



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 2013

No. 43

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 25, 2013, at 10 a.m.

## Senate

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 2013

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, a Senator from the State of Maine.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.  
God of love and grace, our love is pale and fitful compared to Your infinite goodness. Inspire our lawmakers with Your guiding power so that they will pursue paths of peace and justice for all. Keep before them Your vision of bringing deliverance to captives, the recovery of sight to the blind, and permitting the oppressed to go free. Use them as healers and helpers and heralds of Your good tidings to our Nation and world. Assure them of Your love as You give them eyes to see Your saving truth.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable ANGUS S. KING led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are on the budget resolution, that it has been reported.

### CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2014

Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski) amendment No. 431, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to require equal pay policies and practices.

Reid (for Ayotte/Thune) amendment No. 158, to prohibit the consideration of a budget resolution that includes revenue increases while the civilian unemployment rate is above 5.5 percent, the administration's prediction for the unemployment rate without the stimulus.

Reid (for Cruz) amendment No. 202, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and to encourage patient-centered reforms to improve health outcomes and reduce health care costs, promoting economic growth.

Reid (for Murray) amendment No. 439, to amend the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to provide tax relief for low and middle-income families.

Reid (for Crapo) amendment No. 222, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to repeal the tax increases enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that were imposed on low-and middle-income Americans.

Reid (for Shaheen/Stabenow) amendment No. 438, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to health care, including primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, and employer-provided contraceptive coverage, such as was provided under the Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148).

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, from now until 11 a.m., there will be conversation on the floor. At 11 a.m., we will have six rollcall votes. The first vote will be 15 minutes and after that the votes will be 10 minutes each, as we said yesterday, and I enforced it. When the time is up, we are closing the vote. If the Republicans are not here, too bad; if the Democrats are not here, too

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2235

bad. We are going to have a lot of votes today, so everyone should make sure they are here. Understand if you are not here in time, the clerk has been asked to turn the vote in.

After we complete the six rollcall votes starting at 11 a.m., there will be 2 hours of debate remaining on the resolution. Therefore, unless something untoward happens, the vote-arama is expected to begin at 3 p.m. this afternoon. I hope everyone will understand we have had about 400 amendments that have been filed. We are not going to vote on 400 amendments. The average is usually between 25 and 35 votes. So everyone should understand that is about where we should wind up.

Everyone is going to be tired. The two managers have worked very hard on this for a long time, so be considerate of their time, their thoughts, and their efforts also.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. President, S. 649 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 649) to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the measure will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two managers or their designees.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank Ranking Member SESSIONS once again for another good day of vigorous debate. There are clearly some differences between us in the Senate, but all our constituents benefit from having those views laid out and expressed clearly. I appreciate all he is doing to help us move along as well as have the good debate we are having.

Yesterday, the Senate did vote to reject the idea that balancing the budget by an arbitrary date should come before middle-class families and broad-based economic growth. Last night, the Senate voted to continue down the path toward a truly balanced approach to tackling our economic and fiscal challenges. It is the kind of approach that cuts spending responsibly and calls on the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations to pay their fair share.

We voted on an approach that puts our economy first and foremost and makes sure we are protecting, not threatening, our fragile economic re-

covery. That is the kind of approach that is supported by the vast majority of the American people, and the Senate stood strongly behind that.

The Senate strongly rejected the budget that passed the House of Representatives yesterday. Their budget would meet the goal by balancing the budget with an arbitrary date but would do it in a way that would be devastating for our families and the economy. It would dismantle Medicare and end up cutting taxes for the rich while raising them on the middle class; not only that, but it did rely on gimmicks and tricks to hit that arbitrary date. There is nothing balanced about that kind of approach. I am very glad every Member of the Senate had an opportunity to be clear about where we stand on that.

The Senate also voted yesterday to specifically reject the idea that Medicare should be dismantled or voucherized. I am glad we had strong bipartisan support on that amendment. We also voted clearly for the idea that while both sides favor closing tax loopholes and ending wasteful deductions that favor the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations, the Senate thinks some of that revenue should be used to tackle the deficit and invest in the middle class, not to be used to simply cut tax rates for the rich the way the House budget did.

We have a few more hours of debate this morning between now and 11 a.m., followed by some votes, and then we will close out the debate and move on to all the rest of the votes we will take before final passage late tonight or early tomorrow morning.

As the majority leader said, we have hundreds of amendments. If we were to vote on all of them, we would be here every single hour voting between Monday and Tuesday. I think every Member knows that is probably not going to happen. I encourage every Member of the Senate to work with the manager on their side so we can get the amendments up sooner rather than later and vote on the ones each side wants us to.

I urge all my colleagues to work with us and our staff to make sure we know where the priorities are, how to proceed, and we will work with everyone to combine similar amendments. Obviously, among those 400 amendments, there are a number that are similar. We will clear as many noncontroversial amendments by voice vote as we can, and we will get through as many votes as possible in a fair and reasonable manner. We look forward to working with Senator SESSIONS to make sure we can do that.

I encourage our colleagues—there is a bit more time for them to have their say before we vote. If anyone would like to have their say, make sure our staffs know before making any statements.

With that, I yield to my colleague, Senator SESSIONS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have enjoyed working with Senator MURRAY. She is a strong leader. She makes clear decisions and sticks by them and executes them. I respect that. She has stayed within the rules as the chair of the committee. We disagreed on a number of things. Our vision for the financial future of America is quite different.

I understand how difficult it is to produce a budget. That is not an easy thing to accomplish. When there is a divergent caucus, it is particularly difficult.

Politico said the budget was written by the left of the Democratic caucus to the left of President Obama. I think that is probably correct. It is a very big spending, big tax budget. It is the wrong thing for America. It is the wrong thing for economic stability. It is the wrong kind of plan if made into law to help us grow our economy, create jobs, create wealth, get people overtime and bonuses and pay raises, the kind of thing we have when the economy is growing.

This budget is the wrong medicine. I have to say I strongly believe it takes us in the wrong direction. What does it do at the bottom? It raises taxes. It raises taxes, according to the chairman, by \$1 trillion—\$985 billion. That is almost \$1 trillion. We think it raises it \$1.5 trillion. There is a reserve fund to make it easy to raise more taxes. I asked the chair to close that so it could not be used to raise taxes easily, but she declined, which continued to cause me to believe that is an additional part. Regardless, \$1 trillion in new taxes is a huge tax increase.

In January of this year, the President got a \$600 billion tax increase on the rich. Plus there is \$1 trillion in tax increase in the President's health care bill. So we are already at \$1.6 trillion in new taxes, and there is a proposal in this budget for at least another \$1 trillion. That is not healthy for the economy.

We all know when we extract more wealth out of the economy, it does have effects. One of them is it weakens the economy and strengthens the central government. The central government is not managing the people's money well. We have no interest, it appears from this budget, in listening to the American people and running their government better, leaner, more productive, get more bang for the buck. What do we do? We ask for more money. We haven't done anything wrong; send us more money.

I have to urge my colleagues to honestly examine what the budget does. In addition to raising taxes, we would think that would help us. They say they have a balanced approach. We started counting how many times my Democratic colleagues used the word "balance." I think it suggests a guilty conscience myself because the budget in no way comes close to balancing a

budget. It doesn't pretend to. It explicitly rejects it. There is not an arbitrary date. There is not a date proposed to balance the budget. In fact, because it makes no changes in the drivers of our debt, the big entitlement programs, the big welfare programs, the interest on the debt, none of those are constrained by this budget. We know the next 10 years that are outside the budget window will be even worse. They will be on an unsustainable course, accelerating even off the course we are on today, which is unsustainable. So I am very disappointed.

Everybody who has been involved or who has participated—whether it is the Gang of 6 or the committee of 12, as our chairman did, the super committee—knows that nearly 60 percent of the money the government is now spending, such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, food stamps, those programs are out of control. They are entitlements, which means we set up legal standards that if those standards are met, anyone can walk into a government office and demand the money. They have to give it to them. If they don't, they can sue the government. I am 68 years old, I want my Social Security check. We can't say we don't have any money.

So this is the kind of thing that needs to be fixed now. It needs to be discussed now. Every expert who is an independent adviser to the government has said: You guys need to get together and fix this.

So what the budget before us today says is, no, we are not going to fix any of that. We have no plans to construct any of that. And any of our Republican colleagues who suggest that these programs have to be changed, we say they don't like old people. We say they don't like poor people. We say they don't want people to have food.

That is what we say—attack, attack, attack, when everybody knows change must occur. We know that. It is not in this budget—nothing in the budget. So they don't change the programs within the budget. I suggest that is not responsible. I suggest that is not a budget worthy of a party that says they want to lead America. The great Democratic Party is absolutely refusing to confront the great financial issues of our time. No, we won't talk about it, and if our Republican colleagues do, we are going to attack PAUL RYAN because he has a creative, insightful way to preserve Medicare and make it more healthy in the future and put it on a sound path. We are going to say he is trying to destroy Medicare.

PAUL RYAN has a plan to save Medicare, bring it into the 21st century, and make things better. It ought to be discussed openly and fairly, not demonized. That is the level of debate we are in here.

In private when we talk to our colleagues, they say: Yes, we need to make changes. We really do.

Well, when? And when the paper is printed, when the budget is printed, it

is not there. It is not there. So there is no reform of the fundamental drivers of our debt.

We also know that last year we spent \$750 billion on 83 government welfare programs, means-tested programs; that is, if a person's income is below a certain level, the government deems that person worthy of some subsidy of some kind. Many of these 83 programs are duplicative. There is not a coherent focus on them that endeavors to help the people, really, other than giving them money, giving them aid. There is not a sufficient focus in all of these programs in actually helping that struggling mother with children who is out of work, who lost her job, who can no longer get overtime or bonus pay, and young people who are struggling to get up on the ladder of work and prosperity. This is not helping them. And these programs are just temporary. We have billions going out for unemployment insurance, food stamps, temporary assistance to needy families, earned-income tax credit, all of these programs.

It is time for us to begin a massive overhaul, review all of these programs, and several things can happen. One thing that can happen is we can make them better, and we can actually create programs that allow each person in their time of need to get temporary assistance, to be able to refocus their life, to move into the workforce, help them find the training they need to get into areas that need jobs right now, and help them move forward. But do my colleagues know what we have in our Senate and among a lot of the Members of the House? We have a goal to see how many more workers we can bring in without effectively helping American workers who are unemployed.

We have an immigration policy that says we have jobs but we don't have enough workers. That is what the businesses are telling us. We don't have enough workers. They all ought to add—when they send us that message, they ought to say: And by the way, you need to give more welfare and more aid to people who don't have jobs. Now, what is the disconnect there?

We need to be protecting American citizens who are here, out of work, and hurting today—minorities, Blacks and Whites and all colors and races that are hurting today with high unemployment, but we seem to be more focused on how we can ram through this Senate a bill that would legalize millions and create an even more robust guest worker program. There are not enough jobs now. Give me a break.

So we are talking about \$750 billion going out now for these 83 programs, projected to go up 80 percent in the next decade—the total of those programs—go up 80 percent in the next decade. We have calculated those numbers, and if it went up 60 percent, it would save \$1 trillion. I think we can make those programs more effective, more helpful, and organized in a way

that really advances the needs of poor people and save \$1 trillion. That ought to be our goal. We will let it grow as much as we have to allow it grow to take care of people in need. We are going to make sure people have their needs met in America who are struggling out there, but at the same time, it can be done better, and every American knows it. They will talk to us when we ask them about it. They are uneasy about the easy money and the feeling that this system isn't working when it comes to government assistance, and I think they are right. I would ask my colleagues if they think they are right. I really think so. So what does that mean? That means we should be having hearings and doing work to fix it, which we are not doing.

The challenge of our time is the unsustainable debt course this country is on. The challenge of our time is for us to demonstrate that we made the changes necessary to place this economy on a sound footing.

I believe the great minds of our time are not as smart as they think they are. In 2001 Chairman Greenspan of the Fed came before the Budget Committee and talked about what we were going to do when the entire debt of the United States was paid down, and he worried we wouldn't know what to do with the money. Of course, we were in a recession within a few months, and now we see demographically that we are on an unsustainable debt course. The new Fed Chairman, Mr. Bernanke, as the Wall Street Journal documented, at the time was promoting Mr. Greenspan to spend more money and keep losing money before the housing crisis—just exactly the wrong advice. He didn't see it coming. So we are not so smart around here.

I am worried about the future. What do I think responsible government policymakers should do? They should provide a good, solid framework for the vibrant, free market economy in this country to flourish. We can't be the kind of off and on again faucet for money and taxes and spending and not spending and bouncing around here trying to pass laws every few months to meet what is perceived as the financial goal of somebody on Wall Street at that moment. We are not able to do that.

What we should do is lay out a strong, clear policy, adhere to it, and let the businesspeople risk their money with some ability to ascertain what those risks are, not expecting the government to come in and alter the situation and the rules of the game a few months down the road. That is what we should do—create a sound framework. We are not doing that. I am concerned about it.

Finally, this budget increases spending. It increases spending very dramatically at a time when we don't need to be increasing spending at this rate. We are increasing spending above the rate we are currently set to operate by—the Budget Control Act line—

which allows for increasing spending every year. But this budget spends more than that, and it raises \$1 trillion in taxes, at least, and it expends all of those new taxes, eats that up with new spending. If it called for us to stay on the current baseline of spending, growth that is going up, and we raised \$1 trillion in taxes, we would have \$1 trillion in reduced deficit over the next 10 years. But it spends more money, and it eats up the new taxes with new spending. It really does.

This is a failed plan that has been produced by the majority party in the Senate. When people heard this—this is what is being said to the American people, and we all know it: The Democratic leadership is saying, we have a budget that is balanced. What does that mean? It means we are going to pay down the debt, but it is not all going to be cutting spending. We are going to pay down the debt by raising taxes and cutting spending—raise taxes \$1 trillion, cut spending \$1 trillion, so we have a \$2 trillion reduction in the deficit. Doesn't that sound good? That is the kind of thing the American people would like to hear. It is not enough. We could do more, and we don't have to do a lot more, and we will have a balanced budget.

But it doesn't do that, I say to my colleagues. It doesn't. It raises taxes \$1 trillion, but it raises spending \$1 trillion. It doesn't cut spending by \$1 trillion, it raises spending. Therefore, we have no deficit reduction at all, but we have a new \$1 trillion tax.

The government is saying to the American people: We need more money. We don't have any way to cut any spending, and if anybody proposes there are abuses in the food stamp program or there are abuses in other programs out there or that we are wasting money on energy loans by the billions—Solyndra and A123s and those kinds of companies—they are saying all of that, but we can't save any money. There is no money to be saved. You just send us more money, and then we will pass it around, and this will stimulate the economy.

I will conclude. I see we have some colleagues who are here. I would just say this: The debt we have today I have become absolutely convinced is too high. The gross debt of the United States is 104 percent of our economy. It is above our GDP, which is almost \$17 trillion—that debt is almost \$17 trillion now.

What we have seen from the Rogoff and Reinhart study and from recent reports by the International Monetary Fund and a report by the European Central Bank and a report by the Bank for International Settlements—they all say that when debt is as high as it is today in the United States, that begins to pull down growth.

So my colleagues claim they have a budget that will help create jobs. I would say with all respect that we have a disagreement. Democrats believe they can tax more and spend more and

borrow more and that will somehow create growth and prosperity. I believe we have had 4 years of that experiment, which I fundamentally doubted and opposed from the beginning, and it hasn't worked. We can't take a bucket of water from one end of the pool and pour it in the other and gain from it, especially when the bucket is going to leak—a good bit of it—in the process.

So what I would say is that the debt now is so high—according to all of those reports, the debt of the United States is in the zone that they craft, that they have analyzed—when debt gets into that zone, we lose growth. All of those reports—Rogoff and Reinhart, IMF, European Central Bank, the Bank of International Settlements—say we are in that zone.

So if we want to have growth, we are going to have to make our government leaner. We are going to have to begin to get our budget under control and balanced. And if we balance it by allowing growth to occur at 3.4 percent, without having to cut over 10 years—but if we allow our growth to increase at 3.4 percent instead of 5.4 percent, the budget balances. So we don't have to slash and burn, but we do have to get off the course we are on. It isn't easy, but that is what we are paid to do—to be responsible.

So if we get off that course and begin to see our debt-to-GDP go down, which a balanced budget—even over a 10-year, responsible period—would do, then we will be able to actually honestly say we have strengthened America, we have put us on a sound path, and we have allowed the economy to grow again.

There is no doubt in my mind, I say to my colleagues—and I doubt in theirs—that if the world were to see that the United States was on a path to a balanced budget, wow, they would say: Really? This debt spiral the United States and all of these big, fat Western nations have been on—maybe others can do this too. Maybe this is the place to invest our money.

I believe it would help growth, help investment, help put the country on a sound path. I am disappointed that this budget doesn't do it.

I respect my colleagues. We had a great time in the committee. We have had a good time on the floor. Senator MURRAY is a good chair. But I guess the left of the Democratic caucus has produced a budget that won't work. It does not meet the challenge of our time. It is deeply disappointing. I guess there is still some chance something might happen in conference. But from the looks of this budget, the chances are not very great, I have to say.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for this opportunity and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes off the resolution to my friend and colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, the chair of the Appropriations Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS.

I probably will not take 10 minutes, but what I will speak about is really compelling.

AMENDMENT NO. 431

Later on during the vote-arama we will be considering my amendment that will create a reserve fund that should we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, it will in no way negate the spending within our budget. It is essentially the functional equivalent of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that the Senate should pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

We talk a lot about growing the economy. The economy will grow when people work. The people who are entering the workforce who have been one of the driving forces for the last 30 years are women. Although we are in the workforce full force, we are still not being paid equal pay for equal work. It is outrageous. If you want to grow the economy, pass paycheck fairness so we are not harassed for simply trying to find out what our pay is and how we can get equal pay for the same job.

Women across America are worried about staying in the middle class if they are already there or getting to the middle class if they are not there. Nearly 50 years after passage of the Equal Pay Act, women still get paid less than men.

This budget is a reflection of our values and priorities, and eliminating the wage gap should be one. For years I and other colleagues have fought for paycheck fairness. Under that act, no longer would employers be able to retaliate against workers for sharing information about wages. Right now, if you ask someone what they get paid, you can get fired. This bill follows on from the famous Lilly Ledbetter Act. Lilly herself was humiliated and harassed because she tried to find out what she was making.

No longer will women be able to seek only backpay when they are discriminated against. Under this bill they could also seek punitive damages. No longer would employers be able to use almost any reason for paying a woman less: Oh, the men do harder jobs. Oh, they have a better education than you. In fact, the reverse is happening. Women entering the workforce are often better educated, with more academic and trade certifications than men who are doing it. Women are also doing hard and dangerous jobs. We can look at what they do in the military. We can look at them as firefighters, police officers, and prison guards.

Under the legislation I am proposing, no longer will women be on their own in fighting for equal pay for equal work. In this country we say: If you work hard and play by the rules, you will get ahead. We work hard every day, but we find that the rules are different for women than for men. Actually, the rules in many workplaces are rigged against us.

So I would hope that we would adopt my amendment today that would allow

us to be able to go forward later on in the year and pass paycheck fairness. It is important to the women in the workplace, and it is important to our economy.

Much is being said about being progrowth. Who is not progrowth? Of course we want to grow our economy. If we look at the tax structure, I believe we should reward—right now, the tax structure is tilted and the tax breaks that we give are to reward people who make money off of money, not people who make money off of products or the sweat of their own brow. So I think we need to take a look at the Tax Code.

My State is an entrepreneurial-driven State. We are an innovation economy in biotech, cyber tech, space tech. At the same time, we have people who work hard every single day in agriculture, in poultry, in mining, in trying to earn a living by very hard work. I believe we should have a Tax Code that rewards it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, how many minutes are remaining on our side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 48½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COONS. Thank you, Mr. President.

We have heard a great deal about balance in the debates on the Senate floor. As we move toward voting on a budget resolution, I just want to remind all of us in this Chamber today to keep in mind that a balanced path forward has broad support across all of America. Folks are looking for us to take a path toward steady and responsible deficit reduction, investing in growing our economy, investing in helping our private sector grow good jobs, while still honoring the pledges we have made to America's veterans, to our seniors, to those who rely on some of our most important and most treasured Federal programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

There is a sharp contrast—and that contrast will be clear and clearer as this day goes on—between the values embedded in the Ryan budget, passed by the House, and the budget led ably by Chairman MURRAY and the Senate Democrats in the Budget Committee that will be taken up later today. We will be considering dozens, perhaps hundreds, of amendments that will touch on a very wide range of issues—from paycheck fairness and gender equity, as referenced by Senator MIKULSKI just a few moments ago, to issues very widely ranging—ones that I have helped champion on the Budget Committee that would increase investment in manufacturing, making sure that our manufacturing sector is more competitive; ones that allow us to strengthen our R&D sector, strengthen our education sector; ones that ensure we preserve and protect these valued Medicare and Medicaid programs that I referenced.

More than anything, at the end of the day I think the challenge to all of us is

to help the American people understand the fundamental difference in values reflected in these two different budgets.

I know I will be joined in just a few minutes by colleagues who are coming to speak to that point, to help lay out for the American people the fundamental difference between these two budgets. But if I might, sort of at the highest level for a moment, I want to remind folks who might be watching, folks in the Chamber, that a budget resolution is quite different from the budgets that, Mr. President, you might have been used to as a Governor, that others of us were used to from the private sector or from State or county or city governments.

A budget resolution does not have every single item to be spent by this government in great detail. As State budgets are submitted to general assemblies or legislatures, they typically have exactly how the State will spend its funds in the year ahead in enormous detail. This budget resolution sets a framework. It sets sort of top-level spending targets and then directs the committees of jurisdiction to achieve either changes to the Tax Code in the Finance Committee or changes to vital programs in other committees, whether Defense or HELP or others.

So when we talk often about the values embedded in a budget resolution, that is, in part, because a budget resolution is just the beginning of a regular order, healthy budget process. It then has to be complemented with authorization bills and with appropriations bills.

But if you compare the budget resolution that has already been adopted in the House, and that was rejected by a vote on the floor last night, with the budget resolution that has come out of the Senate Budget Committee, I think you see a few simple, stark differences. Both budget resolutions raise a significant amount of revenue through tax reform by closing so-called tax loopholes or cutting spending through the Tax Code. This is spending that is not reviewed every year. This is spending that often has been stuck into the Tax Code through the efforts of the wealthy and well-connected powerful interests in our country, that does not get reviewed every year. It is time for us to look seriously at our Tax Code to make it leaner, easier to understand, easier to enforce, more efficient, and to make our country more competitive.

But a core question we have to address is, To what end do we put the revenue raised through changes to our Tax Code? In the House budget resolution, they raise, if I remember, roughly \$5.7 trillion over the 10-year budget period—all of which is dedicated to reducing the tax rates on the wealthiest Americans and on the most profitable corporations, reducing rates on corporations and individuals.

The much smaller amount raised in our budget plan—\$975 billion over 10 years, through cutting spending

through the Tax Code—is dedicated to deficit reduction.

The balanced path we have talked about—that balances reduction in the deficit through new revenue raised by reforms to the Tax Code with comparable spending reductions across all areas of our budget—is the sort of balanced plan that was on the ballot, that was a critical part of the 2012 election process, and that I frankly think the American people have broadly embraced.

We have put forward a budget that meets the values agenda that our Democratic Budget Committee stands behind: to invest in critical areas of our economy, whether infrastructure, education, or R&D; to help lift the private sector and help grow jobs again; to keep our most vital commitments to seniors and to veterans and to those most at risk in our society, while still making responsible, steady progress toward reducing our crippling deficit and debt. We get the deficit down to less than 3 percent of GDP. At the end of the 10-year period, we stabilize our publicly held debt at 70 percent of GDP. These are the targets broadly agreed on by every major bipartisan group that has looked at the challenges facing the United States, our economy, and our budget.

I will remind you that the Bowles-Simpson Commission—a bipartisan commission—came up with a rough target of \$4 trillion in savings over a decade. This plan, this budget resolution, would achieve—in fact, would exceed—that target in a way that has balance and, I believe, is responsible.

I would be happy to talk further then, if I might, Mr. President, about some of the other issues contained both within our budget resolution and, in contrast, within the budget resolution coming over from the House.

As a number of my colleagues have spoken about movingly on the Senate floor in recent days, one of the most important differences is in the future of the fundamental entitlement programs that are a part of the progressive legacy of FDR and LBJ and that were put in place with both Republicans and Democrats over many years, strengthening and sustaining them. We see a fundamental difference in direction between what has happened in the House and what we have proposed in the Senate.

To put it simply, in the House they would change Medicare from a Federal guarantee, from a program that provides health care to millions of Americans, to a voucher program, one where what the Federal Government provides is not a guarantee but premium support, a voucher, something that would shift costs onto seniors, onto States, and onto communities. In Medicaid, in my view, even worse—because it supports the most vulnerable in our country—they would turn it into a block grant. This would shift more than \$800 billion onto the balance sheets of States.

To talk further about these important differences and the values between the House and the Senate budgets, and to talk about its impact on the future of the United States, I yield 7 minutes to my colleague from the State of Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS.

The Senate budget resolution that we have worked so hard on would, first, replace the harmful budget sequester, the effects of which are only beginning to be felt in our communities—with balanced deficit reduction. Second, it would invest in our crumbling roads, bridges, and water infrastructure. Our engineers give our infrastructure a D-plus. Clearly, we need to make that investment, and it would support continued job creation and economic growth.

Despite this sensible, balanced approach, not a single Republican supported this budget in committee. Republicans prefer to raid the programs that the middle class depends on, while protecting the rich and the well-connected.

A CBS News poll conducted last September shows that 78 percent of Americans favor continuing the current guarantee of Medicare coverage for seniors—78 percent. But the Republican budget would gut Medicare, turning it into a voucher program for those 55 and under—basically putting Medicare into a death spiral. And it would end the Medicare guarantee that has been the pillar of American retirement for half a century.

More than 3 million seniors right now save an average of \$700 a year on prescriptions because we closed the dread doughnut hole. Well, the Republican budget throws them right back in the doughnut hole, forcing today's seniors to pay an additional \$700 a year, on average, out of pocket.

Sixty million Americans got to college and were able to seize their dreams because of Pell grants. The Republican plan cuts Pell grants, dropping an estimated million students in this vital program. This Ryan Republican plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program is so extreme and so radical that even Republicans are speaking out against it.

Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY voted against the Ryan budget. He said, "My home State of West Virginia has the highest percentage of Medicare beneficiaries in the country, and I cannot support a plan that the Congressional Budget Office has determined would nearly double out-of-pocket healthcare costs for future retirees."

Of course, former Speaker Newt Gingrich described this plan as "right-wing social engineering." This Republican budget makes enormous mystery cuts in the budget. Chairman RYAN claims he can cut \$900 billion of appropriated domestic spending over the next 10 years. That means border security, that means the FBI, that means

medical research, that means student financial aid, that means the grants that support our efforts to combat violence against women.

Under the extreme radical Republican budget, domestic discretionary spending will fall to its lowest level as a share of GDP since we started keeping track in 1962. There were not even Pell grants in 1962. There was not even Medicare in 1962. Their future is our distant past.

Chairman RYAN would push \$810 billion onto our States to shift costs to the States for Medicaid, and find another mystery \$962 billion in unspecified entitlement grants. He boasts that the Republican budget repeals ObamaCare but he puts all of the savings from ObamaCare in the budget.

He cannot have it both ways. It is not even an honest budget. It is politically, mathematically, and logically unrealistic. It is not a balanced budget so much as magical thinking. Even if the unrealistic program cuts in the Republican budget could be made, the plan ignores the economic damage that would result.

We have had the austerity experience. We have had the austerity experience in Europe. The evidence is in. Deep austerity cuts in Spain, Greece and Portugal caused persistent double-digit unemployment and negative growth rates. We may be impatient with our unemployment rate, we may be impatient with our low positive growth rate, but the countries that tried what the Republicans want to do have double-digit, 26-percent unemployment rates. Their economic growth is negative. Their economies are shrinking.

The Wall Street Journal just reported that industrial production in the UK after its austerity plans has fallen to its lowest level in 22 years and the country is looking at a third recession. The Republicans who want to emulate European austerity should consider what Jeremy Warner said in the conservative Daily Telegraph.

This is a truly desperate state of affairs. . . . We seem to have the worst of all possible worlds, with nil growth, some very obvious cuts in the quantity and quality of public services, but pretty much zero progress in getting on top of the country's debts.

That should be a warning. Not only is the Ryan Republican budget's magical thinking unrealistic, it is unfair. It achieves 100 percent of its deficit reduction by cutting government programs that benefit lower and middle-income Americans, while getting nothing—not one dime—from wealthy Americans or corporations. In fact, it would cut the high-end tax rate for corporations and wealthy individuals. It adds more tax breaks for the rich and well-connected, and goes after the lower and middle-class families.

The Republican budget cuts total education and workforce training, for instance, by an estimated 47 percent. It cuts \$135 billion out of the food stamp

program, which helps feed the poorest Americans. At the same time, if you are making over \$1 million, it offers you an average tax cut of \$330,000.

For the kind of money the Ryan Republican budget wants to give to the rich and the well-connected, they have to come after the middle class. Chairman RYAN's tax cut would require \$5.5 trillion in new revenue. To cover that pricetag, President Clinton revealed the hard truth. I will quote President Bill Clinton:

. . . they'll have to eliminate so many deductions, like the ones for home mortgages and charitable giving, that middle-class families will see their tax bills go up.

That is the promise of the Ryan Republican budget—middle-class families will see their tax bills go up. We do not. We take 7 percent out of that, which means we can focus on the corporate tax spending, we can focus on the high-end deductions, on the carried interest exception, so we do not have to go after the middle-class tax cuts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Let me close by reading one thing. We have just welcomed a new Pope. The Conference of Catholic Bishops had this to say about the Ryan budget last year:

Congress faces a difficult task to balance needs and resources and allocate burdens and sacrifices. Just solutions, however, must require shared sacrifice by all, including raising adequate revenues, eliminating unnecessary military and other spending, and fairly addressing the long-term costs of health insurance and retirement programs. The House-passed budget resolution fails to meet these moral criteria.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield up to 10 minutes to Senator CRUZ of Texas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for his stirring remarks and, indeed, his powerful arguments against this Nation going down the road of Greece and Spain and much of Europe. Those were indeed compelling statistics of 27-percent unemployment in Greece, and negative nearly 7-percent growth in Greece. I found myself moved looking at those statistics that all of us should act, and act with leadership, to prevent going down that road, to stop the out-of-control spending, the out-of-control debt that put Greece and Spain in those circumstances.

We are right now in a situation where our Nation faces debt larger than our entire economy, greater than 100 percent of our entire economy. That is where the United States is right now. I would suggest the irresponsible policies of this Congress and this administration are why we are seeing stagnant growth. Last quarter, our

economy grew 0.1 percent. I found the speech of my friend from Rhode Island quite powerful for arguing why every Member of this body should vote against the Democratic budget that will be coming up for a vote, because it is clear that raising taxes \$1.5 trillion on top of the \$1.7 trillion tax increase that has already been put in place will only accelerate our path to where Greece and Spain and much of Europe are.

Adopting a budget that never balances in perpetuity, as sadly the Democratic budget does, will only accelerate our path to where Greece and Europe are. So I thank my friend for that stirring recitation.

I would note also that tomorrow is an important milestone. Tomorrow is the 3-year anniversary of the adoption of ObamaCare. As we vote later today, I will be introducing an amendment to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the repeal of ObamaCare.

ObamaCare was passed with many promises. Yet the reality is it has not delivered. When ObamaCare was being proposed, the President told Americans, the average American family would see our premiums drop by \$2,500. Instead, today, the average American family has seen our premiums rise by \$3,000. That is a \$5,500 difference between what was promised and what has been delivered.

Young people in particular have been hit incredibly hard by ObamaCare. The actuaries predict that young people trying to climb the economic ladder could see their premiums rise anywhere between 145 percent and 189 percent.

Seniors also have been hit severely by ObamaCare. As a result of ObamaCare, some 14 million, nearly 15 million seniors are on Medicare Advantage. Half of them will lose their Medicare Advantage coverage as a result of ObamaCare. Seven million seniors will lose Medicare Advantage. I would note, a very large percentage of those are low-income seniors, are Hispanic seniors, are African-American seniors.

Every one of us should ask, when confronted with Hispanic seniors in our State, why is it that we are content to see 7 million seniors lose their Medicare Advantage program. I would suggest we should not be.

Last Wednesday, all 45 Republicans stood united voting in support of an amendment I offered to delay funding ObamaCare at least until our economy gets growing. Our economy is stagnant right now. It is not growing. Last quarter it was 0.8 percent. Sadly, every Democrat who voted voted to continue implementing ObamaCare even as the economy is gasping for breath and to risk very potentially knocking this Nation into a recession.

