



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2013

No. 143

Senate

The Senate met at 11 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, we are indebted to You for Your many mercies and continue to look to You for our well-being. Remind us that prayer is listening more than speaking, an act of empathy rather than self-expression.

Give our Senators this day the special gifts of wisdom and understanding, patience and strength, motivating them to follow what is true and do what is right. Lord, inspire our lawmakers with a renewed trust in You and a commitment to work together for Your glory.

We pray in Your sacred Name. 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.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. The time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At noon there will be a rollcall vote on a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 79

Mr. REID. I understand H.J. Res. 79 is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The measure will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 340; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James M. Kowalski

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senate will now resume legislative session.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is very hard to comprehend that 4 days from today, unless and until a few extremist Republicans—we hope it is a few—too radical to compromise, could force a default on the Nation's financial obligations for the first time ever. Economists say it won't be long before financial markets react negatively to this continued uncertainty.

I believe Monday is a legal holiday and I believe the markets will be closed. That is good. What I see staring us in the face is not a pleasant picture.

Everyone should understand that a bad day on Wall Street doesn't only affect these great big banks or wealthy investors. It affects everyone in our country, not only those with 401(k)s but those who have no savings. It affects everybody, because everyone will lose, not only in America but around the world. The life savings of ordinary Americans are at risk, and that is an understatement.

While this uncertainty is bad, default would be unthinkable worse. To show my angst is real, one only need look at what took place in the House of Representatives this morning. They walked out of another meeting, a conference, a caucus—call it what you

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7419

want—defiant: We couldn't do anything.

Therefore, the government remains closed, and the debt ceiling is, every day, closer and closer—every hour now. While this uncertainty is bad, I repeat, default is unthinkable worse.

Because of the collapse on Wall Street a few years ago, the State of Nevada and States all over the country were hammered. This was only 5 years ago. Americans lost their jobs, their homes, and their savings, as did people around the world. The country is beginning to recover, but it is not in great shape.

The crisis we now face is one of even greater proportion. The government has remained closed for 12 days. Think about this. Four States are buying into programs so national parks can stay open. National parks. They were the brainchild of Republican Theodore Roosevelt.

It is very sad what is happening to our country. Defaulting on our debt would risk millions of American jobs—not thousands, not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of jobs. Social Security checks will likely be halted, Medicare payments and even payments for our troops wouldn't happen.

Without exception, the most respected economists and business minds of our time have said that if America defaults on its debt, there will be dire consequences here and around the globe. We have heard this from everybody, not only economists but business people.

I was pleased to see the Republicans engaged in talks with the President, the House Republicans. That is over, it is done. They are not talking anymore. We learned that this morning.

I say to my friends on the Republican side of the Senate, time is running out. They have urged their more radical Members to compromise.

For example, my senior friend from Arizona came to the Congress of the United States with me and the assistant leader. We have been together for 31 years. These are the sensible words of the senior Senator from Arizona:

Sooner or later, the government will resume its function. Sooner or later we will raise the debt limit. The question is how we get there. . . . Why don't we do this sooner rather than later? Why doesn't the Senate lead?

To that end we are trying. We are going to have a vote in 50 minutes on a long-term measure to avert default and give the economy what it needs.

I have told my Republican friends that allowing the government to operate again is not a favor to me; it is not a favor to the Presiding Officer; it is not a favor to Democrats on this side of the aisle. It is something that should happen. We shouldn't consider this a time for doing favors for individuals or groups. We should understand the government should open because it should never have closed in the first place.

The debt ceiling—reasonable Republicans should understand this should be

extended, not for a couple of weeks or a couple of months, it should be extended for a long time. We shouldn't have this fight. To think that this is only a motion to proceed to the legislation, it is not a vote on the measure itself, and the Republicans, I have been told, are all going to vote against this. What a sad day for America. They are voting to not allow us to even debate whether the debt ceiling should be raised. Are they afraid of that? Do they want this to go away? It is not going to go away. Each hour that goes by, we are closer to a calamity for our country.

The economy needs more stability than short-term Republican proposals. Congress and the country must not be back in a position a few weeks from now wondering whether Republicans will force our Nation to default on our financial obligations.

To think the House Republicans are saying: Well, we will extend the debt for a little while but we are not going to reopen the government, wow, that is so logical, sensible and good for the country—and I say this very sarcastically.

The Senate Democrats' position has been and remains this: We open our government and pay our country's bills so we can move forward with good-faith negotiations on a long-term budget. It is not too late for my Republican colleagues to do what is right for this country.

I am very concerned. It seems the worry about whether our country should have a functioning government and should extend the debt ceiling is only from Democrats. This isn't the way it should be.

I admire President Obama for what he has done the last few days. He has invited every Member of Congress, 535, to meet with him. First he had the House Democrats and then the Senate Democrats, another meeting, then Senate Republicans, and House Republicans. Remember, the last time my friend Speaker BOEHNER was on television, he said: Maybe, oh, 18 times, I haven't counted.

He wanted to have a conversation. The President took him up on that. He invited all 232 Members of the Republican Caucus to come to the White House and visit with him. They refused that. They sent down 20.

I appreciate the President being willing to talk with all of us, and he has done that in detail. The problem is the conversation is one way. The Republicans are not interested, it appears at this stage, of doing anything constructive to extend the debt ceiling and open the government. "Later" is what they always say.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, at 12 o'clock noon we will vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1569. It is barely 1 page, but it is of more significance than anyone can imagine. It basically is an opportunity for us to start the debate—not to end the debate but to start the debate—on whether the United States of America will default on its debt for the first time in the history of this Nation. Other nations have defaulted: Argentina, Venezuela, Cameroon. We have never defaulted.

As a result, the U.S. dollar is the soundest currency in the world. Think about it for a second. Where else would you turn? The U.S. dollar is the soundest currency. Buying the debt of the United States is considered to be the single safest investment any person, business, or country can make.

We didn't just inherit this. We earned this, because every year the United States has been a nation, we have paid our bills, and now this is being brought into question.

Today at noon on the floor of the Senate there is going to be a vote on whether we proceed with the debate over paying our bills. Sadly, we are told not a single Republican Senator will join us in allowing the debate on paying our bills. That is a sad commentary. When we think about it, it is taking the events of the past week or two to the extreme.

It was bad enough to shut down the United States. When Republicans decided that shutting down the government was a great political move, the American people said: Are you out of your mind? Eight hundred thousand people are going to be furloughed, and we are going to stop the services of our government?

For the last 12 days we have seen every single day another indicator, another piece of news, about how this government shutdown is hurting ordinary people across America, whether it is those who were denied clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health outside of Washington, DC—clinical trials that were literally life-and-death decisions; whether we are talking about food inspection, reading the newspaper about salmonella poisoning and realizing the Republican government shutdown is reducing the number of food inspectors. The list goes on and on and on.

But I will tell you this: As sad and unfair as it is for the Republican shutdown of the government to result in 800,000 furloughed Federal employees, the hardships on their families and the hardships on all Americans who count on their jobs and on the basic services of the Federal Government is worse.

This is worse. The Republican shutdown has reached a new level of recklessness, a new level of irresponsibility if we default on America's debt. Sadly, it will mean the victims will not just be Federal employees and their families. No, not even just those who count on government services. The victims

will be virtually every person and every family in America.

Is that an exaggeration? Is it just another politician reaching extreme rhetoric here on the floor? Let me quote a few people who do this for a living—the people we trust. Treasury Secretary Jack Lew in a Finance Committee hearing on October 13 said:

Failing to raise the debt ceiling will impact everyday Americans beyond its impact on financial markets. Between October 17 and November 1, we have large payments to Medicare providers, Social Security beneficiaries, and veterans, as well as salaries for Active-Duty members of the military. A failure to raise the debt limit could put timely payment of all of these at risk.

