All of the seniors, all of the people with disabilities, all of the people who are now

getting notices that they are losing their health insurance—that is what this fight is about.

At a minimum, we ought to agree on common priorities. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund the VA. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our reservists in the National Guard. We ought to come together today, right now, and fund our national parks, open our memorials, and stop barricading and sending police officers to prevent World War II veterans from visiting to the World War II Memorial. We ought to come together, right now, to fund the National Institutes of Health because everyone agrees on that.

The decision to hold those priorities hostage because the Democrats want to force ObamaCare on everyone—it is not related to them, has nothing to do with them, and it is all about political leverage. That is not the way we should be doing our jobs. We should be listening to the people, and we should make DC listen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be the next Democratic speaker following Senator SCHUMER's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before I go into my commends, I want to express my thanks to the Capitol Police, to the Secret Service, and to all who responded to yesterday's pretty scary and dramatic incident. I also want to express my hope that the injured Capitol Police officer quickly and fully recovers, and to the little girl who has now been left without her mother—I hope that as this great tragedy unfolds, we give support to the people who have suffered.

My colleague from Texas has laid out a vision of how he would like to see the day end. He would like to see the day end with funding for VA, NIH, and with the Park Service open, and I think there was one more item, but I will stick with those three—NIH, FDA and VA. He would like to see them open for business at the end of the day.

I have a different vision for the end of the day. At the end of the day today, I would like to see the House of Representatives consider and vote on the Senate-passed continuing funding resolution that would reopen the entire Federal Government and keep it open—not for a long term because we have fiscal issues through November 15—at fiscal year 2013 levels. At the end of the day, if they took up the Senate-passed resolution and actually voted on it, the Federal Government would be open.

At the end of the day, people would actually be back on the job, getting paid for the job they signed up to do, and we would have the Government of the United States of America working the way it should.

At the end of the day, it means the Capitol Hill police officers who were at their duty stations would get their pay. Now they are working without pay.

Under my vision of America, if we open the entire U.S. Government, it means FBI agents who are currently working and doing their job protecting America would be paid. Right now, FBI agents and other Federal law enforcement are working for IOUs. Those very FBI agents we count on are using their own money to put gas in the cars they need to use to go after the bad guys or the bad girls. So under the Mikulski recommendation that was passed by the Senate, at the end of the day, FBI agents would be paid and they wouldn't have to use their own money to put gas in their cars. That is what my vision of the end of the day is. We have to reopen government.

The cynical strategy of the other side, given with ruffles and flourishes and pomp—self-righteously standing up for our veterans, opening our national parks, and funding NIH—really is hollow. It would be great if they actually understood how government works.

Let's take the VA disability claim process. In order to get your disability benefits, your eligibility is determined not only by the VA but with information you get from the civilian workforce at DOD, from the Social Security Administration headquartered in Woodlawn, MD—where 9,000 Federal employees are furloughed—or you would get it from the Internal Revenue Service—also headquartered in Maryland, where 5,000 Federal employees are furloughed. So if we reopened the government, at the end of the day, yes, veterans would get their benefits, but they will get them because not only is the VA open but so is Social Security, and the civilian workforce will be working at DOD and the people who work at the Internal Revenue Service will be there making sure all the paperwork is done in the way it should be. That is what the end of the day should look like.

My colleague from Texas talks about how he would like to reopen NIH. Oh, boy, so would I. Seventy-one percent of the people at NIH right this minute are furloughed. He wants to, at the end of the day, open NIH. So do I. But I also know that after they do their research and they have engaged in all of that, our private sector comes in and begins to develop the products, and they need to take those great ideas—the great ideas that turn into the new products that will save lives and create jobs in the United States—to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration.

So at the end of the day, we want to help NIH stay open, to find the cures for the diseases we want them to find, but we also want the private sector inventing the products to be able to take those great ideas and turn them into what can save lives here and to be able to sell them around the world because they have been certified as safe and effective. So at the end of the day, I would like to open the FDA.

But I don't want to do it one agency at a time. I want to reopen the entire Federal Government. It seems that whenever we now shame them with regard to the reality of the closing of a particular agency, they then decide that agency is important and the House then passes a bill. I don't want shame, I don't want blame, and I don't want political games. I want the Government of the United States of America to be open.

Now let's go to another agency. They haven't even talked about some of these other agencies. Let's take the weather service. Right now storm clouds are gathering not only here in Washington, DC, over politics, but they are gathering in the Southeast. A hurricane is on its way. The weather service is also in Maryland. Eight hundred people are supposed to be on their job.

I was there during another hurricane, just a few months ago. Last October, I was there while they were at their duty station for Hurricane Sandy. We watched this hurricane come. It was devastating. We all recall how devastating it was. In my own State, my mountain counties were hit by a blizzard, and down over on the eastern shore, they were hit by the hurricane, wiping out whole communities and neighborhoods, some people owning family homes and farms that go back generations.

Those very weather service people are furloughed. They are absolutely furloughed. The weather service is calling them back, but they are going to be working without pay.

Let me put a human face on what I am talking about. Yesterday I spoke to Amy Fritz. She works at the weather service. She has two master's degrees, one in meteorology and the other as a physical oceanographer. Her job is to predict storm surges coming from the hurricane. Her work helps to predict how walls of water will come ashore and knowing where that is going to happen, what is going to happen, and how we can begin to protect ourselves so that while we try to save property we can definitely provide protection for lives.

Amy is the primary breadwinner in her family. She is now not getting paid. She has $130,000 in student loans so she could get that great education. And she wanted that great education because she thought: I can serve America. I can be a good scientist and a great American. Well, at the end of the day, I want the weather service open. At the end of the day, I want Amy getting paid.

At the end of the day, I want the entire Federal Government open, not just whatever agency emerges as part of their strategy. Every part of the Federal Government somewhere is playing an essential part in the lives of people in this country and to the communities which they serve.

Last night there was something called the ''Sammie'' Awards. These are awards given to Federal employees

because of their outstanding service. They have either saved lives or they have saved money. Well, let me tell you, there was one Federal employee at the National Institutes of Standards. He has a new way of being able to protect us against fires. Another Federal employee, who has also been furloughed, has come up with how to save $1 billion. Employee after employee.

I say to all the Federal employees who might be watching: At the end of the day, I think you are important. At the end of the day, whatever job you do, I want you to do it well. I want you to strive for competence and excellence. But I want to do my job well. I extend my hand to the other side of the aisle, as I have done repeatedly during the year I have chaired this Committee on Appropriations. I have negotiated, I have compromised, and I will continue to do the same, because at the end of the day I want the Federal Government open doing the job those people were trained to do and that we hired them to do. I want the Federal employees to be able to be at their job, doing the duty they signed up for. Every job has an important mission, whether you are a meat inspector, a poultry inspector, or you work at the weather service.

So we can continue to do this, where they send over to us one program at a time. My gosh. Once again, we are wasting time. And where is our standing in the world? At the end of the day, I want us to be respected. I want us to be respected. What do they think about us around the world? In hearing after hearing, there is a lot of hand-wringing and chest-pounding over what we need to do about China, but China isn't doing this to us. We are doing it to ourselves. There is no foreign predator attacking our Federal Government, we are just defunding it. That is what a shutdown is. We are not funding the Federal Government.

This is not the way the United States of America should be operating. I know the calls I am getting from the over 100,000 Federal employees I represent, and they want to be on their job. It is not only they want to get paid, they actually want to work. And you know, they are prohibited from taking anything home where they could be working. This is terrible.

So at the end of the day, let us find a new way. At the end of the day, let us find a new way to keep the government open. At the end of the day, let us be proud of ourselves and let the Federal Government be reopened.

I once again conclude my remarks by saying to the House of Representatives: Please, take up the Senate's continuing funding resolution that would reopen the Federal Government right away and get us at the desk so that we could negotiate further fiscal compromises. That is the way I would like to see the day end.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very emotional response and her great statement. I hope all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol listen to what she just said to us. She represents a State that is probably impacted as much, if not more, than any other State because of the number of Federal employees who work at FDA and NIH and our other Federal agencies. But she did not come to the floor and say: Open all of the jobs in my State and make sure my State is taken care of. She came to say: Open the Federal Government so every American in every State in every part of our country is taken care of.

And she is right. I share her vision for the end of the day, not that we take a few here and a few there—whatever one individual decides is important here today—but that our entire country gets back to work. And I really share her vision that Speaker BOEHNER simply take up the bill that is at his desk. Allow it to pass. It has the votes. And at the end of the day, we can be proud our country is back to work. So I thank the Senator from Maryland for her very well-stated remarks.

I wanted to speak today about what is going on. Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN said something that I think sums up the House Republican position perfectly. He said yesterday: We're not going to be disrespected. We have to get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

We have to get something out of this—the Republicans in the House. I think that statement makes it very clear. First of all, House Republicans have exactly one set of interests in their mind: Their own. And secondly, they couldn't be more removed from the impacts of the shutdown being felt across the country. Every day Speaker BOEHNER refuses to reopen the government is another day of inconvenience and stress and uncertainty for families and communities we all serve. And because House Republicans clearly aren't getting the message yet, today I want to describe some of what my constituents in Washington State—over 2,000 miles away from here—are saying about the effects of a shutdown.

The families I talk to in Washington State aren't interested in the partisan, political strategizing that goes on in Washington, DC. They have a lot more important issues on their minds right now. Every day they are reading about how the government shutdown is affecting their community. Many are feeling the impacts themselves.

There are about 50,000 Federal employees in Washington State. Thousands are being sent home without pay. The shutdown is going to put a serious burden on many of these workers' families, but the consequences reach even further. This week, the Seattle Times spoke to a deli owner, whose job happens to be in downtown Seattle. She gets about 30 percent of her sales from Federal workers in the building that is across the street from her.

Without their business now, they are all home. And without knowing how long this shutdown is going to last, she is concerned about how she is going to pay her rent and pay her employees. She says, ''I don't think [Congress] is thinking of people like us.'' Well, it is hard to disagree with that. The shutdown is affecting so many. In fact, it is affecting other crucial parts of my home State of Washington. Our national parks are closed—campers and hikers have been asked to leave. And if the government doesn't open soon, participants in the Bering Sea king crab fishery—about which my colleague from Alaska spoke earlier this morning when I was on the floor—many of them are based in Washington State, and they are going to face significant economic losses. Why? Because NOAA employees are needed to process and issue their quotas. They have all been furloughed. There is no one to do the work they need to do their job.

I spoke to some of my constituents in the Washington State construction industry. They told me their business is slow because of all of the uncertainty about where our economy is going because of the shutdown and because of the looming guidelines. And there is so much more.

While our active duty military will continue to get paid, some of those who have heroically served our country are being affected. Furloughs in Washington State and across our country have forced our veterans to stay home and lose pay. As the shutdown continues, veterans are watching, and they are waiting, because if this government doesn't open soon, VA benefits—which many of our veterans rely on just to make ends meet—and support from the GI bill is going to stop.

Our veterans should not under any circumstances be burdened by partisan games. But unfortunately, the longer this shutdown goes on, the more they are having to sacrifice. And this shutdown is affecting the dedicated civilian employees who support our military. We have as many as 8,000 civilian employees at Joint Base Lewis-McChord who have been impacted. Some are going to work without pay and some have been sent home without pay, without any sense or idea of when they are going to be able to return. And, by the way, many of those workers are veterans—and many have already been victims of the gridlock and brinkmanship here in our Nation's capital.

A Washington State news station spoke with Joint Base Lewis-McChord employee Matthew Hines earlier this week, and he said his family already lost $1,300 because of the sequestration furloughs this summer. They are struggling to pay their bills and had to refinance their mortgage. This week, Matthew and his family were left wondering whether they would face more lost pay and more uncertainty.

The shutdown is creating uncertainty for struggling families as well those who depend on nutrition assistance programs. The Spokesman-Review

in Spokane, WA, talked with Rosa Chavira, the mother of an 11-month-old girl. Rosa gets support—because she needs it right now—from the Women, Infants, and Children Program, WIC. It helps her to put food on the table. We are now hearing that the Washington State Department of Health is estimating that WIC funds would be threatened as early as next month if this continues. So next month, just a few weeks away, if we are still in a shutdown, Rosa might take her vouchers to the grocery store and be unable to buy any food for her family. As Rosa told the Spokesman-Review, that is a scary situation.

What I just talked about are a few of the examples we are seeing in my home State of Washington, but I know that families and communities across this country could tell a lot of similar stories. This is beyond frustrating for me. It is beyond frustrating for my fellow Democrats and many Republicans—including, by the way, at least 20 in the House of Representatives, so far, who see absolutely no reason why this shutdown has to continue. We may not agree on much, but there does seem to be bipartisan agreement that the shutdown has to end. And once it does, we should begin the negotiations that many of us, including myself, have been calling for on the floor since March and work toward a bipartisan agreement that ends the brinkmanship, ends the manufactured crises that are so harmful to our workers and to the economy.

I know Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party aren't on the same page as the rest of us about that yet. But as we continue to hear from thousands of Americans—from fishermen to small business owners to struggling moms—who are being hurt as this shutdown occurs, I hope they will at least stop standing in the way of those of us who are ready to get to work.

I will close by quoting Kirsten Watts from Tacoma, WA. She works with the Bonneville Power Administration in Seattle, and she told the Seattle Times:

> It's just sad that the government is playing games with people's livelihoods.

Kirsten said that workers at her agency would still be coming in, but she is worried about the others who will not be. She was thinking about how this shutdown will impact others.

I think Speaker BOEHNER and the tea party—who, according to Representative STUTZMAN, are laser-focused on what is in it for them—could learn a lot from that approach.

So I say today to Speaker BOEHNER: Open the government. Let everybody go back to work. Stop hurting our economy.

All that it requires is bringing the Senate-passed continuing resolution up for a vote on the House floor so that the Democrats and Republicans who want the government to reopen can pass it. Once the government is open, we would be more than happy to sit down and work out our longer-term budget agreement. But we are not going to do it with our families, workers, and small businesses being held hostage.

This is not the time to talk about opening the government. It is time to actually do it. The entire country is watching and wondering how we got to this point. Let's do the right thing and show them we can work together and fulfill the basic responsibilities we were elected to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like many other Members who spoke on the floor today, I too want to acknowledge the extraordinary work that is done by the Capitol Police officers.

Every single day they work around here protecting the people who work and visit here. Yesterday was another great example of the skill, the professionalism, and the courage that they display on a daily basis in a very quiet and humble way, and I wish to express—on my own behalf and for the people that I represent—our appreciation for their extraordinary work and the remarkable way in which they go about their jobs and express how very grateful we all are for that.

I wish to talk about what is happening here in Washington, DC. Unfortunately, we find ourselves on the 4th day of what is a completely avoidable partial government shutdown. It is not like we didn't see this coming. The fiscal year ends every year on September 30. So it wasn't a deadline that we didn't know was coming. In fact, as I pointed out before, the House of Representatives completed work on four appropriation bills. Unfortunately, here in the Senate we didn't move appropriation bills across the floor to comply with the Budget Control Act. We didn't pass a single one this fiscal year.

Then recognizing the need to act at the end of the fiscal year as it approached, the House passed and sent to the Senate a continuing resolution on September 20—2 weeks ago. Instead of acting quickly to bring us to a resolution to keep the government funded, Senate leadership continued to stall, unwilling to negotiate.

The House has now sent us four comprehensive proposals to fund the government and to provide fairness under the law when it comes to ObamaCare. One of these proposals included a request for a conference committee so we could get to work resolving our differences. It was a very straightforward request. The other proposals that had been sent over here—which had other elements in them dealing with ObamaCare, as well as government funding—were rejected by the Senate. They were tabled here. So this was a proposal that was very simple and straightforward. All it asked was, let's have a conference. Let's sit down and try to work out our differences.

Unfortunately, the Democratic majority here in the Senate insisted that they will not negotiate. They tabled the motion—the request to go to conference with the House of Representatives.

So far this week the House of Representatives has sent us five bills to fund various parts of our government. I understand they are continuing to work on additional bills today. These are bills that would ensure that our veterans get paid and that children can continue to have access to life-saving treatments.

Yesterday morning my Republican colleagues and I came to the floor and requested that several of these commonsense bills that the House has sent to us be agreed to by unanimous consent here in the Senate.

Specifically, I asked for a unanimous consent agreement for the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill would ensure that the men and women who proudly serve in our National Guard and Reserve—those who have bravely answered the call to protect and defend our country—continue to train and to get paid for their service. Congress should send a clear message to these men and women who stand ready to serve in overseas conflicts or to respond to domestic disasters, that they will not be impacted by the spending disagreements here in Washington. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle objected to these requests and, unbelievably, the President of the United States has actually threatened to veto those very measures.

Congress has already passed by unanimous consent a bill to ensure that active duty military personnel are paid during this lapse in government funding. It is unclear to me why Senate Democrats wouldn't pass similar measures to fund these important services. After all, taking care of active duty military personnel is something that everybody agreed to here by unanimous consent. That rarely happens around here in the Senate. But Democrats and Republicans agreed that this is a priority. We have to make sure the active men and women in our military who defend this country on a daily basis get paid despite the dysfunction here in Washington, DC. All the bill I offered yesterday simply would have done is to apply that same treatment to our Guard and Reserve.