I would urge this body to reconsider this decision, when so many people are hurting, not to put the kind of impact that could send this country backwards into a recession. ObamaCare itself includes some 20 tax increases, over \$1

trillion. Many in this body talk about the middle class. Many of those tax increases fall directly on the middle class.

Yesterday, over 70 members of this body voted against the medical devices tax. I celebrate that. That is a terrific recognition of the tax burdens of ObamaCare. I hope that amendment is not simply voted on in an aspirational sense, but that it becomes law and we repeal that amendment. But I would suggest the medical devices industry, a critical industry, employs a virtual army of lobbyists. The lesson yesterday illustrated is if you are wealthy, if you are connected, if you are an important industry with lobbyists that can get Senators to come to cocktail parties, you too can see some of the burdens of ObamaCare perhaps lifted from you.

But as we voted for that—I happily voted to lift that tax—it struck me, what about the millions of small businesses that do not have lobbyists in Washington, that do not have the ability to corral Senators and say: It is so important that this burden not fall on me. We respond, quite rightly, to the pleas from one power industry and yet we ignore the pleas from the mom-and-pop shops, from the millions who are struggling.

I will note, if you look at the Hispanic community, there are 2.3 million Hispanic small business owners in this country. Roughly one in eight Hispanic households is a small business owner. But you know what. They do not have lobbyists here who capture the attention of some 70 Senators. Instead, they face the costs and the burdens from ObamaCare.

I want to read to this body a couple of recent press stories illustrating that this is not a Republican talking point or a Democratic talking point. These are the facts. This is what is happening under ObamaCare. The Associated Press on March 13, 2013, so just earlier this month, reported—this is the opening line of the story:

Some Americans could see their insurance bills double next year as the health care overhaul laws expand coverage to millions of people.

It goes on to say:

The biggest price hikes are expected to hit a group that represents a relatively small slice of the insurance population. That includes some roughly 14 million people who buy their own insurance as opposed to being covered under employer-sponsored plans, and to a lesser extent some employees of smaller companies. Yet again, the impact of ObamaCare hitting small businesses, hitting the struggling entrepreneurs.

I would note, two-thirds of all new jobs in our economy come from small businesses. If this body continues to make it harder for small businesses to survive, we will continue to see 23 million Americans out of work, because the new jobs are going to come from small businesses, and we cannot continue to put more and more costs and burdens on them.

The Associated Press continued:

Young people who currently have low-cost coverage may see some of the biggest hikes.

To all of the college kids right now who stood for “hope and change,” to all of the young people who are coming out of school struggling to find jobs and are not able to find jobs right now, I would point out that what the Associated Press reported is that alone, the ObamaCare impact could cause the premium for a 24-year-old who pays \$2,400 annually to jump \$1,800. As their resumes go up, as they see additional dollars taken out of their pockets, as they are struggling to climb the economic ladder, I hope the young people realize the cause for those impacts.

Just this week, the Washington Post, hardly a bastion for conservative thought, had a major story headlined “Health-care law uncertainty grips Old Town Alexandria cafe—and other small businesses.” It explained there is a cafe in Old Town Alexandria which employs 45 people. The owner says:

There is tremendous confusion and fear among many of my competitors and other business owners in my network, particularly about what you have to cover and how you have to report.

This comment was by Hugh Joyce, owner of James River Air Conditioning in Richmond. Continuing:

In speaking to them, I am convinced that the primary reason we aren't seeing a robust economic recovery is the uncertainty and costs associated with this health-care law.

This is from a small business owner saying why don't we see growth, why don't we see the economy blooming? Because ObamaCare stays in force and it is crippling jobs.

The Washington Post continues:

One in eight small-business owners who responded to a survey by the National Federation of Independent Business said their insurance providers had notified them that their plans would be terminated. A study released last week by Adecco, a human resources consulting firm, showed that nearly a third of employers said they stopped hiring of cut their workforce because of the law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. CRUZ. I urge ObamaCare be repealed.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to offer support for an amendment I will be offering, No. 198, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may or may not include CPI.

This amendment is supported by the American Legion, which is the largest veterans organization in our country, AARP, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AFL-CIO, Disabled American Veterans, National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare, Gold Star Wives, and Alliance for Retired Americans. This amendment is supported by every veterans organization, every major

senior organization, 12 million workers in the AFL-CIO, every disability organization, and the National Organization for Women.

Why are they all supporting this amendment? They understand at a time when millions and millions of veterans are struggling to keep their heads above water economically, when we have millions of seniors today who are having a difficult time purchasing the prescription drug they need, food they need, and the ability to heat their homes, it is cruel and immoral to turn our backs on veterans and seniors to make disastrous cuts for the benefits of disabled veterans and for seniors.

Under the chained CPI, a disabled veteran who started receiving disability benefits at age 30 would have their benefits cut by more than \$1,400 at age 25, \$2,300 at age 55, and \$3,200 at age 65.

Memorial Day is coming. I know many of my colleagues around the country will give speeches to veterans and tell veterans how much they support and respect the sacrifices they have made. It is time to go beyond fine rhetoric and fine speeches if we are serious about protecting the needs of veterans. Now is the time to stand tall. They have protected us. Now our job is to protect them. It is wrong to balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans, pure and simple.

What the chained CPI would do to seniors on Social Security is equally bad. In my State we have many seniors—and I daresay in Maine as well—who this winter wonder how they will find the money they need to heat their homes and to purchase the prescription drugs they need. Many of them are living on \$13,000, \$14,000 or \$15,000 a year on Social Security benefits. The chained CPI would say to them, if you are 65 today, by the time you are 75, your benefits would be cut by some \$650 a year. By the time you are 85, your benefits would be cut by \$1,000 a year.

I will offer another amendment above and beyond the chained CPI, which makes the point every single year we are losing tens and tens of billions of dollars. The largest corporations in this country are putting their money in the Cayman Islands and Bermuda and paying zero—zero—in Federal income tax. One out of four profitable major corporations pays nothing in Federal income tax, including some of the Wall Street firms we bailed out a few years ago.

What this whole debate is about is how do we go forward with deficit reduction in a way which is fair, a way which is moral, and a way which calls for good economic policy. I would argue when some of the largest corporations in America pay zero in Federal income taxes, before we cut Social Security and benefits for disabled veterans, ask those people to start paying their fair share of taxes.

We are in a horrendous recession. Real unemployment is over 14 percent, counting those who have given up look-

ing for work and are working part-time. Median family income since 1999 has gone down by \$5,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Let us not balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in our country.

I ask unanimous consent to add Senator WHITEHOUSE to my amendment No. 198.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. If I might, I simply wanted to reassure those who might be watching in the Chamber the Democratic budget and resolution which is pending on the floor reflects some of our most fundamental values and makes responsible progress toward reducing our deficit. We have already done more than \$2.4 trillion toward deficit reduction since the time the Bowles-Simpson Commission suggested an overall target in reduction of \$4 trillion in Federal spending. With this additional \$1.85 trillion, we will get to about \$4.25 trillion. We are making responsible progress.

As my colleague from Vermont and many others have come to the floor and spoken about, we need to do this in a way which still keeps our commitments to America's seniors, America's veterans, and the most low-income and vulnerable in our communities. We need to do it in a way which both stabilizes our deficit and debt, makes critical investments in growing our economy, and preserves the core of the programs on which Americans rely.

This is not just about numbers, it is also about values. It is also about priorities.

If I might, before I yield to the full committee chair, I wish to say I am grateful to Chairman MURRAY for everything she has done to bring us to this point. In the 3 years in which I have served in the Senate as a member of the Budget Committee, we have not had a budget resolution on this floor.

The very difficult and very long process we are about to go through may be a reminder of how challenging legislative compromise can be. It is my hope we may engage in a thorough and vigorous debate and yet by the end of this legislative day we will have a budget out of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. As we consider the budget which is before us today, I would call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the Democratic budget, the Murray budget, was voted down in the House of Representatives 2 days ago by 107 votes. One-fifth of the Democrats, one out of five, 20 percent, voted against this budget. No Republicans voted for it.

This may be because, as Politico said, "to win over her caucus, Murray begins from the left of Obama himself." With regard to independent eval-

uations of the budget, the United States USA Today editorial on March 15 said this:

The plan produced by the Senate Budget Committee Chair, Patty Murray, D-Wash, is a disappointing document. It is a namby-pamby plan that underwhelms at every turn.

The Murray budget neither balances the budget nor reigns in entitlements.

It would help the Nation's Democrats if they were to embrace the goal of a Ryan budget.

This is the view of USA Today, the largest print in the country.

The Washington Post said on March 15: "This document, gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament."

The Wall Street Journal, Investment Business Daily, The Hill, all of these have comments in somewhat the same vein.

What is our problem? Our problem is spending.

People say: Sessions, this is just what Republicans say, and we say it is not taxing the rich enough.

There is a fundamental issue about spending. I dealt with and asked questions of Mr. Elmendorf, our CBO Director, on this very subject. It went to this point: Colleagues, we need to understand it. The American people need to understand it. Taxes, whatever rate they are, tend to grow with the economy. If the economy is going up 2 percent, more people make a little more money and taxes tend to go up 2 percent.

If the economy is growing at 2 percent and your spending is going up 5.4 percent, then you have a problem. You could raise taxes.

I asked Mr. Elmendorf about this. Even though we had a trillion-dollar deficit last year, a 1,000-plus billion-dollar deficit last year—unbelievable debt—almost 35 percent of the money we spent last year was borrowed. We will pay interest on that for decades to come. There is no plan to pay it down in any significant way.

I asked Mr. Elmendorf, if we raise taxes, instead of \$650 billion as we did in January, if we raised them enough to balance the budget, would we stay in balance.

He acknowledged, if the economy continues to grow at 2 percent and growth of spending is at 5 percent, we will immediately be back into a problem area.

In one sense, this is the very definition of unsustainability. This is the very definition of the problem we have that spending is growing faster than the economy. It cannot maintain itself at that rate.

We can spend, and we can say we have a balanced plan, a balanced program, a balanced approach, as my colleagues have done. They know this budget never balances, not in 1 year, not in 10 years, not in 50 years. It will become worse in the second 10 years. It absolutely will be worse.



This is the path which, as Senator CRUZ just indicated, Greece, Spain, and Italy have followed. This is why they are in trouble.

My colleagues say the economy isn't growing well, and it is not. We had virtually zero growth last quarter, zero. We are supposed to be moving out of the recession. As I pointed out last night, the CBO, for the last several years, has been predicting 4 percent growth but not this year. After missing about 2 percentage points for the last several years, they are predicting low growth this year.

What do our colleagues say? They say they have a balanced approach. They keep stating this.

I grew up in the country, where I went to a great little school. There were 30 in my senior class. I am proud of my classmates. My classmate is now president of the University of Alabama—out of our little class.

I know what a balanced approach means. It means nothing. A balanced approach is an unaccountable statement. It provides no ability for the American people to ascertain whether we are doing anything they promise because they don't promise anything. We promised a balanced approach. What does that mean?

Does it mean we raise taxes and cut spending by the same amount, \$1 trillion each or does it mean we raise taxes by \$1 trillion and raise spending by \$1 trillion? They want us to believe they raise taxes by \$1 trillion, they cut spending \$1 trillion, and reduce the deficit \$2 trillion. That is what they are suggesting to the American people. They are using the word "balance" and they hope people will hear it and think this means we have a balanced budget. They know they do not have a balanced budget. They won't tell the American people they do not have one, they just use the word. But it is not in their document.

Where and when do we hold people accountable in this Senate for an accurate statement of legislation? It is wrong. We have counted so far—this is pretty incredible—I think they have used the word "balance" 191 times. Does that reflect a guilty conscience or something, that they want people to think we have a balanced budget? We think we have a plan to get to a balanced budget. Oh, we have a balanced approach. But what does that mean? It means zero. The American people need to know this plan has no vision for America and it misrepresents what it does.

I know it is hard to write a budget with the Democratic Conference, which Politico says is being written from the left—by President Obama himself. I think that is probably accurate. The President's plan is irresponsible also. He has no real plan to do any of this, and he has publicly stated he does not think a balanced budget is important.

May I ask the Chair—we are moving along here, and I know there are other speakers coming, probably on both

sides—to clarify our time situation and what the status is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has 17 minutes remaining and the Senator from Washington has 25 minutes 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. All right, fair enough.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very proud of the balance we have put forward in our budget that makes sure all Americans in this country participate in solving the great crisis in front of us in terms of managing our debt and deficit. We are doing exactly what the American people have asked us to do—making sure that everyone partici-

pates. To me, as someone who has been involved for a long time in taking care of my own family and my community, balance is an important word, and I am very proud of the balance we put into this in terms of the American public.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to speak to amendment No. 202 by Senator CRUZ, which we will be voting on shortly.

The Senator from Texas informed us that the amendment would repeal the Affordable Care Act. Well, that approach has already been rejected by the electorate, I would just reference, in the last election. Also, we have had more than 35 separate votes in the Congress about that and we have always upheld the Affordable Care Act. But I want to focus Senators' attention on something that is in the Cruz amendment that they may not know.

When we passed the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, not only did it contain the health care portion of it, but it also had a portion in there on education. What we did was to stop that old system of subsidizing banks for student loans and changed it into a direct loan program.

That was about a \$61 billion transfer from the banks getting these risk-free government subsidies to basically putting it in so that students could get more of the money. So under that provision, for example, \$36 billion of those savings went to increasing the Pell grants. So now we have a higher Pell grant award and it is indexed to the rising cost of living.

The Cruz amendment—maybe the Senator didn't understand it when he drafted it—in the drafting of it, does away with that. So if my colleagues vote for the Cruz amendment, they are, in fact, voting to cut Pell grants. Go back and tell your colleges and universities that. You may not know that, but that is what is in that Cruz amendment.

Also, \$2.55 billion went to investments in historically Black colleges

and universities serving minority students. That would be cut out with the Cruz amendment. Another \$2 billion went to community colleges, and that would be cut out by the Cruz amendment.

So it is not just the Affordable Care Act, folks, that is being cut or done away with by the Cruz amendment but all of the things we did to bolster education for minority students and for disadvantaged students, and in raising the Pell grants. I would ask my colleagues to talk to their private colleges, talk to their universities in their States and see what they think about this. See what they think about cutting down on the Pell grants. That would be the exact result of passing the Cruz amendment.

There is one other thing we did in that portion of the reconciliation bill. We also put in place a more generous income-based repayment system so that students who graduate from college can base their repayment on a smaller portion of their discretionary income. We capped it. We capped the student loan repayment to 10 percent of discretionary income so that when students get out and get a job, they only have to pay a maximum of 10 percent of their discretionary income to repay their student loans. That would be done away with in the Cruz amendment. I wanted to point that out. Maybe the Senator didn't realize it when he drafted the amendment, but that is the way it is drafted and that is the way the vote will occur. So if my colleagues think they are just voting to do away with the Affordable Care Act, look again at the amendment. It is not just that, it is education funding also. So I wanted to point that out.

We are going to hear a lot about a lot of bad amendments coming up today, but this is truly a very bad amendment. Maybe it should have been drafted differently to accomplish what the Senator from Texas wanted. If that was a clean vote on doing away with the Affordable Care Act, fine, if he wants to do that, but the way it is drafted it cuts Pell grants, assistance for community colleges, and all the things we did to help students get a higher education in this country. I wanted to let Senators know that.

If I have at least 30 seconds or 60 seconds left, Mr. President.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I invite all Senators, before we start voting today, to read the Washington Post this morning, the front-page story: "On Montana Reservation, Cuts Hit Hard." It talks about the Fort Peck reservation and what is going to happen there to these students and these families on this reservation. Please read it. Please.

How can we be so cruel? How can we be so heartless? How can we be so immune from understanding the impact

of the sequester and what is happening to poor kids? This is one classic example.

As one teacher there said: You know, if you have a lot and you cut 5 percent, that is not much. But when you don't have anything, cutting 5 percent really hurts.

The article talks about how much they are going to lose in their Head Start Program, how many students are going to lose because they do not have support systems on the reservation. It tears your heart out to read this.

I think about the kind of votes we are going to be having today and the impact of those votes on these kids and these families on this reservation. They have no place else to turn. They have no place else to turn. It is not as though they have property taxes on the reservation. They do not have that. They do not have businesses there. They do not have anything. But you know what I would like most of all for colleagues to know? One person was quoted as saying: This is not something we are giving our Native Americans, this is something we owe them. This is something we owe them. Read your history—all the land we took from them. Helping them on reservations is not a gift. We owe them this. And now we are pulling the rug out from underneath them.

Read about this young girl whose mother committed suicide and her father is in a drug treatment program in Minnesota. She is 15 years old and she is trying to make it, yet we are telling her—basically, with our votes here and with this sequester—we don't care. I ask people to read that before we start voting today and let your conscience be your guide.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Iowa for his long-time passion for young people in this country. As chair of the Education and Health Committee, he has committed his time to making sure those who are least among us have opportunity in this country. That is so important. He has spoken eloquently against the Cruz amendment, reminding all of us that amendment isn't just about repealing health care but actually taking away the ability for students to be able to go to college on Pell grants and student loans.

I would not be standing in front of us today if our country hadn't invested in me way back to give me the ability to go to college on student loans and Pell grants. So I want to thank him, on behalf of a very grateful country, for his long-time work on this. And as we all know, the Senator will be retiring. We will miss his voice, but his passion will always remain here.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do have some remarks, and we will be having some speakers, who I think are on the way.

Mrs. MURRAY. I withhold my request.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, the Ryan budget is not going to get rid of Pell grants. Is that the level of debate we have degenerated to here? The Ryan budget says we are not going to try to balance the budget too quickly. We are going to do it over 10 years. We will reach a balance.

We have calculated—and it is not disputed—that you can increase spending every year 3.4 percent and the budget will balance. You don't have to cut spending. When they talk about cuts, they are talking about reducing the projected rate of growth, and that is why we are going broke. That is why this country is losing its moorings. We have defined cutting spending as reducing the rate of growth.

You cannot sustain 5-percent growth—5.4-percent growth—when your economy is growing at 2 percent. And the experts tell us we are at a new normal and we are not going to see 5-percent growth in the future—not likely. We might have a year or two of it. Bill Gross and his group at PIMCO, the great bond company, coined the phrase “the new normal,” and the new normal is that a mature economy such as ours, with an aging population, is not going to sustain some of the 9- and 10-percent growth rates that new and developing nations that are down here can achieve. I think that is probably something we have to accommodate, but we need to have policies that create as much growth as possible. That is absolutely true.

We had no growth last quarter—zero. The Congressional Budget Office has been predicting 3- and 4-percent growth the last 3 years. It is not there. It is not happening. The reason it is not happening is we have too much debt. The studies of the European Central Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Bank of International Settlements, and the magnificent “This Time It's Different” by Rogoff and Reinhart demonstrate that statistically, empirically, when nations have this high a debt—we are at 104 percent of GDP, and Rogoff and Reinhart used the gross debt of America, which is almost \$17 trillion now, comparing the gross debt to the size of our economy—that the debt we are carrying is larger than our economy and we have to pay interest on that.

There are a lot of other ramifications and instabilities and concerns that ripple through businesses and foreign investors who are going to create jobs in America, but all sorts of people lose confidence in the country when the debt reaches that high. They say, from their studies of over 200 years of every country that has gone into fiscal crisis, that the debt began to pull them down. They conclude—these Harvard professors—that we could lose 1 to 2 percent of growth.

We are not growing. This is the slowest recovery from a recession since World War II, and I don't think this debt has been recognized in and of itself as a detriment to the economy. But what do our colleagues say the answer is? Tax more on the economy and borrow more. Don't reduce our debt. Get the sugar high now, as Mr. Gross at PIMCO said. All this borrowing and spending creates a sugar high and you have a hangover later.

This is so simple. You can't create something from nothing. You know, Julie Andrews had that great, great song in the “Sound of Music,” “Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could.”

I met a man in Evergreen, AL, in a townhall meeting, who said: My daddy always said that you cannot borrow your way out of debt.

We need to listen to that kind of logic. I don't know who these people are who say that Paul Krugman said we can borrow, borrow, borrow. The other day, he said he didn't care—even if the Defense Department had a wasteful program. He said that we should not cut those programs. How ridiculous is that? I think that kind of thinking is the drive behind this budget, that we have to keep spending even if we keep running up the debt and somehow that is going to make America better and create economic growth.

I am worried about our working people. They are not doing well. Wages have not gone up in a decade. They are slipping below inflation. It is an absolute fact that has happened. The smart people in high-tech companies are doing well. A lot of them are making money. There are certain sectors of the economy that are doing well, but the economy itself is not moving, and I believe the net reason is revealed in the Rogoff-Reinhart analysis, which says that higher debt pulls down growth. So we have to do what families do and States have done and cities have done, and that is to tighten our belts a little bit.

We are proud of the food stamp program, also known as the SNAP program, but we find that it has all kinds of fraud and abuse in it, and it needs to be tightened up. I reject the idea that it is bad for the economy or will hurt people who are legitimately in need of food. We have not done anything like that since the 1996 welfare reform. We need to be doing that throughout the government.

One of the ways to create economic growth is to make American Government more productive and lean. Wouldn't that help? Let's ask this question: Is Mr. Krugman right? Should the government just spend regardless of whether the program is any good? Shouldn't we say to ourselves: Isn't it clear without any real dispute that if our government spent its money on things that are productive for America, this would make America stronger? We have to eliminate every single wasteful program. We don't have a single dollar to waste.

Our colleagues here are saying to the American people that there is nothing wrong. Our government is fine. We cannot cut any program. If we do, we will deny kids the right to go to college.

There is no reason Pell grants have to be salvaged, but maybe they need to be constricted a little bit. Maybe there are some abuses in those programs.

The growth of spending can increase every year at 3.4 percent. We are not required to damage, savage, or devastate the American economy to get the budget balanced. I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks. I really believe the budget process is a bit messy and frustrating, but it is a good one. It has allowed us all to talk honestly about the great choices we face.

I am pleased to see Senator THUNE, a supporter of the leadership on the Republican side, an outstanding Senator and longtime member of the Budget Committee who has been engaged in the financial issues of our time for quite a number of years.

I yield to Senator THUNE at this time.

Mr. THUNE. If I might, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee for yielding, and I will pose a question to the Senator, if I might.

I heard Senator SESSIONS say earlier and put up a chart which suggested that the term “balanced” had been used 191 times by the other side in the course of this debate. Is that correct?

Mr. SESSIONS. That is correct. We probably missed a few.

Mr. THUNE. That may be an incomplete count, but nevertheless the Senator and his staff counted 191 times where the word “balanced” has been used. As the Senator from Alabama very fittingly pointed out, there is nothing balanced about this budget. In fact, this budget doesn’t balance in 10 years; it doesn’t ever balance.

The other thing I would suggest to my colleague from Alabama is that in the course of the debate, it has become clear to me—and I think clear to anybody who has been observing this—that the so-called balanced approach they advocate is anything but balanced.

We have a \$1.5 trillion tax increase. We have a spending increase that is at 62 percent over the course of the next decade—a net spending increase notwithstanding their assertions that somehow this is a reduction in spending. The whole idea that this is “a balanced approach” strikes me as a big charade. I think that is what this entire budget is. That is why all the editorial pages across the country, including those from newspapers that are not considered the least bit conservative—many of us in the Chamber who are on this side of the aisle expect most of the newspapers around the country and their editorial pages to attack Republicans and Republican budgets—have absolutely eviscerated in their editorial comments the budget that has been put forth by the Senate Demo-

crats. I think it is simply because it is anything but balanced.

When they used the word “balanced” 191 times on the floor of the Senate with regard to this debate, if we think about the “balanced approach” they talk about—even when we were dealing with the fiscal cliff, they talked about a balanced approach, but there was no balance there. It was all tax increases. There was a \$620 billion tax increase. Over the course of the President’s first term, we got a \$1 trillion tax increase with ObamaCare. If we add those together with some other tax increases that have been added on, we are at \$1.7 trillion in new taxes—or new revenues, as they say.

We want balance. Well, we have \$1.7 trillion in new revenue already, and then they are talking about another \$1.5 trillion in taxes. Really? Where is the balance in that? This is all about raising taxes and growing government at the expense of the economy.

I say to my colleague from Alabama, we are going to vote on an amendment pretty soon by the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, that raises a point of order against any tax increase that would occur until the unemployment rates gets back down to 5.5 percent, which is what the President and White House said in 2009 would be the unemployment rate by now without the stimulus. It is hard to imagine that after spending \$1 trillion that was borrowed from our children and grandchildren to “stimulate the economy” and still having an unemployment rate that hovers around 8 percent, they would be talking about yet more taxes when we know that raising taxes does nothing but hurt the economy and hurt job growth.

If the real goal is to get deficits and debt under control—my colleague from Alabama shares my view—the best way to do that is to expand the economy. We need to have people working again, investing, and paying taxes. We don’t need less revenue, we need more revenue in order to have a growing economy. That is what we should have before us. This budget does the opposite. It adds \$7.3 trillion to the Federal debt and raises \$1.5 trillion in new taxes on top of the \$1.7 trillion tax increases we have already seen in the last 4 years under this administration. This is a completely wrongheaded approach, which is why it is not just the Republicans in this Chamber who are saying that, it is the so-called independent folks out there in the media who say it on their editorial pages. They are calling it what it is. It is a charade.

There is nothing about this exercise we are going through here on the Senate floor this week that will solve the Nation’s fiscal problems or get people back to work or get this economy growing again. I say that in terms of a budget. The budget is supposed to confront harsh realities, and it is supposed to set a vision and blueprint and pathway for the future.

If this is their pathway—ignoring the problems and sweeping them under the

carpet—as far as the long-term structural challenges we face with regard to Social Security and Medicare, this does nothing to protect those programs. It does nothing. There is no reform in here. There is not anything in here that prolongs the programs that people rely on today that are headed toward bankruptcy. At the end of this decade, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that is going to represent 91 percent of all Federal spending. Think about that—91 percent of all Federal spending will be composed of mandatory programs. Only 9 percent of the entire budget will be left over to pay interest on the debt, national security, and all the other discretionary things the government funds.

This budget does nothing to address the long-term structural fiscal imbalances that face this country. Yet it relies on the same old tried-and-failed policy: Well, let’s just raise taxes a little more. It will be a tax increase on the rich because Lord knows we are the defenders of the middle class.

Let me tell the middle class in this country, they cannot raise taxes enough on the rich to do all the things they want to do in the form of growing government and increasing spending. This is going to hit and penetrate middle-income Americans. Middle-class families are going to get hit with higher taxes because the appetite to spend on the other side is endless. It just goes on and on and on, and we are not doing anything to address that.

We have a spending problem in this country, not a revenue problem or a tax problem. It isn’t that we spend too little or that we tax too little, it is that we spend too much, and that is what we need to address in this budget. That is where this budget falls terribly short.

It is an incredible disappointment to finally—after 4 years—have a budget on the floor of the Senate that is inadequate to the future of America and relies on the same old failed policy that raises taxes and hurts economic growth and hurts job creation.

We are still hovering at 8 percent unemployment. In the last 4 years, we have added \$6 trillion to the Federal debt. We have a sluggish economy that is growing at 1.5 to 2 percent, and for the 4-year average it has been less than 4 percent. The 60-year historical average is 3.3 percent economic growth. If we got back to the normal economic growth pattern average over the last 60 years, these fiscal challenges we face would be so much smaller by comparison simply because a growing economy helps address all of these problems we are talking about today. Unfortunately, the budget we have before us doesn’t focus on growing the economy; rather, it focuses on growing the government, and that is where it falls so miserably short.

It is really unfortunate that is the vote we are going to have today. Many of the amendments we are going to vote on are an attempt to improve it. I

hope that the Ayotte amendment will pass and that the tax increases included in this budget—that the point of order will be approved and will deny any tax increase until we get the unemployment rate back down to 5.5 percent. That is where it should be. If we have a growing economy, it would be closer to that number.

I support the good efforts of my colleague from Alabama. He has been here on the floor for many, many hours over the last couple of days doing yeoman's work by pointing out the shortcomings in this budget that we are considering before the Senate. The Senator from Alabama has laid out a very different vision for how we can solve these problems.

It is really ironic. I am sure this is—The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority time has expired.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I yield back our time so our colleagues have an opportunity to use the term “balanced” a few more times before this debate concludes.

I yield the floor.

#### CHILDREN'S BUDGET

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized to engage in a colloquy with my good friend from Washington, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator MURRAY.

I want to commend the chairman's tireless efforts on this budget resolution. She has done the yeomen's work in crafting a document that reflects the values of our caucus in a balanced and pragmatic way. This stands in sharp contrast to the polarizing and ideologically driven budget our friends in the House passed earlier this week. As you know I have introduced legislation in the last three Congresses to create what I call the “children's budget.” This bill would require that the executive branch agencies include in their annual budget request to Congress a detailed analysis on children's programs. This analysis would include a breakdown of the appropriations, spending levels, and obligational authority and outlays for each program specifically targeted towards children or that serve children as a major component of their mission. Importantly, this would include an analysis not only of the fiscal year for which the budget request is being made, but also the previous and current fiscal years, to provide the Budget Committees and the Appropriations Committees with a comprehensive look at how funding is affecting the youngest Americans.

I have filed an amendment to this concurrent resolution that seeks to address this very issue by encouraging the Appropriations Committees to request the analysis of children's programs contingent on the agencies' funding. However, I understand through conversations with the Senate Parliamentarian and others that indicate such an amendment might not comport with the strict requirements and procedures of a budget resolution. Is this the chairman's understanding as well?

Mrs. MURRAY. I want to thank my friend from New Jersey on his previous work to highlight how our budget impacts children and on his efforts to do so again today. I agree with him that it is important that we have a full accounting of how the Federal Government serves children throughout our Nation. However, my friend is correct, and due to the strict procedural guidelines of the budget resolution an amendment that is primarily focused on executive branch agencies falls outside the scope of a concurrent resolution such as the one we are debating today. However, I want to assure my friend that I will work closely with him to find a path forward on the children's budget and achieve our shared goal of ensuring that the government is doing its best to efficiently and effectively serve our Nation's children.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I rise today to seek support for an amendment to the budget resolution that would discourage aerial surveillance of farms by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Last year, we learned that EPA had been conducting aerial flyovers of livestock operations in Nebraska, Iowa, and other states. Needless to say, farmers and ranchers were not excited about EPA flying over their operations and taking pictures of their farms and homes, which are often the same thing. I tried to get straight answers from EPA about what they were doing, but they were never willing to be forthcoming about this program.

In an age when satellite imagery allows us to see the cars parked in our driveways, one might be tempted to ask, what's the big deal? Well, the problem is EPA's recent track record on agriculture and what they may do with this information. In spite of several high profile outreach events to farmers, I continually hear about EPA's dismissive attitude towards the people who work hard every day to put food on the plates of millions of people.

Some members of this Administration and the media have mocked us farm state Senators for “crying over spilled milk” and fretting about “phantom dust rules.” But we were not using these fears to whip up farmers into an anti-EPA frenzy. Yes these rules were far-fetched, but what had farmers justifiably worried was that EPA was actually considering them.

It took months and several votes before EPA backed off on its attempt to regulate milk spills like oil spills. It's the same story on farm dust. Harvesting crops and driving down country roads is dusty work, especially when we have persistent drought like much of the country is in now.

But EPA still took months to decide that it would not regulate dust. Internal policy documents at EPA recommended that particulate matter standards be revised to include coarse particulate matter, also known as dust. We should have had a final answer from EPA right away that they would not

regulate dust, but it took the threat of legislation to force their hand.

And that's just the low-hanging fruit. I've heard many stories of overly aggressive enforcement by EPA where they don't even need new regulations. Regulated entities can find themselves slapped with multiple fines with a time-consuming appeal process, in spite of their best efforts to comply with the numerous regulations we place on them.

The last EPA Administrator, Lisa Jackson, said that her biggest regret was her poor relationship with rural America. Well, that was certainly frustrating to me as well. But she found an odd way of expressing that regret. In the waning days of her tenure, she released private information on thousands of farms to several environmentalist groups.

It's no secret that environmental groups based in New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco don't always get along with farmers and ranchers in states like Nebraska. These groups do not regulate pollution. Congress has not told EPA to release information to them.

Their only interest in agriculture is in radically reinventing crop and livestock production based on idealistic notions and not on the reality of what it takes to feed the world. Why EPA decided it was prudent to release farmers' and ranchers' personal information to these groups is beyond me.

Is it really any wonder why farmers and ranchers don't believe EPA supports agriculture? They don't trust EPA . . . and they sure don't want them doing low-altitude surveillance flights over their private property.