Of course, he is a government employee, an appointee of the administration. One might say: Well, let's discount that. He is just putting the President's political spin on this. Let's go to Frank Keating, no friend of the administration. He is the head of the American Bankers Association. Before a banking committee hearing on October 10, he said:

Ordinary Americans will bear the brunt of the damage if our leaders do not prevent the United States from defaulting on its debt for the first time in history.

He went on to say:

It would . . . raise the cost of borrowing for businesses, meaning job losses and price increases . . . be a blow to retirement funds, leaving fewer resources available for retirees. For banks, which hold \$3 trillion in Treasury, agency and mortgage-backed securities, the sharp decline in value of these securities would translate into fewer resources available for mortgages, business, auto, credit card and student loans.

To put it in layman's terms, Mr. Keating, the head of the American Bankers Association, is saying if the Congress fails to extend the debt ceiling, as we are proposing to do today, interest rates will go up—interest rates on ordinary Americans, ordinary families, and ordinary businesses.

This is entirely preventable. Let me just lay the cards on the table. I have been in the House and in the Senate. Nobody wants to vote for this because most people don't understand it. They think: Oh, so you want us to go further in debt, Senator? That is why you voted for it.

But that is not the case. The debt limit is paying off the bills we have already incurred. It is like going to a fancy restaurant and ordering the best meal on the menu, eating the meal, and when they come to ask you to pay the check you say: No, I am not paying the check. You see, I am a fiscal conservative. I just don't believe in extravagant eating. But you just ate the meal, and now you are not going to pay the check?

That is what this is about. We have incurred these bills, and now the question is whether we will pay these bills. That is what it comes down to. This is basic and fundamental.

At noon there will be a vote on the floor of the Senate which will have a direct impact on everyone in this coun-

try. The question is whether the Republicans, fresh from the failure of their government shutdown, are going to dig a deeper hole, not just for their party—forget that completely—but for this Nation; whether they are going to create a new group of victims beyond Federal employees that includes every person, every family, and every business in America. That is what is at stake.

Madam President, I am not exaggerating. I think this may be the single most irresponsible thing I have seen in the time I have served in Washington. To let this happen is not good for this Nation, and it is not fair to the people of this Nation.

The majority leader said the markets are closed on Monday. It turns out, I am told, that the bond market is closed, but the stock market is open. That stock market, incidentally, is where mutual funds live, where the stocks people own for their savings and retirement live, and where their savings live. This irresponsible action, sadly, is likely to create a decline in the value of their hard-earned savings.

But it can be avoided. What would it take? Six Republicans. That is what it takes. The Democrats are prepared to move forward and extend the debt ceiling. We need six moderate Republicans to step up and join us. If they will, we will move forward. We will accept the responsibility of ultimately voting for whatever bill there is to extend the debt ceiling. We are asking six Republicans to give us a chance to vote. If they say no at noon today, the consequences could be awful for this great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I hope the country listens to what the senior Senator from Illinois has said about the ramifications of this shutdown. This is not a political exercise. This is not a bumper sticker thing. This is hitting every single family, every single person in America. It doesn't make a difference whether they are Democrats, Republicans or Independents. It is going to hurt and hurt badly. Whether you are saving money for your child to go to college, to put away for your retirement or are paying bills for an illness, all of us are going to be impacted. So I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for those comments.

Madam President, on this 12th day of being paralyzed by this unnecessary shutdown, there are real results that will come about because of it. I have given several examples on the floor about how Vermonters are suffering due to this tea party shutdown. And I am sure the distinguished Presiding Officer probably has similar examples from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or others as well.

Earlier this year I worked with Senator CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, to build the support we needed to reau-

thorize the Violence Against Women Act—VAWA—and I was proud when both the Senate and House passed the legislation with strong bipartisan votes and the President signed it. We put our differences aside—and we are philosophically very different—to help the people we serve, whether they are in Idaho, Vermont, Massachusetts or anywhere else. We sent a clear message that violence against women will not be tolerated. We put the needs of victims first when we promised rape crisis centers and domestic violence shelters they would have the resources they need to keep their doors open and to keep their 24-hour hotlines staffed. But now we are here in October, which marks Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and so many of the lifesaving programs we put in this legislation are caught in the crossfire of the tea party shutdown.

Today, as Federal funds are being held hostage by the tea party shutdown, we are starting to see the real toll of this brinkmanship. In Franklin County, VT, a northwestern county in our State, advocates were hopeful when they learned a new grant would allow one staff person to help victims of LGBT domestic assault in that rural region. Of course, this hope has given way to frustration because the funds promised on October 1 did not come through due to the shutdown.

Barre City, Vermont, is the town where my father was born. It has a population of 9,200. In Barre City, the police force has furloughed two half-time detectives who were providing 24/7 coverage for special responses to domestic violence cases. They were also providing critical training for their colleagues on how to answer these challenging calls.

I was a prosecutor in Vermont, and I saw how terrible these domestic violence cases could be, and they occur in every State. I would bet that every single State can give an example of what this shutdown has meant, the same as Barre, VT.

There is a long list of programs funded with VAWA grants that continue to provide services to victims—and incur the related costs—based on the hope they might be reimbursed once funding is restored. Meanwhile, the tea party says maybe the check will be in the mail. They have no choice because despite what the tea party might think, when you close the spigot of funding, it doesn't mean the victims go away.

I still have nightmares of some of these scenes I saw at 3 o'clock in the morning when I was a prosecutor. They are still occurring. We can at least cut way back on them and help people in America.

But I also want to know what is going to happen to victims and their children when the money for WIC and the TANF programs runs dry. We know many victims of domestic violence have to rely on this support when they leave their abusers. In the past they had to stick with their abusers because

they had to feed their children. Now at least they have a lifeline out there. If you combine that with the impending cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program the tea party wants, I wonder whether this is going to cause these victims and their children to stay in the homes of the abusers just so the children can be fed. That is shameful.

This is America. This is America. All of these tea party members get paid. They are getting paid today. They get their expenses. They get their staff. They can fly back and forth. They can go on television and all of that. They are not facing this abuse or the question of how they feed their children.

Kris Luken, director of Voices Against Violence in St. Albans, VT, says the uncertainty is the hardest part, both for her agency and for the victims it serves. At the end of last week, the first of the tea party shutdown, she said:

We are fielding a lot of calls from survivors who don't know how they are going to make ends meet. People just don't know what the impact will be.

So you get abused first by whoever the abuser is, and now you are going to get abused by this tea party shutdown. In these difficult economic times, it is more important than ever to ensure that our safety net is in place. We cannot turn our backs on these families—that is not who we are as a country.

When we reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act this year, we included provisions to specifically address the high rate of domestic and sexual violence experienced by Native American women. Sadly, this shutdown disproportionately affects that already vulnerable population. Tribal lands rely heavily on Federal funding and one tribal domestic violence shelter in South Dakota has lost 90 percent of its funding. That shelter is at capacity and the loss of funds means victims are being turned away. They are left with no place to turn. That is simply unconscionable.

The District of Columbia's Sexual Assault Nurse's program relies on Federal funds to provide necessary medical assistance to rape victims, including rape kits. Absent emergency funding which will soon dry up unless we end this foolish shutdown, rape kit examinations will cease, leaving victims without the specialized care they deserve and the DNA evidence they need to prosecute and convict their rapists.

Let's end the uncertainty. Let's end the shutdown and fulfill our promises to the people we are here to represent.

The continuing resolution passed by the Senate—a resolution which, after all, was asked for by the House of Representatives and was a compromise with them—could end this stalemate. The leadership in the House of Representatives should have the courage to bring it to a vote—the courage not necessarily for their own political needs but the courage for the needs of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I first of all want to thank my colleague, the Senator from Vermont, for his comments and his relentless voicing of the concerns of folks who are not often heard in the halls of this institution. I thank him for his work and for letting everyone know who continues to be hurt by this absurd government shutdown.