In my State of South Dakota, we have about 4,300 members of the Army and Air National Guard—a couple hundred of which are deployed right now, and the remainder have training functions that they perform on a regular basis. If we don't get this issue resolved, they are not going to be able to meet those training requirements. As we all know, they respond to domestic disasters, to emergencies that require their assistance here at home, as well as on a regular basis are now being deployed to meet the military requirements that we have in many of the

conflicts in which we are involved around the world.

So it strikes me as very strange that Democrats would refuse to act or engage in a meaningful debate in order to find common ground on issues like this and to get our government back up and running.

I think the people I represent in the State of South Dakota, like a lot of other people across the country, expect their leaders to work together to resolve their differences. The position of the Democratic leadership is that they will not negotiate and simply work together. That is not a position I believe is reasonable. We have heard it from the President; we have heard it from the Democratic leaders here in the Senate: We are not going to negotiate.

I think most Americans believe they sent us here to Washington, DC, to work together, realizing there are differences—legitimate differences—about how to solve problems and how to approach issues. But they believe, on a very basic level, that the responsibility we have as their elected officials is to sit down and to try to figure out how to solve these problems.

To say that we will not negotiate as a starting position is a completely unreasonable position to take, in the eyes, I believe, of the American people.

The dysfunction and the gridlock that we have here in Washington, DC, is simply unacceptable.

On Wednesday, the President invited congressional leaders to the White House for what, unfortunately, turned out to be yet another photo opportunity, a publicity stunt. The President waited until after the 11th hour, 2 days into a partial government shutdown, to even engage in a face-to-face way with congressional leaders. It strikes me that when you invite people to the table and in the same breath make explicit that you are not willing to negotiate, that very little work is going to get done for the American people.

I hope we would see better from our President and better from our leaders in the Senate. It seems like the Democrats are very content to take their ball and go home. Four days into a partial government shutdown, they still refuse to negotiate.

We haven't experienced a government shutdown for nearly 20 years. I pose to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the willingness of leaders in both parties to negotiate in good faith during previous negotiations is something from which we could take a lesson.

Going back to 1995 and 1996, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, when he was talking about the shutdowns in that period, said:

> Bill Clinton and I would talk, if not every day . . . we would talk five days a week before the shutdown, after the shutdowns.
>
> We met face to face for 35 days in the White House trying to hammer things out . . .

As we know, ending this unnecessary shutdown is not the only challenge we are dealing with here in Washington. But when it comes to the debt ceiling—which Treasury tells us will be reached in the next few weeks—Democrats refuse to come to the table to enact responsible spending reforms as part of that package. The American people disagree.

According to a recent Bloomberg poll, Americans by a 2-to-1 margin disagree with President Barack Obama's contention that Congress should raise the U.S. debt limit without conditions. The American people understand that if we continue to borrow and borrow like there is no tomorrow and pile that burden on the backs of our children and grandchildren—they understand that if you are going to increase the debt limit, if you are going to ask for a bigger credit card limit, that you ought to be doing something about the debt. That is why, by a 2-to-1 margin, they believe that if you are going to raise the debt limit, you ought to do something to address the underlying debt. In fact, 61 percent of Americans, according to that poll, believe it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised even if it risks default.

I do not believe we ought to have a default, but I believe a negotiation on the debt limit makes sense if we are serious about doing something about the debt. Every time in the past when we have had major budget deals—when we go back to the Gramm-Rudman deal in 1985 or the 1990 budget agreement or the 1993 budget agreement or the 1997 budget agreement or the one more recently, in 2011, the Budget Control Act, it was always done around and in association with an increase in the debt limit. There is a clear precedent, clear history, when we are facing an increase in the debt limit, of having a serious substantive debate in this country about how to address the debt. In many cases, those led to some of the few times in our Nation's history when we have actually gotten budget agreements that did something to reduce spending.

It might come as a surprise to some of my colleagues here also that inasmuch as many of us do not like the sequester that came out of the Budget Control Act of 2011——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what came out of that was now, for the first time since the 1950s, literally since the Korean war, government spending has gone down for 2 consecutive years.

It can be done. It can be done when reasonable people are willing to sit down and negotiate, but that requires the engagement of the Chief Executive, of the President of the United States, and it requires the good will of the people here in the Senate. It does not entail taking a position that ''we will not negotiate.'' That is not a position. What we need is an opportunity where we can sit down together and focus on these big challenges we have. In the meantime, we continue to have opportunities to vote to fund veterans programs, to vote to fund our National Guard and Reserve, to fund the National Institutes of Health—important priorities many of my colleagues on the other side have talked about.

We have bills coming over from the House of Representatives. We could do like we did with the military pay act—pick them up and pass them by unanimous consent so we do not have to worry about any of these issues not being addressed and important programs and projects not being funded. That is all it takes. I hope that can happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, we are here today with our government doors shuttered because of a failure to understand basic civics. Frankly, this ''my way or the highway'' brinkmanship has been building so long here in Washington that I would not be surprised if the American people say ''a pox on both your houses, Republican and Democratic.''

Why are we in this fix? How did we get here? Sometimes when you are lost in the woods, it helps to retrace your footsteps so you can find the way back out. We are here because some of our colleagues have forgotten their middle school civics lesson. They have forgotten the ''I'm Just a Bill'' episode of ''Schoolhouse Rock'' that some of the folks in the seventies and eighties remember that reminds us all that to pass a bill or repeal a bill, you have to meet certain tests. You need a majority of the House of Representatives. You need a majority in the Senate. If someone is going to filibuster, you need 60 votes. And you need the signature and the support of the President.

We are here because my colleagues who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act do not have a majority of the Senate. They certainly do not control the White House despite waging an entire election over the health care law. Since they cannot repeal the health care law the way we all learned about in middle school, they decided to try something new. They have taken the government hostage. They have said: If you do not give us what we want, we are going to close down the Federal Government.

Can you imagine what it would look like if Democrats employed this kind of reckless and irresponsible tactic? What if we said: Unless you raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour, we are not going to pass a spending bill. Remember in 2009 when our party tried to pass a cap-and-trade bill? We did not have the votes to overcome the filibuster in the Senate, so I guess the lesson here is that we should have refused

to fund the government until Republicans relented and passed a cap-and-trade bill. Can you imagine. That is not how our democracy works, it is not what our Founders envisioned, and it is not compromise. It is extortion.

It is our job to pass a spending bill every year. We can fight about how big that bill is. We can fight about how small that bill is going to be. But constitutional duty is not optional. Some are saying there needs to be further compromise on the spending bill, but it is clear that sometimes the Republican House does not know when to declare a victory. They actually got the spending levels they asked for. In the interests of keeping the government open, the Senate accepted House spending levels, sequester levels, in our funding resolution. I do not like those spending levels. Most Democrats do not support those spending levels. But we are not willing to risk the entire economy or well-being of our constituents just to get our way.

The bottom line is this: It is time to reopen the government—no strings attached, no policy riders, and no more hostage-taking, just a clean funding bill that stops hurting our public servants, our communities, and our economy, a clean funding resolution that keeps the lights on while we negotiate over a long-term budget. The Senate had the votes to pass such a bill, and we did. The House also has the votes to pass a clean funding bill, but Speaker BOEHNER will not bring it to the floor. He will not put it up for a vote because the most extreme Members of his caucus want to play hostage politics instead.

It is time to end this. It is time to drop the hostage politics and simply pass the one plan that has the votes to pass both Chambers—a clean funding bill.

Speaker BOEHNER, let them vote. Let your Members vote their conscience on a clean funding resolution. It is your duty, Mr. Speaker. Just let them vote. That is all we ask.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 4 p.m. and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Alabama has graciously agreed to let us flip the order, so I am going to now, before he does, ask unanimous consent that be done and that it not change the alternating pattern, Republican and Democrat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an aspect of the tea party government shutdown that has not gotten the attention it deserves. Sadly, the effects of this tea party shutdown do not stop at our water's edge. The shutdown is putting our national security at risk. The senior Senator from California, the chair of the Intelligence Committee, has talked to us about how 72 percent of our intelligence employees are not working. They are not all useless or laggards or slackers. In fact, there is a high degree of professionalism in the CIA, NSA, and like agencies. To have close to three-quarters of them not on the job puts every American at risk.

There is another area that is putting us at risk. We all know that the greatest threat to our national security and to that of Israel—or one of the greatest threats to our national security and the greatest threat to Israel is a nuclear Iran. In order to punish Iran for their pursuit of nuclear weapons, Republicans and Democrats, in a bipartisan way, led in many instances by two of my good friends here, the Democratic senior Senator from New Jersey Mr. MENENDEZ and the Republican senior Senator from South Carolina Mr. GRAHAM—they have come together to pass tough sanctions that would have a crippling effect on Iran's economy, and this body in a bipartisan way and the other body in a bipartisan way have passed those.

Just last week we saw some of the first results and progress, as President Ruhani said he was open to talks on the nuclear program. Iran had been intransigent before that. We don't even know if they really want to give up nuclear weapons or whether this is a feint, but we certainly know the sanctions are having a dramatic effect. What has changed Iran's mind? Have they suddenly had a change of heart out of the blue? No. The only thing that changed their minds is the sanctions, and that is why they are at least acting differently than they have acted in the past. Who knows. Hopefully they may actually do something real if the sanctions continue. We know that these tough sanctions are a huge weight around the ankles of the Iranian economy.

But right now, when Iran feels cornered for the first time, the shutdown of our government could well take that pressure off the Iranians, and it comes at exactly the wrong time. That is because the shutdown and its concomitant furloughs are preventing us from fully enforcing the sanctions, allowing the companies that are trying to do business with Iran to escape punishment and allowing the Iranian economy to expand faster than it normally would have. There are many companies that try to evade these sanctions, but the Federal Government has cops on the beat who have been, by and large, overwhelmingly successful in making sure nobody can slip through the cracks and do business with Iran. But now, because of the government shutdown and furloughs, those offices are greatly weakened.

Two of the major offices in the Treasury Department that enforce sanctions—the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network—have only 30 of their 345 employees. Let me repeat that. Two of the most important offices that enforce sanctions have less than 10 percent of their employees. Ninety percent-plus are on furlough. They cannot work.

The Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence—a vital part of our enforcing tough sanctions against Iran—is usually staffed by 10 people. Right now they just have one—10 percent.

The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control—the primary office responsible for enforcing these sanctions and punishing those who violate them—is also operating with a skeleton staff.

Just at a time when we need the sanctions to continue to bite, this government shutdown is making it a lot easier for rogue actors to sell oil and trade with the Iranian regime. We all know that those who try to avoid sanctions find the weakest place. Now, with so few of our people on the job because of the shutdown, it is going to be a lot easier for them. New sanctions designations will halt. We will not be able to investigate sanction violations. We cannot punish those who have violated the sanctions. The government shutdown sends a dramatic and strong signal to those who seek to violate the sanctions and give the Iranian regime hope that they can continue to keep nuclear weapons. It could not come at a worse time. The Iranian sanctions have been our best pressure point, and the shutdown is letting the pressure off Iran at exactly the wrong time.

We have seen a pattern over the last few days, and I have a feeling I know what the response from the other side of the aisle—particularly the junior Senator from Texas—will be. He will say: OK, Democrats, that is a good point. Let's fund the sanctions, and maybe tomorrow or the next day we will have a bill on the floor to restore those offices in the Treasury Department. Then maybe we will point out that the government shutdown is hurting middle-class students from getting college loans. Again, that was something that had bipartisan support. Then maybe the junior Senator from Texas or House Republicans will say: OK. Let's fund it too. After a while, it gets a little ridiculous.

The House Republicans, and their seeming acquiescence to the junior Senator from Texas, have given the junior Senator from Texas a veto power over which parts of the Federal Government are funded and which are not. At the request of the junior Senator from Texas—who has fervently and passionately said don't fund the government unless ObamaCare is

eliminated—the House Republicans have shut down government. Those actions are not a surprise. After all, the junior Senator from Texas said 10 months ago that he and the tea party ''have to be prepared to go as far as to shut the government down.'' It is not a surprise.

Anyway, the Republicans have shuttered the entire Federal Government and they say they are willing to reopen it a piece at a time provided that piece is blessed by the junior Senator from Texas. To allow any one person to pick and choose which parts of the government can reopen is a cynical and ultimately extremely damaging way to run government. It is dangerous for the country, and it is obvious it will not succeed.

I have one final point. It seems today's talking point from my Republican colleagues is: Let's talk. It is obvious they feel the pressure because America sees the intransigence of shutting down the government unless our colleagues in the House get 100 percent of what they want. But it is obvious when their talking point is ''let's talk,'' they left out a key point at the beginning of their new talking point. Because to only talk while the government is shut down does huge damage to millions of innocent people and to our country's economy. They forgot to say: Let's vote. Then let's talk. Their motto should be modified.

Our motto is: Just vote. Vote to let government stay open. It will take a single vote in the House of Representatives, and then let's talk. To say ''let's talk'' while the government is shut down prolongs the devastation to our colleagues.

I say to my Republican colleagues who have come up with this talking point ''let's talk,'' they forgot the first part of their talking point: Just vote, and then let's talk.

I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Alabama for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate Senator SCHUMER's remarks about the Iran sanctions. They are very important. It is an action by the United States that I think has helped in a number of ways with the radicalism in Iran, and we need to keep it up.

Yesterday, I heard Mr. Clapper—or maybe it was the day before—testify before the Judiciary Committee, and he said he had a number of people not working. Senator GRASSLEY said: If they are not critical people, then why do you need so many? If you have a critical job, you need enough people to do the critical duties. How many do you need? You must not need all these people. You said they are not important to us. I don't think Mr. Clapper had a very good answer to that.

When someone raised the question of defense cuts under the Budget Control Act, and he expressed concern about that, which I would share. I think Mr. Clapper is right to be concerned about it. So I asked Director Clapper: Do you know the way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? Have you ever heard of the Commander in Chief of the United States?

The House—the Republican House, I must say—has a half dozen times or more, over several years, passed legislation that eases those cuts and finds other reductions in spending from other departments and agencies that have received no cuts and as a result reduces the burden on the Defense Department. Indeed, the Defense Department represents one-sixth of the U.S. budget and they are being asked to take one-half the cuts and don't think that counts in bringing down the war costs in Iraq and Afghanistan; that is entirely different. I am talking about the base defense budget that has taken half the cuts under the Budget Control Act. It is too much for the Defense Department. It ought to be spread around. The House has voted more than one-half dozen times to do that. It died in the Senate because I guess they want to utilize the military to threaten Republicans: If you don't do what we want, we are not going to fund your military.

My goodness, the President is the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military. Doesn't he have a responsibility to make sure we are adequately funded? I have to say, I am just getting a little frustrated with that argument.

First of all, I don't think he is required to lay off that many people. He indicated he was reviewing it. He was going to bring back more people, as he could have been doing all along, but I think it did allow another example of disastrous complaints beyond reality. One more thing. Senator SCHUMER, and many of our Democratic colleagues, have been conducting a sustained and direct attack on the millions of people who supported and identified with the tea party movement. Make no mistake about it, they don't respect the people in the tea party movement. They demean them in every way virtually every day in this body.

The tea partiers believe in America and thought this U.S. Congress has turned into lunatics and are putting this country into bankruptcy by its spending too much and passing ObamaCare. Democrats passed ObamaCare in spite of the overwhelming objections by the American people. They did it without listening. The tea party spontaneously rose up, and it clobbered a bunch of Democratic House Members and Senators. It switched the whole majority in the House by a big number. So they don't like it.

Everybody who opposes them and says: You are not listening to us, they are now demeaning and attacking. I think the American people and the people who identify with and support the tea party, either directly or indirectly, need to know that. I know the people in the tea party. They care about America. They love America. They can't understand what is going on here and they think they are moving us into bankruptcy and we forgot the entire concept of constitutional limited government.

We have heard a lot of talk about the challenges facing the government during the funding lapse we are in. All of us want to see the government return to normal operations, and I certainly do, but what we seem to be losing sight of is the permanent consequences—the debt consequences—of the Affordable Care Act. It needs to be a part of this discussion. The Democrats have refused to listen. They basically blocked any effort in the Senate to reform in any significant way the Affordable Care Act. It has been going on ever since it passed. Their goal is to put up a wall around it so if anything comes up, they will not listen to it. They will not consider it. They will not discuss it. It is a fact. It is a done deal. We can't even discuss it.

The House has a right to fund what they want to fund under the Constitution and not fund what they choose not to fund. They are trying to initiate and force a discussion on one of the most important issues facing America. One of the things that is so dangerous about this law has not been properly discussed, and I wish to talk about it.

A lot of us are going to donate our pay during this furlough to charity. I certainly will. I wish our friends would begin to be more concerned for the private sector workers. There are millions of American workers who will be permanently affected by the Affordable Care Act. They will be hammered by it. Eventually full funding will resume to our government. We know that. This furlough will end.

If this ObamaCare remains in full effect, the consequences for American workers are going to be lasting and damaging, as will the consequences to the United States Treasury and our financial condition.

In particular, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I would like to focus on the huge and fundamental accounting manipulation that lies at the center of this health care law. I am going to make some statements, and if anybody has detailed objections or rejections to it, I want to see them, and I will respond to them. But I am correct in what I am saying, and I look forward to any discussion that anybody would like to have. So far people don't want to talk; they want to ignore the problem.

We have to deal with these accounting manipulations because it is a colossal blow to our Treasury. The Affordable Care Act was packaged and sold based on a promise that I am going to disprove. The American people knew it wasn't true anyway. Before a joint session of the Congress, the President of the United States said and promised this: ''I will not sign a [health care] plan that adds one dime to our deficits, now or any time in the future, period.''