These concerns are bipartisan—last year we voted on an amendment to stop this surveillance and it received fifty-six votes from members of both parties. Yet, EPA has not been forthcoming about this program and has never been willing to answer basic questions about the number of flights they conduct.

In fact, we never received any information from EPA headquarters—only from a regional office—despite multiple requests. The public deserves open and honest information about the agency's use of aerial surveillance across the country.

So, until EPA takes a more common-sense, transparent approach, we need to stop the EPA's aerial surveillance of our agricultural operations that has raised significant privacy concerns. This amendment does that, yet it does not hinder the use of traditional on-site inspections to ensure our waterways are clean.

I ask my Colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, has filed Senate amendment No. 161, which reinforces the current requirement for the Department of Defense to be fully financially auditable by the year 2017. I fully support the

amendment and have joined as a co-sponsor, as auditability is an important step to managing a budget, especially one in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

I wish to clarify, however, that the amendment should not be seen as superseding existing requirements for agencies within the Intelligence Community, including those in the Department of Defense, to be fully auditable by 2016. The Select Committee on Intelligence, which I chair, has been pushing the intelligence community for years to improve its auditability, and I am pleased to say that recently there has been significant progress in this area. We will continue to conduct oversight and ensure that agencies have the tools and resources they need to be fully auditable by 2016, notwithstanding the 2017 date for auditability by the rest of the Defense Department.

The Intelligence Committee staff has confirmed with Senator AYOTTE's office that this is the Senator's understanding and intent with the amendment as well.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I rise in support of amendment No. 136, which creates a prohibition on funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System, MEADS.

This amendment is consistent with the House Appropriations, House Armed Services, and Senate Armed Services Committee positions to stop wasting taxpayer dollars on this bloated, inefficient program the Department of Defense doesn't even intend to buy.

In February 2010, the Department of Defense stated in a memo, which is available online, that the program has "encountered significant schedule and cost overruns since its inception in the 1990s."

I want to stress that we have been investing in this system since the 1990s and it hasn't delivered. Billions and billions of dollars have been wasted.

As far as I can tell, more than two decades later, all we have bought with those billions is full page ads in newspapers that Senators and staff read asking us to give more money to the program.

It's time we stopped wasting valuable dollars on programs which do nothing for Americans, nothing for the warfighter and nothing to promote our national security.

This is simple really. The amendment places a prohibition on further funds for the program.

So I ask my colleagues, do you want to eliminate wasteful spending or not?

Do you want to support warfighter needs or Pentagon pork?

Do you really want to keep paying China for our debt because the Pentagon won't stop sinking money in a program that has no value to our troops when they are facing real threats overseas?

Working with my colleague, Senator KELLY AYOTTE, we made a law in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 prohibiting funds from being spent on the program.

It's imperative we send a message to the Pentagon we won't tolerate more requests for fancy pictures in Capitol Hill newspapers. Our military needs equipment to help them defeat the enemy and equipment to protect them. Not pictures and power point slides two decades later.

I want to commend Senator AYOTTE's efforts on the floor the last couple of weeks to stop wasteful spending on this "missile to nowhere"—as she calls it.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I want to commend the majority for finally allowing us to have this debate. This is the first time since I was elected to the Senate that we will have the opportunity to vote on a Senate budget resolution. The budget they produced is far from what our country needs, but the fact that we are having this debate today is a very positive step in the right direction.

Passing a budget is the basic principle of a government. For too long now, Washington has been operating without one. The American people don't have this luxury. Arkansans ask me, almost daily, how we can spend money we don't have because they can't. They are forced to live within their means while Washington isn't. So I am pleased to see we are putting an end to this unacceptable trend.

Unfortunately, this budget plan falls far short of what we need to get our fiscal house in order and get our economy back on track.

At a time when we need to put Americans back to work, the majority has offered a budget that makes jobs disappear. At a time when we need to cut spending, the majority's proposal increases spending by 62 percent over the next decade. At a time when we need comprehensive reform to ease the tax burden hard-working Americans face, the majority raises taxes another \$1.5 trillion. And at a time when we need to be paying down the national debt, the majority's budget adds another 7.3 trillion to it.

I can tell you what the people of Arkansas think about this budget. Our State is required to balance its budget. Every year, the legislators who serve in Little Rock have to make the difficult decisions that come with that obligation. They make it work. Washington can too.

We need to stop looking to the Federal Government to solve all our problems. The majority's budget proposal not only perpetuates the myth that big government is the answer, but it doubles down on it. It is time to empower the American people by passing a budget that is a blueprint for economic growth and prosperity, rather than bureaucratic growth and massive debt.

Focusing on a progrowth budget is the only way we will speed up the slowest economic recovery since World War II. We aren't going to get there by continuing to do the status quo. It hasn't worked.

I don't say all of this to cast doubt on anyone's intentions. I believe everyone in this Chamber is working for what they believe is in the best interest of the American people. We all want to save future generations from the burden of debt; create an environment where the economy can grow; protect our entitlement programs for future generations; and create a fair tax system that allows every American to keep more of his or her hard-earned money.

These are all admirable goals. I believe they are goals every one of my colleagues would like to accomplish. And the good news is that they are achievable.

If we balance the budget now, we save future generations from the burden of debt.

If we pursue policies that focus on growing the private sector economy, we can create rising wages and better jobs.

If we address the looming crisis with our entitlement programs, we can protect Social Security and Medicare for our children and grandchildren.

If we enact comprehensive tax reform, we can ensure that every American keeps more of his or her hard-earned money and help small businesses grow.

It all starts with a responsible budget. While I am pleased we are going to have a vote on a Senate-created budget, it fails on too many levels to warrant passage. I urge my colleagues to reject the majority's budget and focus our efforts on one that will help us accomplish our mutual goals.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, a federal budget outlines our priorities as a Nation. On both sides of the aisle, we should be able to agree: We need to be wise about our Federal investments. We should be investing in what works—in what gives us the biggest bang for our buck.

For decades, study after study has shown what parents already know—that quality early education is foundational for success in school and life. Quality early education can help kids enter kindergarten ready to learn and avoid falling behind. Later in life, kids with quality early learning are more likely to avoid crime or teen pregnancy. They graduate high school and college, avoid poverty, earn more income, and pay more taxes. That is more revenue for our long-term fiscal picture.

We want to cut unnecessary public spending? Kids with preschool are less likely to need public services—from assistance for needy families . . . to prisons.

For a generation, long-term studies have found that investing \$1 in quality early learning brings a return on investment of between \$2 and \$17 after a generation. In Hawaii, a study for Good Beginnings Alliance found we would get \$4.20 for every dollar invested. Nobel prize winning economist Jim Heckman did the math over a full lifetime. He estimates an average 7 to 10

percent return on investment per year. In the private sector, business leaders would do anything for a return like that.

On Wall Street, you can't get a long-term return like that in the stock market. So it makes sense that business and financial leaders support quality early learning, from the Hawaii Business Roundtable to Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, to leading CEOs, who know that to train tomorrow's workers we must start early.

Law enforcement officials know that quality early learning helps prevent kids from falling behind, dropping out of high school, or getting involved in crime. Military generals and admirals have stressed the importance of quality early education as a national security issue. Today 75 percent of Americans age 17 to 24 are ineligible for military service due to poor education, physical unfitness or involvement with crime. Quality early learning helps kids get on the right path—before they fall behind. Parents know the high cost of childcare is difficult to afford. But parents want more than just safety and supervision for their children. Parents want their children to be prepared academically, socially, and emotionally for success in school and in life.

Teachers and school administrators know firsthand that their students who come to kindergarten with quality preschool are more likely to succeed. We have special education professionals and advocates for students with disabilities. They know quality early learning can identify disabilities early and bring intervention to get kids on track with their peers. That can save billions of dollars in more expensive special education services down the line.

In our States, Governors from both red States and blue States know this is important. In Hawaii we have Governor Abercrombie. In Massachusetts we have Deval Patrick. But also in Louisiana, Governor Bobby Jindal is pushing for quality early education. In Georgia, Governor Nathan Deal is pushing for quality early education. In Alabama, Governor Bob Bentley is pushing for quality early education. Oklahoma is a bright red State and they have been doing quality early education for years.

In February, President Obama called for new support for quality early learning. This is the first time we have ever seen this in a State of the Union Address. States are asking their leaders in Congress to act. Today's Senate budget has a deficit-neutral reserve fund for early childhood education.

Here is what that means. It means let's find a way to pass legislation in this Congress. One of the best investments we can make long-term that does NOT hurt our deficit in the next 10 years. Let's invest in what works: high-quality pre-K for low-income children; high-quality childcare for working families; and high-quality home visiting programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families.

This helps get poor children the health and social services they need before it is too late.

PATTY MURRAY has been working to strengthen quality early education for a long time. She was a mom in tennis shoes. She was a preschool teacher. In the 1980s, she organized 13,000 parents to save a Washington State preschool program. I thank PATTY for her work on this issue in the budget. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with us on early childhood education in this budget and in this Congress. It is one of the best things we can do for our long-term economic health and for our children.

AMENDMENT NO. 430

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for years many of the largest U.S. multinational corporations have been exploiting offshore tax haven loopholes in the U.S. Tax Code to avoid paying billions in U.S. corporate income tax.

According to a recent Bloomberg report analyzing publicly available U.S. corporate financial data, "Eighty-three U.S. companies have stockpiled \$1.43 trillion in untaxed profits in foreign countries." According to the same report, "THE six biggest U.S. drug-makers avoided paying \$7.05 billion in U.S. taxes last year by shifting their profits overseas," nearly doubling "the amount they saved using the same strategy 10 years earlier."

It is time for Congress to close the special interest loopholes that allow sophisticated multinational corporations to defer U.S. income tax through various foreign tax sheltering techniques and offshore tax havens. Senator LEVIN's amendment No. 430 supports legislation to end the abuse of offshore tax shelters. I am cosponsoring this amendment to begin the process of closing the egregious loopholes.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I support budgets that make tough but necessary spending reductions, save our safety net programs, and preserve our commitment to protecting Americans and our interests at home and abroad.

Facing our current debt disaster, there should be no sacred cows in the Federal budget. If there is waste, it should be eliminated. If government dependency is depressing individual initiative, we must reform those programs. Where important and valid programs are destined for bankruptcy, we must save them.

Senator PAUL deserves lots of praise for taking our debt problem seriously and coming up with a plan to solve it. While there are many objectives I support in his budget—including the repeal of ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, allowing the Keystone Pipeline to move forward, and bringing our regulations under control through the REINS Act—I could not support it tonight.

One of the most solemn promises I made to Floridians was to work to save Social Security without implementing personal accounts, which would actually make it harder to get the pro-

grams finances in order. This budget plan calls for Social Security personal accounts, something I do not support.

On national security issues, we also can't walk away from our commitments abroad, which this budget would do by drastically reducing the size and scope of the U.S. military by ending agreements with foreign partners, closing many overseas installations, and bringing troops home from Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. Military reductions would also result from a policy of attrition, a concerning factor because it means we would not be replacing the officer corps that leads our brave men and women.

Whereas the current fiscal year 13 budget for the Defense Department is \$614 billion, this budget would be \$546 billion, with \$554 billion in fiscal year 14—figures that would further strain readiness and impair force projection.

Especially during this dangerous time when our enemies would be emboldened to see us abandon our allies around the world, I cannot support a budget that would make the world less safe place because the U.S. defense capabilities and our ability to influence events around the world are diminished.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate will vote this evening on an amendment offered by Senator DURBIN to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund supporting legislation that would allow States to enforce State and local use sales tax laws. I will vote in support of this amendment because I believe it is important to levy sales taxes fairly and consistently and because States, especially those currently facing budgetary challenges, need to have the tools necessary to collect revenues that are lawfully due. With that said, my support for this amendment should not be mistaken as support for any specific legislative proposal, including the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013, S. 336. I look forward to working with Senators DURBIN and ENZI, the leaders of this effort, in the months ahead to craft a legislative proposal that meets these goals without unduly burdening small businesses or States, such as New York, that already have a system for collecting sales taxes from online retailers.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we consider the budget resolution, laying out a blueprint for how we invest in our Nation's priorities, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment creating a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for the growth of the National Institutes of Health, NIH.

We all have benefited from medical innovations and cures supported by the NIH. If you have ever faced the diagnosis of an illness in your family and turned to the doctor to ask: "Is there a cure? Is there a treatment?" then you understand the importance of NIH research for your family. Great medical care is only as good as the science behind it. Drugs and devices work only as well as our understanding of the medical condition we are treating. NIH

support has established the U.S. as a global leader in medical innovations that save lives, and we are on the verge of so many life-changing discoveries.

We all remember the 1980s as the AIDS epidemic gripped our country and the world with a disease that was at that time a death sentence. But now thanks to drugs created with NIH support, people with HIV can live a long, productive life into old age. Ironically, the same week that sequestration took effect, a groundbreaking medical discovery supported by NIH was made in AIDS research. A 2-year old baby in Mississippi born with HIV may be the first child to be functionally cured of the disease after receiving a cocktail of drugs. This study was supported by the NIH, and NIH played a key role in the development of the drugs used to treat the toddler.

Our country is rich with promising research just like this and rich with bright minds, curious scientists, and innovative labs engaged in work that will lead to a cure for AIDS and treatments for diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's. But cuts to NIH could curb the promise of these medical discoveries.

The medical advancements for which we owe our thanks to NIH are many. Thanks to NIH-supported research, the likelihood that a child with leukemia will survive for 5 years is now 90 percent. And 152 new FDA-approved drugs and vaccines have been discovered with NIH support over the last 40 years. Just 2 weeks ago, I talked with a researcher at the University of Illinois Chicago who credited NIH-supported research that created a blockbuster new drug to treat HIV.

NIH-led research developed beta blockers, a commonly used drug to treat high blood pressure. And thanks to these drugs, fewer people are hospitalized for cardiovascular disease, saving lives and also saving costs to Medicare and the Federal Government of \$6,000 per patient. Investments from NIH in the Human Genome Project opened the door to countless medical discoveries and cures and generated \$796 billion in economic output—a return on investment of \$141 for every \$1. A promising NIH-supported project at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine is working to allow people with paralysis to move a mechanical arm with their minds. Imagine how this innovation could improve the lives of people paralyzed from a stroke and servicemembers with spinal injuries.

I would like to share the experience of Stevie Conti, a 25-year-old woman from Deerfield, IL, who has cystic fibrosis, a rare disease that impacts about 30,000 people in the U.S. Stevie loves cooking and hanging out with friends. Her twin sister says she is the last to complain about anything, including her health. Thanks to investments from the NIH, tremendous scientific breakthroughs in genetic mapping and drugs are improving the lives of people with cystic fibrosis. A little

over a year ago, FDA approved a groundbreaking new drug, called Kalydeco, which is the first drug to treat the genetic cause of cystic fibrosis in some people.

Since Stevie started taking Kalydeco her health has improved by leaps and bounds, and she is able to do simple things that many of us take for granted. She has gained 10 pounds and can run a mile without coughing or feeling short of breath. Stevie has landed her dream job and is able to work 40 hours a week without feeling tired and still has enough energy to hang out with friends after work. Stevie says this drug has changed her life. NIH-supported research and scientists are helping people, like Stevie, live healthier, more productive lives. Right now, when so much good research is showing us the way forward, we should be doubling down on biomedical research and infrastructure.

Due to several years of flat funding and cuts, the current NIH budget is insufficient to fund all of the critical research that needs to be done. Due to cuts to NIH funding and the failure to keep up with rising research costs, the number of research grants funded by NIH has declined every year since 2004. In 2012, NIH funded 3,100 fewer grants than in 2004. Cutting back on biomedical research is a shortsighted act that undermines everything we are trying to do for this country. Medical research saves lives, keeps America's place as a leader in science and medicine, and generates economic growth. Every State and the District of Columbia receive NIH funding. These awards go to universities, businesses, and research centers—engines of growth for local economies.

Not only is NIH dealing with years of insufficient funding, on March 1 sequestration went into effect imposing mindless, across-the-board cuts for critical, federally supported programs like defense, education, aviation safety, and scientific research. This is a manufactured crisis that never should have happened. We need to reduce our deficit in a thoughtful and sensitive way, but sequestration is a hatchet approach that cuts from vital programs that protect our Nation and economic growth. A \$1.6 billion cut to the NIH, due to sequestration, will cause 20,000 jobs to be lost. A cut of this magnitude will have a ripple effect that will hurt every State in our Union.

Last year, Illinois received \$746 million in NIH funding. Sequestration would cause Illinois to lose \$38 million. That translates to 700 fewer jobs, less innovation, and a slowdown of economic growth in my State. Our country is just starting to recover from a recession. We cannot afford a mindless cut that will lay off hard-working people and stall economic growth.

Every \$1 in NIH funding stimulates \$2.21 in business activity that develops around research, such as biotech companies that provide supplies, food services and restaurants, building con-

struction, and hiring support staff. As research projects slow and then stop, the companies that provide equipment and supplies and the construction projects to expand research facilities also slow and then stop. Some U.S.-based companies that provide lab supplies to researchers expect that a cut to NIH will cause a drop in sales and slow down production lines forcing companies to close sites and lay off workers.

Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the NIH, says there is no question that sequestration will slow the development of an influenza vaccine and our progress with cancer research.

Eli Zerhouni, the head of NIH under President George W. Bush, says:

We are going to maim our innovation capabilities if you do these abrupt deep cuts at NIH. It will impact science for generations to come.

Insufficient funding and cuts to NIH will force the agency to not award some grants. And it may need to reduce awards that have already been announced. Research and clinical trials that have already started are less likely to be given funding to continue, so promising projects will be terminated, suspended or forced to lay off workers.

I would like to share the story of Dr. Teresa Woodruff, a researcher and professor at Northwestern University's Feinberg School of Medicine. Dr. Woodruff is leading one of the first major studies on the impact of superfund environmental toxins on reproductive health. Her work could help us understand the health risks of certain chemicals and how pollutants enter the human body. The Monday after sequestration took effect, Dr. Woodruff was delighted to learn that the NIH had awarded funding for her research, but disappointed to learn that—due to sequestration—the grant was cut by more than half.

Dr. Woodruff is thankful for the NIH funding, but this cut means she will have to drop key parts of her research, like studying the impact of toxins on men and children and how pollutants end up in the food we eat. Because of the drastic cut in funding, Dr. Woodruff will not hire new people and will have fewer training slots to teach the next generation of scientists. Dr. Woodruff's experience is being played out across the country as promising researchers are forced to stall clinical trials and lay off support staff.

The percent of NIH grants being awarded since the 1960s has dropped significantly. Currently, less than one in every five grants to the NIH is awarded funding. The primary reason for this decline is insufficient funding. Less funding will result in fewer grants being awarded, and the group of researchers most impacted by this cut is young researchers. Once we add the \$1.6 billion cut due to sequestration, we risk losing a new generation of scientists in our Nation.

Less funding means fewer academic grants to educate young scientists.

And more competition for grants makes it difficult for young scientists to win funding and dissuades new scientists from pursuing careers in research. When and if NIH funding eventually increases, projects will struggle to find and train talented scientists who will make tomorrow's discoveries.

For over a century, NIH-supported scientists have led the way for important breakthroughs to improve health and save lives through discoveries—discoveries such as development of the MRI, extending the life expectancy of people with cystic fibrosis, revolutionizing our thinking about cancer, and creating vaccines.

Two weeks ago, I received a letter from a man named Andrew Young from Vernon Hills, IL. His 16-year-old sister Emily has a rare disease called Friedreich's Ataxia, a rare disease that makes it hard to perform basic motor functions like walk, write, and speak. Most young people with FA need to use a cane or wheelchair by their teens. Emily's world was turned upside down in 2008 when she was diagnosed with FA, but she refuses to let it define her. She wants to go to college and practice medicine and hopes for a cure one day.

Now is not the time to disinvest in NIH and close the door to finding cures for people like Emily. Disinvestment in NIH would be a shortsighted act that risks forfeiting the U.S.'s position as a leader in biomedical research and reaping the economic and biomedical rewards of scientific research. These cuts don't make sense for—patients, local economies, or our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to ensure our country creates and benefits from the life-changing medical discoveries supported by the National Institutes of Health.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of organizations that support my amendment.

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

ORGANIZATION THAT SUPPORT THE DURBIN-MORAN NIH AMENDMENT

Research!America  
 American Lung Association  
 American Heart Association  
 United for Medical Research  
 FASEB (Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology)  
 American Society of Transplantation (AST)  
 The Endocrine Society  
 American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Inc.  
 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC)  
 American Association for Cancer Research  
 Association of Minority Health Professions Schools  
 Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America  
 Digestive Disease National Coalition  
 Dystonia Medical Research Foundation  
 GBS/CIDP Foundation International  
 International Foundation for Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders  
 Interstitial Cystitis Association  
 Joint Advocacy Coalition  
 National Alopecia Areata Foundation  
 National Kidney Foundation  
 National Marfan Foundation

NephCure Foundation  
 Pulmonary Hypertension Association  
 Scleroderma Foundation  
 Sleep Research Society  
 US Hereditary Angioedema Association.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority has 17 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire and 7 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Budget Committee has done an excellent job. While I appreciate the comments of my colleague from South Dakota, I actually think that in order to deal with the budget challenges facing the country, we have to look at both revenues and spending.

One of the areas of spending that have been the most problematic has been health care costs. It has been one of the fastest growing costs for the Federal Government, and what we have to do is look at how we can lower the health care costs.

The amendment I proposed that we are going to vote on this morning, amendment No. 438, is one that actually reduces health care costs.

In the 3 years since the Affordable Care Act was passed, women's access to affordable health care has improved. Women now have access to a wide range of preventive services, such as well-women appointments, screenings for cancer, diabetes, HIV, and counseling for domestic violence. All women now have access to contraceptive coverage for free through their insurance plans. Ninety-nine percent of women report that they have used birth control at some point in their lives, and access to birth control is directly linked to the decline in maternal and infant mortality. I think that is a really important message we need to get across to people. There is a direct connection between access to birth control and maternal and infant mortality. Access to birth control can also reduce the risk of ovarian cancer. It is linked to overall good health outcomes.

Sadly, the United States has one of the highest rates of unintended pregnancies in the industrialized world, and preventing unintended pregnancies just makes fiscal sense. Studies have found that medical services to women who experience unintended pregnancies and to infants who are born as a result of such pregnancies can cost taxpayers up to \$12 billion a year.

My State of New Hampshire has one of the lowest teen birth rates in the country. As Governor, I was proud to sign a law that required health care plans to cover contraception. It was a law that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in our legislature. The

fact is that accessible family planning matters, and it can make a difference.

Despite the research which shows that investments in women's health make sense, we continue to see efforts to deprive women from receiving the most basic of care.

The amendment I am going to be offering this morning will protect women's access to primary and preventive health care, to family planning, and to birth control. At the most basic level, this amendment ensures that a woman's family planning decisions are ones she makes with her doctor and her family, and that they are not dictated by government or by her employer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you. So I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has requested 10 minutes, and I yield to him 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the budget we are proposing. It has three basic guiding principles: First, we must protect our fragile economic recovery by creating jobs and investing in economic growth.

I remember when we did this during the Clinton administration. President Clinton proposed as a deficit reduction package raising income taxes on those who earned above \$250,000 at 39.6 percent. Every Republican voted against it, and many of them went on record saying it was going to cause a recession. Some Members of this body voted against it saying it was going to cause a recession and it would be Clinton's recession. So 22.7 million jobs later there was no deficit. We had a surplus.

This idea we hear from the other side that every time we raise taxes we hurt the economy just defies history. All we have to do is look at recent history, and especially now, at a time when there is a growing disparity in income in our country.

What we are trying to do is to promote growth. We promote growth by investing in that which creates growth. We know what they are. One is education. We are going to cut Pell grants? When my wife was 18 months old her father died in a car accident. He was a decorated World War II vet, leaving her mom widowed at age 29, with 5 kids, four girls and a boy. The boy, my brother-in-law, went into the Coast Guard and he did 20 years in the Coast Guard and he still works for the Coast Guard. He is an electrical engineer in the Coast Guard. He is the second most important man in my son's life. My son was able to get a master's degree in mechanical engineering from MIT.

My three sisters-in-law and Franni went to college on Pell grants and scholarships. At that time the full Pell grant paid for 85 percent of a public



college education. Now it pays for less than 35 percent. The Presiding Officer knows, because my mother-in-law ended up going to the University of Maine. But the Presiding Officer knows that today, kids who go to the University of Maine have debt. All of us know our kids, our students have debt. In Minnesota the average debt is \$29,000.

My wife's family lived on Social Security survivor benefits. My mother-in-law went to college on the GI bill. She got a loan on the GI bill. She became a teacher, teaching title I kids—because of Social Security, because of the GI bill. My wife's family was able to just barely get by. They barely made it. Sometimes there wasn't enough food on the table. Sometimes they turned the phone off, but they made it.

We have people now—they all made it into the middle class. The ladder was there. We are trying to preserve that. They tell us to pull ourselves up by our boot straps in this country. Sometimes people just need the boots first. The government gave my wife's family the boots, and they are all productive members of our society because of programs.

We had a hearing in the HELP Committee, and we had a witness whom the Republicans called, and he testified about what creates the middle class. They called a witness who was from the American Enterprise Institute. They are good people at the American Enterprise Institute. The witness's testimony ended with the idea that government can create jobs is a myth. So when it got to my turn to question him, I said: Have you heard of the Erie Canal? He had. The Erie Canal opened the Midwest to Europe. It made shipping our timber and our agricultural goods 97 percent more efficient. I asked him if he had heard of the Interstate Highway System. He had. I asked him if he understood that we were on C-SPAN, as we are right now, the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network. I asked him if he knew who put up the first satellites; it was the Defense Department.

I noted that he had gone to the University of California at San Diego. I asked him if any of his professors had helped him at all. He said they had. He got his doctorate at UCLA. I asked him if he had heard of the Internet. He had.

By the end of my questioning, he said: To say that the government can't create jobs would be absurd. It started with the idea that government can create jobs is a myth, and he ended his testimony with saying: To say the government can't create jobs would be absurd. There was a 180-degree difference except he added absurdity. So he injected it. That is what I used to do. I used to identify absurdity.

There is absurd stuff going on and being said here. We are hearing things cited that have been disproved so many times.

The budget we are proposing today is based on three guiding principles. First, we must protect our fragile eco-

nomics recovery by creating jobs and investing in economic growth. Second, we must tackle our deficits in a responsible way. And finally, we need to honor the promises we have made to our seniors, our veterans, and our middle class families. This budget does all of those things—and in doing so, it reflects our values and our priorities. In contrast, the budget being debated in the House provides massive tax breaks for the wealthy and big corporations, while slashing critical investments that will endanger our economic recovery.

Everyone agrees we shouldn't saddle our children and grandchildren with insurmountable debt—addressing our debt is a responsibility we take very seriously. But at the same time, if we fail to make the necessary investments in economic growth, public health improvements, quality education, rural development, and clean energy, our children and grandchildren will inherit an equally unacceptable burden.

Drastic cuts to infrastructure, innovation, and education are penny wise and pound foolish. Even if we save a little on paper upfront, the realistic long-term effects are costly and devastating. That is why our budget includes a \$100 billion infrastructure recovery plan that will get workers back on the job, repairing our crumbling schools and bridges, and building up our technology infrastructure, so schools and small businesses, even in rural Minnesota, can stay competitive.

It also lays the groundwork to pass a comprehensive 5-year Farm Bill that will provide certainty and support for Minnesota's farmers. This budget plan protects Head Start, early childhood education, and Pell grants—which make a quality education possible for all students, regardless of background, and will prepare our children for the 21st century workforce.

This budget demonstrates our commitment to responsible deficit reduction. Since the Simpson-Bowles proposal, Congress has reduced the deficit by \$2.4 trillion—\$1.8 trillion coming from spending cuts, and \$600 billion from allowing tax rates for the wealthiest to return to prior levels. This budget builds on that deficit reduction with an additional \$1.85 trillion. That is a total of \$4.25 trillion in deficit reduction—which exceeds the goal set out in Simpson-Bowles.

This budget shares other principles of Simpson-Bowles—that deficit reduction should be achieved through a mix of spending cuts and new revenues, and that deficit reduction should not be done on the backs of the most vulnerable.

At one point in time, there was enthusiasm among some of my Senate colleagues from the other side of the aisle for Simpson-Bowles. One such Senator said, "Say yes to Simpson-Bowles . . . I'm willing to say yes to Simpson-Bowles." Another said, "Everybody knows what the solution is, and that's Simpson-Bowles . . . I mean,

everybody knows that that's the template for what we need to do." Another called the plan "a good starting point and should be seriously considered by Congress." Our budget exceeds the deficit reduction goal in Simpson-Bowles, and follows the same general principles—yet my colleagues on the other side have not yet come around to supporting it.

Finally, in addition to growing our economy and responsibly addressing the deficit, our budget honors the promises we have made to our seniors, our veterans, and our most vulnerable. This is in sharp contrast to the budget being considered in the House.

My colleagues and I pay into Medicare every month, and so we are entitled to Medicare benefits when we reach age 65. The fact that we are entitled to these benefits is not a bad thing. In fact, it is a very important thing for millions of American seniors. In 1965, we created Medicare and Medicaid so seniors could count on having access to medical care in their retirement. As a nation, we promised our parents and grandparents they could count on Medicare and Medicaid as a safety net in their golden years. And the Senate Democratic budget protects that safety net.

However, the House Republican budget would undermine the very foundation of the promise, and end Medicare as we know it. Their budget would replace Medicare's guarantee of health coverage with a voucher, and would raise the Medicare eligibility age. In my home State of Minnesota, this proposal would shift costs to more than 800,000 seniors when they can least afford to bear that burden. It would end the guarantee of health coverage that Medicare has made for decades. In fact, it would end Medicare as we know it.

The House Republican budget would also turn Medicaid into a block grant. Now, a lot of people think Medicare will provide long-term care services for seniors since Medicare is thought of as the health care program for seniors. But it is actually Medicaid that provides those long-term services and supports. Medicare does not cover those.

So when the House Republicans talk about turning Medicaid into a block grant, what they are actually talking about is ending the guarantee that seniors can get the care they need when they need it most. In my home State of Minnesota, that means the nearly 100,000 seniors who depend on Medicaid would no longer be able to count on getting the care they need. Our Senate budget protects the Medicaid program so seniors can access that care when they need it.

I also want to talk for a moment about the SNAP program, or food stamps. The House Republican budget would cut the SNAP program by \$135 billion. This could mean that as many as 13 million people would be cut from the program. More than a quarter of these people would be low-income seniors and people with disabilities. That

is as many as 3 million seniors who would no longer have the assistance they need to buy food. Fortunately, the Senate budget protects the SNAP program so that seniors can continue to buy food.

This budget also keeps our Nation's promise to our veterans. We just marked the 10-year anniversary of the beginning of the Iraq War. We have responsibly brought that war to an end. We remain in Afghanistan, where we have been for well over a decade, though we are also bringing our participation in that war to a responsible end. Well over 2 million Americans have deployed during those wars as part of our all-volunteer force.

The budget funds veterans programs so that veterans can get the education they need, the jobs they are seeking, the homes every American should be able to depend on, and access to the health care they have earned and deserve.

I am proud of our budget, and of the values it reflects. It reflects a commitment to the success of future generations, and to the middle class. It puts the interests of regular people above those of our most profitable corporations. It tackles our budget deficits in a way that will promote growth and prosperity.

I have also filed several amendments that reflect priorities for Minnesota—in particular, the expansion of rural broadband, the promotion of college affordability, encouraging public-private partnerships in workforce training efforts, expanding access to skills courses for the unemployed, and promoting clean energy on tribal lands.

I thank Chairman MURRAY for her leadership during this process, and look forward to carrying out this budget's priorities alongside her in the coming years.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota, as we prepare to go through a series of votes, for reminding us that a budget is not just numbers on a piece of paper. It really is a statement of our values and what we care about and how we are going to invest in our country so we have strong jobs in the future and a strong economy. We really base this budget on those principles, and the Senator from Minnesota reminded us all of that so well today, and I thank him for his statement.

We are within a minute of beginning the vote, so I would remind my colleagues we have a busy day ahead of us. We on our side are very proud of the budget we have put forward that focuses on jobs and the economy, in this fragile time getting people back to work, getting them the resources they need to have a strong future, whether it is education or infrastructure or the research and development that creates the kind of jobs that the Senator from Minnesota has focused on. We on this side do deeply understand the need to manage our debt and deficit respon-

sibly. It is why we have put forward a credible approach, a balanced approach, that makes sure we are cutting, in many programs the Presiding Officer and I care deeply about, but understanding this is the time we are in, where we have to relook at these programs and manage them effectively, and we have done that in our budget. There are many tough choices we have in front of us, but the tough choices we have put forward in this budget reflect the balance the American people have asked us to make in our budget approach.