I really think we are almost in a kind of era of the theater of the absurd at this point. We have a government shutdown for 11-plus days and are 4 days, 5 days from a default. What I keep wondering is—we hear about some of the least fortunate who are being hurt—how much of our economy is being hurt all across the board.

I received a call 2 nights ago from the chairman of a company from Northern Virginia with 5,500 employees. This company has been built by this first generation of Americans. He is extraordinarily proud of what he has done for his company, for his employees. His company serves our government as a so-called government contractor. A lot of these companies are not only in Virginia, in Maryland, but across this region and across this country.

When the shutdown started, 30 percent of his 5,500 employees were told they are not essential. So the company has been trying to make ends meet keeping these folks furloughed but not firing them, trying to pay them a little something during this period. The remarkable thing is that 70 percent of the employees that were deemed essential are not getting paid either—even though the government says they are going to pay them—because the folks who process the checks are furloughed.

Anybody who operates a business on a cashflow basis knows that when the money runs out, even if you have a potential IOU, if you can't go to the bank and borrow money, you shut down. This company, 25 years in the building, this CEO, this chairman, said if this goes on 1 or 2 more weeks, his life's work and—more importantly than his life's work, he said—the 5,500 people who depend upon this company's existence may very well disappear. That is just part of the government shutdown.

Today we are going to vote on an issue that I never thought in my time in the public sector or the private sector we would be seriously considering; that is, the default of the United States of America. I have spent more time in the private sector than I have in the public sector, but I never thought I would see the headline I saw this week in the Financial Times, an international financial newspaper, where the headline was that Japan and China and Russia Say: America, pay your bills. America, pay your bills. America, the largest economy in the world, the country that, because of our exemplary behavior for decades, has been granted the status of the reserve currency.

What does reserve currency mean? It means that every American business does a little bit better than every other business around the world because the dollar is the currency everybody else goes to when times are tough.

There are countries—not all of them friendly to us—that are saying that maybe the dollar shouldn't be the reserve currency anymore, and if we lose that status, it doesn't come back overnight. It is not where the tea party crowd can say: Maybe we made a mistake; we want to roll that back. Once it is gone, it could take literally decades to get it back.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has only been one industrialized country in the world that has defaulted since the year 2000—Argentina. America is not Argentina, but back in December 2001 Argentina defaulted. Prior to that time, Argentina—per capita income—was the richest country in South America, way ahead of Chile, Brazil, and other nations in that region. Once Argentina defaulted, the value of its currency fell by 75 percent, inflation hit over 100 percent a year, and every Argentinean family lost over half of their net worth. Today, 12 years after Argentina defaulted, on an annual average income basis, it falls way below most of the countries of South America.

America is not Argentina. It may not be that catastrophic, but why would anyone take the chance? Why would anyone decide in this uncharted area to potentially threaten default? That is like playing Russian roulette with one bullet and only two chambers. No responsible nation would do that.

We have heard from some on the other side: Here is what we ought to do. Maybe we will kind of default, but we will pay our bonds and we will pay Social Security, pay our military, and then everything else will be put on hold.

That, to me, shows a remarkable, fundamental lack of understanding of how government or economics works. No government has ever tried that. But for the sake of argument, let's suppose that somehow that "prioritization" scheme might stave off America defaulting for 1 or 2 weeks.

Here is the other half of the story they don't acknowledge. Even if America pays its debt, on that list of prioritization does not appear Medicaid, education, transportation, law enforcement, and those dollars don't stay spent at the Federal level, they are spent at the State government level and the local government level.

I had the great honor of being Governor of Virginia before I came to the Senate. We worked really hard to keep a triple-A bond rating. The Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, Louisiana—every one of these States, at least one-third of their State budgets are dollars that pass from the Federal Government down to the State level. We could see within a week or maybe even less every State government and every local government in

America either have a budget crisis or default. What is happening in Detroit could happen across every community in America—not because of mistakes made at the local level or the State level but because of the irresponsibility of a group of folks up here who don't understand the economics that you don't mess with the full faith and credit of America.

What other costs are we playing with? Many of the folks who have been most adamant about keeping the government shut—which, by the way, will cost the taxpayers more and will not save us a dime. Federal employees will be paid, but starting and stopping all these government contracts will hurt the economy, decrease tax revenues, and actually cost taxpayers more.

But what may be even more jeopardizing than those actions with this kind of irresponsible testing of the markets or brinkmanship is that we could see interest rates rise. Every 1 point of increased interest payment on our debt accounts for \$110 billion of additional Federal Government payments every year. A 1-percent interest in the debt increase over a 10-year basis is an extra \$1 trillion of government spending that has a priority over any other aspect of Federal Government spending. Talk about a tax hike that gets America nothing from a group who says: We don't want to increase taxes at any cost—well, playing with the debt ceiling, 1 percent interest, a \$110 billion tax hike on every American family and every American business, and again, you can't say a few days later “oops” and the market would then take back down our interest rates.

I know other colleagues are here and want to speak as well. In my business life, in my time as Governor, in my time as Senator, I have never seen an action nearly as irresponsible as the actions taken—and I don't think this is the majority of the colleagues on the other side—by a small cohort of ideologues who are willing to do whatever, including burn down the house, to try to achieve their goals.

We will have a chance here in the Senate in about 20 minutes to decide whether we will take off the threat of America defaulting. The Asian markets open within 40 hours. The world is going to see whether America is going to maintain its position as reserve currency, the world's largest economy, and the most stable financial basis. I hope we will take a step today to at least remove the threat of default, to encourage our friends on the House side to do that as well as reopen this government, and then, yes, let's get our fiscal house in order. But putting America's fiscal reputation and putting companies in jeopardy with the shutdown is not the kind of governance America needs at this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Virginia for

his outstanding work. He knows this from a business perspective, an economic perspective, and a political perspective, and has been such a strong and vibrant voice about America paying its bills.

I would like to add a couple of things. We have a group of people in the House and the Senate—not a majority—whom we call debt ceiling deniers. They deny that letting the debt ceiling lapse and going into default could be cataclysmic for America. They are wrong. Every person who has studied this knows it is wrong.

The debt ceiling deniers fall in two camps. Some say: Well, we can pay certain debts and not other debts and that would be all right.

Well, let them choose. Pick Social Security over veterans? Pick payments to pregnant mothers versus payments for food safety? We can't do it.

Then they say: Well, maybe we should just pay Treasuries that come due and not pay Social Security.

Well, let me tell you, as somebody who has consulted experts on the market, the overwhelming view is that if we don't pay any of our bills for the first time in U.S. history, the markets could very well freeze up, tighten, and create huge damage to our country.

The second group of debt ceiling deniers say: Well, we don't know the date.

And we don't. The markets are mystical, but once they come to their own most magical conclusion that the United States is going to default, we will be in trouble. That could be the 17th. It could be a day or two before, impertuning us to action as soon as possible. It could be a little bit later. But we don't know when it is. And what a risk.

We are like a blindfolded man walking toward the edge of a cliff. If we keep walking, we will fall off. We can debate whether we fall off in 5 yards, 50 yards, or 500 yards, but we will fall off and we don't know what that line is. Why risk it?

I have one final point. This could be as bad or worse than the 2008 recession. It is the same basic principle. A very important security—in that case, mortgage securities, and in this case, Treasuries—loses tremendous value, the markets freeze, loans can't be made, interest rates rise, and then all the ensuing economic damage. Auto sales will go down and thousands of auto-workers will be laid off. Home sales will go down and construction workers will be laid off. That is what happened in 2008, and it could well happen again and be worse because this will be worldwide. U.S. Treasuries are probably the most widely held denomination of assets on financial institution books and deeper—more institutions have more of them than have mortgage securities. So we are playing with fire.