That is a bold statement. It is as good as ''read my lips.''

As I addressed earlier this week, hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicare savings to the hospital insurance, HI, trust fund were double-counted under the legislation that was passed—at least $400 billion over the 2010 to the 2019 10-year period. I asked for an analysis before the bill passed on December 23. We ended up voting on December 24, Christmas Eve. They rammed it through before Scott Brown, who would have denied them the 60th vote, was elected in Massachusetts—liberal Massachusetts—on the commitment he would be the vote to kill ObamaCare, but they were able to get it through before he was able to take office.

The night before we voted, I asked CBO about it. I insisted they give an answer, and they did. They said:

> The key point is that savings to the HI trust fund—

That is Medicare—

> under PPACA—

That is ObamaCare—

> would be received by the government only once, so they cannot be set aside to pay for future Medicare spending and, at the same time, pay for current spending on the other parts of the legislation—

ObamaCare—

> or on other programs. . . . To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. The CBO went on to conclude to say:

> To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings as both improving the government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double-count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement in the government's fiscal position.

What a statement that was. In fact, CBO estimated that if Medicare savings were truly set aside to pay future Medicare benefits, the new health care law would not decrease but increase the deficit over the first 10 years and subsequent decade. They said it would increase the deficit.

But there is a lesser known, equally shocking, account gimmick that I wanted to mention today; that is, how it was done with Social Security. They have obtained another $100 billion over the next 10 years by double-counting Social Security money.

My time is up, and I could explain it in more detail, but we have to understand this. According to the Congressional Government Accountability Office—and I asked them not too long ago when they issued a report—that over the next long-term implementation of ObamaCare, it would add $6.2 trillion to the debt of the United States. That is almost as much as the liabilities that Social Security has and fully accounted for—my budget staff tells me that the ObamaCare legislation will be harder to fund and add more to the deficit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. SESSIONS. Than Social Security will under the current problems. We need to stop digging the hole and we need to start fixing Medicare and Social Security and not adding other programs we can't pay for.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I know this is not a town that has ever been known for having a long memory. In fact, the recent warning bells rung about our deficits and our debt have predictably faded into the background with all of the attention on the rocky start to this fiscal year.

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office released its long-term budget outlook. Headlines and news stories associated with that release use words such as grim and gloomy and raised alarm about our ''long-term fiscal crisis.'' The very first line in that report reminds us that between 2009 and 2012, the U.S. Government recorded the largest budget deficits—when compared to the size of the economy—in over half a century.

Reflecting on the current state of play, CBO noted that the Federal debt currently stands at roughly three-quarters of our gross domestic product. More alarming, they predict our Federal debt will match the size of our economy or be equal to 100 percent of GDP by the year 2038.

I understand the temptation to roll our eyes and politely suggest that those facts and figures are of more interest to green-eyeshaded bean counters or to simply wave them off as last month's news. Frankly, this is made much easier when the administration says things such as ''we don't have an urgent debt crisis'' and when appropriations bills come to the floor at levels that make little sense given our current fiscal realities.

Unfortunately, these facts and figures only tell part of the story. The CBO provides us insight into the impact these facts and figures will have on the economy and the Federal budget deficit. If the growth in our Federal debt is left unchecked, we could eventually see a further drop in private investment, an increase in interest payments, a decrease in Congress's flexibility, and, obviously, a risk of fiscal crisis.

CBO notes that ''the unsustainable nature of the federal government's current tax and spending policies presents lawmakers and the public with difficult choices . . . To put the federal budget on a sustainable path for the long term, lawmakers would have to make significant changes to tax and spending policies.''

We all know that given the current environment, it is difficult to do that. It is difficult when we have a problem just bringing routine spending measures to the President's desk. So this is not an easy conclusion to hear.

But within our dim current fiscal landscape and even dimmer outlook, there has been at least one bright spot. In 2011, Congress agreed to and the President signed into law the Budget Control Act—the BCA. This included statutory discretionary spending caps as well as automatic, across-the-board spending cuts for our failure to enact additional deficit reduction measures.

Certainly trimming Federal spending via across-the-board sequestration cuts is an inelegant means, at best, of addressing our spending problem. It is often referred to as a ''blunt instrument.'' At a minimum, it is a lazy way to legislate. I believe I join a number of my colleagues when I say I am open to providing additional flexibility while staying within the budget caps with respect to the sequester. But we simply can't deny that locking in discretionary spending caps and enforcing them with automatic sequestration has yielded some of the most significant spending cuts we have seen in Congress in years.

As my colleague from Tennessee, who recently came to the floor, said, 2 years ago, discretionary spending stood at nearly $1.5 trillion. Last year, under the BCA spending caps, that number dropped to just under $1 trillion. This year, if no changes occur to the sequester enforcement cap, we will be at $976 billion. That is a significant drop. That is significant. And that is a good thing.

A recent Wall Street Journal story entitled ''The GAO's Unheralded Victory on Spending'' quoted the head of Americans for Tax Reform as concluding that we had ''made a fundamental shift in the size of the government equation.''

While runaway spending on mandatory programs represents an ever-present issue we have to get our arms around, the BCA spending caps and sequester have put real and meaningful downward pressure on discretionary spending that represents about a third of our Federal budget.

My colleague from Kentucky, the minority leader, recently pointed out that the BCA which passed 2 years ago ''actually reduced government spending for 2 years in a row for the first time since the Korean War.'' I agree with him when he urges that we not walk away from the spending reductions we have already promised taxpayers.

I have made no secret of the fact that I do not favor the strategy of tying the funding of ObamaCare to the current continuing resolution. As the resulting shutdown drags on and there are more stories about the fights over funding next year, and then the coming debate over the debt ceiling, I find myself favoring this strategy even less. It is entirely likely that the sequester opponents will use the larger debate to push to undo the gains we have made of

meaningful spending cuts by abolishing the sequester by replacing it with meaningless savings, budget gimmicks, or even new taxes.

Far from a conspiracy theory, in recent months there have already been calls for a 2-year sequester hiatus. I agree with Taxpayers for Common Sense when they say that ''this may be the convenient answer, but it is no way to get our fiscal house in order.''

It is my hope we can find a way through this shutdown sooner rather than later. It is also my hope that we can at some point have a real conversation about the long-term drivers of our crushing debt that underlie our need to regularly hike the debt ceiling. In the meantime, and as this debate unfolds, I urge my colleagues to resist any effort to undermine the sequester-enforced Budget Control Act spending caps.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, House Speaker BOEHNER is sending the Senate a series of bills to put one Band-Aid at a time on the House Republicans' government shutdown. It is an obvious attempt to fool the American people into thinking House Republicans are acting to end the shutdown. But their transparent tactic is not fooling many people, and here is why: The people of this country know the harm of the government shutdown isn't about the handful of programs that House Republicans will dangle in front of us. The House Republican gambit will not put food inspectors back to work. It will not put Centers for Disease Control experts back to work tracking outbreaks of infectious diseases. It is not going to reopen Head Start classrooms for kids. Their piecemeal approach won't restart lending to small businesses or bring back the FAA inspectors who make sure commercial aircraft are safe, and it won't restore hundreds of other vital services and functions.

No matter how many rifleshot bills the House Republicans try, all they do is leave our government full of holes. We could spend months legislating in bits and pieces while House Republicans ignore the obvious solution: The House should vote on the clean continuing resolution the Senate has sent to them, because that vote will end the shutdown.

The Republican bits-and-pieces strategy is like smashing a piece of crockery with a hammer, gluing two or three bits back together today, a couple more tomorrow, and two or three more the day after that. House Republicans should stop before they do any more damage, put down the hammer, pick up the Senate's continuing resolution, and at least put it to a vote.

I heard one Republican on the Senate floor yesterday argue that we should adopt the piecemeal approach because, after all, he said, under regular order, we pass separate appropriations bills for different parts of the government one at a time. While that is true, it is irrelevant. We have a mechanism for keeping the government open while we go through the regular order process. It is called a continuing resolution, and it keeps the full government open while we adopt appropriations bills one at a time.

Five days ago, the Senate passed, for the third time, a continuing resolution to keep the government open and sent it to the House. It is well past time for Speaker BOEHNER to bring it to a vote.

Republicans want to negotiate changes in the Affordable Care Act. Of course we will talk about that once the government is functioning, but we should not and will not allow the U.S. Government to be held hostage by the Republicans while we are talking about the Affordable Care Act or any other subject which they or we wish to talk about.

I am keenly aware, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that one of the most devastating effects of this Republican shutdown is its damage to our national security. Already our men and women in uniform have been asked to operate under the damaging effects of sequestration. Those cuts have done serious harm to our military readiness and military families, and the shutdown is making things far worse.

Because of the House Republican shutdown, workers at the Defense Department maintenance depots around the country who should be repairing and preparing vehicles, ships, and aircraft for combat, are instead furloughed, along with hundreds of thousands of other Department of Defense civilians.

Training exercises have largely come to a halt. Anyone who thinks that is no big deal has never spent any time with our men and women in uniform. The key factor in our military's effectiveness isn't our sophisticated weapons systems, as important as they are; it is the highly trained men and women who employ those weapons. Every day of this shutdown wears away the sharp edge of their readiness to respond to crises around the world.

Some troops and their families won't get tuition assistance. Most travel is suspended, including many permanent changes of station. That means military families scheduled to move to a new location who may have already sold a home at their old duty location or committed to a lease or a mortgage at their new location, and spouses who need to start a job search, face financial loss and disruption and uncertainty in their lives. Our troops and their families can't even go to their on-post commissaries because they are closed.

The bill we passed last week to ensure our troops would receive paychecks is all well and good, but that did not address the many shortfalls our troops and their families face during this shutdown.

Another truly outrageous example is that the families of the brave men and women who were killed while defending this Nation will see a delay in the payment of death benefits because of this shutdown.

Some may say, You are right, these problems for our national security are intolerable. Let's pass a bill to fix them.

We have. The Senate passed a continuing resolution three times, the last one 5 days ago, which would keep the government functioning. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to allow the House to vote on the Senate-passed continuing resolution. No matter how many piecemeal bills the Speaker sends to us here in the Senate, he will be leaving out millions of Americans who will continue to suffer from the shutdown that he and tea party-dominated Republicans have created. Every day they spend obsessing over ObamaCare is one more day of unfairness and uncertainty for our troops and their families. Every day of the House Republicans' destructive submission to the tea party is another day food is not inspected, it is another day FBI agents are working without pay, it is another day the SBA is not approving loans for small businesses, it is another day scientists are barred from their labs and on and on.

Speaker BOEHNER can bring this chaos to a halt by bringing the Senate's continuing resolution to the floor of the House for a vote. The Senate has voted three times on House versions of continuing resolutions. Speaker BOEHNER refuses to vote even once on the Senate bill. Why? This is the question, by the way, the media has not yet asked Speaker BOEHNER. Why? Why has he not brought to the floor of the House the Senate-passed continuing resolution? Here is to the answer, and it is a stunning answer: Because it might pass. You heard me right. The reason Speaker BOEHNER is not bringing the continuing resolution passed in the Senate to the floor of the House for a vote is because it is going to pass.

That is anathema. It would be anathema—anathema—to the Speaker of the House for a continuing resolution to pass if it depended upon Democratic votes. It is his policy not to depend on any Democratic votes to pass legislation in the House. The policy of the Speaker is truly the epitome of rank partisanship. In fact, I do not know of a clearer example of extreme partisan policy than Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to hold a vote on bills that would rely on some Democratic votes to pass.

One of Speaker BOEHNER's Republican colleagues, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, has verified this sad fact. Here is what Congressman DENT said last night on PBS's NewsHour.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Here is what Congressman DENT said:

I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill to fund the government.

Then he continued:

That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along, but obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill—

Here is his conclusion. This is now a Republican Congressman speaking last night, saying:

. . . a few dozen folks in the House Republican Conference who weren't prepared to vote for a clean bill, and that's why we're in the situation we're in right now.

That is an astonishing report of abdication of leadership in the House of Representatives. What an incredible statement about the stranglehold that a few dozen ideological zealots now have on the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It is an extraordinary moment in history when a Speaker of the House allows a few dozen Members of Congress to bring the government of this Nation to a standstill.

When we cut through all the claims and all the counterclaims, all the press conferences, all the photo-ops, there is one unassailable, indisputable fact that remains: The Senate has passed a continuing resolution to keep the government open, and Speaker BOEHNER refuses to bring it to a vote in the House of Representatives.

It need not be this way. All that is required to break the stranglehold that the tea party has on House Republicans is for Speaker BOEHNER to bring the Senate-passed continuing resolution that would reopen the government to the floor of the House for a vote. I urgently hope he will do so, and I hope that every hour until he does, he is asked to defend his refusal to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 2 minutes and to be followed by Senator ENZI for the normal time he was allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we share being attorney generals of our States, and I just wish to take a moment to express my sincere and deep thanks—and from all of us—to the men and women who protect us every day, the Capitol Police. We had a very serious incident yesterday. Our people rallied and responded in an appropriate way. I believe they conducted themselves in a professional way.

For example, I saw one young man. He said he had heard and responded immediately, was running toward the scene. We think: Well, that is OK. That is what they do. That is what they are supposed to do.

We need to understand, when one of our young men and women are responding to a scene of a firing, of weapons discharged, they do not know what is there. In this environment, it could be a very serious thing. Their very life is at stake every time. Everyplace they stand on our streets, everyplace they stand in our building, the Capitol, and our office buildings, they are standing there subject to a threat by somebody who could appear out of nowhere with deadly force, and they do it with professionalism and courage every day.

We have been very fortunate in seeing this Capitol be well protected, and I wish to express my appreciation for them and all who place their lives at risk every day to protect the operational functions of this government.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his comments. I too want to add my thanks and appreciation for law enforcement people all over the United States who are doing their job and often have to do things such as give tickets. They do not get anything but bad news and grief for it, but they are out there protecting us at the same time and they definitely deserve credit, our admiration, and our prayers.

Madam President, I also wish to comment a little bit on what the Senator from Michigan said with his indisputable facts. The indisputable fact is that we are only where we are right now with a government shutdown and the attempts to get a continuing resolution through because Congress did not do its job, the Senate did not do its job, the job we have to pass spending bills. If we had passed the spending bills—and there are 12 of them—if we passed the 12 spending bills, there would not be a need for a continuing resolution.

What is a continuing resolution? It is permission for government to continue functioning as it has been functioning, spending one-twelfth of what they spent the year before for each month until we finally come up with a spending bill.

The way the law is written, we are supposed to have a budget by April 15 and that is a very significant day and it is an intentional day. Then, right after that, we are supposed to start doing spending bills, and we are supposed to allocate the amount of money we want each agency, program, department to spend.

We have not done that for years. Consequently, we get into this bind where we are saying: Go ahead and spend money, and we will figure it out later.

We have had a sequester, and the way the sequester works is it is supposed to be a 2.3-percent reduction from each agency, program, department. We did continuing resolutions last year. We did continuing resolutions for at least 7 months—probably 7½, maybe 8 months. So they got to continue spending what they had been spending the year before.

They knew a sequester was coming because Congress again did not do its work and come up with an alternate way to fund government. So they only had 4 months left to take their 2.3 percent out of their total spending, which would be the whole spending for the year. Do you know what that does? That makes it 5.3 percent.

But that is not bad enough. We have an administration that sent out word to make it hurt, and we have an administration that also took care of Washington but did not take care of the people out in the hinterlands of Wyoming—Wyoming and the rest of the United States—people who are out there actually doing the work, person-to-person, that is supposed to be done with what we are funding. Instead, it went to a lot of administration.

I had some people in this week from the Head Start program, and they showed me how they were cut 7.5 percent. What part of 2.3 percent would 7.5 percent be? Part of that is that 5.3 percent because it came so late. But it is 7.5 percent because 2.5 percent of that goes to fund the Federal Government in Washington. That is not where the work is done. That is where the reports are done. That is where the regulations are done. That is where the things are done that stymie the people out there who are having to actually help the people.

The Civil Air Patrol came to me. They do search and rescue from the air when people are lost around Wyoming. They said: We are being cut 60 percent. I said: What part of 2.3 percent would 60 percent be? They are even taking three of their five airplanes. I said: If they do not have any money, how can they take your airplanes? How would they have the money to fly them anywhere?

It is just one more of those things where the administration is saying make them feel the pain. Of course, part of that was closing down White House tours. How much can it cost for a self-guided White House tour? That is what they are. They are self-guided. You get a brochure. It is my understanding it is about an $18,000 savings. That is nothing compared to what we are working with.

We have $9 billion a year worth of duplication just on things under health and education and labor and pensions—$9 billion in duplication. What is $18,000? Why couldn't we take a look at those budgets in detail and get rid of duplication? This is duplication that is evaluated by the White House. But when we have a shutdown, we do not do that. We do not eliminate any of that.

Everybody has seen the World War II Memorial with the barricades. Ever since the World War II Memorial went up, I have never seen barricades there. I have been down there in the middle of the night and been able to walk through the World War II Memorial or any of the other memorials down there. I do not think I could use the restroom, and there is probably some justification for having the restrooms closed because there is the problem of cleaning them—what would require some additional personnel—but just to walk through things?

We are making progress, though, because they also barricaded off Lincoln Park. It is a children's playground up here on the Hill. There were pictures in the paper the other day of a little girl looking at the sign on the gate that was locked saying that the park was closed. I am pleased to report that yesterday that sign was gone, kids were playing in the park. There is no cost to that. So there is no purpose in having any kind of a shutdown regarding that.