I look forward to having it passed sometime, I am sure, in the wee hours of the morning. This budget moves us toward a place where we can work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of this city to come together in a way that gets us back on a path so we are not managing this country from crisis to crisis, but are working effectively together to move forward in this country.

So with that, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 431

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 431, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MIKULSKI, the first amendment she has offered is a very important one.

We all know pay discrimination in the workplace is very real. We know women are nearly half of our workforce, but they still only earn about 77 percent of what men earn, and women of color are much worse off. African-American women make 70 cents on the dollar. Hispanic women make only 60 cents on the dollar. We want to make sure all of our families are strong and stable in the future, and pay discrimination is something that is holding women and families and communities back.

So a "no" vote on this means you are actually OK with women earning less pay than men—women not being able to contribute to their families in a strong way so their children can be taken care of and they can pay their mortgage or their rent and put food on the table.

A "yes" vote on this amendment means you acknowledge this as a problem and agree that women must receive equal pay for equal work.

I want to thank the Senator from Maryland for her long-time advocacy on behalf of women in many ways, but particularly on making sure they have equal pay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we would urge our colleagues to support the Mikulski amendment. It sets the goal of equal pay for equal work. Fortunately, it does not specify any coer-

cive method by government to compel that outcome. We think it is a worthwhile aspiration. As a father of two daughters, I certainly hope their work is rewarded by equal pay to that of their counterparts who are young men.

I urge all of our colleagues to support the Mikulski amendment, with that understanding that we are talking about the marketplace setting that outcome rather than coercive policies from the government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would suggest we take this amendment by voice vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, on our side I believe we are happy to have a voice vote on this amendment. And I urge a strong yes. It sets a great tone, by the way, for the rest of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 431) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 158

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided on the Ayotte amendment.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Ayotte amendment No. 158. We should not be increasing taxes now at the expense of jobs, so my amendment would simply bring a budget point of order to prohibit tax increases while unemployment is above 5.5 percent.

The President said if we passed his stimulus package—his team said we would be at 5.1-percent unemployment now. I have heard from so many businesses, with the \$1.7 trillion in tax increases that have already been brought by the President and the Democrats here, jobs are hurting. Now is not the time to raise taxes. Our small businesses are being killed by this.

Mr. President, 23 million Americans are out of work. So many are struggling, with the unemployment rate at over 7 percent. That is why I have offered this amendment.

I urge my colleagues, let's not increase taxes at the expense of jobs. So please support my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I have said many times, this budget asks the wealthiest Americans and our biggest corporations to pay just a little bit more, both to get our fiscal house in order and to make critical investments that will help drive broad-based economic growth.

Economists across the political spectrum will tell you that raising revenues from those who can afford it most will not hurt our economy. In fact, our experience during the 1990s proves that fact. In fact, raising revenues by closing loopholes and cutting inefficient spending in the Tax Code for the

wealthiest Americans, as our budget proposes, actually stands to boost the economy by removing tax breaks that distort the allocation of capital.

This amendment that is being offered would effectively end the privileged status of a balanced and fair budget plan, such as this one, that calls on the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share in order to address our deficits and get our economy going again.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 158) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 202

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on Amendment No. 202, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, tomorrow is the 3-year anniversary of the passage of ObamaCare. ObamaCare is hurting. It is hurting seniors, it is hurting His-

panics, it is hurting African Americans, it is hurting single moms, and it is hurting the economy. It should be repealed.

Yesterday over 70 Members of this body voted to remove one of the most pernicious taxes in ObamaCare, the tax on medical device providers. I happily voted for the amendment, but I would point out this is a wealthy industry which can afford to hire lobbyists.

We should be responsive not only to wealthy corporate lobbyists but to the people and small businesses that are being hurt by ObamaCare and to the workers who are being hurt by ObamaCare. We should be responsive to the American people. For that reason, this amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to defund ObamaCare and repeal ObamaCare.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this will be the 36th time we have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I know the Senators on the other side want to revoke to repeal it. That is fine. I wish to warn you, due to the way this amendment is drafted, it also repeals what we put in that bill on education; to wit, we put in money to increase Pell grants. We put in money to increase funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. We put in money also to help the community colleges, \$2 billion. We also included the more generous income-based repayment system to ensure people don't need to pay more than 10 percent of their discretionary income to pay back their student loans. All of that is wiped out in the Senator's amendment.

Again, maybe it is just a drafting error. But I think Senators should know you are not just voting to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. That is fine if you want to do that. I don't think Senators on the other side of the aisle who are here wish to vote to decrease Pell grants and to decrease funding for universities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 202) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 439

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 439 offered by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we are going to have a lot of amendments, so if we have a lot of floor discussion, this is only going to delay it. I would encourage Senators throughout the day to please take their conversations off the floor after the votes so Senators who are speaking on the amendments on both sides of the aisle have the consideration of being heard.

I will take my 1 minute on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senate budget already includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief. This amendment would make that relief for low- and middle-income Americans explicit, but it would do it in a way that preserves the health care benefits in the Affordable Health Care Act.

Unfortunately, the amendment that follows this one will gut the ACA and leave millions of Americans back in a position where they have to worry about a preexisting condition or a health illness that could bankrupt their household. We have to make sure

taxes do not hit low-and middle-income families, but we should do it in a responsible way that doesn't take away health care for millions of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Budget Committee member Senator TOOMEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I am not rising in opposition to this amendment because I oppose it. We Republicans don't want to raise taxes on low-and middle-income families because we don't want to raise taxes on anybody. But the irony of this is that this budget is an exercise in raising taxes on middle-income families. It is necessarily the case.

By the way, that is above and beyond the huge tax increases my colleagues imposed when they voted for ObamaCare—\$1.2 trillion of tax increases, much of which lands squarely on middle-income families.

The fact is the President showed how he wants to raise taxes on the wealthy, and he has a plan that does that. It raises \$600 billion. My colleagues have reconciliation instructions for \$1 trillion. The difference is going to inevitably come from the middle class. We don't want that to happen.

I would suggest we will accept this amendment. We could accept it on a voice vote. But it doesn't change the central fact that the Democratic budget is all about raising taxes on middle-income families.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we can accept it on a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Brown	Coons
Ayotte	Burr	Corker
Baldwin	Cantwell	Cornyn
Barrasso	Cardin	Cowan
Baucus	Carper	Crapo
Begich	Casey	Cruz
Bennet	Chambless	Donnelly
Blumenthal	Coats	Durbin
Blunt	Coburn	Enzi
Boozman	Cochran	Feinstein
Boxer	Collins	Fischer

Flake	Landrieu	Roberts
Franken	Leahy	Rockefeller
Gillibrand	Lee	Rubio
Graham	Levin	Sanders
Grassley	Manchin	Schatz
Hagan	McCain	Schumer
Harkin	McCaskill	Scott
Hatch	McConnell	Sessions
Heinrich	Menendez	Shaheen
Heitkamp	Merkley	Shelby
Heller	Mikulski	Stabenow
Hirono	Moran	Tester
Hoehn	Murkowski	Thune
Inhofe	Murphy	Toomey
Isakson	Murray	Udall (CO)
Johanns	Nelson	Udall (NM)
Johnson (SD)	Paul	Vitter
Johnson (WI)	Portman	Warner
Kaine	Pryor	Warren
King	Reed	Whitehouse
Kirk	Reid	Wicker
Klobuchar	Risch	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 439) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 222 offered by the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, although it has been a couple of years now since we passed the health care law, it is becoming evident to all Americans that there were in fact many new taxes—almost \$1 trillion of new taxes—in the health care law. And despite the President's firm pledge at that time not to raise taxes by even one dime on middle-income Americans, I at that time asked the Joint Tax Committee to evaluate the law and tell us if there were such taxes in the law.

The letter I received back from the Joint Tax Committee indicated there were at least seven taxes in the health care law that did squarely hit the middle class—and not just in a small way. It is at least a quarter trillion dollars of new taxes that the middle class will pay if we don't fix it. In fact, it is 73 million American families that will ultimately pay this new tax in the ObamaCare legislation if we don't reform it.

This is an amendment I brought during the consideration of the health care law. It was defeated then by a claim that there were no taxes in the bill. We now know there are taxes in the bill, and this is our chance, now that these taxes are beginning to be implemented, to remove them from the law.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is ironic that a number of those taxes are in the Ryan budget that our colleagues voted for last night. But let me say this. The ACA is going to extend health care coverage to nearly 30 million people. They are mostly low- and middle-

income people who don't have access to affordable coverage. The law also fully pays for the costs of expanding health insurance coverage and does it without increasing taxes on our middle class.

I believe expanding health care insurance coverage is one of the most important things we can do for our country and for our economy. The amendment that is being offered would undermine the effort under way to bring health insurance to millions of currently uninsured people in a fiscally responsible fashion.

I urge our colleagues to oppose this amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 222) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 438

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to the vote on amendment No. 438, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, amendment No. 438 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to basic health care, including family planning and birth control. It ensures that employers cannot deny coverage for contraceptives.

We have seen that improving access to preventive care, including contraception, is good health policy, and as a result it means healthier women, healthier children, and healthier families.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, every Senator supports expanding access to health care. We may have strong differences on the best way to do it, but no one should doubt that commitment. However, we must also ensure that we protect deeply held religious beliefs of our citizens.

In this regard, the Shaheen amendment—and the new health care law—gets it all wrong. In addition to growing government and slowing the economy, the law tramples on the rights of individuals.

Later this afternoon, Senator FISCHER will offer a side-by-side to this amendment.

I ask my colleagues to vote no on the Shaheen amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—43

Alexander	Burr	Corker
Ayotte	Chambliss	Cornyn
Barrasso	Coats	Crapo
Blunt	Coburn	Cruz
Boozman	Cochran	Enzi

Fischer	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Flake	Lee	Scott
Graham	Manchin	Sessions
Grassley	McCain	Shelby
Hatch	McConnell	Thune
Heller	Moran	Toomey
Hoeben	Paul	Vitter
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Risch	
Johanns	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 438) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are now in a period of 2 hours of debate equally divided. I understand Senators on that side will begin.

I would like to notify all Senators we are now working through a process to get the next amendment set in order so that Members will know. We do have 2 hours of debate, but Members should know that we may yield back some of that time. So please be ready. I think everybody has a lot of amendments they want to have brought up, and the sooner we can get to that the sooner we will.

So, again, we will now move to 2 hours of debate equally divided.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the managers or their designees.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the number of Budget Committee staff for the minority granted access to the floor at one time be increased by two.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Senator COBURN for 22 minutes. I also have on our schedule of Members, Senator COLLINS for 10 minutes, Senator CORNYN for 10 minutes, Senator INHOFE for 10 minutes, and Senator SESSIONS for 8 minutes.

At this time I yield to Senator COBURN for 22 minutes. First, I would note that Senator COBURN is doing something that every Member of this body should be inspired by. He is actually working hard every day to identify the problems we face with duplication and waste in our government. We do far too little of that, and this budget does virtually nothing about it. So I would like to thank Senator COBURN for being unparalleled in his commit-

ment to financial responsibility, and I yield to the Senator 22 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent to use oversized charts. I don't actually like to use oversized charts, but I cannot get all the information I need to present on one regular chart because I am looking at one subject area.

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

Mr. COBURN. First of all, I wish to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for bringing a budget to the floor. It is great that we have done it.

We know the outcome of this budget vote already. The final budget vote will not come until sometime in the middle of the night. But in that budget we are going to spend \$47 trillion. There is a dispute between how we look at it and how our colleagues on the other side look at it, but there is at least \$1 trillion in tax increases.

The new debt over the next 10 years is \$7.3 trillion despite \$1 trillion in tax hikes. The debt that has been added since the last budget passed this Senate is \$5.5 trillion.

The spending increase above the projected growth over 10 years is \$645 billion. The spending increase in this budget next year above today's budget level is \$162 billion.

The deficit increase next year relative to the fiscal year 2014 projection by CBO is a \$95 billion increase in our debt—we are not going the other way.

The growth rate in the Federal budget over 10 years is going to be 60 percent, and in the mandatory programs it is going to be 80 percent, so we are going to have the government growing at least 7 percent a year, continuing to grow at a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over that 10 years over what was projected may be \$270 billion. The deficit reduction achieved through spending cuts will be zero in this budget—zero through spending cuts.

The deficit reduction through elimination of duplication, fraud, and waste in this budget is zero.

The date this budget balances is never.

I am bringing these charts to the floor because I want the American people to know how we are not doing our job. We are going to get a vote on a lot of these things, I have told my colleagues. I haven't been allowed to offer a lot of these amendments on bills that have come to the floor, so we are going to vote on them tonight and into the early hours tomorrow morning. The reason it is important for us to vote on them is because the American people need to know whether or not we are going to act on them. Let me start to go through some of the programs and see if it matches any type of common sense that anybody in America might have about how we could go about helping American citizens.

Three years ago we forced the GAO to do a duplication study of the whole Federal Government. We are going to get that last report about 1½ weeks from now. They will have looked at the whole Federal Government. This is just the data based on the first two reports. Let me just go through it rather quickly so my colleagues can see.

We have 15 unmanned aircraft programs, 5 agencies, \$37 billion a year. Why do we have 15 of them? Does that make sense to anybody?

We have domestic food programs, 11 different programs, 3 different agencies, and we are spending \$62 billion.

We have 21 different homeless programs—21 different homeless programs. It is great that it is only one through one agency. Why do we have 21 separate programs? Each one of these programs has a bureaucracy and office staff and overhead and administration. Why not have one or two?

Transportation services for transportation-disadvantaged persons: 80 separate, different, distinctly designed programs in 80 different agencies. Why not in the transportation agency alone? Why not run it out of the department it should be run through?

Job training and employment, 47 programs for the able-bodied, 9 different agencies, and it is actually \$18.9 billion. We have actually done all the oversight on this. In Oklahoma, we have 17 federally-run job training programs in a city that has less than 15,000 people and has 400 people unemployed, 17 separate offices run by the Federal Government.

Teacher quality, 82 separate teacher training and quality programs, not run within the Department of Education but run within the Department of Education and nine other agencies. How does that fit? When we are in a time when we are trying to make hard decisions to protect the future of this country and a fiscal balance, why won't we address this? None of this stuff has been addressed. This has been known for 2 years. None of it is in the budget. It is not even in the House budget.

Food safety, 30 different programs, 15 different agencies, \$1.6 billion. Do people realize if we buy a cheese pizza at the grocery store it is controlled by the Department of Agriculture, but if somebody buys a pepperoni pizza at the grocery store it is controlled by the FDA? Does that make sense to anybody? Why would we continue to be stupid? And we are the ones being stupid because we will not address these issues.

Military and veterans health services, we have four agencies running that. I would think we would want the VA to run that, not the VA plus three other agencies.

Economic development, we have 80 programs, 4 different agencies, and \$6.5 billion a year.

U.S.-Mexican border region water needs, all right, we have Arizona on that border, we have Texas on that border, and we have California on that

border. We have seven different agencies that control that. Why? Why would we do that?

Financial literacy programs, I would make the point that we are not very good in financial literacy within the Federal Government because all one has to do is look at our budget. There are 13 different agencies, 15 programs, plus the new Financial Consumer Protection Board is going to create another one—another one. We are spending \$30 million a year on that.

Green buildings, 94 different programs, 11 different agencies, spending \$1 billion a year.

Housing assistance, 160 different programs, 20 agencies—20 Federal Government agencies—spending \$170 billion a year the overhead that is associated with all of this, the duplication that is associated with it, the complications, the paperwork.

Department of Justice grant programs, 253 of them: They are within the Department of Justice, but they are run through 10 other Federal agencies, not the Department of Justice.

Diesel emissions, 14 different programs, 3 different agencies. Why three? Why do we have to interact with three different agencies to have our diesel emissions controlled, and why are there 14 different programs?

Early learning and child care, 50 programs, 9 agencies, \$16 billion.

Surface transportation, 55 programs, 5 agencies, \$43 billion.

Support for entrepreneurs, 53 programs, 4 different agencies. We have small business, but guess what. We have one at Agriculture, we have one at Treasury, we have one somewhere else I can't remember; \$2.6 billion.

Science, technology, education and math, we all agree it is important. The Pentagon has over 100 programs. The Pentagon itself has over 100 programs. Then we have another 105 or so programs spread across the rest of the agencies. Thirteen different agencies have a science, technology, engineering program. Why is that not within the Department of Education?

As I finish this, I will not go to the next chart just on the basis of time.

I outlined a whole bunch of different programs, and not one of them has a metric on it that says we are successful or unsuccessful—not one of them. So even the agencies that have these multiple programs, running across multiple agencies, have no endpoint to say: Are you doing anything?

What we have discovered on job training is we are real good in job training with Federal programs of employing people in job training. We are terrible in terms of giving them a life skill that will give them a lifetime work capability.

Let me take a short time to show some examples. Looking at this chart, we can see why we have such big charts.

Here are the Federal preschool and daycare programs. So if someone wants to provide that to somebody, look at

the maze of bureaucracy they have to go through just to qualify.

The pink areas on this chart show the different departments that run them. The blue areas are the subagencies created out of the green ones. So we can see, in Federal preschool and daycare, we have the General Services Administration, that has four programs; we have the Department of Agriculture, that has this multitude of programs. But even if you have it at the Department of Agriculture, you cannot do anything because you have to talk to the Department of Education too, because they are interrelated in how they are controlled.

Early learning. The Justice Department has a multitude of programs. The Department of Health and Human Services has a multitude of programs. We even have a tax expenditure program for childcare and early learning. The Department of Labor has their own.

We can see what has happened to us is we have not done the oversight, the work to eliminate the problems that are causing us to spend at least \$200 billion more per year than we need to spend.

Here are the Federal programs for surface transportation and infrastructure. We can see why this is so big. Here is the Federal Highway Administration and here are all their subprograms for it. Then over here is the Office of the Secretary. Then we have the Federal Railroad Administration; we have the Maritime Administration; we have the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. If you are a State transportation director, you have to meet the bureaucratic requirements of every one of these programs.

I talked about science, technology, engineering, and math. Look at what we have. What we have is a maze where nobody in the government knows what the other agency is doing. Nobody knows what somebody over here in the Mickey Leland Energy Fellowship funding is doing compared with the New Era Rural Technology Competitive Grants Program.

Here is the other thing we have found as we have gone through all these programs: We have people who apply for a grant and get it from one of these programs and then turn around and go over and apply for the same grant from another program.

It is easy to see, when we continue to see multiple programs—here, even to get efficient in our Federal fleet, we have 5 different programs, 20 different agencies, just to try to get fuel efficiency within the Federal Government. We started out with electronic health records systems for veterans and the military. We have 10 different programs within that—not 1 program, not 2, but 10.

Just one other. Here is a chart with green buildings. We listed that: a multitude of agencies, a multitude of programs. Every department in the Federal Government has a green building

initiative separate and apart from a central area where it ought to be and probably associated with the National Institute of Standards and Technology. That ought to be who is running it, but it is not.

We have all these things. All these require rules for you to comply with if you are going to get a building permit or you are going to have any Federal contracts. It makes no sense.

I will end.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Nobody in their right mind will agree that what we are doing is smart, efficient, effective, and associated with common sense. But yet when it comes to doing the hard work of oversight and eliminating these duplications, nobody in the Senate wants to do the hard work of eliminating them. A conservative estimate is that we send out \$670 billion worth of grants a year. A conservative estimate is that \$200 billion of that is totally wasted, and we are sitting here squabbling about raising taxes. This budget raises \$1 trillion over 10 years. If we would do our hard work in terms of

Mr. President, there is so much distraction in the Senate I cannot talk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COBURN. If we would simply do our job, we would not have to have tax increases, we would not have to have spending cuts that will gut our military, although I can show a lot of waste in the military too, to the tune of \$50 billion a year. But if we would just do our job and actually look in detail—the way GAO has recommended and the way Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has oversights through the years, thanks to the leadership of Lieberman, Collins, Carper, and those who preceded them—what we will see is we have all this research, we have all this knowledge, we have all this stuff we know we can do, but we have no leadership in the Senate to get it done, and we bring a budget forward that perpetuates everything I just showed.

There is no mandate for every committee to eliminate total duplication in this budget. There is no mandate in this budget to consolidate like programs and eliminate cross-agency interference and duplication. There is no mandate in this budget that every grant program ought to have a metric on it to see if it actually accomplishes something. There is no metric in this budget to give the agencies the power and the resources to actually administer the grants effectively so we know what they are doing—none of that. This is all ignored.

As long as we say the only problem is saving Medicare and saving Social Security and saving the Defense Department, we are going to continue to waste \$200 billion a year. I do not know what it is. I do not know if it is that I

am not an effective communicator or if people have other priorities. But our grandchildren are totally dependent upon us eliminating so much stupidity. Yet nobody—the Appropriations Committees do not want to. Most of the authorizing committees do not want to. They will not do the hard work of eliminating the duplication.

I did not show the housing. I showed the total amount we spend. Do you realize we had paid a housing administrator in Oklahoma for 2 years in a town that had no homes. Picher, OK—we cleaned it out because of lead contamination. But we kept paying the housing administrator for Picher for 2 years—until I found it. I said: Why are we paying this guy? There are no homes.

Those little things, multiplied by a billion times throughout government programs, happen every day, and then we tell Americans we are going to raise your taxes because we will not do the hard work of oversight. We deny our oath when we do that, but we also deny the best tendencies and the tradition of this country. We can do a whole lot more with a whole lot less money if we would take care of this problem. But leadership is lacking on doing it.

As long as we have our eye on the ball of saving Medicare and saving Social Security and do not have our eye on the ball of the things that are spending money that we are getting no value for—or very limited value—we are going to continue to be in trouble financially as a country, even if we do save Medicare and Social Security.

Every dollar the American taxpayer pays into this country should be precious to us. Our foreign aid budget, we never talk about it. Our foreign policy has not been reauthorized for years. There has not been a full-time inspector general in the State Department in 6 years. We have seven open spots for inspectors general to actually look at this stuff and to advise us and advise the agencies.

We are failing to do our job. My only wish for my colleagues is to get informed, and if they are on a committee, they do not have to solve it the way I solve it, but just solve it. It makes no sense to continue to duplicate things.

As a matter of fact, in job training, here is what GAO said: Of the 47 job training programs for nondisabled people—we have another 53 for the disabled—of the 47 all but 3 do exactly the same thing.

Either GAO is lying or they are not. If they are not lying, why wouldn't we, in the next 2 months in this place, fix those programs to make them where they are actually giving real skills, for a real livelihood, to people who need real job training. There is no effort at all to do that.

The House just passed a bill, and it barely passed because every one of these squares that we show on any one of these charts has a constituency. In other words, they are dependent on

money coming from the Federal Government. So even though it is not efficient and not effective, our colleagues do not want to irritate anybody getting that money because we are more interested in getting reelected than fixing the long-term problems of our country.

All you have to do is go to our Web site, [coburn.senate.gov](http://coburn.senate.gov), and you will need a strong anti-emetic for the rest of the week if you read the waste and fraud and abuse and thievery that is going on with Federal Government programs. This budget does not address any of that waste.

Do you realize \$200 billion out of \$670 billion is \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. If we just fixed that, it would help pull us out of the big hole. That is \$2 trillion that has a very low economic multiplier in our economy versus \$2 trillion that might have a bit.

I will end on this last point: Last year we gave out \$4 billion to foreign countries that own more than \$100 billion of our debt. Ask the typical American—we are borrowing money from China, and we are giving them foreign aid. They own \$850 billion of our debt. Why would we do that? We are in debt, we are scrambling, we are borrowing \$40 million a minute, and we are taking the money we are borrowing from China and turning around and giving it back to them in foreign aid. Why would we do that? It just shows how out of control all the processes are in Washington because we fail to be informed and hold the administration—whether it is a Bush administration or an Obama administration, all of them are guilty. The reason they are guilty is because we are not raising the question.

I will tell my colleagues, they are going to get a vote on a lot of this stuff. A lot of my amendments have bipartisan support. But we are going to vote. They get to vote on whether they think we ought to eliminate duplication. They are going to have 17 separate votes on that. I am going to try to wind those into two votes. Vote against fixing it and then go home and tell Americans you want to raise their taxes \$1 trillion, and you do not want to eliminate the stupidity going on in Washington.

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

Mr. COBURN. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to just take one moment before I yield time to the Senator from Delaware.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be no expressions from the gallery.

Mr. WARNER. I commend my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, who has made this a passion. I would acknowledge this is a challenge that transfers between administrations.

When I was Governor of Virginia, under the previous administration, we

tried to consolidate workforce training programs. We still had those 47 programs and were not able at the State level to consolidate into a more meaningful approach.

I recall when I first came to this body, I thought let's at least find the low-hanging fruit, and we found those programs that both the Bush administration and the Obama administration had agreed were duplicative and unnecessary—16 programs, \$1 billion; but a billion here and a billion there and you are talking about real money.

I am happy to report 11 of those 16 programs have been eliminated. But the fact that there are those that both administrations agreed upon that have not been eliminated means there is more work to be done. I would simply point out to my friend from Oklahoma there has been legislation that he and the ranking member, the Senator from Delaware, who has also worked hard on these issues, supported 2 years back called the GPRMA bill, the Government Performance Results Modernization Act. In that bill for the first time ever, starting this year, there is a requirement that each agency of the Federal Government identify not only those programs that are the most successful, but those programs that are the least successful.

So regardless of which administration, Republican or Democratic, there will at least be some—beyond just OMB putting forward information that says where the actual agencies themselves think they are not getting good value for the dollar.

Mr. COBURN. Would the Senator, through the Chair, take a question? Does the Senator know the number of agencies in the Federal Government that actually know how many programs they have in their agency?

Mr. WARNER. I know the answer to this because we have talked about this in the past. We do not have a complete list of all of the various programs.

Mr. COBURN. There is one agency in the Federal Government that knows all its programs. Only one. The Department of Education. They actually publish it every year. They actually have done a great job. I compliment them. Not one other Federal agency actually knows all of the programs that run under their auspices.

Mr. WARNER. I turn now to my good friend, the Senator from Delaware. This has been an extraordinary passion of his. I know as chairman of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, along with the ranking member from Oklahoma, this will be an area of great interest and focus.

With that, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. It is ironic; this reminds me of our church. Every now and then our minister is going full steam and preaching to our congregation. He says: I know I am preaching to the

choir, but even choirs need to be preached to.

In this case, the folks, ironically, on the floor—Senator WARNER, Senator COLLINS, Senator SESSIONS, and I think myself and Dr. COBURN—there are probably no Democrats and Republicans more committed to figuring out how do we get better results for less money in everything we do. So even the choir needs to be preached to. We just had a pretty good sermon.

I have a couple of posters here I want to share. I think they might be of some interest and value in this discussion. I like to think of spending, as we are trying to rein it in and get it under control, in three elements. One of those is entitlement spending, which now is over 50 percent of what we spend in the Federal Government. It is growing. We have something called discretionary spending, which includes defense, and the domestic programs which are not entitlements, not Medicare, not Medicaid, not Social Security. Then you have got interest on the debt. That is pretty much it. That is pretty much it. If you look at, again, entitlement spending, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and other things that we are entitled to, it is over 50 percent and growing.

As it turns out, the part of our budget that is being squeezed is the discretionary spending. So about half of that is nondefense discretionary spending. That includes everything from transportation to agriculture, to housing, education, to homeland security, and a whole lot of other things as well. Then there is defense.

If you take a look at this chart, we find that this gray line here is actually nondefense discretionary spending. We start out in 1971. It is about 4 percent of spending as a percentage of GDP. Today it is about 4 percent as well. The budget that I believe we received from the House of Representatives actually—where they actually drop their spending is in that money. That includes workforce development, it includes education, it includes infrastructure—roads, highways, bridges, rail, ports, all of the above. It includes investing in R&D, research and development, through the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and creates among other things goods and services and products that we can sell all over the country and all over the world.

Under the House-passed budget, that money, instead of spending about 19 percent of our budget for nondefense discretionary spending, I think we would end up down around 4 percent for all nondefense discretionary spending—4 percent of our budget. That is not consistent with the priorities of many of us, including those on this side of aisle, include our own congressional delegation.

Here we have health care. This is good. Health care as a percentage of GDP. I mentioned Medicare as a percentage of our entitlements, including

Medicare as a percentage of our budget, now is up over 50 percent and climbing. If you look at health care as a percentage of GDP in this country, we are the green line. What we see from 1961 down to about 2010, the green line keeps going up and up and up.

Today, health care as a percentage of GDP in this country is about 17, almost 18 percent. I think the next closest country is France. We are way ahead of anybody else. We are almost twice as high as the Japanese, for example. We spend about 17, 18 percent of GDP. They spend about 8 percent. They cover everybody. They get better results.

When you have health care, the big part of Medicaid spending, Medicare spending, in fact all of it, is growing as though it is toxic. Entitlement spending continues to grow. We have got to do something about that. The discretionary spending part of our budget has actually been going down over 40 years by a significant amount of money. Today it is less than one-third of our total spending, if you combine defense and nondefense nondiscretionary spending.

So what do we do about it? What we try to do about it in our side in the budget, created with a lot of input from Senator WARNER, a lot of input from Senator SANDERS on our side, great leadership by Senator PATTY MURRAY, who is the chair of the committee—they have come up with a budget that is before us today that says: All right, we know we cannot continue to spend as we are doing. We have got to rein in the spending, not only on the entitlement side but also on the discretionary spending side. We need to raise some revenues.

They go back to take a page out of the Clinton playbook from, gosh, 12, 13, 14 years ago, when we had a big deficit—not as big as this. But they adopted a deficit reduction plan engineered by Erskine Bowles, the Chief of Staff. They did a deficit reduction plan in 1997 with bipartisan support that said: For every dollar of spending that we cut, we raise a dollar of revenues.

We ended up with four balanced budgets in a row. The budget that comes out of the Budget Committee is similar in that it is dollar for dollar, a dollar of deficit reduction on the revenue side, a dollar on the spending cuts. But unlike what happened 12 years ago—15 years ago actually—we do not get to a balanced budget. If there is a fault in the budget that has come out of the Budget Committee, while it reduces our publicly held debt as a percentage of GDP from 73 percent, 72 percent down to about 70 percent in 10 years—it stabilizes and starts to bring it down as a percentage of GDP—we still will have a budget deficit of over a half a trillion dollars 10 years from now. Is that good enough? No. We need to do better. In terms of entitlement program spending, we need to find ways to save more money. We need to do it without savaging old people and poor people. We need to do it in a way that preserves these programs for the long haul.



We were in our caucus. We had some good presentations from a few of the smartest people, health economists, doctors and so forth, that have been around. They gave us a whole bunch of good ideas on how to get better health care results for less money. We need to do that and more.

On the discretionary spending side, Senator COLLINS, who has previously chaired the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee—Senator COBURN and I have the privilege of leading it today. We focus literally every day as an oversight committee, trying to do oversight of the whole Federal Government, which is a whole lot for one committee to do. We do it in conjunction with the GAO. We work off their high-risk list, high-risk ways of saving money. Every few years they give us these great to-do lists for the Federal Government. We work on it in our subcommittee. We work on it with GAO. We work with OMB, Office of Management and Budget, we work with the inspectors general across the agencies of the Federal Government. We work with nonprofit groups such as Citizens Against Government Waste.

Our whole idea is to focus on wasteful spending, as we ratchet down the spending, figuring out where are we going to get good results and where are we not. In the programs where we get the kind of results we want, we fund them more or we reduce them less. If we are not getting the results we need, we close those programs, we reduce those programs. That is the way it ought to be. That is the way it ought to be. That is the way we are trying to do it.

Let me see if I have another chart here that might be relevant. When Bill Clinton was President in the last 4 years of his administration, they negotiated a deficit reduction deal with the Republican House and Senate in 1997, dollar for dollar, a dollar of revenue, a dollar of deficit reduction on the spending side. And for those 4 years we had a balanced budget, revenues as a percentage of gross domestic product. I think it was about 19½ to 20 percent, right around 20 percent of GDP.

Last year, our revenues as a percentage of GDP were down around 16 percent, I think, between 15 and 16. Even with the fiscal cliff deal that was adopted earlier, we will be up to about 18 percent of GDP by the end of the 10-year period.

I would suggest there are three things we need to do here: No. 1, we can build on a plan that has come out of the Budget Committee. It is a good start but it is not the finish line. We need to find additional savings in the entitlement programs that do not savage old people or poor people and preserve these programs for the long haul.

We need, in addition to that, revenue. We can do that by closing deductions, loopholes, credits. We can means-test a bunch of stuff. But we need to come up with the revenue to get closer to 20 percent.