I make a plea to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I know we all have political agendas. I very much would like to see the immigration bill

passed. We all have agendas that are very important to us. Please do not hold the debt ceiling and paying our debts hostage to any other condition. Pass the debt ceiling unconditionally, and then we can go back to our business, debate these issues, and see where the political chips fall. But please, for the sake of this country, for the sake of the men and women who labored before us and never let us default, do not play with fire, pass a clean debt ceiling, and let's move on and debate the other issues that so much deserve debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor today to add my voice to the voices that have spoken since 11:00 our time about the importance of opening this government and sending a strong signal that the Congress will not default on its debt; that we will pay our bills and we will honor the commitments we have made not only to bondholders outside of our country but to our own constituents who hold Treasury bonds in their pension funds and their 401(k)s, who use it to balance their investments in their businesses because they know they can count on those notes being paid. Until just a few days ago it seemed as if that would happen.

Recently, in the last 48 hours, there is a real question as to whether a small group of Republicans in the House understands how high this cliff is and how close we are to it. This problem is completely manufactured by a group of people elected to office to do this exact thing—shut the government down at any expense and, as the Senator from Virginia just said, burn the whole house down with the children inside. They came here with that express purpose. They are wrong, and they are pushing this country to a terrible place.

Leader REID has explained it. Senator SCHUMER from New York has explained it. MARK WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, who is literally one of the finest Governors we have had in the last 50 years in America—and I say that respectfully and honestly; we all know what a great Governor he was—he is now joined by another great Governor from Virginia, Governor KAINE—these men are Senators, but they understand our Governors now are at risk, every Governor, Republican and Democrat, and all the leaders of the State governments and the thousands of cities and villages.

Yesterday we received a letter signed by the Governors Association, Democrat and Republican Governors, saying open the government. Do not let the government default. Why? Because in our system of government, which is the best in the world—it is not perfect, but it is the best in the world ever created by men and women. We are frail human beings. We make a lot of mistakes. We made so many mistakes in the creation

of our country and we still continue to do it, but we are trying to build a model of democracy, the best the Earth has ever known.

There is a group of people in the House who decided that for some reason they do not like the democracy. I do not know what they want to go back to, but it has taken us 230-plus years to get here. I don't think anybody wants to go back to a place where the world had no democracy.

There were elections. People won those elections. President Obama won his election. He did not carry my State, but he won his election fair and square. He campaigned on providing middle-class families for the first time in America a way to purchase health insurance—not a single-payer system, not the government system—to purchase health insurance so they would not be one accident away from financial ruin. “Shame on President Obama. Shame on him for suggesting something so radical that moms and dads could go to sleep at night knowing that if an accident happened the next day they would not have to take bankruptcy or choose between a child disabled or a child who needed to go to college. Shame on President Obama. How dare he suggest such a thing.”

If they do not like the bill, they can change the bill. We did not wake up one morning and declare this the law. The people of the United States declared this through us as their Representatives. If they do not like it, they can unelect us. Believe me, they will have a great chance because I am up for reelection right now. They will be able to do that. But that is the way you do it. You do not threaten to shut down the government.

I am going to run for reelection. I am standing in this election as a supporter of the Affordable Care Act—not because it is a perfect law but because it is much better for all the people I represent than what we had before—the wealthiest people, the middle-class people, and the poor people.

We argued and fought in public, in meetings for 40 years on how to do this. This was not a last-minute, behind-the-scenes deal that nobody read. Have they lost their minds? We debated this for 40 years through every kind of President you can think of, conservative, liberal, different kinds of Congresses.

I know we have devoted 10 minutes, and I know other people want to speak, but I will take just a few minutes.

Contrary to popular belief and what FOX News said, people here read the bills. For 40 years we read the bills. But we did not have to read the bills; all we had to do was look at the faces of kids dying of cancer who had no way to get cured. All we had to do is talk to people who came to our office every day who said: Senator, can't you do something? My insurance is going up. I can't afford it. I want to get out of my job. I worked for GE my whole life. I have a better idea. I want to get a bet-

ter job, but I can't leave because my wife has cancer.

I don't need to read a bill. I listen to my constituents. That is what this is about. Then when they decide they are going to shut down the government because they can repeal this law—now they are deciding that did not work so well. That is not making a lot of sense to people. Now we are going to negotiate on we don't know what, but we have to get something out of this. How dare they? How dare this group of radicals, led by the Senator from Texas—how dare they take the greatest democracy on Earth hostage? Who gives them that right? Do they think they are divined by God? They are not—none of us here are.

God could run this world perfectly, but he doesn't run it. He is in Heaven. Until then we, as imperfect as we are, have to figure out His will through the democratic process. But they have decided that is not good enough.

I don't know anything on Earth that is better. Maybe they can figure it out in the next 48 hours. People have been thinking about that for 6 or 7 or 8,000 years or longer. I don't think 48 hours is going to help them.

Anyway, we are here today. What I would like to say is that I agree with everything my Senate colleagues have said. I urge our colleagues to vote to open the government, to not hold the U.S. Government and the world and all the kids in the world, all the adults in the world, all the businesses in the world hostage over their antics. In Louisiana, let me say, we have 400,000 people who need us to fix flood insurance. They are truly hurting. We have 200,000 people who live in Houma who have been waiting for a levee around their city for 25 years. Then they were told by the Corps, yes, they will build it. Then they didn't; yes, they will build it. Then they didn't. I need to get on that.

We have permits in the Gulf of Mexico, I say to Senator BOXER. I see my friend from California. I am going to turn it over to her. We have a little different view on this, Senator BOXER and I, but people in Louisiana would like to drill for oil. We would like to get our permits to do that. But because this ideological group has shut down the government, there are no permits being issued to produce the oil and gas necessary to keep our country strong. I could go on.

Let us reason together. We can find many issues to negotiate about. I am open to many negotiations, as are the Democrats, but to threaten the core of this democracy, fought for so long and hard over decades by men and women, is beyond the pale.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana. I am so appreciative of her because she is telling it like it is. She is sincere. She cares about her State.

Let me reassure her, she and I do not agree in terms of the parameters of oil drilling and Keystone and other issues. That has nothing to do with our friendship. But the Senator is exactly right. She deserves to have the permits run through the process. It is ridiculous. Just as the roadbuilders are waiting to have the EPA finish the environmental studies so they can get these roads—this government shutdown is brutal.

The reason I am rising—very briefly because I want to leave time for my friend from Oregon to say a few words—is because I wish to be so crystal clear to the people who might be watching us on this unusual Saturday session. We are in the midst of a Republican government shutdown. I am going to say that again. We are in the midst of a Republican shutdown of the government of the United States of America. The Senate passed a clean bill to reopen the government. It is sitting over there at Speaker BOEHNER'S House, and he is blocking all ability to open this government. That is No. 1.

Now we are getting frighteningly close to a default. We are getting very close to the point where America will not be able to pay its bills. The cost of that to our Nation, to our people, to our reputation, to our economy, to our taxpayers cannot be overstated: disaster. We have a chance now to pass a clean debt ceiling bill, which means we will not default. I hope my colleagues will vote for it. They are filibustering it. We need 60 votes. I hope somebody will come to their senses over there because the results of not doing it would be disastrous. I think Senator WARNER has spoken very clearly about what this means from the perspective of both a former governor and a businessman.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article entitled “Business, labor and non-profits demand that the shutdown end ‘immediately.’”

I am going to read a little bit from it and leave the remainder of time for my friend from Oregon:

The most prominent names in business, labor and the nonprofit world on Friday demanded that Washington “immediately” end the government shutdown.

In a joint letter sent to President Obama and lawmakers, leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO and United Way Worldwide said the shutdown shouldn't continue another day.

“As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately,” the letter says.

“While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy.”