The Smithsonian out here is a national park, and there are streets that go through the national park. They go through it one way primarily, but they do not have any additional cost to them. They do not serve anything. But they were blocked off. You could not go through streets that people normally drive through on any given day.

In my own State, Jackson Hole—if you are driving from Dubois to Jackson, on the right-hand side of the road is a gorgeous view of the Tetons. These are some lands left over from the Alps that God had, so he put them in Wyoming. People like to stop and take pictures of them, particularly at this time of year because the aspens are turning to gold and they are mixed in with the pine trees. There is a river that runs through there and then there are these majestic mountains.

The turnouts along that road are barricaded. You cannot turn out. You could not turn out to fix a flat tire. You could not turn out if you needed a nap. You cannot turn out to take a picture. Why? How did they get the barricades? How much did they have to spend for the barricades? How much did they have to spend to have somebody go out and put up those barricades?

Incidentally, if you drive along the GW Parkway out here, it is the same way. The little turnouts that are along there are barricaded. Where did we get all these barricades? If it was a business and they treated their customers that way, they would be out of business, and they would deserve to be out of business. We should be operating differently than that.

I did notice Air Force is going to play Navy tomorrow. But the justification is there is some revenue for that, and there is. If you charge admission to those things, and they are highly popular sporting events, there will be a lot of people who go and they will pay a lot of money for it and it will exceed the cost of putting it on at the venue. That would be the government making money. There is an oxymoron.

But Yellowstone Park is in my State. Yellowstone was the first national park. In fact, it was the first park in the world. It is a huge park. In fact, it is the size of Connecticut. It sits up there in the corner of Wyoming. A lot of people go through Yellowstone in order to get to Idaho or Montana or maybe Montana folks trying to get down to Wyoming. But that is all closed off now.

What is interesting to me is that if you do drive through there, you pay a fee. It is actually revenue. Now, of course, when I brought that up, I was reminded that the revenue goes to the general fund. But I had to say: Do you know where the money for the national parks comes from? It comes from the general fund. So if you do not collect the money, you will not have the money to put back into the park.

Not only that, there are concessionaires who pay to be able to sell gas and food and lodging in Yellowstone Park. Their customers cannot get to them. I do not think we relieved them of paying the fee they have to pay. I am pretty sure the concessionaires were expecting about $4.5 million worth of business this month—not the busiest month but an important month. I think there are ways we could have continued to collect revenue, but we are not doing it. Let's make it hurt.

We are here with this continuing resolution. The last vote I got to do was actually a vote to have a conference committee. It wasn't any demand from the House, it was a request for a conference committee. What happens in a conference committee? The leader appoints some people from here, in conjunction with the minority leader. They appoint some in the House. They get together and try to work this out. But, no, that was voted down by the Democrats, so we are not going to have that.

I have a lot more that I would say. I realize my time has expired. We are in this position because we have been doing a bad job of governing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, we are in day 4 of a tea party Republican shutdown. We need to be very clear as to how we got here. The Senate majority leader negotiated with the Speaker of the House, and after a long negotiation in which the Senate made major concessions, we agreed to pass a 6-week funding bill for services of the government, to keep services open while we negotiate the larger issues around the budget.

We passed a bill with the funding levels asked for by the House Republicans. Republicans asked that we continue funding below the levels we believe are necessary to grow the economy for 6 weeks. Rather than having a government shutdown, at the time we believed it was in the interests of the American people, of all of those who provide those important services to us, that we, in fact, agree with the House on a 6-week extension. We sent it over to them, asked for by the Speaker, agreed to by the Senate. There it has sat.

Let me quote again from Congressman DENT—a Republican colleague of Speaker BOEHNER's—who said last night on ''PBS NewsHour'':

> I do believe it's imperative that we do have a clean funding bill, a straight funding bill to fund the government. That was the intent of the Republican leadership all along. But obviously there were a few dozen folks in the House Republican conference who were not prepared to vote for a clean bill and that is why we are in the situation we are in.

''A few dozen folks''—part of this tea party wing. He said: That is why we are where we are today.

You can overcome that very simply. Just bring the bill that the Speaker said he wanted, that we were willing to agree to for short-term funding of Federal services, bring it to the floor, and those few dozen folks can vote no and everybody else can vote yes. Then we would have the government back open. So it is truly a question of just letting the House vote. Just vote. Right now, today, before 5:00, we could be done with this irresponsible action. We could then make sure the Federal Government can pay its bills and not default and at the same time go to conference to negotiate the larger budget issues, which we need to do, but that is not what is happening.

So it is now day 4. Government services are still closed. The bill that could open them—which has a majority vote, which has Republicans and Democrats—is sitting in the House because admittedly Republican Members of the House are saying a few dozen folks did not like it.

Well, in our great democracy, our Founders said majority rules, but somehow we seem to have forgotten that around here. We have elections. The person who gets the majority wins. The others are not happy. They lose. Majority rules. Same thing happens on legislation.

So now we are in a situation with a group defined as ''a few dozen folks'' in the House driving the train because there is no leadership in the House to bring up the vote and be able to pass this continuing resolution with a bipartisan vote.

We are paying a very big cost right now as a country waiting for the House to vote. Nearly 800,000 people have been laid off—800,000 people. We are just barely coming out of the recession. We are coming back. We are creating jobs—not enough. When this President came in, we had six people looking for work for one job. Now it is down to three people looking for work for one job. That is better. It is not good enough. There is more to do, and we all know it. So what is the response? Well, let's just lay off 800,000 people in the middle of this effort to try to bring a middle class roaring back in this country.

There are about 7,500 people in my State of Michigan who are providing important services, people who are in middle-class jobs, have a mortgage, have at least one car payment, many sending their kids to college, trying to make sure they can care for their families, proud of what they do providing various public services that we all benefit from, and they are now sitting and waiting.

It is costing our country about $300 million a day—$300 million a day—in

lost wages and productivity, $300 million a day that we cannot afford to lose. This could all be ended in 5 minutes if the Speaker of the House would just allow a vote on a bill that contains the funding levels that the Speaker himself asked for, not those that we would like to see because on a longer term negotiation, we are going to fight very hard to increase opportunities for education and innovation, focusing more on economic growth and jobs. This is a number asked for for a short-term continuing resolution for 6 weeks. They evidently cannot take ''yes'' for an answer.

Today I had an opportunity to meet a wonderful little boy named Kai who is 2 years old. He and his mom Anna were with us talking about the impact on the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, and other public health functions for our country and what it means to families.

Kai was born with a heart defect. He has had two bypass surgeries now in just his 2 little years of life. Thanks to a clinical trial at the Children's National Health System, Kai was able to get innovative treatment that he needs. He was running all over the place this morning, a great success story.

The things we do together as a country are what we should be proud of. The work that is being done by our doctors and researchers at places such as the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Food and Drug Administration are literally saving lives. These men and women who are now furloughed, not working because of the shutdown, have gone through years of training. They are dedicated. They love what they do. These are some of the top experts on infectious diseases and food safety and cancer research in the country and in the world. Right now they are sitting at home, maybe watching us, trying to figure out what the heck is going on—or stronger language. They are not allowed to work. If they are working, they are not working with pay, all because of a few dozen folks in the House of Representatives, tea party folks who are running the show in the House who have decided they want to shut the entire government down over the Affordable Care Act, over the fact that we believe—the country believes there had to be a way to find affordable insurance for 30 million folks who have not been able to find and purchase affordable insurance.

The director of the division at the CDC that monitors food-borne illnesses—scary stuff like E. coli outbreaks—said recently he has three people working in his whole department right now—three people for our country monitoring food-borne illnesses, three people in charge of tracking every possible case of food-borne illness in the entire country.

This needs to be a wake-up call. It is time to get the government open so that people can go back to work who are in positions to monitor and protect our public health, the defense of this country, educational opportunities, and the safety of our country. Get these CDC officials back to work and make sure our families are safe.

CBS News reports that the Centers for Disease Control headquarters, which is in Atlanta, GA, is a ghost town. Folks who monitor infectious diseases have 6,000 employees in Atlanta, GA, and they are calling it a ghost town—in America, the greatest country in the world. The Director of the CDC, the Nation's top doctor in charge of infectious diseases, said he is ''losing sleep'' because ''I do not know that we will be able to find and stop the things that might kill people.''

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Let me go on and conclude. We heard on the floor earlier from the junior Senator from Texas, who spoke eloquently about the great work being done by the veterans health care system. It is unfortunate that it took a government shutdown for my colleague, I might say through the Chair, to understand how important a completely government-run health system is. The VA is completely government run and funded.

My colleagues who are opposing people buying private insurance through private exchanges and making their own decisions about what works for them, who are saying it is the end of the world if families can buy insurance that is more affordable for them and that they can actually get what they are paying for because insurance companies cannot kick them off when they get sick or block them from getting insurance if they have a preexisting condition—they are saying that is awful, but a completely government-run health care system called the VA should be funded.

I happen to agree with that. Our system through the VA is important for veterans. We need to keep it funded. We need to keep the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and every other part of our important system funded.

The House needs to vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELLY. First, I wish to thank the Capitol Hill police and the Secret Service for their bravery, their heroism, and their work, not only yesterday but every day, to keep this Capitol safe and to keep the people in it safe. We are in their debt.

The people of Indiana all want jobs. We want to go to work. We want and we know the dignity that comes with a good day's labor and the chance to take care of our family. The people in Indiana have told me time after time, and they have said it very clearly: Joe, focus on jobs, focus on the basics.

I couldn't be prouder of my home State. Every day I am thankful I have the amazing privilege to represent all Hoosiers in the Senate. But our economy in Indiana isn't as strong as we would like it to be. The national unemployment rate is 7.3 percent; Indiana, 8.1. Indiana's median household income declined 13.2 percent from 2000 to 2012 and it lags behind the national average. We have dropped to 40th among States in per capita income. We have so much work to do in my home State and in our country.

As you know, I am an optimist by nature, but I am incredibly disheartened by what I have seen in Washington recently. Some in Congress are playing a game of chicken with our jobs, with our economy, and with our future. Because these folks haven't gotten their way, thousands of Hoosiers are furloughed and are not receiving paychecks, the paychecks that help them feed their families, pay for college, and invest their hard-earned money in the local-run businesses.

Many of the good people at the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Crane, IN, who keep our troops in Afghanistan and around the world safe, were sent home recently. They can't do their critical work that keeps our Nation safe.

The demands of a few here have caused the scientists at the Centers for Disease Control to be unable to go to work. These actions have also caused many of the patriots at Fort Wayne's Air National Guard Station and Grissom Air Reserve Base and at Terre Haute to have their work and their operations idled.

We are now at a point in the debate where some are putting our economy at risk simply to advance their own political agendas. These folks are shutting down operations across our Nation and in my beloved home State, and that hurts our still recovering economy.

We have so much work to do to move Indiana and our Nation forward, and Congress isn't helping. We talk all the time about providing certainty to our business friends. Hoosier businesses thrive on hard work, creativity, and teamwork. They also deserve a government that provides certainty, a steady hand in choppy seas. They don't need a government that creates the storm.

Most folks back home think Congress can play some role in improving the economy, even if that role is simply not to make things worse. But over the past year, Congress has made and continues to make things much more difficult. It is embarrassing that the actions of some in Congress these days are now the greatest obstacle to future job creation in our country.

America's economic confidence is measured daily by polling by Gallup. It is currently at minus 22. It matches the low for the year. It is worth pointing out that the other low for the year happened right before sequestration took effect in March—another problem, another self-inflicted wound caused by Congress.

The implementation of sequester cuts, which is what happened when Congress proved itself unable to make the tough decisions that Congress was sent here to make, has led to job losses and furloughs, so many families don't have as much to make ends meet.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported we could lose up to 1.6 million jobs next year if these across-the-board cuts continue. Further, a number of economists have concluded that Congress significantly reduced this country's economic growth because we failed to replace the cuts with something smarter. Economic growth is a fancy term for people going to work and people who have jobs.

The American people are losing confidence in their economy because of Congress. Here we are 6 months later, 4 days into a government shutdown, 13 days away from defaulting on our debt. History tells us government shutdowns are terrible for the economy and terrible for jobs.

If we look at the last time the Federal Government shut down in 1995 and 1996 for 27 days, Congress put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, with $1.4 billion in damages, and consumer confidence took a double-digit dip. Back then our country's economy was in a stronger place than it is today and it recovered a little bit more quickly. This government shutdown is damaging our economy at a time where it is very fragile.

However, this government shutdown has damaged our economy, but a default on our bills as we look forward would be absolutely devastating. What happens if we fail to raise the debt limit and if we stop paying our bills? That is what the debt limit is. It is our obligation to pay our bills.

While it is completely unprecedented, well-respected economists warn it could send us right back into a tailspin. We are still recovering from the last recession. At a time when Hoosiers are trying to get back to work and take care of our families, Congress's inability to work together is making it so much more difficult. Congress is not helping and is actually hindering job creation and economic growth.

This is no way to run a country. I stand ready to work with anyone in a commonsense way out of this train wreck. We must find a way to stop hurting the economy and to actually help the people who have made this country such a great place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. As did my colleague from Indiana, Senator DONNELLY, I also wish to take a moment before I deliver my remarks here to thank the Capitol Police, all of law enforcement, and first responders who have put themselves on the line to protect others.

I know I speak for every Republican, every Democrat, and all of our staffs that we deeply appreciate their work and their sacrifice. These brave men and women are here every day whether they are paid or not. We appreciate that.

If there is one thing we are united on, and I wish there were more, it is our respect for those who serve to protect, those serving us here at home as well as those serving us in harm's way abroad. We owe them our support and we owe them our thanks.

I am hearing from a number of Hoosiers, as my colleague from Indiana has, that they are tired of political gamesmanship, they are tired of paying taxes to a government that isn't listening or delivering for them, and now we are in a situation where they are tired of our careening toward these cliffs and shutdown. But when the Republican-controlled House sent over legislation to the Senate, calling for House and Senate leaders to conference together, to sit down in a room, talk through this problem and come to a solution, this good-faith effort was rejected out of hand by the Senate majority leader, Senator REID of Nevada.

We wanted to sit down and debate this issue. Once again, yet another good-faith effort sent over by Republicans to help fund the essential functions of this government was dead on arrival in the Senate. The Senate majority leader, parroting the words of the President, said: We will not negotiate. This was refusing to allow Republicans and Democrats to try to find a way forward to resolve this issue and get our government functioning.

In the past when these things happened, Presidents, realizing that they were elected to lead—we are elected to serve here, we are elected to serve the President, we are elected to serve the people we represent, but the President is elected to serve this country. When the President in the past has come up in a stalemate situation, there has been a reach out to the other side whenever we have a divided government.

After 2008, when the Democrats won control of the House, the Senate, and the executive branch, they had total control. They pushed through a number of measures without any single Republican or opposition support. Those programs now we are dealing with, and ObamaCare is the primary one that has brought us to this particular point. The lesson learned here is when one party has total control without support from the opposition party, we end up with legislation that is dysfunctional, that doesn't work, that reflects the ideology of one party and doesn't have any balance to it. We are now in a position where we have a divided government. What we would like is to have some say on how this goes forward, to point out those things of this bill that are not working, to point out the disaster this is turning out to be, the dysfunction of this particular legislation.

The point I am trying to make here is whatever the issue, whenever we come to a stalemate, historically throughout the history of this country it is the Commander in Chief, the President, who has stepped forward and taken the initiative and said: We need to work together to solve this. We can't impose our will on the body that the American people has divided, giving control of one House to one party and control of another House to another party.

Ronald Reagan reached out to Tip O'Neill, and some very significant measures, stalemates, were resolved because the President reached out and was willing to negotiate.

The Democratic President, Bill Clinton, reached out to a then-Republican Speaker of the House in the 1990s, and we addressed a major issue with welfare reform, much-needed welfare reform. It couldn't have happened without the President reaching out.

I could give other examples, but we are in another stalemate situation. Yet what do we hear? No matter what Republicans send over, no matter what the offer is, if the offer is to let us sit down and conference this, the reaction from the Senate majority leader is: We refuse to negotiate. The reaction from the White House and this President over and over and over again is: I will not negotiate.

Even though the American public sent you control of one House of Congress, even though the Constitution establishes the role of the Congress vis-a-vis the President, and calls for an agreement between the two before we can move forward, this President, for whatever motive, says: I will not negotiate.

We can do something right now to help Americans. We can come together to help fund important programs and departments that should not have been jeopardized because of this impasse. We can at least do that. If we can't get the President to negotiate, can we not at least take some steps forward for those essential functions of government?

Republicans have sent over nine such propositions and proposals. Each one of them has been rejected, dead on arrival, not even allowed to debate, and procedurally stopped by the majority leader.

Let me suggest four that are waiting in the wings and surely, for reasons of health and safety of Americans, surely we can agree to support these four and perhaps more. Some others have been suggested. Surely we have to conclude that this is an essential function. How it was that they were declared nonessential is beyond me.

Let me mention the four: Honoring our veterans and the commitments that we have made to them, providing for our national security, and protecting Americans' health.

I spoke earlier this week on the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act, a bill providing funding for disability payments, the GI bill education training, and VA home loans under the same conditions that were in place last year. The House passed this, but the Senate majority leader has blocked it here.