The last thing, really in conjunction with what Senator COBURN was saying, is we need to look at every nook and cranny of the Federal Government—every nook and cranny of the Federal Government, from A to Z, from Agriculture to Transportation and everything in between. We need to ask this question: How do we get a better result for less money in everything we do? It is not just the responsibility of our committee, Homeland Security and Government Affairs, it is not just the Budget Committee, it is every committee. It is all of us who can win this together. It is the administration. It is the taxpayers groups. We are all in this together. If we are going to get to where we want to be, that is a fiscally sustainable roadmap to the future, it has to be all hands on deck. It has to be those three things: entitlement reform, additional reform, and to really squeeze every dime on the spending side and move from a culture of spend-thrift to a culture of thrift.

The budget resolution gets us going in the right direction. We are going to meet up in the House in a conference committee, their vision, our vision. That is where the real hard work begins. Out of that I hope we end up with a real focus on those three things. If we do and we can work together, and the administration and the President provide the leadership we need, we will get where we need to go in the future.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to Senator COLLINS. I would note that she has been a leader in governmental reform through the committee that she chaired and has been ranking member on. I would value her insight at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, let me thank the ranking member of the Budget Committee for all of his incredibly hard work on this issue. It is a hopeful sign that the Senate is finally debating a budget to set priorities for Federal spending and revenues in the coming year. While I am disappointed that we failed to perform this fundamental duty for the past 4 years, and that the budget reported by the Budget Committee is, unfortunately, a partisan one, I nevertheless welcome this budget debate.

I wish to describe the amendments I will be offering to the budget resolution later today. The first of these amendments is No. 144. It would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the purpose of correcting ObamaCare's definition of what is a full-time employee under the law. This amendment would allow employees to work more than 30 hours a week without triggering possible penalties on the businesses that hire them.

ObamaCare requires businesses with 50 or more full-time employees to provide qualified health insurance to their

workers or face onerous penalties. These penalties begin at \$40,000 for businesses with 50 employees, plus \$2,000 for each additional "full-time equivalent" employee. These penalties are a huge disincentive for any small business that wishes to grow and add new jobs.

One Maine business I know has 47 employees, and it would like to hire more but won't because of these onerous penalties. Another employer told me she is better off financially if she were to cancel the health insurance she provides to her employees and instead pay the fines. The fines are cheaper than paying the health insurance premiums for her employees. What perverse incentives ObamaCare has.

Greatly adding to the problem, ObamaCare defines full-time employees as averaging just 30 hours of work a week. This definition is completely out of keeping with standard employment practices in the United States today. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average American works 8.8 hours per day, which equates to 44 hours per week. GAO, in looking at this issue, uses 40. We pay overtime after 40 hours per week. The number of hours set by ObamaCare as full time is nearly one-third lower than the actual practice.

By using this unreasonably low threshold of 30 hours per week to define a full-time employee, ObamaCare artificially drives up the number of full-time workers employed by a business, exposing the employer and business to the risks of substantial penalties.

The consequences are some businesses are restricting their employees to no more than 29 hours per week to ensure their workers are considered part-time under ObamaCare. If more businesses follow suit, millions of American workers could find their hours, and thus their earnings, are cut back at a time when many of them are already struggling.

My amendment would allow for legislation setting a sensible definition of a "full-time" employee for purposes of ObamaCare penalties. This will help protect workers who otherwise will find their hours curtailed and their earnings cut as a result of the requirements in the ObamaCare law.

I would note this affects a wide range of employees. This is why you have NAM, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the NEA, the National Education Association—strange bedfellows indeed—both supporting my amendment.

The second amendment I am offering is amendment No. 459. It calls for sensible regulatory reform. Its provisions are based on legislation I have introduced in the past, the Clearing Unnecessary Regulatory Burdens Act or the CURB Act. This bill is designed to ease the regulatory burden on our Nation's job creators and is supported by the Nation's largest small business advocacy group, the National Federation of Independent Business.

My amendment would require Federal agencies to take into account the impact on small businesses and job growth before imposing new rules and regulations. It does this in three ways: First, it requires Federal agencies to analyze the indirect cause of regulations, such as the impact on job creation, the cost of energy, and consumer prices.

Second, it prohibits Federal agencies from circumventing the public notice and comment requirements by issuing unofficial rules known as "guidance documents" to avoid the review required under Executive orders. Third, it helps small businesses avoid unnecessary penalties for first-time, non-harmful paperwork violations.

The third amendment which I will offer is amendment No. 143. It would simply require the President, Vice President, and Cabinet-level officials to purchase their health insurance through the exchanges established by the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare.

ObamaCare requires individuals to purchase qualified health insurance or face a penalty. Those who cannot obtain coverage through their workplace or another source are required to purchase insurance through the exchanges which would be created under this law. ObamaCare specifically requires most Members of Congress and their staff to obtain health insurance through exchanges. If the exchanges are good enough for Members of Congress and their staffs, then surely that same requirement should apply with respect to the President, Vice President and Cabinet-level officials. My amendment would extend this requirement to them.

Finally, I am also pleased to be cosponsoring an amendment with my colleague Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania to prevent government waste in the Job Corps Program by requiring the long-overdue implementation of financial management, internal controls, and updated program integrity protocols at the Employment and Training Administration.

What has happened with the Job Corps Program is an utter disgrace. This program has significant shortfalls, which are caused entirely by the inexcusably poor management of this program for 2 years in a row by the Department of Labor. Job Corps is expected to be in a shortfall again next year.

The impact has led the administration to suspend new student enrollment into the Job Corps Program. These programs are critical for at-risk youth. They provide education, training, and job skills. It is a disgrace the administration has had such terrible management in Washington that furloughs are happening and students are being denied services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendments today.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 47 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Alabama has 23 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MURRAY. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if the Senator from Virginia may speak for 10 minutes? I see the Senator has some speakers on his side?

Mr. SESSIONS. I believe that would be appropriate.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia for helping to craft this budget and for his intense focus on making sure we reach a balanced agreement for our Nation's future. This has been his lifelong passion, and he has done a great job. He is a great working partner, and I appreciate all of his experience.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me thank the Chair for her good work and putting this budget together, which I believe is the first step as we try to resolve this issue.

The Senator from Washington has mentioned this has become my passion in this body. I absolutely believe getting our debt and deficit under control, getting the country's balance sheet right has almost become a proxy for whether our democratic institutions such as Congress may actually work in the 21st century. This debate we are going through is an important step in that direction.

We are about to proceed to the section of debate where a host of amendments will be put up, debated, and decided. It is my hope sometime later tonight or early tomorrow morning we will be able to conclude this process and move on to the next steps.

As I listen to my colleagues, particularly from the other side, I do wish to make three quick, brief points because there are actually a lot of agreements between us. I think we all realize that in addition to trying to get our tax policies and spending policies right—I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma—there are areas of duplication which could be improved upon.

I would point out one amendment this Budget Committee put together in a bipartisan fashion—the majority and minority were working together—was looking at the area of workforce training programs for further consolidation. We are able, not just in workforce training but across government, to find better ways to combine our programs and obtain more effective use of our tax dollars. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to do that.

I would also say while we have this problem about how we are going to raise our revenues and how we are going to spend, an important component of all of this is how we grow our economy. One of the challenges I find—

and the proposal mostly from the House, which appears to be the proposal endorsed by many of our colleagues on the other side—I am not sure their budget proposal puts forth a growth agenda.

At the end of the day, countries, just as private companies—and I spent 20 years in business, longer than I have in public life—need a business plan. Any good business plan invests in three things: people, plant and equipment, and an investment plan to stay ahead of the competition. Companies do the same thing; namely, invest in education, infrastructure, and R&D.

Unfortunately, the proposal which has been put out by the other side of the House would cut our government's investment in domestic discretionary spending from what is already at a very meager rate, closer to the Eisenhower administration rates. We currently spend about 16 cents on every Federal tax dollar on all of our domestic discretionary budgets combined. Over a period of time their plan would take that 16 cents to less than 5 cents.

I spent 20 years investing in business. I would never invest in a business which spent less than 5 percent of its revenues on its workforce, its plant and equipment, staying ahead of the competition. No country can stay competitive against emerging nations such as China, India, and Brazil. And Europe, facing financial crises, is trying to reset itself as well. Any of those nations are spending a larger percentage of their Federal revenues or their national revenues on training the workforce, building their roads, airports, broadband, and ports. They are trying to do research and development, which creates the intellectual capital which will drive our economy in the 21st century. Every other nation in the world with which we compete has a much more aggressive business plan than the business plan that would have been put forward by the House. Unfortunately, it would be put forward by many of our colleagues on the other side if they were allowed to cut domestic discretionary spending at the levels they propose.

We have often heard a lot of discussion on this floor about revenues. I don't think anyone on either side wants to be taxed more than is necessary.

The other side says we have a spending problem but refuses to look at the other side of the balance sheet. As a business guy, I find that troubling. I agree there are a number of areas where we need to cut back spending.

Look at revenues on a historic basis, look at revenues on the basis of when America had the fastest growth rate in recent time. During the 1990s, with President Clinton, our Nation added jobs at a record level. Our Nation made innovative grants, innovation and discovery of great new intellectual property at an unprecedented level. In the 1980s America was considered to have seen our best days. We came roaring back in the 1990s.

I didn't hear many complaints about our Tax Code in the 1990s during those periods of enormous growth because of those investments and because of that growth early in the beginning of this century. Around 2003, I think this body, and both parties, were part of it and made a mistake on assuming that the roaring good times were going to last forever. We cut \$4.5 trillion over a 10-year period out of the revenue side.

Anybody who runs a business knows you must look at spending and you must look at revenues. We took \$4.5 trillion out of our revenue stream at the very same time we doubled defense spending and increased spending on homeland security. We went to war twice entirely on the credit card. We provided new benefits for our seniors with prescription drugs, and seniors were going through the normal aging process. Many of those spending initiatives, again, were supported by both sides. But when the music stopped, we realized we had a structural budget deficit that now accounts for \$16.5 trillion in debt and it goes up by \$3 billion a night. While we have to take steps to rein in spending, we also have to realize not to grow government but, just to pay our bills, we have to put some of those revenues back into the revenue stream if we are ever going to get to some level of balance.

Well, what does this side of aisle propose? Have they said, You know, we need to go willy-nilly and go out and dramatically increase taxes even beyond what was proposed in the 1990s? No. Do the folks in this budget on the Democratic side say we at least ought to put 70 cents of that \$4.5 trillion back into the revenue stream? No. Do we say we ought to put half of the revenues back into the revenue stream that we took out? Again, the answer is no. This budget, combined with what we did on New Year's Eve, puts approximately \$1.575 trillion over a 10-year period back into the revenue stream—literally only one-third of the revenues that were taken out under the so-called Bush tax cuts back into the revenue stream.

Yet to hear what folks on the other side say, it sounds as though this is apocalyptic. Well, I have to tell you, as somebody, again, who will match my business credentials against anybody in this body, you have to look at both sides of the balance sheet. We have to find ways to rein in spending but we also, finally, have to find ways to make sure we have a revenue stream to allow us to meet our obligations.

A final point I wish to make—because I know my colleague, my good friend from Oklahoma, wants to rise to speak as well—is that I believe very strongly we have to get a handle on our entitlement programs. Medicare and Social Security are the two most successful programs our government and, for that matter, probably any government around the world, has ever implemented and we need to make sure the promise of Medicare and Social Security

is going to be here for our kids and our grandkids.

Around some of those programs some of the basic math has changed. When I was a young person, there were 16 people working for every 1 person who was on Medicare and Social Security. Today, it is 3. In 15 years, it will only be 2. So we do have to make changes. And this budget starts us down that path—\$275 billion in entitlement changes, on top of \$700 billion in entitlement changes that were part of the Affordable Care Act.

If we are going to make comparisons, apples to apples—and this gets a little bit technical, and I will again try to be very brief—I have not heard a lot of my colleagues acknowledge this. When this debate around debt and deficit really picked up steam—it started back in 2010 with a lot of very good bipartisan work done by the Simpson-Bowles Commission that pointed out we were on an unsustainable path and if we didn't take action we would send our Nation over a fiscal cliff. In the Simpson-Bowles report, they pointed out we needed to make substantial changes, for example, in Medicare and Medicaid. Well, they had some proposed changes that would have amounted to roughly over \$400 billion in savings over a 10-year period.

What is remarkable, and is not mentioned, is that because—whether it is recession or the Affordable Care Act—the rate of increase of our health care programs and our entitlement programs over the last 3 years has dropped dramatically, and independent of the \$275 billion of entitlement savings in this budget, based upon the assumptions that were made in 2010, based upon the Center for Budget Priorities, in 2020, because of the declining rate of increase of cost, we will have an additional \$500 billion in health care savings that are already built into this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds, and I will finish.

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

Mr. WARNER. I would simply say that I want to commend this debate we are having and commend Members on both sides of the aisle. As I said at the outset, no budget is going to be perfect for every Member, but this is a credible, important first step in this process, and one of which I think we can all be proud. I look forward to finishing this debate and moving on to the next stage to make sure we put this question of our Nation's balance sheet in order and then move on to the other important issues our country faces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague and friend Senator INHOFE. I think Senator INHOFE was told he had 8 minutes but this says 5.

Mr. INHOFE. I would respond to my good friend and say I will take the 8.

Mr. SESSIONS. All right. There is 5 minutes, and if the Senator needs to go over that a little bit, I will understand.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much.

We have been very much involved—not just myself but the Senator from Alabama and others—in this whole sequestration thing. The longer we have these hearings on this, the more we come to the realization we are not sure a lot of the things we are doing in these cuts are actually going to have the effect of cutting. If they did, our concern would be the fact that defense, which consumes 18 percent of the budget, would be getting 50 percent of the cuts, and that is over and above what this President has already done, projecting out in 10 more years at \$487 billion in cuts.

This sequestration is projected to be—the way it was drafted in the Obama sequestration—an additional  $\frac{1}{2}$  trillion. I remember when the previous Secretary of Defense was there and he used the word “devastating.” It was devastating.

One thing that has not been observed is the possibility that some of the things that are on there and are designed to be done will actually cost more money. Let me share, if I may, some quotes by some of the military.

First of all, Department of Defense Comptroller Hale said—and this is very significant:

We would also be forced to disrupt as many as 2,500 investment programs, driving up costs at the very same time we are trying to hold them down.

In other words, he says that particular part of this could actually cost more than the cuts.

General Odierno said this at one of our hearings:

The Army agrees that the hidden costs of sequestration may actually nullify any savings anticipated to be gained through sequestration.

There again, it could actually cost us money, not save us money. Admiral Ferguson said the same thing. I like his statement. He said:

Much like an automobile owner who chooses to skip a series of oil changes today to realize near-term savings . . . eventually his decision will result in the need for a costly engine overhaul later, the downstream cost of cancelled maintenance . . .

And that is what is going to have to be done under sequestration—

. . . is both reduced operational availability and much higher depot-level type repairs in the future.

This is something that was understood by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and myself when Senator LEVIN and I jointly signed a letter to the budget people saying we have a problem; that sequestration could cost more, and we recommended that in those areas where it costs more, then we would add \$16 million—that would be one-third—to the OCO account so that could be used in the

event—only in the event—we find we are spending more money on that.

As I say, I did give a copy of this letter as a reminder to the chairman of the committee, Senator LEVIN. So all we are doing is what we requested be done some time ago. Most likely, it is not going to cost anything and it is not scored. This is the OCO account, and it is increasing it \$16 million more, to \$66 million. It is interesting that in the budget that came over from the House it was \$95 million, so this is considerably less than that.

I think this is a good thing to do, and I honestly believe it will enjoy enough support that we will be able to get it with a voice vote. I can't imagine anyone being against it. Because what we are saying is, in an area where it is costing more, we will have something to cover that rather than it coming out of the defense budget.

I will not take a long time on this other one. I don't have the assurance yet that we are going to have a vote on it, but I think it is very important. There are a lot of us here, and I dare say a majority of us in the Senate, who are looking at this United Nations arms trade treaty and thinking: Why in the world would somebody want to cede to the United Nations, or to any multinational group, the power to make determinations as to with whom we trade arms? We may have an ally out there that maybe the United Nations doesn't agree with and they would be able to keep us, through a treaty, from trading arms with our allies—an ally such as Israel, as an example.

So I have an amendment—amendment No. 139—that I will try to get a vote on because I think we should. This may end up being the only vote that is addressing this real hot issue of guns right now, and that is all we have heard about in the last few weeks. I am going to tell you the actual wording of this so we are not hiding anything.

If you are for gun control, you won't like this. If you are for the nationalists being in a position to determine with whom we trade, you are not going to like this. And to show you what this is, I will read the new language in the bill. It says:

... upholding Second Amendment rights  
... preventing the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Treaty.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I am going to try hard and encourage our leadership to allow a vote on this very significant amendment. And I would say, if we could pull out maybe 3 or 4 amendments of all the 200 or 300 amendments, this would have to be one that most people would consider to be a very significant amendment.

With that, I would only mention one other thing. I am not going to bring this up, but I do have an amendment—amendment No. 282. A lot of people in States such as Alabama and Oklahoma recognize that our banks were not the

problem. We didn't have problems in my State of Oklahoma. So when we talked about State banks and community banks, we were in a position to take care of our own needs and we should not be a part of it. So this amendment—and then I will close—merely says we are going to come forth with legislation. We are going to draw a distinction, not just on Dodd-Frank and that type of legislation, but between community and State banks and Federal banks. The latter is where the problem is, so let's not try to correct something or fix something that doesn't need fixing.

Before I yield the floor, let me ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Senator CARL LEVIN and myself dated March 1.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, March 1, 2013.

HON. PATTY MURRAY,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

HON. JEFF SESSIONS,  
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR PATTY AND JEFF: In accordance with your request, we are forwarding our recommendations for the FY 2014 budget resolution. As you know the Department of Defense faces an unprecedented level of fiscal uncertainty. Congress has not completed action on FY 2013 appropriations, the government is operating under a continuing appropriations resolution that expires on March 27, and the FY 2014 budget has been delayed. Additionally, discretionary accounts face sequestration starting on March 1. Sequestration is expected to increase the cost of defense programs, placing additional demands on the DOD budget in the long run. We urge our colleagues to support passage of full-year FY 2013 appropriations as well as legislation that would eliminate sequestration in FY 2013.

Normally, the Committee would use the President's budget submission as the starting point for developing our recommendations for the FY 2014 budget resolution. While we do not have a 2014 request the Committee notes that last year's budget, submitted to the Congress on February 13, 2012, projected \$579.7 billion in discretionary budget authority for the Department of Defense in FY 2014. This total included \$535.5 billion for the base budget and \$44.2 billion for overseas contingency operations. The budget request also projected \$17.2 billion for defense programs in the Department of Energy in FY 2014. Last year's budget request, together with the out-year budget projections, was developed pursuant to a new defense strategy released in January 2012. We anticipate that meeting our national security requirements and providing for our men and women in uniform and their families will require the FY 2014 National Defense discretionary and mandatory budget projections that were included in last year's budget submission. We recommend that the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014 include the projected amounts of budget authority and the associated outlays (subject to any technical revisions by the Congressional Budget Office) for national defense.

If sequestration is implemented over the next seven months, it will impose significant long-term costs on the Department of Defense to recover acceptable readiness levels

and carry out the national military strategy. Accordingly, if Congress is unable to enact legislation avoiding sequestration, we recommend that the base budget for the Department of Defense be increased by two to three percent to enable the Department to address these problems. If such legislation is enacted, the increase in funding will not be necessary.

The Committee recognizes the requirement pursuant to section 411 of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution that directed Committees to review programs in their jurisdictions to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse, and to include recommendations for improving government performance. Last year, the Committee was responsible for the enactment of the FY 2013 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which reduced the authorization levels for the Department of Defense and the national security functions of the Department of Energy by \$29 billion when compared with the levels authorized in FY 2012.

The FY 2013 NDAA included a number of cuts to the President's budget request. For example, the FY 2013 NDAA: cut more than \$660.0 million from the President's budget for military construction and family housing projects; prohibited the obligation or expenditure of FY 2013 funds for the Medium Extended Air Defense System eliminating a \$400.9 million expenditure; cut \$200.0 million from the Commander's Emergency Response Program; cut \$197.0 million from Army and Marine Corps' ammunition procurement accounts; cut \$190.0 million from the Joint Tactical Radio System; cut \$175.0 million from excess unobligated balances; and cut \$77.1 million from the request for development of the KC-46A aircraft program.

In addition, the FY 2013 NDAA included a number of provisions to improve defense contracting and reduce waste in the operations of the Department of Defense. For example, the legislation:

Requires the Secretary of Defense to implement a plan to rebalance and reduce the DOD civilian employee workforce and service contractor workforce, achieving a savings of 5 percent in each workforce over a 5-year period while providing the Secretary flexibility to exclude critical elements of the workforce and to phase in reductions.

Improves the cost-effectiveness of DOD contracting by strictly limiting the use of cost-type contracts for the production of major weapon systems; enhancing protections for contractor employee whistleblowers; restricting the use of "pass-through" contracts; and clarifying DOD access to contractor cost-and price-information.

Strengthens the authority of the senior DOD official responsible for developmental testing on major defense acquisition programs.

Restricts the use of "pass-through" contracts by requiring a contracting officer determination to support any contract on which more than 70 percent of the work will be performed by subcontractors.

Requires DOD to review its existing profit guidelines and revise them as necessary to ensure an appropriate link between contractor profits and contractor performance.

Requires DOD and other agencies to conduct risk assessments and take steps to mitigate significant risks associated with contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations.

Requires DOD and other agencies to establish clear chains of responsibility for key acquisition functions in support of overseas contingency operations.

Added funds to support the DOD Corrosion Prevention and Control program. DOD estimates that corrosion in military equipment costs the Services over \$22.0 billion per year;

expenditures in this area have yielded an estimated 14:1 return on investment by reducing the bill for repair and replacement of corroded systems and parts.

Added funds to support the DOD Inspector General (IG), to enable the IG to continue growth designed to provide more effective oversight and help identify waste, fraud, and abuse in DOD programs, especially in the area of procurement. DOD IG reviews resulted in an estimated \$2.6 billion savings in FY 11—a return on investment of \$8.79 for every \$1 spent.

The Committee will continue to develop recommendations to improve the efficient management of taxpayer funds, including identifying additional savings across the full range of defense programs.

The Committee notes that last year the Department of Defense submitted a program that included \$487 billion in budget cuts over ten years. The Secretary of Defense has testified that the additional cuts required by sequestration would be devastating to defense programs and would require a new strategy with an unacceptable degree of risk to our national security. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has also stated that the military cannot absorb such cuts without direct impacts to missions and capabilities. We agree with these assessments and urge the Budget Committee to develop a plan that avoids sequestration.

At this time, absent receipt of the FY 2014 budget request, we believe that the funding levels we are recommending will allow us to meet our current national security requirements. We may wish to amend our recommendations after receipt of the budget request and we look forward to working with you to create a budget that supports our national security.

Sincerely,

JAMES INHOFE,  
*Ranking Member.*  
CARL LEVIN,  
*Chairman.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I allot myself 5 minutes of the time allotted to Senator CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the spending decisions that are crippling the long-term budget outlook and the futures of our children and grandchildren.

I am one of two accountants serving in the Senate, so the purpose of the budget resolution makes a lot of sense to me. It is like an accounting ledger—a blueprint that lays out spending priorities for the country for the next fiscal year. Back in my accounting days, I made sure that the ledger balanced. I would look carefully line by line at what was being spent and where it was

being spent. If the ledger didn't balance, I looked at what could be trimmed from the overall budget. To do that, I would sit down and prioritize what was needed to make the business work, and what could be cut with the least impact on the business or its customers. I would also look at where the business might be duplicating some of its efforts and what could be cut there.

But that is not what we are doing in this exercise. We are not taking a serious look at spending and making the necessary and tough choices about what we can afford.

We aren't even able to vote on spending items that both sides agree are duplicative or wasteful, as we saw during the weeklong exercise with the continuing resolution that passed yesterday.

What we should be doing is asking every agency to prioritize what it does from the best to the worst, and then we would be able to compare that list to the wasteful and duplicative items that have been identified, including some by my colleagues, such as Senator COBURN. He has been tireless in his effort to identify these spending items and bring them to the attention not only of his fellow Senators but the American people. Then we should cut what the Federal Government isn't doing well.

We can also use the principle behind my One Percent Spending Reduction Act—also known as the penny plan. This is a bill that has a simple and direct plan to achieve the spending cuts necessary to balance the budget. It would accomplish the task by cutting a single penny from every dollar the government spends every year for 3 years and end with a balanced budget after those 3 years. Taking this approach, each agency and program within that agency could determine its priorities and decide where to cut 1 percent of its budget. Guaranteed, if given the choice, agencies and programs—I hope—would cut the least important, the least likely to affect staff and overall operations. In other words, they would cut what they could do without, and every business and every agency has those things.

The problem is that every program has a constituency. Every program has folks who are telling me or my colleagues: Yes, we understand the need to cut spending, but my program is an integral part. So don't cut me, cut someone else.

At this point we have to step to the plate and say that there are no easy choices left. If we all feel a little bit of pain now, we can avoid the pain we will face if we continue to kick the can down the road when it comes to our long-term budget outlook. We have to get serious about providing a blueprint for future spending that provides a path to a balanced budget. We need a blueprint that funds the government and necessary programs but takes an honest look at where taxpayer dollars are going and makes changes to spend less and spend more wisely.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle have talked about providing for future generations in the budget resolution. With this budget we are providing for future generations—we are providing them with less prosperity and fewer opportunities by refusing to make some hard decisions and saddling them with unpaid trillions of dollars in bills.

I have three children and four grandchildren who live in Wyoming. Many of my colleagues have children, grandchildren, nieces, and nephews. It is because of them and families across the country that we have to make tough choices on our spending priorities, and we have to make them now. This budget resolution doesn't do that. Instead, it is another missed opportunity, another ledger that just doesn't balance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I would recognize Senator CORNYN for up to 6 minutes.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the third anniversary of the Affordable Care Act—the law that President Obama said would reduce health care costs and strengthen our economy without forcing anyone to lose their existing coverage and without raising taxes on anyone making less than \$200,000. Those were the promises of ObamaCare, but over the last 3 years we have seen the reality, which is far different.

Reality No. 1: Amid the slowest economic recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression, ObamaCare represents a \$1 trillion tax increase that will affect all Americans, not just those making less than \$200,000.

Indeed, ObamaCare is a tax increase that will affect everyone, from young people with health savings accounts, to middle-class workers with families, to senior citizens on fixed incomes. It is a tax increase that will punish investment and hinder medical innovation, a tax increase that is already discouraging job creation and already hurting the economy.

Reality No. 2: ObamaCare has not solved the problem of rising health care costs, and in the years ahead it will make the problem much, much worse.

Remember, during the 2008 campaign, President Obama told us his health care plan would reduce family premiums by \$2,500. Yet the cost of family

premiums has increased by nearly \$2,400 between 2009 and 2012. And once the President's health care law is fully implemented, premiums will soar even higher.

All we need to do is look at the front page of the Wall Street Journal, which reports:

Health insurers are privately warning brokers that premiums for many individuals and small businesses could increase sharply next year because of the health-care overhaul, with the nation's biggest firm projecting that rates could more than double for some consumers buying their own health plans.

The truth is that young people will be hit the hardest, people the age of my daughters—31 and 30 years old. The American Action Forum recently projected that premium costs for young and healthy Americans will “increase by an average of 169 percent.” Such a dramatic increase in health care premiums will come at a time when middle-class workers and families are already struggling to make ends meet. After all, the median household income in America has fallen more than \$2,400 since 2009.

Reality No. 3: Even if you like your existing coverage, you probably won't be able to keep it.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, 7 million Americans will lose their health insurance because of ObamaCare. Another study estimated that 30 percent of employers would drop their employees from their employer-provided coverage. In short, millions and millions of Americans who want to keep their existing coverage will be forced to give it up.

Which brings me to reality number four. For starters, ObamaCare is a massive job killer. No. 1, it increases a new tax on medical devices that is already prompting companies to reduce investment in the United States and lay off workers, including in my home State of Texas.

The Michigan-based company Stryker has recently shut down two of its facilities and is cutting 5 percent of its workforce; the Indiana-based Cook Medical has cancelled plans to build five new U.S. manufacturing facilities; and New York-based Welch Allyn is slashing its workforce by 10 percent.

Texas has more than 66,000 jobs in the medical technology industry, which ranks as among the top 10 States nationwide. But those jobs are at risk. According to one study, the medical device tax could destroy as many as 1,400 jobs in Texas alone, and reduce our economic output by \$252 million. This tax will also hamper innovation and reduce patient access to advanced medical devices.

Not surprisingly, the medical device tax is now facing strong bipartisan opposition. In fact, last night 79 Members of this Senate—Republicans and Democrats alike—voted to repeal it. Seventy-nine out of one hundred Senators voted to repeal it.

Unfortunately, the medical device tax is not the only job killer in the

President's health care law. But as we consider this litany of broken promises and as we sort through all of the unintended consequences of ObamaCare, I can only shake my head in frustration.

Three years ago this Chamber had a unique opportunity to pass common-sense, market-driven reforms that would have made health insurance more affordable and health care more accessible, while safeguarding the doctor-patient relationship and boosting our economy. I still believe we can achieve those goals. But the President's health care law—now 3 years after it was passed—remains a huge obstacle standing in our way.

That is why I supported an amendment to the continuing resolution that would have defunded ObamaCare and an amendment to the budget that would have repealed it. Both of these amendments were introduced by my colleague Senator CRUZ. Along with Senator CRUZ, I will continue pushing to replace the President's health care law with more sensible alternatives.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator CORNYN for his remarks. I think it is a cautionary tale that when you pass a bill with the very stated idea from the Democratic leader in the House that “We will find out what is in it after we pass it” then you know we are in trouble.

ObamaCare is a monstrosity of a bill that has 1,700 references that say we will execute this legislation pursuant to regulations to be issued by some nameless, faceless government operative somewhere. It will bind and affect the very health care of millions of Americans. I have become more and more convinced it will not work.

The budget that has been presented to us today fails to meet the challenge of our time. It does not alter, confront, or reform and put on a safe path our important Social Security and Medicare Programs, both of which are heading to deficit and disaster. They need to be fixed now. The sooner we fix them, the better off we will all be. And it can be done. It just requires some willingness to stand up and be counted and do the right thing.

There is no reform of the wasteful government duplicative spending that goes on. Senator COBURN just went through a whole litany of duplicative programs: 47 job-training programs, many education programs, huge duplication in highway programs throughout different agencies and departments of the government. We know those exist, and nothing has been done about it. It does not alter the debt course we are on and, in fact, keeps it at the same rate.

It says we are going to raise \$1 trillion in taxes and we are going to cut spending \$1 trillion, and this is the balanced approach. We have been told that over and over: This is a balanced approach.

But that is not what the budget does. It does indeed raise taxes—at least \$1 trillion actually—and it increases spending. So the net result of this budget over 10 years is to have no effect on the deficit even though it raises taxes \$1 trillion. A balanced approach, in the terms of my Democratic colleagues, is to raise taxes \$1 trillion and raise spending \$1 trillion. This is irresponsible.

I am baffled by the willingness of my colleagues to proceed in that fashion, representing the budget to be something it is not. I think they have a guilty conscience, perhaps. We have been trying to keep up with how many times they have used the word “balanced.” How many times in the last 2 days have the Democratic speakers all across the board—who have their poll-tested language used the word “balanced,” when in fact they have an unbalanced budget that does not change the debt course and leaves us on a financial path that the CBO Director said is unsustainable. But you know the American people want a balanced budget, so you say: We have got a balanced approach, a balanced plan, a balanced priority, and you use that word over and over, with the idea that it sinks into somebody's mind and they begin to believe that you have a balanced budget. I can hear an ad agency explaining how this works.

But we don't have a balanced budget. It never balances. It has no goal of balancing. It is no closer to balancing than the current baseline and current law we are spending on.

So we have calculated—and the numbers have gone up every hour—201 references on the floor of the Senate to “balanced.” It just now begins to highlight the fact of how unbalanced this is, how unbalanced this budget is, how it does not do what we need it to do.

Back when I opposed the nomination of Jack Lew, who was Chief of Staff and OMB Director, to be Secretary of the Treasury, we talked about his first budget. It was the same way. They decided in early 2011, after the 2010 shelacking, to produce a budget that did not come close to balance. They had a little problem because the American people had just whacked the big spenders in the 2000 election. So what did they decide to do? They just said it would balance. They said we are only spending money we have. We have a budget that does not add to the debt. We have a budget that begins to pay down the debt. All three of those things were utterly false. The lowest single deficit, in his own numbers he submitted to us, was \$600 billion. That was the least that he had in his entire 10-year budget of what the deficit would be that year—\$600 billion deficit. Yet he said we have a budget that pays down the debt, we have a budget that only spends money we have, and a budget you can be proud of.