It goes on. I want to say to my Republican friends: Wake up. This isn't a letter from one Democratic group or a liberal group or even a centrist group. This is a letter from America, from the business leaders and the workers and the nonprofit leaders. You are so out of

step it is frightening. Vote with us for a clean debt ceiling so we will not default and we do not send a terrible message to the markets. Open this government now. Take up the Senate bill over there, Speaker BOEHNER, put it up for a vote. Let's open this government and give it back to the American people because they deserve it. They do not deserve to be treated this way. They do not deserve to be hurt.

I yield the floor.

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

[From the Hill, Oct. 11, 2013]

BUSINESS, LABOR AND NONPROFITS DEMAND THAT SHUTDOWN END "IMMEDIATELY"

(By Kevin Bogardus)

The most prominent names in business, labor and the nonprofit world on Friday demanded that Washington "immediately" end the government shutdown.

In a joint letter sent to President Obama and lawmakers, leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO and United Way Worldwide said the shutdown shouldn't continue another day.

"As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately," the letter says.

"While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy."

The signatories on the letter were Tom Donohue, the Chamber's president and CEO; AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka; and Stacey Stewart, the U.S. president of United Way Worldwide.

"Our three disparate sectors share a common view—no one benefits from the current shut-down and everyone will be harmed if the government defaults. It is in the interest of our nation that Congress restore the normal functioning of our political process, fund the government immediately and quickly move to resolve the impasse over the debt ceiling limit," the letter says.

The shutdown is in its 11th day even as the Oct. 17 deadline to raise the debt ceiling approaches. Talks between the White House and Republican lawmakers to resolve the budget crisis picked up on Thursday, but an agreement is far from certain.

Business leaders fear a failure to raise the debt ceiling by the deadline will send the stock market into a tailspin and plunge the economy into recession.

Labor unions have been protesting the government shutdown since last week. Trade groups have also been active—from the American Hotel & Lodging Association to the International Franchise Association—telling lawmakers that the shutdown has hurt business.

The Chamber, the AFL-CIO and United Way said both parties need to work together to resolve the impasse.

"We urge all of our leaders in Washington to set aside the many issues we disagree about, reach across the aisle and end the shutdown and the threat of a national default," the letter concludes.

TO PRESIDENT OBAMA AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately.

Our country is navigating the most challenging economic times in a generation.

While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy.

Large and small businesses, the workforce (especially federal workers), people who rely on public and privately-funded social services, and communities at-large, are being harmed by the shutdown. The federal government is our nation's largest consumer of goods and services, our largest employer, and the single largest source of financial support for state and local governments and for private social services. Several hundred thousand public servants are at home without pay. The longer the shutdown continues, the more people and communities' economic security will be damaged. Ultimately, our economy could be driven back into a recession.

As we often have in our history, our country benefits from strong differences of opinion on many important issues affecting both federal legislation and the federal government. We believe it is important that we turn to the normal processes our government has for resolving these issues. We cannot afford to have either our government closed or our nation's creditworthiness called into question as part of the way we resolve these important issues.

Our three disparate sectors share a common view—no one benefits from the current shutdown and everyone will be harmed if the government defaults. It is in the interest of our nation that Congress restore the normal functioning of our political process, fund the government immediately and quickly move to resolve the impasse over the debt ceiling limit. We urge all of our leaders in Washington to set aside the many issues we disagree about, reach across the aisle and end the shutdown and the threat of a national default.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DONOHUE,
President and CEO,
U.S. Chamber of
Commerce.

RICHARD L. TRUMKA,
President, AFL-CIO.

STACEY D. STEWART,
U.S. President, United
Way Worldwide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. The word's "fiscal responsibility" have echoed in this Chamber time after time and they have been put forward in defense of a series of strategies this year that can only be described as incredibly irresponsible.

Let's turn the clock back 6 months. We tried to convene a budget conference committee with the House and it was blocked. The budget conference committee was not blocked with the argument of fiscal responsibility. Yet there was a blockade of putting together a budget so we could have a smart plan to go forward and a foundation for the appropriations bills.

Then colleagues across the aisle blocked the appropriations process. They argued it was fiscally responsible to do so. But that meant keeping programs that are not working and continuing them rather than replacing them with better plans. So that, too, was irresponsible.

Then we had folks argue it would be fiscally responsible if we shut down the

government. But this is costing America. This is decreasing revenue. This is increasing expenses and it is increasing the deficit. Therefore, we have imposed by this group who argues in the name of fiscal responsibility that we have a tax across America, the government shutdown tax imposed on families across the land. If that was not enough, not enough to block the budget process, not enough to block the appropriations process, not enough to shut down the government, now we have a group wanting to go even further. They have their grand default strategy. They want the United States to default and they argue this will do us well fiscally.

They could not be more wrong. In the Banking Committee we had a series of experts come in and we asked the question, What will happen if we default? Just simple examples were given. For example, the interest rate will go up on mortgages. A 1-percent increase on a mortgage means for a family buying a 200,000 house, about \$120 more a month. That is the shutdown and the default tax that colleagues are imposing on families across America.

It doesn't stop there. Everything based on interest rates goes up. Everything based on income from economic activity goes down. Expenses of safety net programs go up; in other words, the deficit goes up and the debt goes up.

Let's stop this irresponsibility of blocking the budget process, blocking the appropriations process, shutting down the government, and imposing a default tax on families across this land. It is not only incredibly wrongheaded, it is doing great damage to families in every county, in every State across the United States of America. At this moment in this vote we are about to have, let's end this attack on the American families. Let's end this irresponsibility.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Udall, Bill Nelson, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Maria Cantwell, Tim Kaine, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the

obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reid
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Chiesa	Hoeben	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Coburn Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, was I originally recorded as “yes”?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. REID. The record should reflect that I have changed that to “no.”

Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 1569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak now during our morning hour business for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. I have just been told by my able assistant here that we are still on the motion to proceed. So we are not in morning business.

Now, Mr. President, just a quick announcement: Democrats will caucus in the Mansfield Room forthwith, right now.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for everyone—this has been cleared with Senator MCCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. REID. Following the remarks of Senator LANDRIEU and Senator JOHANNIS, I would ask that—well, I will say that the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are going to be retiring to caucuses to try to figure out how we are going to move forward, and I am confident, with the good work of the people in this Chamber, we will find a way.

Senator JOHANNIS and I have been working, along with many of our colleagues, to try to come to some resolution about funding a city in the United States, the District of Columbia, that is not an agency of the Federal Government that happens to be the city that the seat of government sits in.

While I am not going to ask for consent now, I want to, through the Chair, ask Senator JOHANNIS to express, if he could, a few views about this, as we try to work our way forward for sometime maybe later this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the good working relationship with Senator LANDRIEU. We have been talking back and forth. We exchanged phone calls through the evening—never quite did connect—but we have been talking here today. It is our desire to find a solution to this issue.

We understand that what the District of Columbia is asking for is the simple ability to use its funding. We are talking and working, and I am optimistic we are going to find a solution.

I would also say, as a former mayor, I can only understand the sleepless nights the mayor is going through. So both of us want to try to solve this issue, and I think the Senate does.

What I would like to do is continue our conversations over the next hour or so. They have been fruitful, and I think we are working our way toward a solution.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with Senator LANDRIEU.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor.

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am opposed to S. 1569. Our national debt is nearly \$17 trillion and has nearly doubled since the beginning of the Obama administration. If we allow the Nation to continue on its current path, it will only lead to economic destruction. Raising the debt ceiling without any strings attached would be irresponsible and reckless.

The President has already increased the debt limit five times since coming to office. The first occurred just a month after President Obama took office. At \$789 billion, the increase was provided to pay for his massive, un-

successful stimulus package. With supermajorities in the House and the Senate, the President was able to push nearly everything he wanted into law.