The House also passed the Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act. This bill provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the Reserve component and National Guard component who are scheduled to report for duty as early as this weekend. Denying support for those who wear the uniform and stand ready and are engaged when called on, and have been trained to do so, is a great disservice to the men and women who have dedicated so much and put themselves at great risk to wear the uniform of the United States.

Secondly, funding the Department of Homeland Security. There are a number of ways our homeland security is impacted under the shutdown. One of the impacts on FEMA—the Federal Emergency Management Agency—is the need to be funded so they are prepared to respond to natural disasters. We are only a breaking-news headline away from another natural disaster or from some other need for FEMA to engage. Yet their employees are furloughed and not in place to be ready to respond.

We have a tropical storm in the gulf right now that may turn into something dangerous. Our emergency response efforts to provide for our homeland support is inadequately funded. Can we at least do that?

How about funding for our intelligence community? The House will send us Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act, which will provide immediate funding for personnel compensation and contracts for those individuals who have been determined by the Director of National Intelligence as necessary to support critical intelligence activities and counterterrorism efforts.

Under the current shutdown, 70 percent of our civilian employees in our intelligence community have been sent home on furlough. Director of National Intelligence Clapper said this lapse in funding our intelligence agency is a ''dreamland'' for our foreign intelligence adversaries.

Can we not at least, if we have a delay in resolving our issues here—and we have that delay, as I said, because the Senate majority leader has not allowed us to sit down and work—Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair.

Can we not at least fund those agencies that are looking to protect us from terrorist acts, that are in place to keep the American people safe? How can we reject that?

Finally, let me mention a fourth—and there are others, but let me mention this one. Fund Food and Drug Safety Programs, safety programs for those who are in need of approvals for new drugs and new devices and who are experiencing significant delays because the Federal employees at FDA who review these functions cannot report to work.

Madam President, frankly, I am perplexed why the majority leader continues to oppose even consideration and debate for individual funding bills when they just agreed a couple of days ago to funding for our troops, and I applaud that and support that. But if we did that because of the essential nature of their function, shouldn't we also include these other items? Shouldn't we agree we need to fulfill our commitments to guard and reserve and our intelligence community at this critical time?

The House has already sent over nine proposals to the Senate for consideration—nine—and nine times the Senate has had the opportunity to pass legislation to reopen our government and fund essential programs, but the Senate majority leader chose not to do so and the President refuses to even engage.

A government shutdown is a pox on all our houses. We need to do what the people of this great country elected us to do, and that is to work to find a solution to this government shutdown. How can we do that if the Democratic chair at the negotiating table is empty? What we are looking at here is a Clint Eastwood moment. We are looking at an empty chair. Mr. President, where are you?

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I want to thank the Senator from Indiana for invoking the name of one of my favorite actors and directors. I would say to my friend, I didn't think our friend Clint Eastwood's appearance at the Republican National Convention was one of his finest moments, but it is what it is. It is nice to be with my colleague and to follow him on the floor.

Madam President, if it were left up to the Senator from Indiana and this Senator, as well as our colleagues here from North Dakota and Rhode Island, I think we could probably work out a pretty good budget deal in a fairly short period of time that raises some revenues through tax reform to reduce the deficit, reforms to the entitlement programs to save money and save the programs for the long haul, and to make sure we don't savage old people and poor people. And while we are doing that, probably we can change the culture of the Federal Government a little so that we focus even more—not on a culture of spendthrift but on a culture of thrift.

Those are the things we need to do. And I am always happy to be with him and happy to follow him. It is so nice to be with Senator COATS today.

Following up on what Senator COATS has been saying, it reminds me of a phone conversation I had with a Delawarean today. She asked me: Why don't we all just agree to what the Republicans are proposing and adopt a couple of bills or amendments to fund some pieces of the government but not many? And I said: Let's go back a little in time.

What I sought to do in that conversation was to explain, in pretty simple, straightforward terms, how the budget process works here—how the budget process works here—and where it has gone awry. We have had a budget law since about 1974. The expectation of the Budget Act is that the President, usually in January or February of every year, will give a budget address. This is what the President and his or her administration thinks we ought to do in terms of revenues, in terms of spending—what our priorities should be.

The expectation in the law is also that this body, the Senate, and the House down the hall from here, will agree on a budget resolution sometime by, say late April of the year, for a budget starting October 1 of that same year. For a number of years—about 4 years—we didn't do our job in terms of developing a budget resolution. It was difficult in a divided Congress to do that. So for several years we didn't. Republicans criticized us harshly for not having passed a budget. What they were talking about was a budget resolution.

There is a difference between a budget and a budget resolution. In my home State of Delaware, we have three budgets: An operating budget for the State of Delaware, a capital budget for the State of Delaware, and something called grant and aid, which is something the legislature cares a lot about. It is only a couple of percentage points of all our revenue. But there are actually three budgets. Here we have one, and it is a unified budget with capital and operating expenses thrown in together. But there is no real direct corollary between what we do here and what we do in most of our States.

Most States have an operating and a capital budget. Here we have a budget resolution. The budget resolution is not a nitty-gritty line-item budget. What it does is to set a framework for what is to follow—the appropriations bills, roughly a dozen of them—and what we do on the revenue side through the work of the Finance Committee here and the Ways and Means Committee in the House.

The budget resolution says: This is roughly how much we are going to spend in these general areas, and this is roughly how much revenue we are going to raise from these general sources. That is a budget resolution. It is, if you will, a framework. I call it the skeleton. It is like a skeleton. Later on we have to come along and put the meat on the bones.

The budget resolution is supposed to be adopted here by the end of April. Usually the Senate will adopt one version, our version, and the House will adopt another version. We did that this year, by the end of April, as I recall, and they were different. In our budget resolution we did deficit reduction. We

didn't balance the budget over the next several years, but we continued to reduce the deficit. Remember, 4 years ago, the deficit peaked out at $1.4 trillion—$1.4 trillion. This last year that was just concluded we cut it by more than half, as I understand, and we expect it will be brought down again further this year. Should we do better? Do we need to do better? Sure we do.

The budget resolution we passed here took a 50–50 approach; half the deficit reduction for the next 10 years will be on the spending side and half will be on the revenue side. The budget resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, as I recall, did nothing on the revenue side, nothing on the Defense side, as I recall, and basically took the savings out of, for the most part, domestic discretionary spending. If we set aside entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—set aside Defense, and set aside interest payments, the whole rest of the budget—everything from agriculture to transportation, everything else—that is where they took the savings. And they reduced that part of the budget from about 15 percent of all Federal spending down to something close to 5 percent. That is not my vision of what government should be about.

Anyway, we came to the end of April, and the Senate and House passed different budget resolutions, and there was an effort here to go to conference—to create a conference committee and for us to send conferees. For people who might be watching and asking: What is he talking about, a conference committee is like a compromise committee—some Members of the House, some Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, go to this committee we create for just a short period of time to hammer out a compromise. In order to do that, somebody has to come to the floor—usually the leader comes to the floor—to ask unanimous consent that the Senate appoint conferees, Democrats and Republicans, to help create this conference committee and work out a compromise.

That request was rejected. It was objected to. It has been objected to again and again and again, whether the person making the unanimous consent to go to conference to work out this budget compromise—it has been made by Democrats or Republicans, at least one Republican. Senator MURRAY has made the request—she chairs the Budget Committee—close to 20 times, and JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, and Presidential candidate a couple years ago, long-time friend and colleague, has made the request close to 10 times. He wants to go to conference. He wants to solve the problems. So do I, and I think most of us do.

The ways to do it are those things I talked about—entitlement reforms that save these programs, that save some money but don't savage old people or poor people; tax reform that generates, among other things, some revenues that can be used for deficit reduction; and then to focus on everything we do. How do we get a better result for less money in everything we do?

Long story short, here we are. It is not the first of May, it is not the first of June, not the first of July, and not the first of August or September. It is the first part of October, and we have yet to be able to get the unanimous consent to form that conference committee to work out a compromise on the budget. That is where we have fallen short. That is where we have fallen short.

We hear a lot about obstruction: The majority leader or the President won't let us work with the Republicans on these piecemeal approaches. For everybody here—and I love DAN COATS—but for everybody here in the Senate, we could all come up with our list of four. We could come up with a list of 14 priorities. If you multiply that by 100, that would be 1,400 priorities that ought to be in all this piece work, these piecemeal changes we are going to make to the spending for the next couple of weeks or next couple of months.

Why don't we just do this. Why don't we agree to what the Speaker of the House agreed to, and that is a spending level for a short period of time—a continuing resolution, a spending plan, for a short period of time—not for the whole year. In this case, we have been talking about a continuing resolution, a short-term spending bill, that runs about 45 days, until maybe the middle of November.

The level of that spending, we can argue about that. But what we ended up doing is, our leader, HARRY REID, talking to JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House—and he has a tough job. None of these jobs are easy, but they have really tough jobs. But our leader said to the Speaker: What would be a level of spending for those 45 days or 60 days for the short-term spending bill? What level of spending works for you? My understanding is the Speaker vetted that with his folks over there and they came back and said: How about using the level of spending we are at for the last fiscal year, for 2013, and to fund for those 45 or 60 days whatever is covered by the continuing resolution, funded at that level for that period of time?

That is not our level. The Democratic level, to be honest, is not $986 billion, which is last year's level for discretionary spending. We were more interested in something like, I would say not $986 billion but about $1.05 trillion, something like that. Something like that, in trillion dollars.

So about another $70 billion—that was our number. The House had their number. We agreed to the House number. We said: OK, we agree on the number. Now let's figure out how long we are going to fund the government at the same level as last year.

Then the ship ran aground.

Our friends over in the House said: That is not enough. We also want to defund Obamacare, the Affordable Care Act.

This is not like a proposed bill, this is a law. I was here in the Finance Committee when we debated it, amended it, argued it, reported it out, and here when we voted on it and then the President signed it. It is law. The President ran for reelection on this and was reelected. We pretend it was a landslide reelection. The electoral vote was fairly big, but it was a reasonably close election. But he won, and he won fair and square. When you look at the Electoral College, he won by quite a bit.

It has been litigated in the courts. The Supreme Court looked at the one area that some people think is unconstitutional; that is, the idea of having a so-called individual mandate. They said it is constitutional. Where did we get the idea? We got it from Massachusetts. And who was the Governor that signed the Massachusetts law into effect? The Republican Presidential nominee, who then turned around and ran away from his own idea in the Presidential election last year. I think there is some irony to that.

Then, on October 1, this week, what happened? I think some good news happened, and the good news is there are 40 million people in our country who didn't have health care who had a chance to sign up for something new and different. It is not socialism, it is not communism, it is not government-run health care. It is a Republican idea called the exchange, the health marketplace. And my understanding is that when HillaryCare was discarded in the early part the Clinton administration, the Republican counterproposal to HillaryCare was something like a large purchasing pool, which in the health care exchange we call the marketplace today.

On October 1, all over this country 40 million people who didn't have health care coverage had a chance to start signing up for health care in a large purchasing pool in their State, with a variety of options, health insurance companies competing with each other, driving down costs—in my State, tens of thousands of people; States like Wisconsin, probably hundreds of thousands of people; other States like North Dakota, tens of thousands of people; but States like New York and California, millions of people who don't have health care coverage have a chance to sign up there and take advantage of

driving down the price—competition among insurers—and also taking advantage of economies of scale, driving down administrative costs as a percentage of premiums.

To buy health insurance in Delaware for families or maybe small businesses with five employees—we would pay a whole lot more money than folks are going to pay on these exchanges, these large purchasing pools. For one thing, the administrative costs are so high when you buy for yourself or a small business; however, when you are buying health insurance for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands or millions of people, administrative costs are much lower. Competitive forces bring down the prices as well.

Our friends in the other party want to pull the plug on the efforts of 40 million people to find health care coverage for themselves. I think that is wrong. It is the law of the land. It is a done deal. It has been litigated. It is going to be with us. And I think some of our Republican friends are not afraid that it is not going to work; I think maybe they are concerned that it is going to work and it is going to actually meet the needs of people.

Abraham Lincoln, when talking about the role of government, would say: The role of government is to do for people what they cannot do for themselves.

The chamber of commerce in Sussex County in southern Delaware—a rural area—tried to set up a purchasing pool and couldn't do it. They tried it 10 years ago.

Another guy, David Osborne, in the book ''Reinventing Government,'' described the role of government and said the role of government is to steer the boat, not row the boat. And the exchanges are really that. The idea is to create large purchasing pools, a partnership between the State and the Federal Government in many States, Delaware and others, but to then let the private sector do its job. These are great examples of government steering the boat and the private sector and other providers rowing the boat.

I would like to close with this: People say we ought to change ObamaCare, we ought to change the Affordable Care Act, make significant changes to it. I agree. And the President already made one big change 1 month or so ago when he announced that the employer mandate was going to be delayed for a whole year to give us a chance to stand up the exchanges, make sure they are working, and then to revisit this issue of the employer mandate. The coverage, if you have more than 50 employees—a year from now it will be more than 100 employees they have to cover, I think, but at least more than 50.

Some people say we have to change it right now. I want to go back in time 6, 8 years. We debated on this floor the issue of prescription drugs. Should we have a prescription drug program for Medicare? Most people said we should have had it when we created Medicare in 1965. If we could have done as much then with pharmaceuticals as we can do now, it would have been a no-brainer. Prescription drug coverage would have been part of Medicare since its inception. But it wasn't until about 2005 that we actually got to a place where we had some agreement that this is what we ought to do. Ted Kennedy and the Democrats had one idea how to do it, and some of our Republican friends—certainly President Bush—had another one. We ended up with sort of a hybrid—a little more like President George W. Bush's idea—and a lot of our Democrats objected. They didn't say: We are going to shut down the government because we didn't get our way or because we didn't get our specific prescription drug program. They said: Why don't we figure out how to make it better?

Almost everybody has heard of the doughnut hole with respect to the Medicare prescription drug program. The way the original program worked is the first $2,000 of pharmaceuticals for a person in Medicare Part D—Medicare paid about 75 percent of the cost. If they used over $6,000 of prescription medicine a year, Medicare paid about 95 percent of the cost, everything over $6,000. But roughly between $3,000 and $6,000—when the program was introduced and for its first half dozen or so years, if you were between $3,000 and $6,000 roughly in prescription medicine purchases, you got nothing from Medicare. It was all on you.

When we did the Affordable Care Act, as our friends from Rhode Island and North Dakota know, we started filling the doughnut hole. Now, if you happen to be in that gap between $3,000 and $6,000, Medicare pays over half and will eventually pay 75 percent. That is the way we took a good program—Medicare Part D—and we made it better, and we can do that with the Affordable Care Act, and we will.

For our Republican friends, our friend Winston Churchill once had a great quote. He used to say: You can always count on Americans to do the right thing in the end, after they have tried everything else.

This is a tough time. I feel especially bad for those Federal employees across the country who have been furloughed. We are going to bring you back, I hope, this month. My hope and belief is that we will bring you back and make sure you are made financially whole.

I say to my Republican colleagues, the next time, whether it is JOHN MCCAIN or PATTY MURRAY or somebody else who asks unanimous consent to go to conference and work out a real budget agreement, don't object. Let's accept that and get on with the work that lies ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, yesterday was a scary day on Capitol Hill. I was sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair and saw the bells ring, saw all the Capitol Police hustle our great pages in to protect them. Senator MCCAIN was speaking, and like the veteran he is he continued to make his impassioned plea for help for the Syrian opposition as things swirled around. For members of our staff and Members of the Senate and the House and all the tourists and the visitors, I think the only thing that stood at that moment between them and potential harm was the Capitol Police and the Secret Service. I was struck by that.

As a former attorney general who actually ran a law enforcement agency, I have a lot of great relationships with law enforcement people. In fact, I lost two officers in the line of duty during my tenure as attorney general, and I know the sacrifices, I know the fears of the families, and I know that every day, regardless of what is going on, some average, ordinary beautiful day can turn into a catastrophe where an officer loses their life.

As we were standing there, I was visiting with one of the officers who was protecting the pages, and she told me a story. She told me a story about a uniformed Capitol Police officer who told her that morning that he has a stay-at-home wife and she is raising their children, and he has $115 in his checking account and doesn't know how he is going to get through this time period to the next paycheck. Even though they are here and some of them are working overtime, they are here without a paycheck and potentially might not receive a paycheck.

So today we wear these buttons that say ''thank you.'' And I think about the hypocrisy of that. I think about the hypocrisy of buttons and galas and ribbons and all, and I want to say it is time for the Congress to not just pass out buttons that say ''thank you'' but pass out paychecks. That matters more. That is a real thank-you. That is real recognition of the value of those services.

So it was with great outrage that I left this body last night as we were working through the challenges, and I realized the great humor of the Capitol Police. I was leaving the building and visiting with my guys at the door. He was giving me a hard time, and I said: I want to thank you for being here every day. I want to thank you for your sacrifice. I want to thank you for the trauma your family goes through. And he said: Just think how good I would be if you actually paid me.

So I wish to say to all of my friends in the Capitol Police, who have been really truly friends—on some days I feel as if the only friendly face I see—that we care deeply. But it is not enough to wear a button. We have to start solving the problem of this impasse. We have to start recognizing that all of our people, all of our employees in the Federal Government—we have heard all day here this laundry list of let's do this and let's do this. I think we are up to 9, 10, and they are building, they are growing each one of

these lists. There should be some point when we get to the tipping point where we realize that all of the functions are important. Everybody who is out there working is important, is essential, and the best way forward is to fund government.