That is what we have here. I hate to say it. My colleagues have produced a budget that utterly fails to alter the

debt course we are on. It raises taxes, but it does not use the taxes to reduce the deficit. It uses the taxes to fund new spending. It truly does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is the concern we have today. We will head now into the votes. I thank Senator MURRAY for allowing us to have free ability to speak and debate. We do not agree on these issues, but we will head into an afternoon that hopefully will allow our Members a full opportunity to get a vote on amendments, if they believe strongly in them. We hope we do not have needless amendments, that Members are looking and understand the needs of our time.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the only time left in debate right now is Democratic time. But in a spirit of bipartisanship, I yield 5 minutes of our Democratic time to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Washington for providing time. I rise to discuss three of my amendments that I filed to the budget, amendment Nos. 293, 476, and 477.

My first amendment deals with an issue that is very important to my home State of Nevada and nearly one dozen Western States where a bird called the sage grouse is found.

The Department of the Interior has engaged Western States in developing State-specific Greater Sage-Grouse management plans to address the threat of an Endangered Species Act listing for the bird.

Nevada is one of several Western States have convened task forces to develop recommendations for their respective Governors to serve as a foundation for State-level sage-grouse management.

These State plans are designed to conserve the species and its habitat while maintaining predictable land use policies as well as the ability to foster a healthy economy and preserve the Western way of life.

These goals can only be achieved if the States, Federal Government, and other concerned stakeholders use this opportunity to forge a partnership under the ESA.

My amendment simply reaffirms the importance of this partnership. It en-

ures that States can continue to be drivers in ways to find a balance between economic development and reasonable protections for wildlife.

My two other amendments, Heller Nos. 476 and 477, deal with another issue important to Nevada, namely, veterans. My first amendment is a straight forward amendment that says that the Department of Veterans' Affairs needs to ensure that they meet the needs of a growing veterans population, female veterans.

As the dynamics of our Armed Forces are changing so, too, are our veterans.

This measure simply calls on the VA to take into account the population of female veterans when planning, leasing or building infrastructures that will house veterans.

Ensuring that our female veterans have a lock on their door or a separate wing in the VA facility or separate restroom ensures a level of safety and privacy that should be provided without question.

Last Congress I introduced legislation that focused specifically on meeting the needs of female homeless veterans. My amendment builds upon this legislation to ensure that it includes all VA facilities.

Another important component of our growing homeless veterans population are their dependents. My other amendment, Heller No. 477 simply ensures that dependents of homeless veterans who are receiving services at a VA-funded shelter are eligible for services as well.

In Las Vegas last year, there were more than 1,300 homeless veterans roaming the streets. Some of these individuals have their children with them.

Right now if a homeless veteran brings their child to a VA facility for the night, that facility is not authorized by Congress to provide services to the child.

My amendment ensures that children of homeless veterans—veterans who bravely fought to preserve our freedoms—are not turned away from receiving services if they are with their parent at a VA facility.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, we have about 12 minutes remaining. I ask unanimous consent to give 2 minutes of my time to my colleague for his closing remarks, and I will take the last 10 minutes.

I want all of my colleagues to know that we will start votes right after we are finished with our closing remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator MURRAY. She has been a great person to work with. She is firm, clear, and tough, and has moved us forward. I always felt that when she made a decision, it was justified. She kept us under control and let us fuss and complain a bit. The content of the plan that the majority has moved forward I think explains why they have had difficulty revealing it from the beginning. It is because it is not the kind of budget that can be defended effectively. Honest people can disagree on policy, but there can be no disagreement, I believe, on the need to change our Nation's debt course. A singular truth that no one can escape is that the House budget changes our debt course while the Senate budget does not.

The Senate budget increases taxes, increases spending, and during that 10-year period another \$7.3 trillion will be added to the debt. There will be no real deficit reduction, and it never balances. Republicans have given opportunity after opportunity, through votes, to produce a balanced budget, but that has been rejected.

The massive debt we racked up to finance our wasteful government is pulling down economic growth today. This is so important for us to understand. Gross debt—over 90 percent of GDP—weakens growth; not tomorrow, it is weakening growth today. In other words, continuing to borrow to bail out the government, and keep checks flowing, creates debt that pulls down wages, jobs, and job creation. It is time to stop shielding the government bureaucracy, which is hurting people today.

There is nothing virtuous about defending a broken welfare state that is trapping millions in poverty. Every time our colleagues raise taxes instead of reforming the government, they are enriching that bureaucracy at the expense of the people. When they demand more money, they are saying that reform is not important, just send us more money; we are not at fault.

I will conclude and say, we have to move away from a budget and a plan that enriches the bureaucracy at the expense of the American people.

I thank Senator MURRAY for her courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Senate—and in particular, my ranking member JEFF SESSIONS—for their valuable contributions to the debate we have had over the last few days and weeks. While there are clear areas of disagreement about how to restore our Nation's fiscal health, this is an important conversation, and one we can build on.

We all like the word "balanced." As chair of the Senate Budget Committee, a critical part of my role is making sure the voices of the American people

are heard in the budget process. I believe that budgets are about far more than numbers on a page. They are about the values and priorities of the American people. In their daily lives, families across our country will feel the impact of the plan we lay out in a budget, and they deserve a seat at the table. That is why at one of my first hearings as chairman, we invited inspiring Americans to speak about how the Federal budget impacts their day-to-day lives and the opportunities they have had to reach their own goals.

A young woman from New Hampshire named Katyanne Zink attended my hearing. She grew up in a low-income neighborhood in New Hampshire. Her parents didn't go to college themselves, but they desperately wanted the best for their children. Thanks to a great public school teacher who encouraged her to aim high, and with the help of Pell grants and student loans, Katyanne was able to go to college. She is now giving back to her community as an urgent care nurse. Tara Marks of Pittsburgh also spoke at our hearing. Tara never expected to find herself in poverty, but when she was suddenly hit by hard times, she temporarily depended on food stamps to feed herself and her young son. Tara firmly believes that without help when she needed it the most, she would not have been able to get back on her feet.

We heard from Patrick Murray, who is an Operation Iraqi Freedom veteran. Patrick explained that after suffering severe injuries while serving his country, Federal support helped him live independently so he could focus on finishing his degree.

The stories that Katyanne, Tara, and Patrick shared are just a few of the millions we must keep at the forefront of this discussion because the interest of hard-working Americans must come first in our decisionmaking. I am proud that the Senate budget my colleagues and I put forward does exactly that. The first priority of our Senate budget is creating jobs and economic growth from the middle out, not from the top down.

With an unemployment rate that remains stubbornly high and a middle class that has seen their wages stagnate for far too long, we cannot afford any threats to our fragile recovery. That is exactly why our budget responsibly replaces the harmful and arbitrary cuts from sequestration. It removes the unnecessary burden on our economy that would lower employment by almost 750,000 jobs this year alone. Following the advice of experts across the political spectrum, the Senate budget invests in education and job creation targeted through infrastructure and training initiatives while putting in place a responsible plan for deficit reduction over the long term. To secure strong economic growth in the future, our budget invests in our greatest resource, the American people, by strongly supporting high-quality education from preschool through college and career training.

As my colleague Senator WARNER said so eloquently here earlier on the floor, we have to stay ahead of our competition. Our budget supports Federal R&D, which will help us make sure that growing industries and the jobs which come with them take root in the United States, not in China or India.

This budget also recognizes that getting our debt and deficit under control is crucial to our Nation's economic strength in the coming years. Our Senate budget puts forward serious, responsible deficit reduction that reflects the recommendations of bipartisan experts and the values and priorities of the American people.

Back in 2010, the Simpson-Bowles Fiscal Commission recommended finding about \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years. This has become, as we all know, the benchmark for other serious bipartisan proposals. Building on the \$2.4 trillion in deficit reduction put in place over the last 2 years, our Senate budget pushes us past that \$4 trillion benchmark with \$1.85 trillion in deficit reduction that is evenly divided between responsible spending cuts and new revenue from the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations.

This budget cuts spending responsibly by \$975 billion, and we make some pretty tough choices to get there. By taking the balanced approach the American people have consistently called for, our Senate budget matches those responsible spending cuts with \$975 billion in new revenue, which is raised by closing loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code for those who need it the least. This should not be controversial. There is bipartisan support for reducing the deficit by making the Tax Code more fair and more efficient.

If our Senate budget is enacted, the total deficit reduction since the Simpson-Bowles report will consist of 64 percent spending cuts, 14 percent tax rate increases on the rich, and 22 percent new revenue by closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. We will have put our debt and deficit on a downward, sustainable path. This is a responsible approach. It is a balanced and fair approach. It is one that is endorsed by bipartisan groups and experts, and it is one supported by the vast majority of American people.

The Senate budget takes the position that the solution to our fiscal challenges will not be found in deep cuts to programs vulnerable families depend on. It maintains crucial services that mothers such as Tara and millions of other families struck by hard times have used as a way to make ends meet while they recover. The Senate budget preserves and protects Medicare for seniors today and into the future.

As Senator STABENOW explained on the floor so well yesterday, Medicare is vital to the health and well-being of more than 50 million seniors and Amer-

icans with disabilities. Upholding our commitment to seniors and helping struggling Americans get back on their feet is not just good for our economy, it is the right thing to do.

I realize there are serious differences between the parties, and in the last few years it has been especially polarized here in Congress. But the House has now passed its budget resolution. We will be working here in the Senate to pass ours sometime late this evening. We have presented very different visions for how our country should work and who it should work for, but I am hopeful that we can bridge this divide.

As we look ahead now, I urge my colleagues to think of the millions of Americans such as Katyanne, Tara, and Patrick. I urge them to think of the millions of middle-class families across the country who are looking to all of us to get this right; families who want us to invest in them and their communities; who want us to focus on the economy and on opportunity and the future; who are not looking for a handout, just a hand up when they need it; a government that works for them during the good times and the bad; and who desperately want us to break through this gridlock and end the dysfunction that is hurting our economy and costing them jobs. They are what this debate is about. They are who sent us all here to represent them.

The Senate budget works for families. It is a balanced and responsible plan that will tackle our economic and fiscal challenges in a way that puts the middle class and broad-based economic growth first.

When this comes up for a final vote tonight, I am going to be proud to vote for it, and I hope all of my colleagues will do the same.

When this passes the Senate, by the way, the work is far from complete. I will be working with Chairman RYAN in the House and anyone else who is interested in coming together to make some compromises, and to get to a balanced and bipartisan deal that the American people expect and deserve. It is not going to be easy, but I am hopeful it can be done. I know the families who sent us here expect nothing less.

I wish to thank Senator SESSIONS again for working with me on this. We have different views on many issues, but I am proud of the work we did together to make sure we had a robust and fair debate in the committee and here on the Senate floor. I also wish to thank all of his staff who have worked so hard, all of our staff who are continuing to work—all of them—very hard behind the scenes to pull this together. I wish to thank all of my colleagues again on the Budget Committee for contributing their ideas and their thoughts and their values to this resolution. I believe we have a very strong budget here. I am proud to vote for it, and I am very glad to have worked with so many people to get us to this point and, hopefully, in not too many hours we will pass the budget in



the Senate and can go to work for the American people.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator from Alabama has asked for 2 minutes and I would be happy to oblige him as we are trying to work out an agreement to get going on votes. I yield him 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. How much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. SHELBY. I will try to be careful and quick. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for yielding the time.

I rise today to once again express my concerns about the fiscal problems facing our Nation. Thus far this year I have held public meetings in 61 of my State's 67 counties. Without exception, my State's top concern is our Nation's unsustainable debt and its effect on job creation and economic growth.

Alabamians know the Federal debt currently stands at nearly \$17 trillion. Yet they see that the Democratic budget before us does not balance—not in 10 years, perhaps not ever. They know the Federal debt has increased by \$6 trillion under President Obama. Yet they see that the Democratic budget proposes to pile on \$7 trillion more.

My constituents know that excessive taxes are choking job creation in this country. Yet they see that the Democratic budget costs \$1.2 trillion of new job-killing taxes. They know the stimulus package was an abject failure.

My constituents understand that the more we borrow, the more we must pay back in interest. Yet they see that under the Democratic budget, we will pay more in interest on the debt—\$791 billion—than we will spend on national defense. They know that fiscal reform without entitlement reform is meaningless. Yet they hear no mention of entitlements in the Democratic budget.

It has been 1,423 days since the Senate passed a budget. My constituents waited that long for this. There is little wonder that trepidation over our Nation's future is so prevalent. No dominant power in world history has remained strong with a weak economy—not the Persians, not the Greeks, not the Romans, not the British, not anyone. Under the Democratic budget, our Nation would learn that lesson the hard way.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank all of our Members for their patience. I think we have an agreement put together, and we will be able to get going, so I would ask for everybody's attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order to be called up after the disposition of the Republican side-by-side amendments to Shaheen No. 438 be the following: Menendez No. 651, Coburn No. 409, Whitehouse No. 652, Blunt No. 261, Boxer No. 622, Hoeven No. 494, Durbin No. 578, Murray No. 653, and Collins No. 144; and that the only second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to the amendments listed above be the following amendments to the Durbin amendment No. 578: Enzi No. 656, Ayotte No. 657, and Baucus No. 658, to be offered in that order en bloc; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote, with the exception of the vote prior to the Enzi second-degree amendment No. 656 to Durbin No. 578, where there will be 40 minutes—10 minutes each for Senators DURBIN, ENZI, AYOTTE, and BAUCUS, or their designees; that the order of votes with respect to the second-degree amendments to Durbin No. 578 be the following: Enzi, Ayotte, and Baucus; that upon disposition of the Collins amendment No. 144, the majority have the next amendment in order; finally, that all after the first vote will be 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, we are now going to be starting a series of votes. I would ask Members to stay in the Chamber. We are going to be very strict on the time in making sure we move through these.

Again, I would ask all Senators to please respect those Senators who are speaking so that they can be heard, keep the conversations in the cloakroom, and be ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 239

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I would call up amendment No. 239.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

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

The clerk will report the amendment. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. UDALL], for himself and Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. WYDEN proposes an amendment numbered 239.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional suppression resources to the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior for the protection of communities, homes, water supplies, utility infrastructure, and natural resources from catastrophic wildfires)

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, wildfires threaten communities all across my part of the country, the West, but I daresay all around our great country. That is why I am proud to partner with my colleagues, Senators BARRASSO, WYDEN, BENNET, MERKLEY, and others from the West, to introduce what is a commonsense, bipartisan, and deficit-neutral amendment to the 2014 budget.

We need to reduce the Federal budget deficit. We all agree that is important. But if we don't invest in firefighting efforts and mitigation, that will levy an unacceptably steep and entirely avoidable cost upon Colorado and the entire country. So my amendment would allow for an increase of \$100 million in funding available for wildfire suppression.

I yield time to my friend and colleague and cosponsor Senator BARRASSO to speak on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I am pleased to cosponsor Udall amendment No. 239. Communities in Wyoming and other Western States continue to be threatened by wildfires stemming from excessive fuel loads in our national forests, continued drought, and excess beetle-killed timber. I speak in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I suggest we do this by voice vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, our side is amenable. If both Senators agree, we will do this by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 239) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 630

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 630, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. FISCHER], for herself Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ENZI and Mr. JOHANNIS, proposes an amendment numbered 630.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to health care, including primary and preventive care, in a manner consistent with protecting rights of conscience)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFICIT RESERVE RELATING TO WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to women's access to health care, which may include the protection of basic primary and preventive health care, in a manner consistent with the First Amendment to the Constitution, sections 506 and 507 of Division F of Public Law 112-74, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, the protection of religious beliefs and moral convictions and without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to offer a side-by-side amendment to Senator SHAHEEN's amendment No. 438.

My amendment defends the rights of employers opposed to subsidizing certain health care services because of conscience objections or religious beliefs.

We have all heard from employers, hospitals, and physicians who have told us about their concerns about inadequate exemptions for those with religious objections to certain types of health care services. In my home State, the Nebraska Medical Association passed a resolution in 2012 calling for increased protection of conscience rights for licensed physicians. I am pleased that this amendment does just that.

The amendment does not add a dime to the deficit, it protects the quality of women's health care, and it defends the conscience rights and religious principles of employers and physicians. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this important amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, this amendment would allow any employer or insurance company to refuse to cover any health care services for women based on their own religious beliefs and moral convictions that have nothing to do with the health needs of those denied coverage.

The compromise put forward by President Obama ensures that religious liberty is respected while ensuring that women can get access to the health care they need. Last year, Judge Carol Jackson, who was appointed by President George H.W. Bush, ruled in support of this compromise, saying that Federal religious freedom law is "a shield, not a sword . . . it is not a means to force one's religious practices upon others."

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—55

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 630) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, for the information of all the Senators, that vote went a little bit over. We will not let votes go over. Anyone who is not in the Chamber is going to miss a vote. We have to be able to do this in order to move expeditiously. I want to let all Senators know they leave at their own peril.

With that, I am going to turn to Senator MENENDEZ so he may offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 651

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 651.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. COWAN, proposes an amendment numbered 651.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To call for a comprehensive approach for wage index reform)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAKE COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE-RELATED PAYMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would adjust Medicare payments for hospitals, which may include adjustments to reflect area differences in wage levels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this is a side-by-side to Senator COBURN's amendment, and while I stand in strong opposition to the underlying amendment of Senator COBURN, I do recognize the need for a comprehensive examination to the current Medicare wage index system. HHS and MedPAC and others have issued detailed reports highlighting that very fact, showing that the current system is full of special add-ons, reclassifications, and other provisions that distort the overall system.

In essence, that amendment would create such harm in so many hospitals across this Nation from Alaska to New Hampshire, to Nevada, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Rhode Island, just

to mention a few. Our effort is to look at this comprehensively. We need to look at the entire Medicare hospital wage index system. We should not pick out one small provision that does so much harm to so many hospitals across the country instead of addressing the system as a whole.

I am joined in this with Senator WARREN, Senator COWAN, and Senator LAUTENBERG, among others, and I urge my colleagues to support the side-by-side amendment so we can address this in a comprehensive and responsible way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. My colleagues might want to hear the other side of the story. My amendment reverses \$4.6 billion that was taken from rural hospitals all across this country and given to two States. Every Member's rural hospitals lose money based on the earmark placed in the Affordable Care Act. All this does is reverse that.

There is nothing in the amendment by the Senator from New Jersey about wage neutrality, which is the whole problem in the first place. The cosponsors, I am sure, of the two States have markedly benefited at the expense of every other rural hospital across this country.

A vote for the Menendez amendment keeps us in line to continue to take \$4.6 billion over the next 10 years out of rural hospitals. If Senators vote for my amendment, we go back to a fair distribution for the rural hospital payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Franken	Murphy
Begich	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cardin	Kaine	Sanders
Carper	King	Schatz
Casey	Landrieu	Schumer
Coons	Leahy	Shaheen
Cowan	Levin	Stabenow
Donnelly	Menendez	
Durbin	Merkley	

Tester  
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)  
Warren

Whitehouse  
Wyden

NAYS—50

Alexander  
Ayotte  
Barrasso  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Burr  
Chambliss  
Coats  
Coburn  
Cochran  
Collins  
Corker  
Cornyn  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Enzi  
Fischer

Flake  
Graham  
Grassley  
Hagan  
Hatch  
Heller  
Hoeven  
Inhofe  
Isakson  
Johanns  
Johnson (WI)  
Kirk  
Klobuchar  
Lee  
Manchin  
McCain  
McCaskill

McConnell  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Paul  
Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Rubio  
Scott  
Sessions  
Shelby  
Thune  
Toomey  
Vitter  
Warner  
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 651) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, there are no tricks in this. All we are trying to do is reverse what was done inappropriately.

There is no question we need to do some adjustment on wages. That is for another time when we actually try to save Medicare.

This amendment requires all States but two over 10 years to increase the payments to rural hospitals back to what they would have been had the amendment by Senator Kerry in the Affordable Care Act not been there. So that is the whole purpose, to bring us back to where we were.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer the amendment?

Mr. COBURN. I ask to call up amendment No. 409.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. BALDWIN, proposes an amendment numbered 409.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to sunset the provision of Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that increases payments to hospitals in a few States by reducing payments to the majority of States through the Medicare hospital wage index)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE STATE-WIDE BUDGET NEUTRALITY IN THE CALCULATION OF THE MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FLOOR.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would adjust Medicare outlays, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legis-

lation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, if there is no opposition, nobody on my side wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition.

First, there was an error made in the number for the Whitehouse amendment for this sequence of votes. I ask unanimous consent that the Whitehouse amendment No. 646 be put on the list instead of Whitehouse No. 652.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment the Senator has offered would reverse a provision in the Affordable Care Act which required that Medicare's area wage index changes be spread budget neutrally throughout the entire Nation.

I, as do many, recognize that Medicare's area wage index reimbursement system does require a thorough review and revision. But the amendment in front of us now singles out one provision that negatively affects some areas while ignoring the larger payment reform.

I believe Congress should have a larger discussion on area wage index reform within the committees of jurisdiction, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Fischer	Merkley
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Baldwin	Franken	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Nelson
Begich	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hagan	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Carper	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Casey	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Schumer
Coats	Johanns	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	King	Thune
Coons	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	McCaskill	Wyden
Enzi	McConnell	

## NAYS—31

Baucus	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Brown	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Cowan	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harkin	Murray	
Heinrich	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 409) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are ready to call up the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

## AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I call up amendment No. 646. I believe it is the next one in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE] proposes an amendment numbered 646.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring that all revenue from a fee on carbon pollution is returned to the American people)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT ALL REVENUE FROM A FEE ON CARBON POLLUTION IS RETURNED TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of a fee on carbon pollution, provided that—

(1) all revenue from such fee is returned to the American people in the form of Federal deficit reduction, reduced Federal tax rates, cost savings, or other direct benefits; and

(2) such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President and colleagues, we have a new Pope, Pope Francis, who said last week that our relation with God's creation is not very good right now. God's creation runs by laws—the laws of nature, the laws of physics, the laws of chemistry—and God gave us the power of reason to understand those laws. But they are not negotiable. They are not subject to amendment or repeal. And the arrogance of our thinking that they are is an offense to His creation.

We can ignore obvious facts, we can ignore the essentially unanimous science, we can ignore our generals and admirals, we can ignore the insurance industry's warnings, but we ignore carbon pollution at our peril, and we have subsidized it long enough. It is past time to wake up from our sleep-walking. This vote is a test. Whether we pass or fail is a measure of us.

I urge that we support this amendment that will allow us to put a price on carbon and protect the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I would have some hesitation anyway about opposing my good friend from Rhode Island, but to have to oppose the Pope is really ominous.

I know the Pope also mentioned, more times than he mentioned carbon tax, helping the poor. This amendment says that if there is a carbon fee, we will use it to reduce the Federal deficit, to reduce Federal tax rates, to have other direct benefits.

I would just say, when the poor family cannot pay their utility bill—the family who is the last family to get the new refrigerator, the family who is the last family to get the insulated windows, the family who is the last family to insulate their ceiling—I guess we tell them there are going to be some Federal tax rates that will be added for a family who cannot pay their utility bill.

By the way, there are other direct benefits you might be able to use whenever you do not have heat or you do not have cooling.

This is a tax that slows down our ability to compete. The most vulnerable among us are the most impacted by this, and I oppose it.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

## YEAS—41

Baldwin	Casey	Hirono
Begich	Coons	King
Bennet	Cowan	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Durbin	Leahy
Boxer	Feinstein	Levin
Brown	Franken	Menendez
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Merkley
Cardin	Harkin	Mikulski
Carper	Heinrich	Murphy

Murray	Schatz	Udall (NM)
Nelson	Schumer	Warren
Reed	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Reid	Stabenow	Wyden
Sanders	Udall (CO)	

## NAYS—58

Alexander	Graham	Moran
Ayotte	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Baucus	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heitkamp	Pryor
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeben	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Coats	Isakson	Rubio
Coburn	Johanns	Scott
Cochran	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Tester
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Landrieu	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Fischer	McCaskill	Wicker
Flake	McConnell	

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 646) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

## AMENDMENT NO. 261

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask unanimous consent it be called up on behalf of Senator THUNE and me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], for himself and Mr. THUNE, proposes an amendment numbered 261.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would create a Federal tax or fee on carbon emissions)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) would result in revenues that would be greater than the level of revenues set forth for the first fiscal year or the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years under the concurrent resolution on the budget then in effect for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) for any year covered by such resolution, includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. BLUNT. This amendment would protect consumers from energy price spikes and workers from significant job loss by providing a point of order against a carbon tax or a fee on carbon emissions.

Energy-intensive jobs are the first to go when you utility prices get uncompetitive. Your ability to compete in the world marketplace, the price of American-made goods, what families pay at the pump, what they pay for heating and cooling, what they pay for every American product they make would be impacted by a carbon tax.

I urge the support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, except perhaps in Congress, and in the boardrooms of ExxonMobil, it is no longer credible to deny what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and to our oceans. We aid and abet that harm by subsidizing carbon, distorting the market, by violating the rule that the cost of a product should be in its price. Nonrepealable laws of nature, laws of physics, laws of chemistry are at work. History's judgment will be harsh if we continue to fail in respecting those laws.

I urge a "no" vote and yield back to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act for consideration of the pending amendment, No. 261, pursuant to 904(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heitkamp	Pryor
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Coburn	Isakson	Rubio
Cochran	Johanns	Scott
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Corker	Kirk	Shelby
Cornyn	Landrieu	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McCaskill	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and amendment No. 261 falls.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 622

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 622.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 622.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting the interests of the United States in making a decision relating to the Keystone XL pipeline)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN MAKING A DECISION RELATING TO THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expeditiously analyzing and making decisions on the Keystone XL pipeline, which may include whether the pipeline is in the national interest if it increases oil prices, harms domestic energy security, including through exporting energy products, uses materials not manufactured in the

United States, adversely affects individual property rights, otherwise adversely affects job creation in the United States, or our national security by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, my amendment simply ensures important issues will be addressed, such as how much oil will stay here versus how much will be exported and, therefore, will we suffer from higher energy prices? How much steel will be made in America? How many private property rights suits will result from this pipeline? We have had a lot of them on the southern lake.

How will this affect our national security, the dirty tar sands oil? Our American national security experts warn us against the instability worldwide caused by climate disruption.

I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment, regardless of how you feel about Keystone. These are essential issues which must be addressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask this amendment be opposed. It is an effort to prevent construction of the most studied pipeline in the history of the United States. After four environmental impact statements, every one of the reports has shown no environmental impact. Every State on the route has approved this project. The studies which are asked for in this amendment have been done.

In 2011, the Department of Energy provided a report and said the oil will be used in this country, and we will need more. In addition, this would preclude local eminent domain laws which would prevent the pipeline from being constructed. It also says you can't use any materials manufactured in Canada for a pipeline which is built half in Canada and half in the United States.

I urge a "nay" vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Bennet	Boxer	Cardin

Durbin	Menendez	Sanders
Feinstein	Merkley	Schatz
Franken	Mikulski	Schumer
Gillibrand	Murphy	Stabenow
Harkin	Murray	Tester
Heinrich	Nelson	Warner
Hirono	Reed	Warren
Leahy	Reid	Whitehouse
Levin	Rockefeller	Wyden

## NAYS—66

Alexander	Donnelly	Manchin
Ayotte	Enzi	McCain
Barrasso	Fischer	McCaskill
Baucus	Flake	McConnell
Begich	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hagan	Paul
Brown	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Pryor
Carper	Heller	Risch
Casey	Hoeben	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coons	Kaine	Thune
Corker	King	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Klobuchar	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Landrieu	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 622) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

## AMENDMENT NO. 494

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, this amendment is a bipartisan amendment. It puts the Senate on record in support of the Keystone Pipeline project, and that is just appropriate. As I said just a minute ago, every State has approved the project. The Department of State has done four environmental impact statements over the last 5 years—four—and has said there are no significant environmental impacts. So it is time the Senate stepped up with the American people.

In a recent poll 70 percent of the American public said: Build the pipeline. Only 17 percent said they opposed it. So it is time for us to enjoin every single State on the route to say we support this project. We support this pipeline. After 5 years, let's build it.

This is energy, this is jobs, this is getting our economy going and growing, and this is making sure we don't have to import oil from the Middle East. It is not just oil from Canada, it is oil from the great State of North Dakota and Montana—light, sweet crude we need to get to our refineries. Please join me in voting yea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator call up the amendment?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN], for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms.

HEITKAMP, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BEGICH, proposes amendment numbered 494.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote investment and job growth in United States manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors through the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROMOTION OF INVESTMENT AND JOB GROWTH IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING, OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION, AND REFINING SECTORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may result in strong growth in manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors of the economy through the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, Mr. President, the handwriting is on the wall. I see it. But I do believe when my colleague argued against my amendment—and he was quite successful—it was not an accurate argument.

The fact is his amendment has already made the decision for us that everything is hunky-dory with this pipeline. Well, it is not true that all the work has been done. We don't know how much of the steel will be American; we don't know how many of the jobs will be American; we don't know if our national security people think that dirty tar sands is going to create climate disruption.

Wake up. This is the only place in America where people don't understand that real climate disruption is very dangerous.

You want to talk about polls? Look at what the people think about extreme weather. Look at what the people think about too much carbon pollution. So there will be another day to fight, but I want to say to my friend—he is a good guy, and we have worked well together on this. But I hope we will vote no and allow the process to continue.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to this vote, I would just remind all Senators that at the end of this vote there will be up to 40 minutes of debate before the next amendment. I would ask all Senators who leave the floor to be back here by 6:30, maybe a

little bit before that. But I would remind all of my colleagues that if you drift back in for half an hour on the first vote, it will be later and later as we get through this. So I would really ask everyone who leaves after they vote to be back here at 6:30 at the latest. We may yield a little bit back, but please be back by that time.

With that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. COWAN). Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

## YEAS—62

Alexander	Donnelly	McCaskill
Ayotte	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Baucus	Flake	Murkowski
Begich	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Carper	Heller	Roberts
Casey	Hoeben	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (SD)	Tester
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Coons	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Landrieu	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Warner
Crapo	Manchin	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

## NAYS—37

Baldwin	Hirono	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Levin	Stabenow
Cowan	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Harkin	Reed	
Heinrich	Reid	

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 494) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

## AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 578. I ask the clerk to please call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. DURBIN], for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KING, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado, proposes an amendment numbered 578.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure marketplace fairness by allowing States to enforce State and local use tax laws)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW STATES TO ENFORCE STATE AND LOCAL USE TAX LAWS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to allowing States to enforce State and local use tax laws and collect taxes already owed under State law on remote sales by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 656 TO AMENDMENT NO. 578

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 656 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. HEITKAMP, proposes an amendment numbered 656 to Amendment No. 578.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after "DEFICIT" on page 1, line 2, and all that follows, and insert the following:

**-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW STATES TO ENFORCE STATE AND LOCAL USE TAX LAWS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of any committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to allowing States to enforce State and local use taxes already owed under State law on remote sales by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding under the unanimous consent request there was 40 minutes of debate allocated between those of us in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act and those who are offering amendments, Senator AYOTTE and Senator BAUCUS; is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the Senator mind if I say a word in opening?

The Marketplace Fairness Act is known to every Member of the Senate because I have spoken to everyone on this side of the aisle, and I think Senator ENZI and Senator ALEXANDER have spoken to everyone on the other side of the aisle. First, give credit to the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI. He began this effort 14 years ago. He is a small businessman by profession and when he came to the Senate he saw a problem that needed to be solved and he has done yeoman's work to reach this point in the debate.

I salute him for that effort. I thank him for allowing me to join and bring it to the floor this day. Special thanks to Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, who has been an able partner in allowing us to bring this matter before the Senate.

This is an issue every American can understand. We now live in the Internet age. Internet retailers are selling things over the Internet that we are buying every single day. Estimates are that \$150 billion in sales are made each year over the Internet. That is part of America. It is part of our economy. But it has created an unfairness which we need to address with this legislation.

Back home in Massachusetts, in Illinois, in Tennessee, in Florida, there people with shops and businesses who get up every morning and open those shops, watch their employees file in and do business locally. When they make their sales of goods and services, they collect the sales taxes which each State requires and they collect other taxes as well. Their taxes sustain businesses, sustain schools and highways and police protection.

Unfortunately, a Supreme Court decision of almost 20 years ago, the Quill decision, basically said if we are going to require the Internet sales to collect sales tax, Congress has to do it. That is why we are tonight on this Marketplace Fairness Act.