Because the stimulus package ended up being more expensive than expected, the President got another increase of \$290 billion just 10 months later. Then, just 2 months after that, the President pushed another increase through, this time for \$1.9 trillion. Thirteen months into his Presidency, President Obama had already increased the debt limit by nearly \$3 trillion.

Then, following the 2010 midterm elections, Republicans in Congress welcomed reinforcements, which changed the dynamic. With control of the House and an increased margin in the Senate, Republicans were able to force spending cut concessions from the President before agreeing to any debt limit increase.

In August 2010, after nearly exceeding the debt limit, the President agreed to increase the debt limit by \$2.1 trillion in exchange for \$2.1 trillion in spending cuts, including what has become known as sequestration. While I supported the total reduction in spending enacted by the bill, I voted against it because I believe the cuts should have been allocated in a different way. In total, nearly \$1 trillion was cut from national security spending, which is having a very real, hollowing effect on our ability to protect the Nation. Further, these cuts did not include anything from mandatory entitlement programs like food stamps, and too little of it came from other domestic programs that are better suited for the States to run.

Earlier this year, the President demanded another debt limit increase. He received it, but only after agreeing to force Senate Democrats to consider a budget, which until this year had never been done during the Obama administration. This bill also suspended Congressional pay until a budget was agreed to. I oppose this bill because I do not believe that simply passing a budget was enough. Real spending cuts with real reforms to our permanent programs are needed.

Today we find ourselves in the same situation, and my position has not changed. Spending is continuing to spiral out of control, and if we do nothing to rein it in, our national debt will skyrocket to \$25 trillion in the next decade. Even the President agrees with those numbers. We cannot allow this to happen, which is why I oppose S. 1569.●

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:16 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HEINRICH).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President. I understand that we are in session for Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, we are here on Saturday, and we just had a very significant vote in the Senate. The vote was on whether we would move to a bill, fully debatable, to raise the debt ceiling without any strings attached.

The Republicans, en bloc, voted against that. As a result—since we need 60 votes to bring a bill to the floor—the vote was 53 to 45. There should be no mistake in anyone's mind. This was a very clear vote, simply to move to a bill, fully debatable, amendable even, but the Republicans would not even vote to go to that bill today.

Quite frankly, I must admit that when I was driving in to the Senate, I was thinking about this. I thought what we will do is that we will get on the bill. Obviously they will vote for cloture to proceed to the bill, and then we will get on the bill. I was wondering to myself how long we will have to be on the bill, what kinds of amendments would be offered, and then would we have to file cloture on that bill also.

I was quite surprised to see every Republican vote against even going to the bill. It begs credulity. I am incredulous at this, especially with the markets opening in Asia later tomorrow, on Sunday. How are they going to read this? I think if we had voted to at least move to the bill and debated it, they would have stabilized somewhat because they would say at least they are willing to talk about it. Now they can look at the bill and say simply, Republicans are not going to discuss this.

It is shocking that this would have transpired today at this last minute. No one gave up anything in the bill. It was simply to move to the bill, and the Republicans said no.

We have been closed for 2 weeks. I have come to the floor several times, as I know others have, to talk about this irresponsible and dangerous episode in our Nation's history. I understand that different groups are coming together trying to float some kind of an idea.

I hope something comes of it. I truly hope cooler heads will prevail and we will reach some agreement that will allow the government to reopen, allow the debt ceiling to be extended with no strings attached for at least 1 year or more—at least to get us through the next elections of 2014—and then we ought to go to negotiations.

Our Budget Committee passed a budget. The House passed its budget. They should meet and try to work it out in conference. Our Appropriations Committee passed our bills. The House

hasn't passed all of them. Then we could go to work and work these things out in the next 6 weeks, up to December 1. I hope that works and we get that kind of a compromise, but I do not want to see some kind of compromise which says to one side or the other that you have to do this or you have to do that.

It should be open. Our Budget Committee is under the able guidance and direction of Senator MURRAY of Washington. I am not a member of the Budget Committee, but they ought to go to conference without any strings attached or some artificial levels put in. They ought to take what we passed as the budget, as the House did.

What is happening is that—and it is getting worse every day, another week, another 2 weeks—it is unfathomable how many more people are going to be hurt.

A lot of Americans may think sequestration wasn't a big deal or that closing the government wasn't. I saw a piece in the paper where some tea party people were meeting. What came through is they weren't being directly hit or hurt by the government shut-down.

One respondent was quoted in the paper as saying: We need to go back to the late 1800s, the way this country ran then, where everybody grew their own vegetables.

I would say to that person: If you want to grow your own vegetables, you can grow your own vegetables. If you want to live somewhere without electricity, air conditioning, with no health care, and never go to the doctor, you should be able to do that. But why should you make the rest of the country go back to the 1800s?

This is what a handful of people are trying to do. They can't do it legislatively, they can't do it through the courts, they can't do it politically, and they can't win elections on that basis. So they are trying to do it by holding a gun to our heads, keeping the government closed, and threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

I wish to say in the few minutes I have remaining what another yearlong sequester would mean in human terms. These are things that come under the jurisdiction of my Appropriations Committee, which I have been privileged to chair or where I have been the ranking member since 1989. We have never had these kinds of problems before—Republicans or Democrats—when Republicans ran it or Democrats. I have been back and forth on this many times, in terms of Republicans chairing it—Democrats, Republicans, Democrats. We have never had these kinds of problems.

If we go 1 more year under sequester, that means 177,000 fewer children will get Head Start services—177,000—and 1.3 million fewer students will receive Title I education assistance. What is Title I? This goes to the poorest kids, the poorest families, the poorest areas.

So 1.3 million low-income kids won't be helped.

Oh, our kids will be fine, kids from the middle class, the upper class, and of Senators and Congressman. They have money. I am talking about the poor kids, and there are 1.3 million.

There are 760,000 fewer households that would receive less heating and cooling assistance under the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and mostly they are elderly poor people.

There will be 9,000 fewer special education staff in the classroom. In other words, under IDEA we provide money for special education teachers and support staff for special education students, and 9,000 will be cut.

There will be \$291 million less for childcare subsidies for working families, for people who need childcare subsidies. They are low income, they are going to work every day, but they need some childcare help—\$291 million cut away from that. How many will not be able to go to work or what will they do with those children? Will they put them in substandard childcare facilities?

One thing that is mind-boggling is we have a program in Medicare that goes after fraud, waste, and abuse. We know from the past that for every dollar that we put into that, we actually recover \$7.90. I don't mean something phony. I mean we actually bring back \$7.90 for every \$1 dollar we put into it.

Because of the cut under sequester that means in the next year there will be \$2.7 billion that we will not recover. By reducing the number of people in the fraud, waste and abuse section, that means it opens the door to fraud. People say: Oh, they are not there. They are not checking, right?

People say: Well, now we are going to give them flexibility under sequester. But there is no flexibility. That has to be cut.

Another yearlong continuing resolution under sequester means \$2 billion less for the National Institutes of Health, which means 1,300 fewer research grants.

Again, I would say that people say: Well, we will give flexibility. My colleague on the other side says: We will have sequester, but we will leave flexibility to the departments.

Let's see how that goes.

The funds for the Administration for Children and Families—what would they do? Would they preserve Head Start slots by cutting childcare subsidies?

At NIH, would you preserve cancer research by cutting Alzheimer's research? These are terrible choices. Flexibility does not answer these questions. It is not the answer.

When they talk about flexibility, I know what is on their mind—military spending. Everybody likes to talk about the sequester and the level of sequester. Do you know what the House did? A sequester says it is 50/50, 50 percent cut from defense, 50 percent from

nondefense discretionary. What the House did in the Ryan budget was to leave things whole and take it out of things like Head Start, IDEA, special education, and programs such as that. They took it out of there, but they left defense whole. That is not at all what was in sequester.