I want to build on what Senator CARPER has been talking about because I think it is so important. I probably was sitting in the chair the first time this happened. As most of you know, I am new to the Senate and new to these procedures. And Senator MURRAY, chair of the Budget Committee, came out and she asked to appoint a budget conference committee. I know this process fairly well. You get the big targets, and then they get passed down to the appropriators, who then build the budget within those guidelines. And the Senator from Texas stood and objected. I thought, why would you object to the appointment of a conference committee with the House and with Representative RYAN, who has been a staunch conservative and a staunch proponent of targets that I would think the Senator from Texas agreed to? There was this long back-and-forth, and then Senator MURRAY sat down and that was the end of it. I was perplexed. I thought, well, when do we get to vote on this conference committee? When do we get to kind of tell her it is OK because there are a whole lot of people in this place who agree that we should go to conference—only to find out there is something called unanimous consent.

The same people who have brought us to the brink of triggering a result of a slowdown in our economy with this behavior also have stopped the compromise. Now, adding to the hypocrisy of the day, we have the same claim for ''let's compromise.'' The easy compromise here is when Senator MURRAY comes to the floor and asks for a conference committee, we all agree to start doing it, we all agree to start doing our job.

There has been a lot of attention on the so-called tea party shutdown and the tea party faction and calling them out and saying: You are a minority. But I would like to take a different tactic this afternoon, and I want to challenge the good people in the House Republican caucus who have already recognized that the best thing to do would be to pass a clean CR. I want to say I know what it is like to take a tough vote that your party doesn't agree with. I know what it is like to feel as though you have let people down who are part of a group that is helping and moving things along and that represents, kind of, your team to some degree. I know what that is like. I have been there and I know it doesn't feel good. But I know at the end of the day doing the right thing for what you believe your State believes in is a better feeling.

I am suggesting maybe the minority, the minority of the majority that has an opportunity to step forward and take on this challenge and do the right thing, are those folks who know this is wrong, those folks who know over there that we could do better, that we have an opportunity to end this nonsense and move forward.

There is a procedure for doing this, as I understand it. I want to speak to those folks who I think are good-hearted, who understand the impact on families, on children, on our Native Americans. I could tell you horror stories right now, where we are looking at a snowstorm in North Dakota and many of our native families rely on fuel assistance. The people who do that are not on the job. How are they going to heat their houses in the middle of this snowstorm? This is life and death. I do not see a special provision coming across for those folks.

That is the problem when you piecemeal this. I think there are good people in the House Republican caucus who know that. If there is a way that they can in fact step forward, there will not be a lot of floor glory in their caucus. Trust me, I know. There won't be a lot of pats on the back and it might be pretty chilly for a long time. But you will have your conscience clear knowing that you did the right thing.

I am hopeful we can get good people to step forward, to stand up to behavior that can only be described in some ways—it has been talked about as hostage-taking here. It is really bullying behavior when the small minority does this.

Let's step forward. Let's do the right thing. I challenge you to do the right thing on behalf of the Native Americans, on behalf of my sheriff from Fargo, who was sent home from Quantico, the premier training facility. He waited years and years to be in the queue to get that training and now has been sent home. On behalf of law enforcement, on behalf of the Capitol Police, where we, yes, honor them today by wearing these buttons, let's honor them more by passing out paychecks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I join my former attorney general colleague, Senator HEITKAMP, in expressing all of our appreciation for what the Capitol Police did. We all know when that event transpired, our job was to go and hunker down, stay away from windows where we might be a target, and keep out of the way and not add to the difficulty or confusion. They had a much tougher job. Their job was to go to the danger and keep the United States Capitol safe. They did their duty and they did it well.

It is now incumbent upon us to do our duty and that is to get rid of the tea party shutdown. We are now in tea party shutdown day 4. I have been watching this debate as it transpired on the floor and I have been participating a little bit in it. I have heard some interesting comments that have been made out here.

The first one is the suggestion that this is not a tea party shutdown. They say it is not a tea party shutdown, but the tea party warned of it, the tea party wanted it, the tea party is cheering it, and the tea party says they are profiting from it, that it is a big success.

When did the tea party warn of it? One example is when LYNN WESTMORELAND, the Republican from Georgia, long before this all began, told the Faith and Freedom Coalition:

> This is what we are going to do. If the Government shuts down we want you with us.

The tea party wanted it.

JOE WALSH, Republican of Illinois:

> Most people in my district say shut it down.

Representative JACK KINGSTON told reporters that his Georgia constituents would rather have a shutdown than ObamaCare.

Representative TIM HUELSKAMP said:

> If you say government is going to shut down my constituents say, OK, which part can we shut down?

The tea party not only warned of it and wanted it, but they are cheering it.

MICHELE BACHMANN, Republican of Minnesota, said this:

> We are very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

She pointed out in another quote:

> This is about the happiest I have seen members in a long time.

How happy are the tea partyers about the tea party shutdown? Here is what Republican Representative DEVIN NUNES said: ''They are all giddy about it.''

The dictionary definitions of ''giddy'' say, ''feeling or showing great happiness and joy. Joyfully elated, euphoric.'' ''Giddy'' also means ''lightheartedly, silly'' or ''dizzy'' and ''disoriented,'' but that is another story.

Elated, giddy, exactly what we wanted—now they say they are profiting from it. Here is GOP cheerleader John Tamny, in Forbes magazine. I am quoting.

> Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government—

and get this—

> and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

I will say that again:

> Republican politicians and members of the Party should cheer. . . . The Republican Party . . . decision to allow a shutdown of the federal government and to ideally allow it to remain shut through the 2014 elections . . . is . . . good politics.

Echoing that sentiment we had our colleague Senator RAND PAUL the other day say, ''We're going to win this, I think.''

So the tea party warned of the tea party shutdown, the tea party wanted the tea party shutdown, the tea party is cheering the tea party shutdown. They are so happy that they are giddy. And they are claiming that their tea

party shutdown is a big success. It is a little late now to say, well, it is really not our tea party shutdown.

I have also heard colleagues come to the floor and say nothing they are doing is extremist. It is not extremist to shut down the government and make the demands they are making. One dictionary definition for extremist is ''one who advocates or resorts to measures beyond the norm, especially in politics.''

I would say that shutting down the U.S. Government is beyond the norm, even in politics. I would say refusing to ever allow a vote on a Senate-passed bill under the constitutional procedures that prevail between our Houses is beyond the norm. And I would say that deliberately putting hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country out of work is beyond the norm.

The norm would be for them to vote on our Senate bill over in the House. Over and over we in the Senate have voted on their House measures. We voted to strip out the extraneous measure and send back the continuing resolution. We voted to table. We followed the Constitution, we have done our duty, and we have voted. They in the House may not like that they do not win the Senate vote, but we did our duty in the Senate and have repeatedly voted on House measures.

Over in the House they have not yet once voted on the Senate measure. It is sitting on the Speaker's desk without ever a single vote. If the Speaker called up the Senate measure and allowed a vote over there in the House, it would pass and the tea party shutdown would be over. But, remember, who wants this shutdown in order to use it for bargaining leverage? The giddy folks, the folks who are so happy they have caused this, the folks who think this is good politics.

I think it is safe to say they are extremists, both by the dictionary definition and in their disregard of our traditional back and forth, one House voting on the other House's measure.

Last, and this one is particularly rich, they say we won't negotiate. Let's remember that this all began with a deal negotiated between the Speaker and the majority leader that we pass a clean continuing resolution funding the government. What did the Speaker get out of that deal? We agreed to fund the government at the Speaker's level. He actually won that negotiation. That was what was negotiated. But the Speaker did not honor the deal.

As I say, it is rich that we negotiate, we give the Speaker the funding level he wants, then he breaks the deal and now claims we won't negotiate.

One of my colleagues came to the floor a little while ago and he called to mind the radio commentator Paul Harvey. Paul Harvey used to have his catchphrase in his radio broadcast, ''and now for the rest of the story.'' And he talked about the rest of the story. The President has made his position very clear. It is: We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Open the government and we will negotiate about everything and anything. But we will not negotiate while you are holding hostages.

All the Republicans report in this Chamber is the first part: We will not negotiate. It is not a question of the rest of the story, how about the rest of the sentence? We will not negotiate while you are holding hostages. Remember that 19 times we have tried to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget between the Senate and the House and every time, the tea party extremists have stopped us. Let's remember that they do not want to negotiate. They want to negotiate with hostages. That is a very different thing. They want to negotiate with hostages, hundreds of thousands of people who serve our country whom they are using as hostages and will not let go back to work and earn their living. That is not just negotiation. There is something more than just negotiation going on when it involves hostages or other threats.

Every mom whose 4-year-old is having a tantrum over not getting what they want knows that is not just negotiation. Every 12-year-old picked on by the school bully in the school playground knows that is not just negotiation. And every businessman who is asked to pay protection money knows that is not just negotiation. There is something else going on. Ordinary Americans get the difference between negotiating in good faith, the way we have to if we had appointed conferees and went to have an actual conference between the House and the Senate about our budget, the way the rules in the Constitution propose, and negotiating with a threat or negotiating while holding hostages.

We are not going to negotiate while you are holding hostages. There are two parts to that sentence.

May I have 1 minute to conclude? I see Senator PORTMAN has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader said publicly he will negotiate on anything and everything as soon as the hostages are released and the tea party shutdown has ended. To now blame the majority leader for this tea party shutdown reminds me of when President Lincoln was put in such a position. When President Lincoln was accused of the very thing he was trying to prevent, he said:

> That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth: ''Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!''

That was Abraham Lincoln.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam chair, we find ourselves here in Washington with the government shutdown in place and a debt limit approaching, and I read this morning in the newspaper that a senior White House official has said with regard to the shutdown, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us'' how long it lasts.

That is not the right attitude. Today I call upon the White House to stop the political posturing, to come to the table so we can find common ground and end this government shutdown and negotiate something sensible on the debt limit. This notion that a senior White House official would say, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us'' how long it lasts, shows that it is politics, not substance that matters.

It may not matter to the White House how long it lasts, by the way, but it does matter to the American people because they expect us to fulfill our constitutional duties, to get our work done, and not to take America to the brink. They expect us to do the job that we were sent here to do.

It matters, by the way, to a lot of Americans because they are being affected by it. There are 8,700 civilian employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base outside of Dayton, OH, who are being affected. It matters to the roughly 1,800 Ohio National Guardsmen across the State of Ohio who have been furloughed.

We can stand here and point fingers at each other as to how we got here. The truth is that how we got here is we didn't do our work. The fact that we have a continuing resolution at all, which is a continuation of funding from last fiscal year, is a mark of failure. It is a mark of failure because it means that the Congress didn't do the appropriations bills that it was supposed to do. There are 12 of them, and the idea is that Congress sits down and has hearings about the departments and agencies to provide proper oversight to the Federal Government, and then they put together appropriations bills in 12 different areas. That hasn't happened. Congress did not pass these appropriations bills in an orderly way. If they did, there would not be a continuing resolution.

We can talk about the fact that over the last 4 years, under the leadership of the majority in the Senate, we have passed exactly 1 appropriations bill out of 48, on time—1 out of 48. That was the military construction bill. I think it was in about 2011. That should be a relatively easy one to pass.

The House has done better. They have passed more appropriations bills, and they passed a budget consistently every year. This year—in the fourth year after 3 years of no budget—the Senate did pass a budget, and I applaud the Senate for that. I do support going to conference with those budgets, but the fact is that Congress has not done its work, and that is why we are here. Only 1 appropriations bill out of 48 in the last 4 years has passed this Senate on time—one.

There is another way to get around this, and we can talk about that. There is legislation called the end government shutdown bill, which simply continues funding from year to year. If we

get to September 30, and any appropriations bill is not done, it says we will have the same level of funding as the previous year, except after 120 days there is a 1 percent reduction in funding, and after another 90 days, there is another 1 percent reduction in funding, and so on. The reason is to encourage the appropriators to meet and get their work done, so we put a little inducement in there.

That legislation is bipartisan. We voted on that legislation in the Chamber earlier this year. It was supported by 46 of the 100 members. It was supported by every Republican except for two, and it was supported by three Democrats. It is my legislation, and we tried to bring this up as an amendment last week on the continuing resolution. It would have made all the sense in the world. Instead of us having this discussion we are having now in the context of a government shutdown, if we had passed the end government shutdown amendment to the CR last week, we would continue funding from last year knowing it would be reduced by 1 percent in 120 days, which gives us plenty of time to get the appropriations together, and then another 1 percent after 90 days, and another 1 percent after the next 90 days.

We wouldn't be sitting here today in the situation of a government shutdown had we passed that. The majority refused to allow that amendment to even come up for a vote. I don't know if we could have passed it or not. Again, 46 of us supported it last time. My sense is, given the fact that we were heading toward a government shutdown, we could have gotten a majority of this body to support that. But we don't know because, as is the case so often, the leadership here blocks amendments, so we never had the opportunity to have our voices be heard as Senators.

Without a doubt, there is plenty of blame to go around, but whatever brought us to this point, it is where we are. I can promise this: As long as the White House and the majority in this Chamber continue to refuse to talk about it and negotiate, and as long as they refuse to attempt to find common ground—any common ground—we are not going to make progress. As long as they treat it as a political opportunity, one to score political points, then we are not going to be able to move forward. It is a failure of leadership because governing is about talking, negotiating, discussing, debating, and then finding common ground. It is hard, but it is what we are hired to do.

We talk a lot in this Chamber about this notion of finding common ground, and I support it strongly. We don't do it enough. But to find common ground, you have to step off your own territory and on to some territory in the middle, and that requires negotiations. It requires sitting down with both parties and talking. It is what the American people, by the way, want us to do. They do it in their lives every day. We do it in our marriages and in our businesses. Yet, there is this unbelievable quote from this morning that I talked about by some senior official at the White House saying, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't matter to us'' how long it lasts.

We have legislation coming over from the House to this Chamber that says: Let's have a conference. That is the conference between the House and the Senate. So there is a formal process where we have conferees over here—people to represent the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, and to represent the House, Republican and Democratic conferees. They come together and discuss, in this case, the continuing resolution and the debt limit, and that was tabled here. In other words, the majority here did not want to move to conference, so they blocked it. To me that seems to be the wrong approach. Let's have a conference and a discussion.

By the way, this is on top of a hardline position the President has taken, and I have talked about this over the last month because the President has been saying it for the last month. He has refused to talk about or negotiate on the debt limit. That is coming up in only a couple of weeks. As important as the government shutdown debate is, in my view, the debt limit discussion is even more important because it puts our country's economy at risk.

I don't think we should be taking a position on anything if we don't talk, but certainly not on the debt limit discussion. The irony, which has been pointed out by others, is that we have a President of the United States who says he will negotiate with President Putin of Russia, but he will not talk with the Speaker of the House who is in the other party. To me it is irresponsible. It is a failure of leadership, and I don't think it is sustainable. I hope it is not.

By the way, the President has said he refuses to talk about the debt limit because we should just extend the debt limit without any preconditions, without any reduction in spending, without even any discussion of what should go along with a debt limit extension. That, my friends, is not consistent with the historical precedent either. Every President, Republican and Democrat alike, has engaged in negotiations and discussions about the debt limit, in part, frankly, because the debt limit is a hard vote. The folks I represent back home get it. For them it is kind of like the credit card. Their deal is: OK, Congress has once again gone over their limit on their credit card.

I have to be careful which credit card I hold up. I am not advertising for any particular one. This happens to be a MasterCard.

They are saying: Before you guys extend the limit on the credit card, let's deal with the underlying problem. It's kind of like if your teenager puts you, as a parent, in a position of having gone over the line on the credit card. We have teenagers here who I am sure have never done that. Your parents would probably say, after they rip up the credit card, let's get at the underlying problem, which is the spending problem. Why are we spending more than we are taking in to the point we have to keep extending the limit on this credit card?

The American people get it. That is why every President—Republicans and Democrats alike—has had to come to Congress and say: OK, how are we going to work together to extend this debt limit while also dealing with the underlying problem, which is the fact that we are spending too much? But this President refuses to do it.

I have gone back and looked. For the last 3 decades the debt limit discussion is the only thing that has led to Congress doing anything substantial on spending. This is a period at which Congress has consistently spent more than it has taken in. Congress and the Presidents—Republican and Democrat alike—have led the country into deficits and debt. We are now at historic levels. This year the debt is just under $17 trillion. We are in uncharted territory. This year it is higher than ever. Yet this President is saying, unlike other Presidents, that he refuses to even talk about it.

I will tell you what has happened. Over the last 30 years, every substantial deficit reduction has come in the context of a debt limit debate. Some may remember Gramm-Rudman back in the 1980s. It was considered historic legislation at the time, when we had smaller deficits and a much smaller debt. But it provided rescissions—across-the-board spending cuts. It was bipartisan. It came out of a debt limit discussion.

In 1990, when President George H.W. Bush, the first President Bush, went out to Andrews Air Force Base, with Republicans and Democrats alike, to negotiate a budget agreement, it was in the context of a debt limit discussion. The pay-go rules that many Democrats now talk about favorably came out of the discussion about the debt limit.

The 1997 balanced budget agreement with Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton that ended up leading to the balanced budget we got a couple of years later came out of a discussion about the debt limit. Most recently, of course, the Budget Control Act came out of a discussion about the debt limit.

So this notion that Presidents never talk about or negotiate on the debt limit is just not accurate in terms of our history. In fact, just the opposite is true. It is the only time we have been able to reduce spending.