What we are proposing is not a new tax. It is the collection of an existing tax, a sales tax that is basically owed in all but four States across the United States.

We believe this is a fair thing to do so those local businesses have a fighting chance; otherwise, they are competing against retailers who do not collect sales taxes and have that price advantage over them.

That is not fair to the businesses on Main Street across America. It isn't fair to our economy. What we are looking for is basic fairness.

At this point, I yield the floor to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank Senator DURBIN and Senator ENZI for their hard work. They have taken a problem and simplified it and solved it, in my opinion. This is an 11-page bill, a rarity. It does only one thing. It gives States and State legislatures the right to decide to collect sales and use taxes that are already owed from all the people who owe it rather than just some of the people who owe it.

I have a very conservative friend over here on the Republican side who said to me: I hate taxes, but the one thing I hate worse is people who owe taxes who do not pay them. That is what this is about. But for me as a former Governor, there is something even more important; that is, the importance that we respect our constitutional framework, which says Governors and legislatures should make their own decisions about their services and their taxes.

That is the spirit of the 10th amendment. That is the spirit of this country. We don't require States to play Mother May I to the Congress of the United States. So we say to the Governor of Tennessee and the legislature of Tennessee: You decide whether you want to allow people who owe the sales tax not to have to pay it because the sellers do not collect it.

That is why many Democratic Governors support this. But a growing number, an honor role of conservative leaders and Governors, support the Marketplace Fairness Act. Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union, supports it. He says the system we have today is outdated and unfair. After that, Governor McDonnell of Virginia, Governor Corbett of Pennsylvania, Governor Haslam of Tennessee, Chris Christie of New Jersey, Mike Pence of Indiana, Mitch Daniels, Jeb Bush, Haley Barbour, Rick Snyder—they all say: Look, we are Governors of the States. We should have the responsibility for doing that.

There have been some strange arguments made against this, such as wait for tax reform. How can you do this in tax reform if it not in the Tax Code? Have we sunk to a new low where we use the State budgets to balance our own budget?

No, this is a straightforward issue. Are we going to respect, as we swore to do when we took an oath to this constitutional framework—are we going to respect the States, recognize that States have the right to be right and the States have the right to be wrong; that Illinois is different than Tennessee and Tennessee is different than Wyoming. Governors in those States can decide what their tax structure should be, how they want to direct it, and they should decide, in my opinion, although we do not have to decide that here, that they would not pick and choose between sellers, pick and choose

between taxpayers and businesses. If I walk into the National Boot Company and try on a boot and buy it, the seller collects the tax, sales tax. If I order in a catalog the seller does not. The Governor of Tennessee wants to be able to treat them the same.

I think we should do this. I fly up here every week for an hour. That hour plane ride doesn't make me any smarter than I was when I left Nashville. I think our Governor, our Lieutenant Governor, our legislature—very conservative, very Republican—understand that they do not like taxes, but they do not like, worse—they do not like, worse, people who owe taxes but do not pay them, and they want the right to fix that problem.

I am in strong support and stand with the 15 or so Senators on both sides of the aisle who endorse the Marketplace Fairness Act. I congratulate Senator DURBIN and Senator ENZI for their hard work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will yield a couple minutes to myself.

Different States have different regimes. Some States decide they want to have income tax. Other States have big property taxes. Other States say they want to have sales tax but not income tax. There are many States with no income tax and those States are States some people gravitate to because they do not want to pay State income taxes.

But I think States should have the right to choose their own taxation system, and we should not pass legislation which tends to force a certain State taxation system on the others. That is what this legislation does. It basically forces all States to have sales taxes, whether they want one or not. In my State of Montana, sales tax is anathema. Nobody touches a sales tax.

What this says is: OK. You can have a sales tax, eventually, in my State, because we don't have a sales tax, and, therefore, businesses in Montana don't collect sales tax, but they will have to collect tax on sales for other States. In effect, we are going to be forced to have one and we don't want one. We are going to fight it fiercely.

Second, basically, the language says, I will read it to you, allowing States to “. . . enforce State and local use tax laws and collect taxes already owed under State law on remote sales by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes. . . .”

Essentially, it says a person in California can use State law to enforce and collect—and audit even, probably—a businessperson in another State. I have never heard of this happening before. Just think of it. We are asking, and telling, and directing States to force law on another State, at least on another businessman in another State. I have never heard of this. This sets a terrible precedent. We don't want to do this.

Next is the complexity of this thing. The authors of this have been working on this issue for 12 years, saying they have all these computer programs that can do it. We have never seen it. There is no indication that all the bugs, over thousands of jurisdictions in States and localities and municipalities—just put yourself in the position of a small businessperson trying to figure out what in the heck is the law in this jurisdiction. What about that? It is going to be changed this year or next year, changed in lots of jurisdictions all over the country. How are we going to deal with it? We are not going to be able to do it. It is just a maddeningly complex situation.

I have lots of other points I wish to make later, but those are two. I believe it makes much more sense, with all the complexity in this thing, for the committee of jurisdiction, the Finance Committee.

I disagree with my good friend from Tennessee. Of course it is a tax—not a State tax, not a payroll tax, it is a sales tax. It is a tax. We could easily deal with this in the Finance Committee. That is our jurisdiction. That is what we are supposed to be doing. Then he can deal with all these complexities that have not been addressed in this resolution. There are no protections in this resolution whatsoever.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire to use in any way she wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I stand in opposition to this so-called Main Street Fairness Act. There is nothing fair about Federal intervention in the Internet marketplace. We have seen so much entrepreneurship in the Internet marketplace. Yet what this does is force the Internet marketplace and online businesses to become tax collectors.

This act should be called what it is—the Internet tax collection act. This act essentially forces States to become tax collectors for 9,600 State and local tax jurisdictions across this country. It tramples on States rights. It tramples on the rights of private businesses in all States but especially in States such as mine, New Hampshire. It creates a bureaucratic nightmare for these States that will have to comply with almost 10,000 tax jurisdictions across this country. Guess what. They could be subject to nearly 10,000 tax audits within those jurisdictions. One of the businesses in New Hampshire—and I see Senator SHAHEEN is here as well—said that it is a job killer. Compliance with this act is absolutely terrifying and another blow for so many small businesses that are using the Internet.

Finally, I say to my conservative friends, there is nothing conservative about this. It is the long arm of the Federal Government punishing States such as mine that don't have a sales tax and have made fiscally responsible

choices. It picks winners and losers instead of letting the marketplace do it.

There are a whole host of conservative groups that have come out against this act, including the Heritage Foundation and the Campaign for Liberty. The Americans for Tax Reform has, in fact, said this legislation can only be viewed as a tax increase. In addition to the group I just mentioned, the Cato Institute, the National Taxpayers Union, and The Heartland are against this as well. There is nothing conservative about this. This tramples on States rights. Think about it. This act turns online sellers into tax collectors because States are cash-strapped. It is wrong. I hope my colleagues will vote against it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I think it is time for those on the other side to say a word or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliments from the two people who are from States that don't have the sales tax. We are not on the bill. This is an amendment to find out if a majority of the Senate is in favor of making sure we go through with some legislation that will actually solve the problem that is over 20 years old.

This is a problem the Supreme Court decided on and said Congress was the one that needed to fix it. They didn't say States should fix it, they said Congress should fix it. What we have been trying to do is fix it.

I had a complicated bill before called the streamlined sales tax bill. It took care of a lot of the problems we are talking about, such as multijurisdictions, and allows for one check to be dispensed to one location and then distributed to those who are participating.

Senator ALEXANDER had a better idea, and that is the one which is in the bill that is before us, and that is one which makes it States rights. It is where States can decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it provided they follow a certain number of rules. This is not as definitive as that bill yet because that bill would have to pass through this body as well.

I can assure everyone that no person in a State that doesn't have a sales tax now would have to pay a sales tax. If there is a business selling into a State that does have a sales tax, yes, they would have to collect that sales tax and forward it to that State. If there are complexities or conflicts with that, those can be worked out as the legislation goes through too.

Nobody mentioned that there is a \$1 million exemption in the bill. So when we talk about small businesses, if they have less than \$1 million in sales, they don't have to do this. Once they reach \$1 million in sales, they have to do it the next year so it doesn't become a problem that starts in the middle of the year.



It also requires that the States provide the information and the programs for them to do this. So it is a States rights issue, and that is what the Supreme Court suggested when they suggested we needed to fix this.

If Senators talk to their small businesses, they will find that they want it fixed because there is not fair competition anymore. People will come into a store—I was in the shoe business—and try on shoes. They get all the help they need, find out what they want, and then just order it over the Internet. I think it is kind of interesting when they say: Well, I got free shipping. When someone goes into a store and tries on shoes, they can get it that day. There is not even a day's delay; express shipping is not even needed.

I hope we are able to work on the bill and actually complete a bill and take care of the difference that is taking money away from States. They are not asking the Federal Government for a single dollar. They are not asking for the Federal Government to enforce this. They are asking for the right to have their States rights.

I yield the floor, and I will keep the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 7 minutes, the Senator from New Hampshire has 7 minutes, the Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes, and the Senator from Illinois has 5 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon. I might say that I yield 1 minute to the other Senator from Oregon as well. I urge the Senator not to use it all right now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Durbin-Enzi amendment forgets that we are in a global economy. This measure does not and cannot reach foreign retailers. A small business, for example, in Montana is sacked with the burdens of this bill. It is an administrative nightmare, which Senator BAUCUS and Senator AYOTTE have outlined. Some businesses are just going to say: Why not do business in Canada or Mexico or even China. Now, I know my colleagues who are advocating this don't intend this result, but their legislation really ought to be called the shop Mexico bill or the shop Canada bill or the shop China bill. I don't think that makes any sense.

Chairman BAUCUS handles these global economic kinds of questions in the Finance Committee, and that is the place we ought to look at it, and that is why we ought to reject this amendment today.

I yield the floor and reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in Oregon we don't like the sales tax, and

that is why we don't have one. It is regressive and more expensive to collect. What we hate even more is some State telling us what we have to do. I have heard people on this floor talking about States rights all the time, and now folks are standing up here and saying: We want your retailers to collect our tax, and we are not even going to compensate them for their time or effort. That is virtually a taking.

As my colleague pointed out, this is really about attacking business in America, small- and medium-sized businesses in America, which will just end up benefiting our foreign competitors. That is wrong, and we should oppose this for those multiple reasons.

I yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, and the other opponents of this amendment.

Senator ALEXANDER said that States should be able to decide what to do about taxes. Well, in New Hampshire we have decided. We don't want a sales tax. We don't collect one, and we don't ask our small businesses to collect one. And the fact is that this amendment would harm small, family-owned retail businesses in New Hampshire.

I talked to a business in Hudson, NH, which is along the border with Massachusetts. He has six employees, and he is about to reach \$1 million in sales. He said that under this legislation, his company would have to start collecting taxes not just in New Hampshire but for 45 other States. It would put him at such a disadvantage that he could not continue to grow. Just as Senator WYDEN said, what these businesses are going to do then is go look for someplace else where they don't have to worry about collecting these taxes over the Internet.

I agree with Senator ALEXANDER. I think we should ensure States rights and ensure that small businesses are protected, but we don't do that by passing this amendment.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield a couple of minutes to my colleague from Montana, Senator TESTER. I understand Senator AYOTTE is going to yield additional time.

Mr. TESTER. I thank the senior Senator from Montana. I thank the Senator for allowing me to be a part of this discussion.

This is an incredible overreach. The Senator from Wyoming talked about the fact that they are not forcing a sales tax on any State, but that is what this does. This amendment will require our small businesses to collect taxes from other States. This is an incredible violation. It changes the entire stand-

ard for tax collection. It is not a road anyone wants to go down. Yet we are going to allow businesses in Tennessee or Illinois or Wyoming or any other State in the Union that has a sales tax to walk into my State and tell my small businesses that they are going to collect taxes for other States. Who is going to pay for that and who is going to do the audit?

The Senator from New Hampshire said it is a job-killing bill. Well, it is a job-killing bill, but it is a great job creator in the bureaucracy. We are going to create bureaucracy in this government for tax collection like we have never seen before. There will be auditing like we have never seen before. Who pays for it?

I guarantee it is not fair to force this kind of tax collection for another State and then tell another State what they have to do to collect taxes. It makes no sense.

There are State and local taxes. There are all sorts of different mechanisms here. If there is a State that collects a 5-percent tax and another one that collects 10 percent, the business that has a 5-percent sales tax will have to collect another 5 percent and bring it back to that other State. Does it sound complicated? It is. It is very complicated.

We do not want to go down this road. This is a bad, bad, bad public policy. I encourage everyone in this Chamber and everyone who is watching on C-SPAN to vote this amendment down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 2 minutes, the Senator from New Hampshire has 5 minutes, the Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes, and the Senator from Illinois still has 5 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I suggest their side has more time remaining, so they should speak next.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thought my colleagues from New Hampshire and Montana might share with us a little bit about the amendments they are proposing, but in light of them not doing that, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I will yield my time to the Senator from North Dakota, who was a party to the Quill decision, which was before the U.S. Supreme Court 20 years ago, and who has also served as tax commissioner in the State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I would like to make a couple of points on foreign corporations. We already collect sales tax and impose use tax on foreign corporations all the time. In fact, North Dakota does require probating so long as they have a physical presence in North Dakota.

On the issue of New Hampshire and Montana, I will bet I could find small businesses that are in New Hampshire and in Montana that already collect sales and use taxes for other States. The only thing that this does is change the rules regarding what is required on nexus. What is the single thing that happens that requires a collection responsibility? For years, not just in the Quill case, but National Bellas Hess said there has to be a physical presence. The world has changed since we have physical presence. We now say economic presence is adequate for equal protection to be satisfied.

What we are asking for is that we look at economic presence the same way we do across the boundaries and create fairness for mainstream businesses. What do I mean by that? I mean Main Street businesses that every day compete against Internet sellers unfairly, Main Street business that are struggling, Main street businesses that put ads in fliers for local schools and contribute to their community but yet cannot survive because they cannot afford a 7-percent or 8-percent or 9-percent disadvantage in the marketplace. It is not fair. It is not fair to Main Street. We need to recognize the reality. We have heard about the global economy. My colleague is right, the economy has changed. How we do business doesn't depend on physical presence anymore, it is economic presence, and \$1 million is a lot of economic presence in the marketplace.

So I yield the remainder of my time back to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, things are getting a little down to the wire here. How much time is remaining?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, is there any time remaining of the time yielded from the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I will be very brief. Under this amendment, we could not touch an online retailer that is wholly overseas shipping into the United States with UPS. We could not touch them.

What the Senator from North Dakota is talking about is obviously foreign corporations, people with physical presence. But if you are wholly overseas, an online Internet retailer shipping into this country, you get a free ride under this legislation. That is why it is going to create an incentive to take American jobs from here and locate overseas where they get a free ride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. I yield 3 minutes of my time to the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO.

Mr. RUBIO. This is a very interesting debate. It is a very interesting topic to

talk about. I have talked to a few Members who have had this debate internally with their staff, and from an intellectual perspective it is a very interesting issue. But I want Members to understand what they will have to explain to people in their States.

If something like this were to happen, there will be businesses in your State that at the end of the year will have to be audited by or interact with States across the country, on the other side of the country; places where they don't know anybody, places where they don't have a lawyer or a lobbyist or anybody representing them. They will have to deal with States they have nothing to do with. That is what Members will have to explain to the businesses in their States.

The businesses in your States are going to have to comply with laws and courts and regulatory agencies and others they have nothing to do with, other than the fact that someone who lived there happened to buy something from them. So try explaining that. It sounds great here, but try to explain that to a business man or woman in your community or in your State, and I guarantee you are going to get puzzled looks.

Here is another thing I will tell my colleagues, because I understand there is an exemption for businesses with \$1 million in revenue, but depending on what you sell, it may or may not be that much. I would say that over time, that figure is going to be less and less in terms of who doesn't have to comply.

I dealt with this issue when I was in the State legislature in Florida, especially the last 2 years when I was the Speaker. I will be frank. This is about the fact that according to some, there is \$23 billion of what they claim is uncollected sales tax receipts across the country. You don't think that gets their attention? You don't think that is what this is about? That is what this is about. I am not saying that on the retail side they are not interested in the way the business is conducted and what it means in comparison to their competitors, but I promise my colleagues from the governmental side this is about the money they think they can get their hands on and what it would mean for their government and their ability to function.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will inquire again as to the time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute.

Mr. BAUCUS. Does the other side have any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators from Wyoming and Illinois have 5 minutes each.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. We have heard a lot of complaints from primarily the non-sales-tax States about the amendment we have proposed, but we haven't heard about the amendments they have pro-

posed. I thought they would use part of their time to make the case for what they were proposing. I am still expecting them to do that, and when they do that, then we ought to have some time for rebuttal. That is why we have saved some of our time. So I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. In the interest of moving this forward, we have scheduled a vote on the Ayotte amendment next, after the vote on the Enzi amendment. I urge everyone who votes for the Enzi-Durbin-Alexander amendment to oppose the Ayotte amendment because she includes a provision in that amendment which absolutely destroys the whole effort here. She requires physical nexus.

As Senator HEITKAMP has said, that is what this debate is all about—whether one has to be physically present in order to have an obligation to pay sales tax.

So I urge all of my colleagues who support the Marketplace Fairness Act to oppose the Ayotte amendment. I hope she will explain why she wants—I think we understand from the arguments why she takes that position.

May I say one or two things about what has been said? To my friend from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, who talked about the impossibility of collecting sales tax from foreign entities, that is just not true. The same collection mechanisms presently available to States to obtain and enforce judgments against foreign entities would be available to States with respect to foreign entities failing to comply with the MFA. States currently have, and would continue to have, access to customs information on imported goods. Accordingly, States can and do use that information as a means of encouraging remote sellers to collect sales tax. States currently have, and would continue to have, the ability to impose liens on any property owned by remote sellers, even property in transit. So to argue we can't collect taxes from international entities is to ignore existing law.

Let me say a word about the small businesses in Montana. After the \$1 million exemption, I would ask my Senator friend from Montana if he knows how many Internet retail sellers would be affected by the Marketplace Fairness Act in Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Too many.

Mr. DURBIN. There are 3. There are 3 out of 975 Internet retailers with over \$1 million in sales. There are 3 in the State of Montana. This is an undue burden on the small businesses of Montana?

What I would say to the Senator from Florida and the Senators from Montana, what we are saying is very basic. You aren't forced to sell in Illinois. There is no reason you have to sell in Illinois. You choose to do it. If you choose to do it, all we say is follow our law. Our law says if you make a sale in our State, there is a sales tax to be paid. If you don't want to get involved in that, you don't have to sell in

our State. Keep your marketplace limited to places where you want to do business. That is your right as a businessman. But if you want to sell in our States, you have a legal obligation to pay in our States.

If you want to open a business on Michigan Avenue in Chicago, you know you would have to pay plenty of taxes. Why is it if you want to sell to the same people living on Michigan Avenue, you have no obligation to pay a sales tax? That is what this is about.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I would say this: I can't imagine that businesses in New Hampshire or businesses in Wyoming or other businesses now—if this is passed, not only are they going to have to collect—all businesses—all 9,600 tax jurisdictions. But, heaven forbid, they are audited because now they are going to have to get on a plane, find a lawyer in another State, and deal with some other State's jurisdiction. That is the nightmare of this. I can't imagine that people would want to support it.

I also want to mention the privacy implications of this. I know the Senator from North Dakota mentioned a case she had. I actually had a case when I was attorney general where New Hampshire refused to collect tax for Massachusetts. They tried to bring us into court and I won that case.

Do my colleagues know what one of the big issues was that won it? Privacy—asking our retailers to ask people who bought things from them, where are you from, what are you going to use it for, and that is exactly the problem. There are serious privacy implications with all of the information that we are going to be gathering with this so-called making our businesses across the country tax collectors.

Generally, States do collect taxes, but we don't generally ask private businesses to do the job of the State and become tax collectors.

My amendment is simple. It respects States rights. If anyone wants to respect States rights and make sure there is a level playing field for all States to make their decisions in protecting data as well as to protect the rights of their States against foreign entities, that is what the amendment does.

I thank the Chair and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee and then my final minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President. We talked about how difficult this is. This is a good example of why we need to get this out of Wash-

ington and back in the States. For the last 15 years the States have been figuring out how to do this. They have it pretty well worked out, and in just a 20-minute debate we make it sound complicated.

Here is how hard it is. If I buy some ice cream ingredients from Williams Sonoma, and they are in another State, I use my credit card, I put in my ZIP Code, and the software automatically tells Williams Sonoma what the sales tax is that is owed. They collect it and they wire it to the State government. That is all that happens.

This debate sounds like it happened in 1890 before the horse and buggy, before the Internet. I mean, we live in a different world.

Here is what is fair. What is fair is allowing a State—not Washington—listen to the chairman of the American Conservative Union Al Cardenas. He says:

When it comes to state sales taxes, it is time to address the area where federally mandated prejudice is most egregious—the policy towards Internet sales, the decades-old inequity between online sales and in-person sales as outdated and unfair.

If I am trying to run the International Boot Company, I have to pay a 10-percent penalty to somebody who is out of State. If somebody is out of State and by catalog or by Internet they want to sell to the 6 million people in Tennessee, they don't have to do that. They can sell in Kentucky, they can sell in Ohio, they can sell everywhere else. But if they want to sell in our State, they should live by the same rules Tennesseans do.

We don't believe in picking and choosing winners and losers. We don't believe in treating one taxpayer this way and another one that way. We don't want to pick one business this way and another that way, and we don't like the idea of Washington making us play Mother May I to come up here and ask permission to decide whether we are going to collect a sales tax from everybody who already owes it rather than just some people who owe it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for making that point. As to this notion that there is something fundamentally unfair that we would ask an Internet retailer that wants to sell in Illinois that they collect the same sales tax for that sale as the businesses in Illinois, for goodness' sake, you are asking for a safe haven, an advantage over a lot of good small businesses in my home State. As Senator ALEXANDER said, if you don't want to abide by the laws of Illinois, for goodness' sake, make your sales elsewhere.

The Marketplace Fairness Act levels the playing field for all retailers, Internet and direct. It provides software free of charge to help retailers calculate sales and use taxes.

I heard my friend, the Senator from Montana, talk about how complex this was, how difficult this was.

I just made a recent purchase on Amazon which endorses the Marketplace Fairness Act, and I paid sales tax. They didn't ask for any additional time to calculate it. It assumes I put in my ZIP Code, and they knew exactly what to collect from me. That is how easy and simple it is these days.

This bill will also provide liability protection to ensure that if the software calculates the wrong tax, Internet retailers are held harmless.

Finally, the bill protects small businesses, as we mentioned earlier, by exempting small sellers with less than \$1 million in annual remote sales nationwide.

I know as well that there are other elements of this that ought to be considered, but we ought to consider this: There was a time when we stayed away from this issue. I remember the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, was in on this conversation about the Internet being brandnew, the baby in the crib, let him get started, let's make sure they are solid and moving forward. We can't ask them to do certain things.

That day is over: \$150 billion in sales. It is in our lives, everybody's lives. We use the Internet every day. What is wrong with asking them to pay sales tax for the sales into the States where they are doing business? Otherwise, look at the disadvantage we create for businesses.

The State of Oregon, represented in this debate, the State of Montana, the State of New Hampshire, and one other have decided they don't want a State sales tax. There is nothing in this bill which will require the residents of that State to pay one penny in sales tax on anything they purchase, period. There is no requirement to change that.

I know, as Dale Bumpers used to say, they hate sales tax in your States like the devil hates holy water, but we are not imposing a sales tax on you, only if your New Hampshire business wants to sell in another State. Then, of course, I think they ought to play by the rules of that State. That is basically what we are asking.

So at this point I ask how much time is remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Is there any time remaining on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to say this: The Senator has it all wrong because when the business from New Hampshire—when the person from Illinois buys from the business in New Hampshire, it should be up to Illinois to enforce against their own residents because they are essentially buying from New Hampshire.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BAUCUS.

Senator DURBIN is right. Things have changed. The Internet now is the shipping lane of the 21st century, and foreign retailers are going to get an advantage.

Colleagues, if this were enforceable as Senator DURBIN and Senator ENZI are saying, Europe would go out and put it in place tomorrow and do it to our sellers.

It is not enforceable. It violates the World Trade Organization. It advantages foreign retailers at our expense. I hope my colleagues will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is right. And I see the Senator from North Dakota shaking her head. With all due respect, I think she is not correct. This is either enforceable on foreign countries or it is not. It is impossible to force our laws on other countries unless other countries consent. Just to say so in a statute here does not make it true, in a bill does not make it true. There has to be a treaty, a tax treaty. There has to be some way for the foreign jurisdiction to agree; otherwise, we cannot possibly enforce this in other jurisdictions or on the other side, if we do, then those other countries can come back and do the same thing to the United States.

Do we want Chinese direct sellers to come back to the United States or, vice versa, for the Chinese to collect in the United States? The Senator from New Hampshire had it exactly right: It should be the purchaser who pays the tax, and that is where it should be enforced, not the tax collector, the small businessman in another State.

I might sum up by saying, we will take this up in the Finance Committee and work out all these different kinks and wrinkles on it, but that is where it should be done.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, do I have the last minute remaining?

Let me just say, my friend, Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota, knows this subject so well. The case you want to read is *Buckley v. State of California* as to whether State laws are enforceable against foreign companies. And they are. That decision has already been reached. This argument does not hold water.

What does hold water is this: There is no reason why any State retailer should have an unfair advantage doing business in my State or any other State. If they want to compete with my businesses that pay their taxes, as they are supposed to do, let them do

business under the laws of the State of Illinois. If they do not want to play by these rules, then they do not have to come to Illinois. This is a question of fairness.

The last point I will make is this: This is voluntary—voluntary—under the Marketplace Fairness Act. States have to voluntarily decide that they want to be under this act. If they do not care to be, they do not have to be. So there is no heavy hand of the Federal Government here. The States can make this decision. It is up to them. I hope that all of those who support the Marketplace Fairness Act will support the Enzi-Durbin amendment.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, my understanding is that all the debate time on this has expired, all the time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. MURRAY. And that the Enzi amendment is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Feinstein	Menendez
Baldwin	Fischer	Mikulski
Begich	Franken	Moran
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murphy
Blumenthal	Graham	Murray
Blunt	Hagan	Nelson
Boozman	Harkin	Portman
Boxer	Heinrich	Pryor
Brown	Heitkamp	Reed
Burr	Hirono	Reid
Cantwell	Hoeven	Risch
Cardin	Isakson	Rockefeller
Carper	Johanns	Sanders
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Coburn	Kaine	Sessions
Cochran	King	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Thune
Corker	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Levin	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Warren
Durbin	McCain	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker

NAYS—24

Ayotte	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hatch	Paul
Baucus	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Cornyn	Lee	
Cruz	McConnell	
Flake	Merkeley	

Scott	Tester	Vitter
Shaheen	Toomey	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 656) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator AYOTTE and Senator BAUCUS, who are next, are not going to call up their amendments. The question now is on the Durbin amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the Durbin amendment.

The amendment (No. 578), as amended, was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 144

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the next amendment that is in order is my amendment. I would like to yield to Senator COLLINS to speak on the amendment following mine, Amendment No. 144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, my amendment is No. 144. I ask unanimous consent that it be called up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] proposes an amendment numbered 144.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore a sensible definition of full-time employee for purposes of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employer penalties in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which may include restoring a sensible definition of "full-time employee", provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, my amendment would allow for legislation

setting a more sensible definition of “full-time employee” under the Affordable Care Act. Under the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, the definition of a full-time employee averages just 30 hours a week. That definition is not found in other areas of the law. It is creating this perverse incentive where employers are actually reducing the number of hours their employees work in order to keep under that 30-hour threshold and thus avoid penalties.

All this amendment does, however, is call for a more sensible definition of what a full-time employee should entail. I ask unanimous consent that we voice vote the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was going to offer amendment No. 653, but I am not going to call up that amendment.

I would agree with Senator COLLINS on her amendment and ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 144) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we have now gone through all of the amendments from the unanimous consent agreement. We are within a couple of minutes of having a unanimous consent request for the next group of amendments. I would ask that all Senators stay in the Chamber because it will just be a matter of several minutes and we will ask unanimous consent for the next group of amendments.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: Begich No. 341, Alexander No. 51, Merkley No. 398, Rubio No. 292, Hagan No. 278, and Isakson No. 138; that there be no second-degree amendments prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that upon disposition of the Isakson amendment No. 138, the majority have the next amendment in order; finally, all these votes be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reserving the right to object, I think this is a good list. I look forward to moving on. I will try to work with Senator MURRAY and others. Perhaps we may avoid the gaps we have been experiencing. We have a lot of Senators here, a lot of things to do. There is an anxiousness we shouldn't be having so much downtime, and we will be working toward that.

I thank the Chair and would not object.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I would agree with the Senator. We are trying to work through. Members have a lot of priority amendments. We are trying to make sure our lists match. Our staffs are working very hard to go back and forth so everybody has equal time on the amendments which are a priority to each side. I apologize for taking time to do it. We are trying to come to an agreement, and sometimes it takes a few minutes.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 341

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 341.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BEGICH], for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 341.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FISH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 341 offered by the Senator from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, this amendment deals with labeling genetically engineered fish, the first hybrid animal being proposed for human consumption. The FDA is reviewing this precedent-setting action not as a food but as a drug. They haven't studied the

long-time health impacts and I can see why because all of these chemicals are added to this fake fish.

At a minimum, this fish should be labeled. Consumer Reports indicates 95 percent of the population want products labeled. Last year 1 million people wrote to the FDA asking for this product to be labeled. Labeling is done in 60 other countries. Three weeks ago, major retailers, Whole Foods, Trader Joe's, have assured they are not going to sell this fake fish.

We urge support for this amendment and ask it be passed.

I yield time to Senator MURKOWSKI.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I join my colleague in urging Members to support this amendment. All it does is require labeling of this fish, this fake fish. If you are going to be serving your family a good-quality product, you want to know it is good and it is quality. Allow us to label this fish.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe we can pass this amendment on a voice vote, unless there is an objection. Seeing none, I suggest we do this by voice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 341) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I believe Senator ALEXANDER's amendment is up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senator ALEXANDER is off the floor. Senator MERKLEY is here. I would ask unanimous consent to reverse the order of these two amendments and go to Senator MERKLEY and then back to Senator ALEXANDER.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 398

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 398.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 398.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase investment in high-impact breakthrough clean energy technologies through the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy of the Department of Energy)

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$18,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by \$18,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by \$13,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 398.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment increases the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy of the Department of Energy by \$50 million. This is essentially what we know as ARPA-E. This is the most basic research to create breakthroughs in areas which range from renewable energy to energy conservation, so on and so forth. Energy is the lifeblood of our economy. It is the lifeblood of putting ourselves in a position to be one of the nations which sells technology to the world, rather than buying it from the world. This is a huge leverage issue, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I request Senators be recognized to speak at this moment.

Mr. President, I believe, as I indicated last night, Mr. Lomborg of Europe, who has done a lot of research on these issues—energy research is preferable to mandating requirements which would utilize inefficient sources and oversubsidizing. Breakthroughs might happen. This is a paid-for amendment. I would suggest we take it by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 398) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senator ALEXANDER is on the floor, and I

will yield to him to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 515

Mr. ALEXANDER. I call up amendment No. 515.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. ALEXANDER], for himself and Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 515.

The amendment is as follows: (Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the education of low-income children, which may include allowing funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to follow children from low-income families to the school the children attend)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHOOL CHOICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the education of low-income children, which may include allowing funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to follow children from low-income families to the school the children attend, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 515 offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of Senator PAUL and myself, with Senators TOOMEY and MCCONNELL cosponsoring. It is designed to help 11 million low-income children in this country. We appropriate \$14.5 billion every year through our title I Federal funding. It is supposed to go to them but it doesn't get there. That is agreed upon by both the left and the right.

For example, Marguerite Roza, writing for the Center for American Progress, says the difference between school expenditures is often substantial, and she pointed out the money goes to schools where teachers are paid more but the children aren't necessarily the poorer children. So the poorer children—the ones we intend to help—are left in schools with less money. And sometimes the money can add up to quite a bit.

The same analysis has been found by the Fordham Foundation—I would say that is a center-right organization—because of the Federal formula we use.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. So we are suggesting to let the money follow the

child to the school, whether it is public or private and accredited.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield our time to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the way this amendment is drafted means the money that goes to title I could then be taken and go to private schools. That is the first thing.

Secondly, we have tried this before. The District of Columbia has a voucher program that we passed in Congress in 2003. And guess what they have found since 2003? It made no impact whatsoever on student achievement, and now the program is to the point it is being phased out.