In my area of Health and Human Services, education, labor, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, NIH, next year we would cut about \$34 billion. People will say, I don't know what that means. As I said, it is how many more children will not be in Head Start, how many more families will not get childcare subsidies, how many more research grants will not be funded by the NIH. We will not have our Centers for Disease Control and Prevention epidemiologists out in the field watching for food outbreaks, food-borne illnesses, et cetera.

It is a disaster if we continue with the yearlong sequester and a continuing resolution. That is why we need a short-term one, so our committees can go to work. Perhaps cooler heads will prevail, and we can get a better budget for next year before the end of the year. To me, this is the way to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I commend the words of our chairman, the senior Senator from Iowa, for his warnings about the impact of sequestration and the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts. We are grateful for that because we need to be thinking about what happens down the road when we have a budget agreement.

I want to start today with a brief comment on what happened earlier. At about noontime we had a vote, which is a procedural vote which I was hoping would go in a certain direction, but it didn't. It was a vote to move forward on the question of how we are going to avoid default. I don't think it is the last word on this issue for the next few days, but I was hoping that the Republicans would at least allow a debate on how we can avoid default. So far that hasn't happened, but we are confident that in the next couple of days we will resolve this. But I do think it is important we lay a foundation for why we need to avoid default, because we have talked a lot about the consequences and the impact of a government shutdown—and that remains what might be called a clear and present danger to the middle class and to our economy—but we have to talk at the same time about the consequences of default because we are only days away from the deadline.

Maybe the best way to start is not with numbers but with part of a letter I received from a constituent this week. The letter was dated October 8, so my assumption is that most of what is contained in this letter are fears about and the impacts from the shutdown only. The sentiments expressed in this letter will only grow in signifi-

cance and severity as we get closer to the deadline and closer to default. I am reading just in pertinent part. This particular constituent is from northeastern Pennsylvania, about an hour from where I live, but in the same basic region. She talked about her own circumstances and that of her husband and then she continued on:

Besides our personal difficulties due to the budget impasse, my elderly parents live with the worry of when and if they will receive their Social Security checks. At 85 and 83 they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my mother say she can't sleep and has a stomachache from the worry about where our country is headed. Middle- and low-income families cannot afford another economic downturn. We are just barely recovering from the last one.

That is what she says about her parents. Now, again, it is my assumption the worry and the anxiety expressed in that paragraph are solely attributable to the government shutdown. Those worries and anxieties, and, frankly, real pain, the physical pain expressed in that paragraph about her mother, will only grow the closer we get to default, because we know the consequences of default are almost unimaginable—about the worst economic hit we could take as a country. So that is why we have to take every step necessary to avoid it.

But I think the words of a constituent from Pennsylvania speak in this case for the Nation. Why should people have a worry, even if that worry is unfounded? We know Social Security checks are going out now, thankfully, but they are slowed down substantially if there is a default. We know even in a shutdown, if you reach the age of 65, it is going to take you a while to get the checks you are entitled to because the process of validating your eligibility is held up. But why should there be uncertainty? Why should any mother or father or grandmother or grandfather have an anxiety and a worry that leads them to have a stomachache, in the case of this letter, or where they can't sleep because of the political agenda of one part of one political party in one House of Congress?

So that is where things are with people's feelings and their anxieties, and we have to be able to respond to that.

The default question itself is of great significance now. Maybe 10 days ago it wasn't, but I am afraid we are in a period now where just the talk of default, just getting close to default, will have an adverse impact on our economy. This did happen in 2011. That is irrefutable. All the data, all the facts, show just getting close to default has an adverse impact on the economy. By one estimate, a recent estimate, that was almost a \$20 billion hit to the economy, if you measure it over 10 years. There are all kinds of other consequences that I won't dwell on right now.

There were two statements made by Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew in his opening statement to the Finance Committee on Thursday morning that

I think we should be reminded of. This was in reference to the question, what if you go over the line in default and you have to decide which bills to pay, which is the wrong way to go, but Secretary Lew posited these two questions.

How can the United States choose whether to send Social Security checks to seniors or pay benefits to our veterans?

That is question No. 1. Question No. 2.

How can the United States choose whether to provide children with food assistance or meet our obligations to Medicare providers?

These are the kinds of questions we are all going to have to answer if we—as some people apparently want us to do—go over the default line for the first time in American history. To say it is fiscal madness doesn't begin to describe it.

Secretary Lew also said something else which we should contemplate today. He said:

It is irresponsible and reckless to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

We have heard talk in this body and in the other body about maybe we can survive if we go over the line; that maybe it is okay, maybe we can prioritize payments. I think we should be reminded of those words. Again, that quote:

... to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

It makes no sense and, fortunately, there is a consensus against it, but we still have work to do to prevent it from happening.

I will read as well a couple of lines from a letter I received from a friend of mine who has spent a lot more years in the financial markets and has spent a lot of years trying to get both parties in Washington to come together fiscally. I will read some lines from this memo he sent me. He was talking about what happens with default. It is like anything else—if you default on your mortgage, if you default in your personal life, you have a credit problem. He said:

From the standpoint of our creditworthiness, a default is a default. Once you have defaulted, you are a—

And I will leave the word out he put in there because it may not be appropriate for this Chamber, but I think people can figure out what the word might be here.—

And everyone fears they will be the next party not to be paid. As in the Lehman bankruptcy—

And here he is talking about the fall of 2008.

the potential for unintended consequences that spiral out of control is enormous. In short, toying with default is not akin to playing with fire but is more like handling financial weapons of mass destruction. It is a violation of the trust we place in our elected leaders to safeguard the welfare of our country.

That is what this person, who I know has a lot of experience in the markets, describes could happen in the event of default.

I will conclude with some quick references to the impact of default as described by economists, as described by experts in the field of measuring the impact of default, and folks who know a lot about what would happen. I will read them as quickly as I can, because we know some of these already but we have to remind ourselves: Increasing borrowing costs. Many have talked and written about that. Damaging economic growth. Higher interest rates. Higher debt payments. Slow economic growth.

One expert was talking about the Lehman bankruptcy and then putting that in the context of a default, and making the case that a default has a much bigger impact than even the Lehman bankruptcy had.

Consider this: In 2008, the Lehman bankruptcy was an “event that triggered the financial crisis that caused the stock market to lose half its value over just 5 months and helped to trigger the worst recession since the Great Depression.”

That was just the Lehman bankruptcy. Imagine in the context of default how much worse it could be.

Retirement savings. According to newer data, an equivalent hit could cost—comparing it to what happened in 2011—the average person in his or her fifties, who has been saving for 20 or 30 years, as much as \$11,000.

Mortgage payments would be hiked. After the 2011 shutdown, mortgage spreads jumped by 70 basis points, which would have added \$100 per month to the cost of a typical mortgage.

So we have data from 2011 that measures the adverse impact on mortgages just by getting close to default, not in the event of default itself.

Disrupted payments. Delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57½ million Americans from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner and interfere with payments to 3.4 million veterans.

I will read two more. Moody’s chief economist Mark Zandi, who has testified in front of the Senate many times—who, parenthetically, as relates to the shutdown testified yesterday over in the House, because the Joint Economic Committee is a joint committee—predicts that, just as it relates to the shutdown, in this fourth quarter, the fourth quarter we are in, we will have lost ½ point of growth. So instead of the GDP growth in the fourth quarter being 2½ percent, as Mark Zandi would have projected absent a shutdown, with the shutdown we will go from 2½ percent growth to 2 percent. That is a shutdown in one quarter. Just imagine the impact on growth if we default.

Here is what Mark Zandi says. I am quoting him directly:

It would be devastating to the economy. Confidence will evaporate, consumer confidence will sharply decline, businesses will stop hiring, consumers will stop spending, the stock market will fall significantly in value, borrowing costs for businesses and households will rise.