I see the distinguished majority leader is on the floor, so I will be short.

We need to figure out how to come together. The President needs to engage. It is time to govern. If the President refuses to talk, we will not be able to come to an agreement. If he does engage, as history has shown us, tough decisions can be made.

I have gone through a litany of times when we have done it. I have also talked about the fact that this year we have a bigger debt than ever, a bigger deficit than any of those historical examples I gave. Therefore, there is a greater need than ever for us to come together and find that common ground.

Mr. WICKER. If the Senator would yield for a moment. I think the distinguished majority leader is going to make a procedural motion which will take only a moment, and then I have a question for my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I will be happy to yield.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 5 p.m., and that all the provisions under the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate my two friends for yielding for this consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, as far as I am concerned, my distinguished friend from Ohio can still have the floor. I only wanted to take a moment to congratulate him on his remarks and to observe that when it comes to budget matters, he knows whereof he speaks. He not only has a distinguished record in the House of Representatives, but he is a leader in being a budget hawk and was an opponent of additional debt in the House of Representatives, and has had a distinguished career in the Office of Management and Budget. So I thank the distinguished Senator.

It may be that he has already asked for an opinion piece from today's Wall Street Journal to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PORTMAN. I have not.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time an opinion piece written by Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey on page 23 in today's Wall Street Journal entitled ''Obama Rewrites Debt-Limit History.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 2013]

OBAMA REWRITES DEBT-LIMIT HISTORY

(By Kevin Hassett and Abby McCloskey)

As the government shutdown continues, the nation gets closer and closer to the day—probably Oct. 17—when Washington hits the debt limit, and with it the specter of default. President Obama may be getting nervous about what will happen to his negotiating position as that day approaches.

He keeps asserting that the debt limit has never been used ''to extort a president or a government party.'' Treasury Secretary Jack Lew is selling the same story, saying ''until very recently, Congress typically raised the debt ceiling on a routine basis . . . the threat of default was not a bargaining chip in the negotiations.''

This is simply untrue. Consider the shenanigans of congressional Democrats in 1989 over Medicare's catastrophic health coverage provision.

In this case, the problem was political infighting within the Democratic Party between the House and the Senate. ''Weeks of political maneuvering brought the government to the brink of financial default,'' the New York Times wrote on Nov. 8 of that year. The debt limit was raised just hours before all extraordinary measures to avoid default were exhausted. The final bill dropped any action on Medicare but included a measure to repeal 1986 tax rules barring discrimination in employer-paid health insurance plans.

The Obama administration's campaign to make the debt limit appear non-negotiable might reflect concern that Republican congressional strategy might actually work. Six out of 10 Americans say ''it is right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised, even if it risks default,'' according to a Sept. 26 Bloomberg poll. (Only 28% say ''the debt ceiling should be raised when necessary, with no conditions.'')

One thing is certain: The debt limit has been a powerful negotiating tool in the last several decades. It has enabled the passage of important additional legislation.

According to the Congressional Research Service, Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about $16 trillion from $752 billion. Of these 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in a split Congress, and seven in a Republican-controlled Congress.

While large increases that give the U.S. Treasury a healthy amount of borrowing space happen occasionally, small short-term increases are common. In 1990 alone, while Republican George H.W. Bush was in the White House, a Democratic-controlled Congress voted to increase the debt limit seven times.

Congressional Republicans who want legislative conditions in exchange for a debt-limit increase are following a strategy that has been pursued by both parties the majority of the time. Of the 53 increases in the debt limit, 26 were ''clean''—that is, stand-alone, no strings-attached statutes. The remaining debt-limit increases were part of an omnibus package of other legislative bills or a continuing resolution. Other times, the limit was paired with reforms, only some of which were related to the budget.

In 1979, a Democratic Congress increased the debt limit but required Congress and the president to present balanced budgets for fiscal years 1981 and 1982. In 1980 the debt limit, again increased by a Democratic Congress, included repeal of an oil-import fee. In 1985, the debt limit that was raised by a divided Congress included a cigarette tax and a provision requiring Congress to pursue an alternative minimum corporate tax in the next year.

Most recently, a divided Congress that passed the 2011 debt-limit increase included the Budget Control Act which aimed to reduce the deficit by $2.4 trillion over 10 years and included the automatic budget sequester that kicked in on Jan. 1.

As the finger pointing begins, it is important to keep this history in mind. All told, congressional Democrats have been responsible for 60% of the ''dirty'' increases when the debt limit was raised alongside other legislative items. Republicans were responsible for 15%. The remaining 25% occurred during divided Congresses.

Of the Democratic dirties, six occurred when Democrats also controlled the White House, and 10 occurred when a Republican controlled the White House. For Republicans, all four occurred while a Democrat held the presidency.

Debt-limit votes often have been contentious, but on the whole they serve an important function. First, they force painful votes by legislators who would prefer to offer supporters free lunches through unfunded spending programs. Without these votes, politicians of both parties would have a significantly easier time ignoring fiscal discipline.

Second, debt-limit votes have provided a regular vehicle for legislation. Divided governments have a difficult time passing anything. Since the consequences of government default are so severe, debt-limit legislation has always passed in the end, and it has often included important additional legislative accomplishments.

Third, the debt limit has provided significant leverage to the minority party and has been a check on the power of the presidency.

Republicans today are playing a role that has been played many times. While the debt-limit kabuki inevitably roils markets as deadlines approach, the alternative absence of fiscal discipline would make government insolvency more probable in the fullness of time.

Trying to separate ObamaCare from the debt limit, President Obama has asserted that his health law has ''nothing to do with the budget.'' His argument is eagerly echoed by an at-best ignorant media. The Affordable Care Act was passed under ''reconciliation''—a legislative process that is used only for budget measures and which limits congressional debate.

The notion that legislation passed as part of a budget might be reconsidered as part of subsequent budget legislation should be uncontroversial. Perhaps that is why the administration has staked so much on its misrepresentation of history.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

This article points out in a very detailed and annotated way a number of times when this Congress has made policy changes, important, far-reaching policy changes, in connection with negotiations on the debt ceiling increase.

So I join my friend from Ohio in saying it is absolutely incumbent on this Senate—Republicans and our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle—as well as Members of the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, to, once again, negotiate in good faith.

The President may feel we are entirely unreasonable in our position. Frankly, there have been times during my 19 years in the House and now in the Senate when I felt the Chief Executive was completely wrong in his viewpoint on how we should address our national debt. But at no time in my recollection have the parties been simply unwilling to sit down and talk at all or to have meetings in the White House and in those meetings to basically say we are not going to make counterproposals or to say publicly: Why should I offer them anything at all? I think the American people see that is an unworkable approach.

So I point out to my colleagues, and I thank the Senator from Ohio in

pointing out that very important fiscal decisions, very important debt-related decisions have absolutely been made in our Nation's history, and I am glad they have been made in connection with this debate on the national debt.

I yield back to my friend from Ohio and thank him for allowing me to intrude on his time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, if the Senator will hold for a moment, first, I thank the Senator for referring to the op-ed in the Wall Street Journal. I have not seen it yet so I look forward to reading it myself. It sounds as though it is consistent with what I was pointing out, which is it would only make sense that the American people would want us to reduce spending when we extend the debt limit yet again—again, at historic levels now. The American people get it. They know we can't keep spending more than we take in, so they expect us to do something about the underlying problem.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, the Senator from Ohio mentioned the Budget Control Act of 2011. It wasn't a particularly pretty way to do debt reduction, but it did give us the spending levels we are operating under now.

The authors of this opinion piece go on to point out that according to the Congressional Research Service—an independent arm of this government—Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about $16 trillion. In at least 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in split Congresses, and 7 in Republican-controlled Congresses. It goes on to point out time and again how important policy changes were made in connection with this debate.

So I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to ask my friend from Mississippi a question. He has been stalwart on budget debates and he is a guy who has always held the line, in the House and in the Senate. He voted for the Budget Control Act because he believes we need to get our spending under control. He also wants to ensure that we deal with the part of the budget that is not being talked about because the whole continuing resolution debate is about 35 percent of the budget. The other 65 percent, which is the faster growing part, based on the Congressional Budget Office, parts of that—the health care entitlements—will grow over 100 percent over the next 10 years. I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he is hearing back home what I am hearing from my constituents, which is they want us to do something on the spending before we extend the credit card limit again.

I wonder if he could tell us what he is hearing back home, given his background.

Mr. WICKER. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the American people are alarmed, actually, at the level of debt this government has run up, particularly in the last 4½ to 5 years. It has been astounding. We cannot continue to add debt upon debt for the next generation, many of whom are within the sound of our voices and some of whom are employed as our pages. The Senator has already referred to them today. We owe them a government that grows our debt at a much slower rate.

We have done it before. When the distinguished Senator and I were in the House of Representatives, we were told we could not balance the budget within 10 years. Actually, with the leadership of my friend from Ohio, we passed legislation. We had the cooperation of the President of the United States who negotiated with us, and that divided government balanced the budget not within 10 years but within 3 or 4 years, and we fulfilled that until the terrorist attacks of 2001.

So, yes, the American people are concerned. I think we would be doing a disservice to them, simply to go along with a debt increase without addressing the underlying problems. As my friend from Ohio knows, the President of the United States himself in this budget has proposed very significant changes in the growth rate of certain of our entitlement programs, which would go a long way toward getting us to a bipartisan resolution on this issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator raises an important point, which is that the larger part of the budget—the 65 percent of the budget that is not being debated as part of a continuing resolution, not subject to congressional appropriations and the faster growing part of the budget—is an issue the President actually did address in his own budget. In fact, he laid out a number of proposals called mandatory spending reforms that would help to reduce some of the debt by reducing some of the cost increases on that 65 percent of the budget.

By the way, 65 percent today, 10 years from now will be 76 percent of the budget. The departments and agencies that are appropriated every year are only 35 percent, soon to be reduced to 24 percent of the budget. So that is a very good point the Senator makes.

The President himself has pointed out that we need to make changes. Yet he refuses to negotiate, refuses to talk, refuses to consider any of these proposals. It doesn't seem to make sense, and it is certainly not in the interests of the American people, the people from Mississippi and the people from Ohio.

I thank my colleague from Mississippi for joining me. I look forward to reading the new material he has provided for the RECORD today. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as my colleagues have done on several occasions, I come to the floor also to speak on the shutdown and the pending effort to find a compromise we can finally get to the President of the United States. Today, specifically, I come to the floor to take issue with a remark made by the President on Tuesday this week regarding the health care reform bill that he also sometimes calls ObamaCare. He said:

> The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

While I understand the President's position on the law that now is referred to by his name, he also misses the point. On Monday night, the Senate had the opportunity to keep the government running. The Senate had a bill that funded the government and did so without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. As we all know, the Senate voted down that bill. So let me repeat: The government could have been kept open without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. Anyone who says anything different is simply not being accurate.

What did the bill Monday night seek to do? The bill sought to delay the implementation of the individual mandate for 1 year and require executive branch appointees to go to the exchanges. Those are changes to ObamaCare.

Apparently, the President doesn't believe we are allowed to make any changes whatsoever to ObamaCare. I would respect that position if the President actually enforced it over the last several years, as he had bills presented to him that he signed and that actually made some changes in the health care reform law. In fact, Congress has made numerous changes to ObamaCare since it was signed into law. I have a list here, but it is a list I will read in its entirety so people know the President has accepted changes to his prime piece of legislation and so I can refute that the President isn't consistent when I go back now to his quotation when he says:

> The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

By that, I think the President is signifying that we can't do anything to touch the issue whatsoever, even to the minimal extent that we tried to Monday night.

So this list was conveniently assembled not by this Senator but by the Congressional Research Service, and it was done on behalf of Senator COBURN.

In the 111th Congress, to start with the first change we made that the President accepted, H.R. 4887 clarified that health care provided under TRICARE, TRICARE for Life, and the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program constitutes ''minimal essential health care coverage.''

Then we had H.R. 5014, clarifying that the health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs constitutes, according to the health care reform bill, ''minimal essential health care coverage.''

H.R. 1586 modified the definition of average manufacturer price to include inhalation, infusion, implanted or injectable drugs that are not generally dispensed through a retail community pharmacy.

H.R. 4994 offset the costs of the Medicare and Medicaid Program extensions and the postponement of cuts in Medicare physician payments with a change in the Affordable Care Act, but the President signed it.

H.R. 4853 extended the nonrefundable adoption tax credit through tax year 2012.

H.R. 6523 extended TRICARE coverage to dependent adult children up to age 26, to conform with the private health insurance requirements under the Affordable Care Act. The President signed that.

In the 112th Congress, H.R. 4 repealed the requirement that businesses file an information report whenever they pay a vendor more than $600 for goods in a single year.

H.R. 674 modified the calculation of modified adjusted gross income to include Social Security benefits.

H.R. 3630 reduced the Prevention and Public Health Fund annual appropriations over the period from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2021 by a total of $6.25 billion to help offset the cost of extending the payroll tax cut. That is a monumental change in the bill. The President signed that.

H.R. 4348 modified the Medicaid disaster-recovery FMAP adjustment by changing the adjustment factor and the effective date.

H.R. 8 transferred 10 percent of the remaining unobligated Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan—and we call that the CO-OP—program funds to a new CO-OP contingency fund and rescinded the other 90 percent of those funds and repealed the CLASS Act.

H.R. 1473 was another bill that the President signed. It canceled $2.2 billion of the $6 billion appropriation for the CO-OP program.

H.R. 2055 rescinded $400 million of the remaining $3.8 billion for the CO-OP program, rescinded $10 million of the $15 million fiscal year 2012 appropriations for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, instructed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Web site with detailed information on the allocation of moneys in the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and prohibited use of those funds for lobbying, publicity or propaganda purposes. That bill was signed by the President.

H.R. 933 rescinded $200 million of the $500 million transfer from the Medicare Part A and Part B trust funds for the 5-year Community-Based Care Transition Program and rescinded $10 million of the Independent Payment Advisory Board's fiscal year 2013 appropriation.

These are changes made by Congress to the law the President refers to as settled law. When he talks about settled law, he talks to us that the Affordable Care Act cannot be changed now as we are debating things with a continuing resolution. Obviously, the act is not so settled that Congress cannot and has not amended it in the last several years.

But as we all know, the President, through his own actions, has, in addition, considered ObamaCare not to be settled law either. The President has, through administrative action himself, made numerous changes to ObamaCare.

In February, the President delayed application of the out-of-pocket limits. In March, the President delayed implementation of the Basic Health Plan Option. Also, in March, the President delayed a requirement that small business exchanges offer a choice of plans. In July, the President delayed the exchange applicant eligibility and verification. In July, in perhaps the most famous example, the President delayed implementation of the employer mandate. In regard to that, there were even Members of the President's party in the Senate—that said the President did not have the legal authority to do that.

So on Monday night, House Republicans sent the Senate a bill that did not defund or delay ObamaCare. It continued funding our government. It simply sought to amend ObamaCare in the same way—dozens of times—as I have just illustrated it has been amended. There was not even any debate of the proposals on their merits. It was simply handled in the most simple way you can here, tabled by the Democratic leadership. Now we hear about the farcical issue of settled law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, could I have 2 more minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do not know where this settled law legal theory comes from. I would note that some of my colleagues have ignored this theory during previous health care debates.

In 2003, Congress passed a law, a bipartisan law, called the Medicare Modernization Act. This law passed with Members of both parties supporting it. It was signed into law by the President. It survived any court challenges that were made against it. It was, by the same token, settled law. That did not stop my colleagues from proposing legislation to amend Part D, called the Medicare Modernization Act. In fact, Democrats, including Members still currently in the Senate, proposed and voted to alter the Medicare Modernization Act by striking the noninterference clause. We considered that proposal and debated it on its merits, as we should have the amendments to the Affordable Care Act recently offered. We did not dismiss it as offensive because it sought to amend a settled law.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the Democrats' unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over the proposals to amend ObamaCare, not defund it or delay it.

We are where we are because the majority refuses to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans are by going to the exchange.

In the wash of words that we will hear on the floor, I hope this simple truth can be heard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, recently there was a disturbing poll in the Washington Post. It said that most Americans fear that the American dream is passing them by. Almost 65 percent worry that they cannot make ends meet with their current incomes. That is up from 48 percent in 1971.

We are not talking about luxuries—just basic living expenses: food and clothing for their kids, a roof over their family's head, just getting by day-to-day. So many of our fellow citizens are working harder than ever and still feel as though they are falling behind. They wonder: Where is the country headed?

This week, they are wondering more than ever, watching the spectacle here in Washington, watching the government shut down, grinding to a halt. I am hearing from my constituents, from people in New Mexico, and they are frustrated and worried. They are concerned about the U.S. Department of Agriculture crop payments, as we head into the harvest, when they need financing the most. They are concerned about being able to close on mortgages with Federal backing, with their loans on hold.

Many New Mexicans are going to be furloughed without pay. This hurts their families and all the businesses that rely on them in our economy—restaurants, retailers, car washes, landscapers, any type of business one can imagine.

This shutdown did not have to happen. We are not debating the amount of the budget. The fact is, House Republicans are demanding concessions just for keeping the lights on at the Federal Government.

I think most Americans have two questions. How did we get into this mess and how do we get out of it?

We are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression, but recovery is underway. We have seen 42

months of private sector job growth. That is 7.5 million jobs. That is hope for millions of families. We have had nine consecutive quarters of economic growth—the longest stretch since the recession hit in 2008. So we are slowly making our way back—not fast enough, with too many folks still struggling, and with great challenges for the future.