And he goes on from there. But, look, you don’t have to be an economist to know the impact of default. All you have to do is read what economists are saying across the board. These are people who disagree on a lot of things. They might disagree on a budget item. They might disagree on econometric modeling. They might disagree on tax cuts. They might disagree on a usual Democrat versus Republican approach to the economy. They might have fundamental disagreements on everything, but on this they are speaking with one voice: Don’t default, they are telling us. Don’t even get close to defaulting. Don’t even talk about or debate defaulting. Just prevent it from happening. That is the overwhelming consensus.

Let me conclude with one reference here. When I got to the Senate, one of the leading Republican voices on the budget—because he happened to be the ranking member on the Budget Committee—was Judd Gregg from New Hampshire. He had been a Governor of New Hampshire and then served in the Senate for many years. This is what he had to say recently in talking about what would happen in the event of default and brinkmanship with the debt limit.

[It] is the political equivalent of playing Russian roulette with all of the chambers of the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy. A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

So says the former ranking member of the Budget Committee, the former Republican Senator from New Hampshire. So the idea that some think for some reason we could go into default or even get close to it doesn’t make a lot of sense.

I will conclude with this thought. That letter I started with from my constituent in Pennsylvania, who speaks for the country, I believe, when she was talking about her parents—her 82- or 83-year-old parents—and about the uncertainty they have, about the worry and the anxiety that is literally causing, in the case of her mother, according to this letter, physical pain, but even if it didn’t rise to that level, just the idea of a government shutdown coupled with the potential default is causing that kind of anxiety and is really disturbing, and I think it is an insult to so many Americans.

We have to come together and open the government at long last and make sure we pay our bills and not even get close to defaulting, and then we can have negotiations and discussions for weeks and months about long-term and short-term issues. In the meantime, we have to make sure we pay our bills and open the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we exited the Chamber to go to our Democratic caucus, I am certain my Republican colleagues and friends were talking among themselves as well, trying to find a way forward.

A reporter stopped me and said: What do you think the Senate is going to do?

I don’t know the specifics, but I am most certainly hopeful and remain cautiously optimistic that the Senate will step up to the job at hand and fulfill the promise and hopes of our Founders, who created the Senate to operate at times just like these where there seems to be no way forward, to find a way forward; where the political winds have gotten so bitter and cold, for the 100 of us to find a way forward to help keep our economy whole and operating and functioning well, not just for our Nation but for the world, which is important; to help support and bolster the recovery that is underway; to set aside the bitterness and the rancor and try to find a way forward.

I am very encouraged despite the fact that the vote was very divisive—all Republicans on one side and all Democrats on the other. I am confident because I know Members of this body well and I have been here long enough to know that the many people of good will on both sides of the aisle can try to find a way forward. And I know the President of the United States is open to negotiation.

Maybe we can find resolution within the political parties, but that is not what is important. What is important is finding a resolution in the Senate of the United States for all of the people of the United States. We do not represent narrow districts with narrow ideologies. We represent States—big ones, such as California, medium-sized ones, such as Louisiana, and small ones, such as Delaware. But inside of Delaware, inside of Louisiana, and inside of California, there are people of all different political persuasions. As Senators, when we run for office we have to listen and take all of that in and then try to make the best decisions we can. It is an honor to serve in the Senate even though it is tough, it is hard, and it is very difficult at times.

I have been proud to serve here for 18 years and be among many groups that have found compromise and the middle ground, that have tried to work to understand where the other side is coming from and move our country forward. It has not always been perfect, and none of us are perfect here, but I am proud I have at least been one to say: Count on me to try to see what we can do to resolve the situation. I want to say that today for my constituents. That is what they want me to do. That is what they sent me here for 18 years ago and what I know they want me to

continue to do. I do feel strongly on their behalf that the government should open and the 21,000 of them who have been wrongly laid off by the actions of a minority—the government needs to open, and the debt of the United States most certainly needs to be honored so this economic recovery can continue.

But there are plenty of things we can negotiate. The debt of the country is too high. We do need to have some earned benefit and potential entitlement reform—not necessarily cutting benefits from people who count on them but for the government to do its part to meet people halfway. There are always efficiencies that can be created if we work together.

So on behalf of my constituents, I am very hopeful that we can find a way forward. I think Senator REID has been providing extraordinary leadership, and hopefully we can find a way forward.

I would briefly mention that there have been some very good conversations going on about funding for the city of Washington—not a part of the Federal Government—which has not been resolved yet, but Republicans, Democrats, and the White House are working together to find a way so the District of Columbia, the city of Washington—with its own mayor and city council, its own budget, its own local funds—does not have to be caught up in a very tough circumstance that is not of their making. They are not part of the Federal Government, and neither is New York, Chicago, New Orleans, or Baltimore. They are separate cities, and they should be treated that way. We haven't found a way yet, but we are working on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana, but I want the RECORD spread with the work she has done that I have seen in our years together in the Senate. No one has been more of an advocate for a State than the senior Senator from Louisiana. What she did after that terrible hurricane hit that area is now legendary—the ability that she had to change what had been standard procedures and law in this country for decades. We changed that for a lot of reasons. One was her advocacy. We did it because of her.

In fact, the Democrats in the Senate voted for things they never voted for before because of the good Senator from Louisiana. It was not done to help on a temporary basis but long term for the State of Louisiana.

I hope they understand what a difference one person can make. She has made a difference and she has changed things forever in Louisiana already. I am sure the best is yet to come.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators per-

mitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PRELIMINARY TALKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as most know now—we did a press event so everybody knows, I guess, but I will say it again—I had a meeting with Senators McConnell, Alexander, and Schumer this morning to work on issues before us. The conversations are preliminary, but we are talking. I hope everyone understands how positive this is. It is the first discussions we have had here, period, during the whole pendency of this artificially driven government shutdown and not raising the debt limit when we should.

I am confident Senator MCCONNELL understands that defaulting on our debt would mean millions of jobs in the United States, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands but millions. It could halt Social Security checks, Medicare payments, and even paychecks for our men and women in uniform.

Democratic Senators agree with President Obama and we share a simple goal. We want to reopen the government and pay our bills so we can move forward in good-faith negotiations for a long-term budget to protect jobs, the middle class, and the American economy. That is our goal.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following Members to be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LUCAS, KING of Iowa, NEUGEBAUER, ROGERS of Alabama, CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. DENHAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, PETERSON, MCINTYRE, COSTA, WALZ, SCHRADER, MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. VELA.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House amendment, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE, MARINO, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 1207 and 1301 of the House amendment, and sections 1301, 1412, 1435, and 4204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CAMP, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and LEVIN.

For consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. FUDGE.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1571. A bill to permit the District of Columbia to obligate and expend local funds in accordance with the local budget adopted by the Council of the District of Columbia during any period of fiscal year 2014 in which no Federal law appropriating such local funds is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS ON OCTOBER 11, 2013

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1352

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1352, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Gov-

ernors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1570

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1570, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S.J. RES. 24

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution to amend the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 to make continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased members of the Coast Guard.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON RESERVOIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 812 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 812) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed

and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 812) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 812

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

SECTION 1. AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES CONCERNING TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON RESERVOIRS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to take actions necessary to implement the terms of the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, which is hereby approved, including—

(1) to approve unitization agreements and related arrangements for the exploration of, and development or production of oil or gas from, transboundary reservoirs and geological structures;

(2) to disclose as necessary under the Agreement information related to the exploration, development, and production of a transboundary reservoir or geological structure that may be considered confidential, privileged, or proprietary information under law; and

(3) to accept and take action not inconsistent with an expert determination under the Agreement.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES. 76

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that H.J. Res. 76 has been received from the House and is at the desk and due for activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow, Sunday, October 13, 2013, and 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, Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. 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 2:58 p.m., adjourned until Sunday, October 13, 2013, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 12, 2013:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES M. KOWALSKI