This is a time for leadership, for working together. Americans expect their leaders to act as grownups. But they feel they are watching a schoolyard spat. Is it any wonder they hold Congress in such contempt or that they worry about the kind of country they will leave their children?

Here is what we should be doing. We should have a farm bill by now. We should have comprehensive immigration reform, and we should have a serious budget—one that would get rid of sequestration's meat-cleaver cuts with targeted spending reductions, tackling the deficit, reforming the Tax Code, helping the middle class and small businesses, helping families and seniors who are struggling, moving ahead with smart investments in infrastructure, creating jobs, investing in our future.

The Senate passed that budget 6 months ago. But the House went in a completely different direction. Their budget put tax cuts for the richest Americans above funding for education and ensuring the safety of our roads and bridges.

Democrats and Republicans have differences. That is no surprise. But we still have a job to do. We still need to sit down and work it out. But a minority in the House has blocked our way forward—not once, not twice but time and time again.

American families and businesses need a long-term budget. Businesses do not hire on a monthly basis. They need certainty and the confidence that their government is working to create an environment for growth. We are giving them neither; instead, we lurch from crisis to crisis.

The worst thing about it is it does not have to be this way. This is a manufactured crisis, a series of self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The American people do not want this. They want a strong economy. They want jobs and a government that can actually get something done for the middle class, not just for Wall Street billionaires. The American people want a government that works, not a government shutdown.

There is no logic behind this crisis. Why are we here? Because the other side wants to kill the Affordable Care Act. I respect the diversity of views in America and in Congress. But the Affordable Care Act passed Congress like every other bill. It passed the House, it passed the Senate, and the President signed it. If Republicans want to repeal this law, they should make their case to the American people and work to pass their own health care law. What is happening is unprecedented, disruptive, and undemocratic behavior.

We heard a lot of indignation—hour after hour of it. But here is the thing: It does not stop the Affordable Care Act. This whole stunt has been a colossal waste of time, and wasting time is something we cannot afford. The real problems facing our Nation are still waiting.

Everyone outside of a radical group of obstructionists knows this is silly, knows this is misguided and dangerous to our economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, business leaders from coast to coast—there is a loud chorus of: Stop. This is enough. But, so far, it is not loud enough.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I am not going to come here to the floor and say the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What law is? But it is the law of the land. It is being implemented. Shutting down the government does not change that. Here is what a shutdown does do: 27,000 Federal employees in my State could be furloughed and lose their income. Nearly half of the civilian workers for the Department of Defense will be sent home. In New Mexico, that is over 6,500 people who help defend this country, and they may not be paid.

Social Security applications could be jeopardized. Calls to SSA for help could go unanswered. Federal loans would be delayed for tens of thousands of folks trying to buy a home or applying for a small business loan. Those doors may be locked. National parks will close. So will museums and monuments.

This hurts the tourist economy in my State and hurts small businesses. During the last shutdown, 7 million tourists were turned away. Our veterans, who already face too many delays in their claims for benefits, could face even more. During the last shutdown, more than 400,000 veterans saw their disability and pension claims delayed.

Students will also be hurt. Work-study and Perkins loan payments would stop. Pregnant women and mothers who need nutrition assistance for their children may not get it. All of this is because the other side wants to send a message on ObamaCare? Well, it has a very high price, costing our Nation billions of dollars every day and hurting Federal agencies, including our critical national labs such as Los Alamos and Sandia, in their important national security mission.

Wall Street is on edge. Main Street is on edge. Families are worried. Communities suffer. There is another cost. The paralysis of government sends a terrible message, a terrible message of failure and dysfunction.

What is next? The debt ceiling. Holding the credit of the United States of America hostage for political gain. Instead of serious debate, we have ultimatums. Instead of regular order, we have midnight shutdowns. Instead of compromise, we have all or nothing, take it or leave it.

My friend from New Mexico, MSG Jessey Baca, summed it up well in an interview with KOB-TV back home. He said:

> I'm not angry. I'm frustrated because of the way we've always been taught to work together to get things done, you work together—and that just doesn't seem to be happening. Settle your differences.

Jessey is right. We need to start working together. We have not done that. So here we are on the wrong train, on the wrong track going nowhere. It is hurting families, hurting communities, could derail our economy with the recovery still under way.

The hard-working families of this country want a government that works, not one that shuts down just to send a message. Meanwhile, those families wait—wait for us to meet the real challenges that face our Nation and that make a real difference in their lives and the lives of their children.

Before I finish, I want to discuss the subcommittee I chair on Appropriations, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee. We work with agencies that are critical to keeping the economy running smoothly. I have to speak up and make sure that those who are causing this shutdown know exactly how badly the country needs the government to reopen. This shutdown is jeopardizing consumer safety. It is adding to the uncertainty facing our financial markets. It is doing real damage on our economy.

Our subcommittee funds the Small Business Administration. Small business owners are really going to take a hit in this shutdown. The SBA, Small Business Administration, is closed. I do not know about my colleagues, but the top concern I hear from small business owners in New Mexico is how hard it is to get a loan to expand. The SBA approves an average of $86 million in loans to small businesses each day. But while the government is shut down, our Nation's job creators are not getting those resources. If the shutdown continues, 28 million small businesses will no longer be able to get capital from the SBA to expand.

There are other impacts too. Each day the government is closed our economy grinds down a little further. The shutdown is affecting the services that keep our capital markets safe. The CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, will have just 4 percent of its normal staff during the shutdown. That means markets will be without effective oversight.

We are about to hit the debt ceiling, our Nation's borrowing limit. It is a potentially dangerous financial situation. The shutdown has put our watchdog at the CFTC and the SEC to sleep. Global markets are open, Wall Street is open, but investor protection agencies are closed. It is an open invitation to financial abuse.

The shutdown is also putting the safety of our children at risk. Christmas may seem far away, but companies are already working to get ready for the holiday season. They are shipping

goods in from overseas, including millions of toys. During this shutdown, only 22 employees at the Consumer Product Safety Commission will be available nationwide. That is 22 people to inspect millions of imported toys and gifts, gifts that American families will be putting under the Christmas tree. These agencies were created by Congress to protect American investors and consumers, to help small businesses. It is a travesty that tea party Republicans in the House have been allowed to hold the country hostage. That is unconscionable. Real people are being hurt, the people who are going without pay, without veterans' benefits or survivor benefits, without important financial and consumer protections.

You know the one that is the most devastating to me? People who are going without food. Here we are talking about millions of women and children in this country in poverty.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it has been 7 days since we passed a piece of legislation to fund the government. I wonder how many days it will be that the Speaker makes the American people wait to open the government. How long is he going to make them wait before the government is open? It is a real hardship not only to the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees but the people who depend on the Federal employees for their own jobs. So it is very unfortunate.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have not had a harder working Senator in the past 9 months than the Presiding Officer.

You have worked so hard doing so many different things, not the least of which is presiding over the Senate. You have presided over the Senate in the early morning hours, late-night hours. It is remarkable. I so appreciate your doing this. The entire Senate, Democrats and Republicans, has expressed their appreciation through me to the Presiding Officer for the good work you do in trying to make this place better. Not only do you preside, but you do a good job. You are dignified, and you do it with authority.

The people of Wisconsin are so fortunate to have the distinguished Presiding Officer as a Senator. I have had the good fortune to serve with a number of other Senators from Wisconsin. Russ Feingold was such a good friend. I miss him very much. Herb Kohl is a unique individual who added a great deal to the Senate with the many things he did as a long-term member of the Appropriations Committee. However, none of the Senators I have served with from Wisconsin will outshine the distinguished Presiding Officer. You have been remarkably good. You have only been here a short period of time, but in the short period of time you have been here, you have had admirable dedication to this institution.

Senator BALDWIN is a native of Wisconsin—the first woman ever to represent that great State.

As frequently as you have presided, you have enjoyed a front-row seat. History is being made during this congressional session. Some of the sessions you have watched haven't been too much fun, but it has been good, and you have done such a remarkably good job.

On behalf of all of the Senators, I congratulate you and thank you for your service to the Senate. This is the first Golden Gavel Award. There will be a presentation made at our caucus this Tuesday to recognize your distinction. This is something that is traditional, the Golden Gavel. It is a beautiful memento we will present to you on Tuesday.

MARSHALL LEGACY INSTITUTE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to recognize the work of the Marshall Legacy Institute, MLI, and extend my congratulations on its 16th anniversary. While serving as Secretary of State, GEN George C. Marshall devised a plan to rebuild Europe after the devastation of World War II. Founded in 1997 on the 50th anniversary of the plan that bears General Marshall's name, the MLI's goal is to extend the plan's legacy by helping rebuild today's war torn countries.

Over the past 16 years, the MLI has focused on assisting severely mine-contaminated countries, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, and Afghanistan, by clearing mines, offering survivors' assistance programs, and providing educational outreach to children. This work is vital to civilians who, when they are finally able to return to their homelands after war, often face the unpredictable threat of landmines. It is also critical to protecting the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, who risk their lives every day to defend our country and often serve where landmines pose a significant threat to their safety.

One such servicemember is PFC Barrett Austin, a combat engineer in the 4th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division who bravely served our country in Afghanistan, and who died on April 21, 2013, after his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Austin's dedicated service, selflessness, and sacrifice were the qualities that General Marshall exemplified and valued. It is therefore fitting that the MLI pay tribute to this soldier through its Mine Detection Dog Partnership Program by naming a mine detection dog in his honor.

I thank MLI for its 16 years of service, and for its continued efforts to make our world a safer place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr.

SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 265. A resolution expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 266. A resolution designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1567, a bill to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

S. RES. 227

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 227, a resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 265—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, AND COMMENDING AND THANKING MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, FIRST RESPONDERS, AND CIVIL SERVANTS FOR THEIR COURAGE AND PROFESSIONALISM

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSINOS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 265

Whereas, on September 16, 2013, a tragic mass shooting took place at the Washington Navy Yard in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the people of the United States mourn the loss of the 12 innocent victims who were killed as a result of the mass shooting;

Whereas the Washington Navy Yard serves as headquarters of Naval District Washington and is the workplace of 18,000 military, civilian, and contractor personnel who serve the United States; and

Whereas military officials, law enforcement officers, and other first responders reacted swiftly and courageously to prevent additional loss of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims killed or wounded during the horrific violence that took place at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013;

(2) offers support and hope for all the individuals who were wounded and discomforted by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(3) recognizes the difficult healing and recovery process that lies ahead for communities affected by the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(4) honors the courageous and professional service of —

(A) the uniformed men and women of the Navy and other members of the United States Armed Forces;

(B) all civilian employees who provide support for the United States Armed Forces; and

(C) the law enforcement personnel, emergency responders, and medical professionals who responded to and assisted victims of the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard;

(5) thanks those individuals for their selfless and dedicated service; and

(6) remains committed to preventing the occurrence of tragedies similar to the mass shooting at the Washington Navy Yard.

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH 13, 2013. AS ''NATIONAL CHESS WEEK'' TO ENHANCE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE STUDENTS AND ADULTS TO ENGAGE IN A GAME KNOWN TO ENHANCE CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN) submitting the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 266

Whereas there are more than 80,000 members of the United States Chess Federation (referred to in this preamble as the ''Federation''), and unknown numbers of additional people in the United States who play chess without joining an official organization;

Whereas approximately ½ of the members of the Federation are members of scholastic chess programs;

Whereas many studies have linked scholastic chess programs to the improvement of students' scores in reading and math, as well as improved self-esteem;

Whereas the Federation offers guidance to educators to help incorporate chess into the school curriculum;

Whereas chess is a powerful cognitive learning tool that can be used to successfully enhance students' reading skills and understanding of math concepts, as well as to improve memory function for people of all ages;

Whereas chess also offers educational and social activity benefits to adults and is used in programs to help stroke victims and people suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder; and

Whereas the Federation offers programs for adults including senior citizens, members of the Armed Forces, and veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to play chess, a game known to enhance critical-thinking and problem-solving skills for students of all ages, learning abilities, and strengths; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chess Week with appropriate programs and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1848, to ensure that the

Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''consensus standards'' means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term ''part 23'' means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee'' means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term ''small airplane'' means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

SMALL AIRPLANE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further action on H.R. 1848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the substitute amendment, which is at the desk and is the text of S. 1072, as reported by the Commerce Committee, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that 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 amendment (No. 1999) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and countries around the world.

(2) Small airplanes comprise nearly 90 percent of general aviation aircraft certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots who secure the economic success and defense of the United States.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying jobs in the manufacturing and technology sectors in the United States and products produced by those sectors are exported in great numbers.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to the market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Since 2003, the United States lost 10,000 active private pilots per year on average, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations relating to small airplanes to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue a final rule—

(1) to advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements for such airplanes under part 23 to streamline the approval of safety advancements; and

(2) that meets the objectives described in subsection (b).

(b) OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The objectives described in this subsection are based on the recommendations of the Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee:

(1) The establishment of a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and reduce the regulatory cost burden for the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry.

(2) The establishment of broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) The replacement of current, prescriptive requirements under part 23 with performance-based regulations.

(4) The use of consensus standards accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration to clarify how the safety objectives of part 23 may be met using specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Administrator shall use consensus standards, as described in section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), to the extent practicable while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''consensus standards'' means standards developed by an organization described in subparagraph (B) that may include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free, or reasonable royalty basis to all interested persons.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED.—An organization described in this subparagraph is a domestic or international organization that—

(i) plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates, through a process based on consensus and using agreed-upon procedures, voluntary standards; and

(ii) operates in a transparent manner, considers a balanced set of interests with respect to such standards, and provides for due process and an appeals process with respect to such standards.

(2) PART 23.—The term ''part 23'' means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) PART 23 REORGANIZATION AVIATION RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee'' means the aviation rulemaking committee established by the Federal Aviation Administration in August 2011 to consider the reorganization of the regulations under part 23.

(4) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term ''small airplane'' means an airplane which is certified to part 23 standards.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1848), as amended, was passed.

TRUCKER SLEEP APNEA RULES

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3095, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the bill be read three times and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3095) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESCUE OF DANISH JEWS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 200, S. Res. 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 227) to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 17, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORT FOR FREE AND PEACEFUL DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 201, S. Res. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 213) expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title, as follows:

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 213

Whereas the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela guarantees its citizens full political rights, including the right to freely associate for democratic political purposes, and the right to a secret ballot through regular free, universal, direct elections and referenda;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that ''representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region,'' and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that ''the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it'';

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolas Maduro to have been elected in Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, with 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the Supreme Court of Venezuela refused to hear legal cases presented by the political opposition regarding alleged violations of electoral law, and the CNE denied the opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas Venezuela's Unified Democratic Platform (MUD) has formally requested the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to conduct an impartial review of alleged violations of Venezuelans' civic rights through electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses in the April 2013 elections, and the Government of Venezuela subsequently announced its withdrawal from the Inter-American Court on Human Rights;

Whereas, in response to the political opposition's decision not to recognize Nicolas Maduro as President, legislators from opposition parties in Venezuela were denied the right to speak and removed from key committees by the President of the National Assembly, were violently assaulted by members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV), and increasingly face the prospect of politically-motivated criminal charges;

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013, and the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that ''violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly'';

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) repudiated the incident by stating that it ''reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country''; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy as guaranteed by the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela;

(2) deplores the undemocratic denial of the legitimate rights of opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela, the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside chambers of the National Assembly, and the growing efforts to use politically-motivated criminal charges to intimidate the country's political opposition;

(3) commends legislators from other countries in the Americas who have declared their opposition to alleged electoral irregularities and condemned the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Department of State to work in concert with other countries in the Americas to take meaningful steps to ensure the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter and to strengthen the ability of the Organization of American States to respond to the erosion of democratic norms and institutions in member states; and

(5) calls for the United States to work with other countries in the hemisphere to actively encourage a process of dialogue between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition through the good offices of the Organization of American States so that the voices of all Venezuelans can be taken into account through their country's constitutional institutions and free and fair elections.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela, condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, and calling for dialogue between all political actors in the country.''.

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 213), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the title was agreed to.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY THE ATTACK AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 265) expressing support for the individuals impacted by the senseless attack at the Washington Navy Yard, and commending and thanking members of the military, law enforcement officers, first responders, and civil servants for their courage and professionalism.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 265) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3230 AND H.J. Res. 72

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading, but object to my own request for both of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

NATIONAL CHESS WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 266) designating the week of October 7 through 13, 2013, as ''National Chess Week'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am proud today to speak in support of my resolution to designate October 7 through October 13, 2013 as National Chess Week. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues Senator ALEXANDER and Senator LEVIN.

National Chess Week is designed to increase awareness about the many benefits of chess, and to encourage both children and adults to enjoy this game. Chess has a wide range of educational and cognitive benefits, including improving problem-solving skills and developing critical thinking skills. It helps increase memory function and hone reading and math skills. For these reasons, chess is used by some educators as part of their curriculum, and is even used to help patients who are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or the effects of a stroke.

Over 80,000 children and adults nationwide are members of the U.S. Chess Federation, and ½ of them are students. Engaging students in chess can help make learning fun, and give them a lifelong pastime that they can enjoy while using and developing their skills. I am proud to support and endorse National Chess Week, which I hope will result in engaging even more citizens of all ages in this important activity.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 p.m., on Saturday, October 5; 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; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 NOON TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:53 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 12 noon.