Again, at this point in time when we are worried about uncertainty in our schools, teacher salaries, and we have the sequester taking money from schools, this isn't the time to take even more money out of our public school system.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker

NAYS—60

Baldwin	Fischer	Menendez
Baucus	Franken	Merkley
Begich	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Bennet	Hagan	Moran
Blumenthal	Harkin	Murkowski
Blunt	Heinrich	Murphy
Boxer	Heitkamp	Murray
Brown	Hirono	Nelson
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Cardin	Kaine	Reed
Carper	King	Reid
Casey	Kirk	Rockefeller
Collins	Klobuchar	Sanders
Coons	Landrieu	Schatz
Cowan	Leahy	Schumer
Donnelly	Levin	Shaheen
Durbin	Manchin	Stabenow
Feinstein	McCaskill	Tester

Udall (CO) Warner Whitehouse  
Udall (NM) Warren Wyden

NOT VOTING—  
Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 515) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 292, offered by the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 292.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 292.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate to enact the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) laws requiring parental notification or consent prior to an abortion, or in the alternative judicial waiver, are in effect in more than half of the States, but these laws are often circumvented by interstate activity in which minors travel or are transported across State lines to avoid laws requiring parental involvement;

(2) abortion providers use targeted advertising to minors across State lines, using avoidance of parental notification requirements as a selling point;

(3) when an abortion provider performs an abortion on a minor without parental notification, the provider is likely to lack the complete medical history of the minor, and parents of the minor are unaware of the need to watch for complications that may develop after the abortion when the minor is sent back to her State of residence, far from the provider; and

(4) parental notification and parental consent laws are supported by overwhelming majorities of the public in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a physician who performs or induces an abortion on a minor who is a resident of a State other than the State in which the abortion is performed should be required by Federal law to provide, or cause an agent of the physician to provide, at least 24 hours advance notice to a parent of the minor before the abortion is performed;

(2) such a Federal requirement for interstate parental notification should not apply if—

(A) the minor declares in a signed written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent, and, before an abortion is performed on the minor, the physician notifies the authorities specified to receive reports of child abuse or neglect by the law of the State in which the minor resides of the known or suspected abuse or neglect;

(B) the abortion is necessary to save the life of a minor whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or phys-

ical illness, including a life endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, provided that the attending physician or an agent of the physician notifies a parent of the minor in writing that an abortion was performed on the minor and of the circumstances of the abortion within 24 hours;

(C) the abortion is performed or induced in a State that has in force a law requiring parental involvement in the abortion decision of a minor and the physician complies with the requirements of that law;

(D) the physician is presented with documentation that shows with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the State of residence of the minor has authorized that the minor be allowed to procure an abortion; or

(E) the minor is physically accompanied by a person who presents the physician or an agent of the physician with documentation showing with a reasonable degree of certainty that he or she is in fact a parent of that minor;

(3) a parent who suffers harm by a violation of the interstate notification requirement should be entitled to obtain appropriate relief in a civil action, unless that parent has committed an act of incest with the minor;

(4) whoever has committed an act of incest with a minor and knowingly transports the minor across a State line with the intent that the minor obtain an abortion should be subject to imprisonment of up to 1 year for such transportation, in addition to any other penalties; and

(5) Congress should enact S. 369, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA), to accomplish these purposes.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, abortion is a divisive issue in this country, and I deeply respect everyone's opinions with regard to this issue. But there is one thing that is not dividing us. There is one thing we are united upon as a people, and that is the idea that parents should know what their children are being involved in, especially when it comes to a medical procedure of this magnitude. That is why so many States have passed parental notification laws that require parents to be notified before their child—a minor—undergoes an abortion.

Unfortunately, in this country there are people who are transporting these children across State lines in order to avoid these notification laws. This sense of the Senate is based on a bill I have filed, and others have supported in the past, that makes that illegal, that does not allow that to happen.

You will hear arguments against this in terms of maybe the child is living in a very unstable environment or a dangerous environment. Maybe one of the parents—God forbid—is involved in the pregnancy that led to this, and that is why there are judicial overrides at the State level, so they can go to courts to override it. That is why this sense of the Senate is built on a bill that has exceptions for things like rape or incest or medical emergencies or a hostile home. So this is an important point, and I hope it can garner the support of as many Members as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Rubio amendment hurts families. It is opposed by respected doctors organizations and many women's groups.

Colleagues, under the Rubio amendment, a doctor and a grandmother would go to jail if the grandmother brought her grandchild across State lines, say, after she was raped. Senator RUBIO insists that only a parent be there. But what if the mom is ill or the dad is in Afghanistan or she is scared to death to tell her mom or her dad? Colleagues, there are cases of daughters dying due to their desperation and fear of telling their parents. Let's not endanger our children and place government against our grandmothers. Please vote no.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not germane to the underlying resolution. It, therefore, violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. I move to waive the rule with regard to the applicable portion of the act and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Pryor
Burr	Hatch	Reid
Casey	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoehn	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCaIn	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—51

Baldwin	Cowan	King
Baucus	Durbin	Kirk
Begich	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Bennet	Franken	Landrieu
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Leahy
Boxer	Hagan	Levin
Brown	Harkin	McCaskill
Cantwell	Heinrich	Menendez
Cardin	Heitkamp	Merkley
Carper	Hirono	Mikulski
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Murphy
Coons	Kaine	Murray

Nelson	Schumer	Udall (NM)
Reed	Shaheen	Warner
Rockefeller	Stabenow	Warren
Sanders	Tester	Whitehouse
Schatz	Udall (CO)	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 278

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote in relation to amendment No. 278, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mrs. HAGAN.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, this amendment establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for families of servicemembers and veterans. My home State has the third largest military footprint in the Nation. One out of every three people is in the military, a veteran or related to a servicemember or veteran. We are proud that we make military families welcome in North Carolina because supporting military families is one of the best ways we can support our troops.

This amendment is deficit neutral. It will not add one penny to our deficit. It helps to create room in the budget for legislation to help military families in areas ranging from health care to housing and from education to job placement while their loved ones are serving our country away from home.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for our military families, for the sons, daughters, husbands, wives, and families who sacrifice for this Nation alongside our troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 278.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mrs. HAGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 278.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the families of United States servicemembers and veterans)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolu-

tions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including—

(1) expanding educational opportunities;

(2) providing increased access to job training and placement services;

(3) tracking and reporting on suicides of family members of members of the Armed Forces;

(4) ensuring access to high-quality and affordable healthcare; or

(5) improving military housing;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to consider our military families who serve this Nation. They just don't do it in uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, unless there are any Senators who wish to speak in opposition to this amendment, I know we are all in very strong support of veterans. This amendment would make it easier to pass legislation, but that legislation would be required to be deficit neutral. I think we have to know that nothing comes from nothing. If we start new programs, they have to be paid for. But we certainly support the goal of this amendment. I suggest we could take it by voice vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I suggest we voice vote this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 278) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I believe the Senator from Georgia is next.

## AMENDMENT NO. 138

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 138 offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 138.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. ISAKSON], for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN, proposes an amendment numbered 138.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, this is an Isakson-Shaheen budget amendment that creates a deficit-neutral fund for the purpose of converting our appropriations and budget process to a 2-year process where we budget and appropriate in odd-numbered years.

We would budget and appropriate in odd-numbered years and do oversight for efficiencies, finding abuses and finding those programs that are not working in even-numbered years. This is a process asked for by every President, from Ronald Reagan to our current President, and endorsed by Democrats and Republicans in this body. The person who knows the most about it is Ms. JEANNE SHAHEEN, former Governor of New Hampshire and a Senator, who is my partner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator ISAKSON. I was a Governor for three budgets, and we were able to balance them every other year every cycle because biennial budgeting gives us an opportunity to prioritize scarce resources and provide more oversight to the budgeting process.

This is idea whose time has come. We need this reform and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mrs. MURRAY. Is there a Senator who wishes to speak in opposition?

Seeing none, I yield our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

## YEAS—68

Alexander	Boozman	Cochran
Ayotte	Burr	Collins
Barrasso	Cardin	Coons
Begich	Carper	Corker
Bennet	Chambliss	Cornyn
Blumenthal	Coats	Crapo
Blunt	Coburn	Cruz



Donnelly	Johanns	Risch
Enzi	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Fischer	Johnson (WI)	Schatz
Flake	Kaine	Scott
Franken	King	Sessions
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Graham	Leahy	Shelby
Grassley	Manchin	Tester
Hagan	McCain	Thune
Harkin	McCaskill	Toomey
Hatch	McConnell	Udall (CO)
Heinrich	Moran	Vitter
Heitkamp	Murkowski	Warner
Hoehn	Murphy	Warren
Inhofe	Portman	Wyden
Isakson	Reid	

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Kirk	Reed
Baucus	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Boxer	Lee	Rubio
Brown	Levin	Sanders
Cantwell	Menendez	Schumer
Casey	Merkley	Stabenow
Cowan	Mikulski	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Nelson	Wicker
Heller	Paul	
Hirono	Pryor	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 138) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay the motion on the table.

For the information of all Senators, we have worked through a lot of amendments, and I appreciate everybody's hard work. I am about to ask for unanimous consent that will lock in the next 16 amendments, which will take us well past midnight. I suggest that any Senator who is going to need a vote and wants to keep the Senate later talk to either Senator SESSIONS or myself very soon.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 693, 307, 198, 697, 482, 263, 314, 247, 606, 689, 537, 535, 442, 514, 273, AND 373 EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: Warner amendment No. 693, Thune amendment No. 307, Sanders amendment No. 198, Burr amendment No. 697, Reed of Rhode Island amendment No. 482, Paul amendment No. 263, Landrieu amendment No. 314, Cornyn amendment No. 247, Menendez amendment No. 606, Vitter amendment No. 689, Tester amendment No. 537, Toomey amendment No. 535, Casey amendment No. 442, Coats amendment No. 514, Cardin amendment No. 273, and Lee amendment No. 373; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that upon disposition of the Lee amendment No. 373, the majority have the next amendment in order; finally, that all of these votes be 10-minute votes and the Chair report en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe this is a good list, and I support this list. I would advise that a number of Senators have amendments that

they have waited patiently on and that they are entitled to get votes on, so we need to move forward. The more effectively we can do so, the sooner we can finish. There are some very serious matters that have not yet been put on this list that will need to be voted on.

With that, I withdraw my objection. Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. The Senator from Alabama talked about Senators who have been waiting for a long time. It happens that I was among the very first to put all of mine in—I was ready to go—and cut it down to two votes. I am still waiting. I will not wait beyond the next time; I am serving notice.

At this time, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we finalize these amendments, and we will have disposed of 41 amendments. Senators are going to have to understand that this is not going to go on forever. The average is about 30 or 35 votes. After we finish, it will be 41. Everyone should understand that we had 400 amendments that had been offered, and we are not going to do that.

Mr. DURBIN. Voice votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I will again remind Senators that if anyone has an amendment, please let us know very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. We look forward to working hard as we go forward and take up new amendments. It is unfortunate that we are coming to the end of the week as we have. We still would have a week when we come back—the week of April 8—but I know the majority leader wants to finish. So we are going to try to cooperate, and I know he will cooperate with us as we seek to get as many amendments done and as many people satisfied with the issues they are concerned about as is possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the clerk could call up the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 693.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] proposes an amendment numbered 307.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 198.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BURR] proposes an amendment numbered 697.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 482.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 263.

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 314.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 247.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] proposes an amendment numbered 606.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 689.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER] proposes an amendment numbered 537.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOOMEY] proposes an amendment numbered 535.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] proposes an amendment numbered 442.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] proposes an amendment numbered 514.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 273.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 373.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 693

(Purpose: To repeal or reduce the estate tax, but only if done in a fiscally responsible way)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REPEAL OR REDUCTION OF THE ESTATE TAX.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the repeal or reduction of the estate tax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 307

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to permanently eliminate the Federal estate tax)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PERMANENTLY ELIMINATE THE FEDERAL ESTATE TAX.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may permanently eliminate the Federal estate tax without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 198

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND THEIR SURVIVORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills,

joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to protecting the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 697

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would raise taxes on veterans, and for other purposes)

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 2.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by \$40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by \$55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by \$70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by \$82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by \$95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by \$115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by \$135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by \$149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by \$159,650,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by \$40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by \$55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by \$70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by \$82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by \$95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by \$115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by \$135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by \$149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by \$159,630,000,000.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RAISE TAXES ON VETERANS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase taxes on United States veterans or their survivors.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

## AMENDMENT NO. 482

(Purpose: To provide funding for low-income weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs)

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$18,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, reduce the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by \$18,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by \$13,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by \$2,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 57, after line 25, insert the following:

(4) low-income weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs;

On page 58, line 1, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

On page 58, line 3, strike “(5)” and insert “(6)”.

On page 58, line 4, strike “(6)” and insert “(7)”.

On page 58, line 7, strike “(7)” and insert “(8)”.

On page 58, line 9, strike “(8)” and insert “(9)”.

On page 58, line 10, strike “(9)” and insert “(10)”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 263

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, March 21, 2013, under “Text of amendments.”)

## AMENDMENT NO. 314

(Purpose: To modify the deficit-neutral reserve fund for America’s servicemembers and veterans to include leases of major medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs)

On page 59, line 25, insert after “space” the following: “, to include leases of major medical facilities,”.

## AMENDMENT NO. 247

(Purpose: To ensure that if the President fails to submit his budget by the deadline set in law the Director of the Office of Management and Budget does not get paid until he submits a budget; and that any savings will reduce the deficit)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. . . . . DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR NO BUDGET, NO OMB PAY.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the federal budget process, which may include prohibiting paying the salaries of either the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the OMB Deputy Director, or the OMB Deputy Director for Management, or all three officials, for the period of time after which the President fails to submit a budget, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and until the day the President submits a budget to Congress.

## AMENDMENT NO. 606

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide funding for the purposes of embassy or diplomatic security)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR EMBASSY OR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide funding for the purposes of embassy or diplomatic security, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 689

(Purpose: To End “Too Big To Fail” Subsidies or Funding Advantage for Wall Street Mega-Banks (over \$500 billion in total assets))

At the appropriate place insert the following:

**SEC. . . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END “TOO BIG TO FAIL” SUBSIDIES OR FUNDING ADVANTAGE FOR WALL STREET MEGA-BANKS (OVER \$500 BILLION IN TOTAL ASSETS).**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors received by bank holding companies with over \$500,000,000 in total assets, which may include elimination of any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of federal assistance to prevent receivership, or any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of federal assistance to facilitate exit from receivership, or to realign market incentives to protect the taxpayer, except in the case of Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 537

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to authorizing children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RETAIN SUCH ELIGIBILITY UNTIL AGE 26.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 535

(Purpose: To repeal the tax increase on catastrophic medical expenses created by Obamacare)

On page 49, strike lines 20 through line 2 on page 50

The levels in this resolution are amended by—Reducing total revenues by the following amounts

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by \$4,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by \$4,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by \$5,100,000,000.

And reducing the amounts by which federal revenues should be changed by the following amounts

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by \$4,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by \$4,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by \$5,100,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 442

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for State and local law enforcement)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to support State and local law enforcement, which may include investing in State formula grants, to aid State and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems in implementing innovative, evidence-based approaches to crime prevention and control, including strategies such as specialty courts, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 514

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to enable prompt action relating to the Presidential exemption for the rule of the Environmental Protection Agency commonly known as the Mercury and Air Toxins Standard for affected electric utility steam generating units that need additional time to install the major emissions control equipment, construct replacement generation, or implement other mitigation measures in order to ensure the reliability of the grid)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE PROMPT ACTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTION FOR MERCURY AND AIR TOXINS STANDARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that may allow the Environmental Protection Agency to enable the President to be adequately informed and take prompt action to issue, on a case-by-case basis, Presidential exemptions, which may include exemptions under section 112(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(i)(4)), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 273

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve oral health care for children with Medicaid coverage)

On page 76, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) **ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN WITH MEDICAID COVERAGE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the oral health outcomes for children covered by Medicaid, including legislation that may allow for risk-based disease prevention and comprehensive, coordinated chronic disease treatment approaches, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 373

(Purpose: To provide a point of order against budgets spending more on net interest payments on the debt than on national defense, and to ensure the United States government funds its military at higher levels than the militaries of foreign holders of its debt)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

**SEC. 4 \_\_\_\_ . SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET PROVIDING OUTLAYS FOR INTEREST ON THE DEBT IN EXCESS OF OUTLAYS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that includes outlays for function 900 in any fiscal year that exceed outlays for function 050 in the same fiscal year.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 693

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 693, offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. **WARNER.**

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. **WARNER.** Mr. President, in the spirit of what our leader said about us trying to move along, I think while we may have a variety of views, we all know we are \$16.5 trillion in debt—a debt that goes up by \$3 billion every night. The last thing we should do is dig this hole any deeper.

This amendment is paired actually with an amendment that will be offered by the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. **THUNE.** The Thune amendment would repeal the estate tax without the ability to offset with additional revenue.

I believe the estate tax is actually a meaningful part of our Tax Code. We put in place appropriate exemptions: \$5 million a person, \$10 million a couple. That means the estate tax right now only applies to about 3,800 people a year. Yet, if we were to repeal the estate tax without any offset, that would add \$600 billion to our debt.

We have spent a lot of time over these last number of months talking about the dramatic cuts in defense from sequester—\$550 billion.

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

Mr. **WARNER.** Mr. President, I urge my colleagues, if we want to repeal the estate tax and pay for it, to vote for the Warner amendment No. 693.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. **THUNE.** Mr. President, I appreciate the effort being made by the Senator from Virginia. He is moving in the right direction. We do need to get rid of this once and for all. I would be happy to accept his amendment by voice if he would be willing to do that. But I think it is important to have a vote on eliminating the death tax.

The death tax is a punitive tax. It hits farmers and ranchers squarely in the face at a time when they are trying to pass on their farm or ranch operation to the next generation of Americans.

By the way, the amendment I will offer is a deficit-neutral reserve fund; it would be offset. The point the Senator from Virginia made about it not being offset is not accurate.

The way we would approach this, it would have to be offset, but it is time that we put a stake in the heart of the death tax and end it once and for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I believe we need a balanced approach. The notion that we can continue to take away revenue sources is not a responsible way to address this budget.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 693.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Nelson
Begich	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Hagan	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Pryor
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Boxer	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeben	Schatz
Cardin	Inhofe	Scott
Carper	Isakson	Sessions
Casey	Johanns	Shaheen
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coats	Kaine	Stabenow
Coburn	Kirk	Tester
Cochran	Klobuchar	Thune
Collins	Landrieu	Toomey
Corker	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Cowan	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Warren
Cruz	McCaskill	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	Wyden
Enzi	Mikulski	

NAYS—19

Baldwin	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Coons	Levin	Schumer
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Harkin	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 693) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 307

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there now will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 307, offered by the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this amendment will create a deficit-neu-

tral reserve fund to completely—completely—eliminate the Federal estate tax burden that is facing America's family farmers and small businesses. There are lots of reasons to support elimination of this destructive and inefficient tax, but for me the issue comes down to being able to tell the farmers and ranchers I represent that I am doing everything I can to make sure they can pass on their family farm to the next generation without a double tax imposed from Washington, DC.

Behind me is a chart. This is data selected from the latest Agriculture Department report on farmland values. Farmers in the States represented on this chart truly are land rich and cash poor. These farmers literally have to sell off land or spend large sums in financial planning solely because of the estate tax—all of that to bring in less than one-half of 1 percent of all Federal revenue.

Next year the estate tax will generate \$15 billion—that is all—relative to all the harm that it causes to farms, ranches, and small businesses in this country. It is time to end this tax. It is time to put a stake through the heart of this tax. I ask my colleagues to support the repeal with this amendment.

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

Who yields time in opposition?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there are strong feelings of opinion in this body about the estate tax. I personally believe the current estate tax—with a very generous \$5 million-per-person exemption, and \$10 million per family; an estate tax that only applies to 3,800 families per year—is a fair part of our Tax Code. Others may disagree.

But in our previous amendment, Warner amendment No. 693, we said if you are going to replace the estate tax, you have to pay for it. The unfortunate thing about the Senator's amendment is it says if you repeal the estate tax, you cannot use revenues to replace that. It will only have to be replaced with additional cuts.

The problem we have at this point—\$16.5 trillion in debt—is because we have not recognized to get a budget balanced you have to look at both sides of the balance sheet, revenue and spending. You cannot just keep taking revenue away on every item. So I would urge my colleagues to oppose the Thune amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—46

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

NAYS—53

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 307) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 198

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 198 offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 198.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI—no chained CPI.

This amendment is cosponsored by Senators HARKIN, HIRONO, and WHITEHOUSE. This amendment is strongly supported by the American Legion and all of the veterans organizations. It is supported by the AARP and all of the senior organizations because they do not want to see cuts in Social Security. It is supported by the AFL-CIO and the National Organization for Women, among many other groups.

After all of the fine Memorial Day speeches about how much we love and support our veterans, the Disabled Veterans of America, the Gold Star Wives—

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

Mr. SANDERS. They want to know if we are going to balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans. I hope very much we will not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it. I support chained CPI, just as the President, as it relates to entitlement reform. The fact is, if we want to protect veterans, then the important amendment is the next one. It is the amendment that bans excessive taxes from being applied to our country's veterans. It shields them from the massive tax increases found in this budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I believe we can take this on a voice vote.

Mr. SANDERS. If Mr. BURR supports this amendment, I ask for a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment there is not a sufficient second. At this time, there is not a sufficient second.

The question is on the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for a voice vote on the Sanders amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 198) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 697

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 697.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment that will actually protect veterans, one that will protect them from the massive tax increases in this budget. The budget before us today raises \$1 trillion but does not tell us how. My amendment would ensure that the Democrats in the Chamber cannot raise a dime of that trillion dollars on the backs of our Nation's veterans. It would strike their ability to fast-track any tax increases through this body.

I encourage all Members to vote for the amendment that will actually protect veterans from the threat before them. That threat is higher taxes that will come from this budget.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose this amendment. Repealing this budget's revenue increase and striking reconciliation would be irresponsible. Our budget would not raise taxes on veterans.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. What this amendment basically says is it does away with the revenue that the committee has put into the bill. It says the only way to do deficit reduction is to cut, cut, cut—cut Social Security, veterans programs, Medicare, Medicaid. One out of four corporations does not pay a nickel in taxes today. No problem. We are losing \$100 billion with companies putting their money in the Cayman Island's tax havens. No problem. The only way to go forward is to cut, cut, cut. The American people do not support that concept. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act for consideration of the pending amendment No. 697 pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Cardin
Baucus	Boxer	Carper
Begich	Brown	Casey
Bennet	Cantwell	Coons

Cowan	Klobuchar	Reid
Donnelly	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Durbin	Leahy	Sanders
Feinstein	Levin	Schatz
Franken	Manchin	Schumer
Gillibrand	McCaskill	Shaheen
Hagan	Menendez	Stabenow
Harkin	Merkley	Tester
Heinrich	Mikulski	Udall (CO)
Heitkamp	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Hirono	Murray	Warner
Johnson (SD)	Nelson	Warren
Kaine	Pryor	Whitehouse
King	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45 and the nays are 54. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and amendment No. 697 falls.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 482

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to amendment No. 482, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. This bipartisan amendment, cosponsored by Senator COLLINS, Senator MERKLEY, and others, would add resources to energy programs for the purpose of increasing support for the Weatherization Assistance Program. It would also include weatherization in the investments under the deficit-neutral reserve fund on clean energy and environmental protection.

Weatherization does several things: It puts people to work, helps low-income people control their energy bills, and helps us move toward energy independence. We need to do more of this, not less. This amendment will put us back on the track of doing more, not less.

I would urge passage of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator and his cosponsors for their work on this amendment. I note it would double the budget number for the weatherization program. Also, the Recovery Act of a few years ago, the stimulus bill, provided \$5 billion for the weatherization program. While I am dubious about the wisdom of the doubling of this program, it is offset. Therefore, I would accept a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Without objection, we will move to a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 482) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 263

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 263 offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the President is fond of calling for a balanced approach. Today, I rise in this body to offer a balanced approach to budgets. I offer a budget that balances in 5 years.

This budget is called the Revitalize America Budget. It reforms and saves Social Security and Medicare, making them solvent for 75 years; it creates millions of jobs by letting taxpayers keep an additional \$600 billion of their income; it repeals ObamaCare; and it requires Congress to vote to approve or disapprove all major regulations.

Our ever-expanding debt is costing us millions of jobs a year. It is time to stop burying our kids in debt. I suggest a vote for this 5-year balanced budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the budget resolution before the Senate represents the values and priorities of the pro-middle-class agenda. The Paul budget that is being offered includes tax savings for the wealthy and eliminates the programs that strengthen our economy and support our middle class.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 81, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

## YEAS—18

Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Coburn	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Sessions
Cruz	McConnell	Shelby
Enzi	Moran	Vitter

## NAYS—81

Alexander	Carper	Gillibrand
Ayotte	Casey	Graham
Baldwin	Chambliss	Grassley
Baucus	Coats	Hagan
Begich	Cochran	Harkin
Bennet	Collins	Hatch
Blumenthal	Coons	Heinrich
Blunt	Corker	Heitkamp
Boozman	Cowan	Heller
Boxer	Donnelly	Hirono
Brown	Durbin	Hoeven
Burr	Feinstein	Isakson
Cantwell	Fischer	Johanns
Cardin	Franken	Johnson (SD)

Kaine	Murkowski	Schumer
King	Murphy	Shaheen
Kirk	Murray	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Nelson	Tester
Landrieu	Portman	Thune
Leahy	Pryor	Toomey
Levin	Reed	Udall (CO)
Manchin	Reid	Udall (NM)
McCain	Roberts	Warner
McCaskill	Rockefeller	Warren
Menendez	Rubio	Whitehouse
Merkley	Sanders	Wicker
Mikulski	Schatz	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 263) was rejected.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 314

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 314 offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am proud to offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator CHAMBLISS, Senator VITTER, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator ISAKSON, Senator MURPHY, and Senator UDALL of New Mexico that will fix a problem in the way CBO is scoring the leasing of veterans clinics.

This amendment, if adopted, will have no impact on the deficit. It will allow veterans clinics in 30 States to be able to finance their buildings. It is something that must be done in order to solve this problem for our veterans, and I think we can take this by voice vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe Senator COBURN wished to speak on this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I understand what the Senator from Louisiana is trying to do, but it goes toward the bigger problems of GSA. I will give you a great example.

In my hometown they are building a brand new U.S. Attorney's Office with four other sites that are available that could have been leased, and they are going to lease this one as well. So leasing doesn't solve the problem. What we need to attack is the inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of GSA.

I am sure we will take a voice vote on this, but I am not sure I agree with the solution of the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. This is only for veterans clinics, and I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if there is no discussion, we will take this by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 314) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 247

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 247, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 247 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this is an amendment which would facilitate passage of legislation that would deny pay to the personnel at the Office of Management and Budget for such time as they delay in the statutory requirement for the President to submit a budget for consideration by the Senate.

As we all know, the law requires the President to submit a budget the first Monday in February, but the President has not done so 4 out of the last 5 years, nor will he do so this year reportedly until April. The problem with that is we will finish our work here this week, the House will finish their work, and the President has rendered himself entirely irrelevant.

We know because the House passed the No Budget No Pay bill that it prompted the first budget in the Senate in more than 1,400 days, and that is good, that is progress. We would like to do the same now with the Office of Management and Budget to encourage the President to be relevant to the budget debate and require him to submit his budget on a timely basis.

So I would ask my colleagues for their vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, there is no opposition. We suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 247) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 606 WITHDRAWN

## AMENDMENT NO. 483

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Menendez amendment listed in the previous order, amendment No. 606, be replaced with Udall amendment No. 483.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Amendment No. 606 has been withdrawn.

The clerk will report amendment No. 483.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] for Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, proposes amendment numbered 483.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to hardrock mineral royalty and fee reform)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING HARDROCK MINING REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include provisions relating to budget deficit reduction, establishment of a reclamation fund, imposition of a locatable mineral royalty, revenue sharing with States, and improvements to the permitting process, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 483

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 483, offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. UDALL.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, let me just say that I very much appreciate the help on this amendment from both Senator WYDEN, who is here and is the chairman of the committee, and also Senator MURKOWSKI, who has been working with me on this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if there is no opposition, I would suggest a voice vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand there have been discussions about this, and it is on the agreed list for a voice vote. I would have no objection unless others do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 483) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 689

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 689, offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 689.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, there have been at least three independent studies now recently that underscore that too-big-to-fail is still alive and well, and that too-big-to-fail policies give Wall Street megabanks a subsidy in comparison to their competitors—an unfair advantage, creating an uneven playing field. And not coincidentally, that is why these megabanks dominate the market—the biggest market share ever in history.

This amendment is very simple. It says we should do away with the Federal policies that create that subsidy, the uneven playing field. It doesn't say

we forcibly break up the banks, it doesn't say we tax them, it just says that.

I yield the remainder of my time to Senator BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we ask support for the Vitter-Brown-Corker-Pryor amendment. The community banks of America support it because they know the playing field isn't level.

One real quick statistic. Eighteen years ago, the six biggest U.S. banks had assets equal to 18 percent of GDP. Today it is 65 percent of GDP.

I ask for your support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I don't believe there is any opposition to this amendment. I would ask the Senator if we could have a voice vote on this amendment as well.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, we believe this is an important matter, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At this moment there is not a sufficient second.

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Ayotte	Franken	Murkowski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Barrasso	Graham	Murray
Baucus	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Pryor
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Heller	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Inhofe	Rubio
Cardin	Isakson	Sanders
Carper	Johanns	Schatz
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Coats	Kaine	Sessions
Coburn	King	Shaheen
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Landrieu	Tester
Corker	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Cowan	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 689) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 537

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 537, offered by Mr. TESTER.

Mr. TESTER. I rise on behalf of amendment No. 537.

First of all, I thank Senator COONS and Senator HELLER for cosponsoring this amendment. It would allow the children under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, otherwise known as CHAMP-VA, to remain eligible for coverage until their 26th birthday. These children are the children of veterans who have been rated permanently and totally disabled and children of veterans who have died from a service-connected disability or service-connected disease.

With the enactment of the Affordable Health Care Act, children up to 26 years of age can now be covered on their parents' health insurance if they are unable to receive health insurance from their employers. In contrast to private insurance plans, or TRICARE, children under the CHAMP-VA program are only eligible for coverage until age 18 or 23 if they are a full-time enrolled student. This amendment is offered on their behalf to allow them to be on the CHAMP-VA program up to age 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SESSIONS. This is a budget-neutral reserve fund, and it essentially says, using that language, if the authorizing committee can pay for this bill, it will not be subject to a budget point of order. It should be offset to avoid that. This is certainly a worthy goal. We would like to see if this can be done. It would be a challenge for the authorizers because nothing comes from nothing. It could well end up cutting other veterans benefits. But I think this is a worthy goal. I think the Senator would suggest we take it by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Seeing no opposition, I suggest we take this by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 537) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 535

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 535, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 535.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. TOOMEY. As we know, the ObamaCare bill raises taxes by \$1.2 trillion. Much of that is on middle-income families. One in particular is a tax increase on people who incur and then deduct catastrophic medical expenses.

Imagine a woman slips and falls at home, is seriously injured, runs up huge medical costs which she pays for out her own pocket, and then on top of her personal and physical misery ObamaCare hits her with a double whammy by reducing the amount of medical expenses she is allowed to deduct. Who does this hurt? Disproportionately, middle-income taxpayers; 96 percent of these deductions are for people who earn less than \$200,000. It adds up to \$30 billion over 10 years. Madam President, 60 percent of these deductions are by senior citizens. The fact is the ObamaCare tax increase imposes this tax on people who can least afford it, the sick, elderly, middle-income folks.

My amendment repeals this ill-conceived tax on victims of catastrophic illness and repeals the reconciliation instructions in the budget.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second.

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, again, for our colleagues, the goal of our budget is to tackle our deficit and debt responsibly in a way that works for our middle-class families and our economy. That means a balanced mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue from those who can afford it most.

I remind all Senators every bipartisan group who has examined our budget situation has acknowledged that reality. Simpson-Bowles, the Gang of 6, Domenici-Rivlin—all recommend several times more revenue than the roughly \$600 billion that was generated by the yearend deal. In fact, Simpson-Bowles and the Gang of 6 each recommend well over \$2 trillion in new revenue. So striking this reconciliation instruction, which is what this amendment does, and reducing the revenue level, goes in exactly the wrong direction. I ask for a strong “no” vote and oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 535) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 442

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 442, offered by Mr. CASEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I call up amendment No. 442.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. CASEY. This amendment creates a neutral reserve fund that supports the Edward Byrne memorial justice assistance grants. It helps every one of our States. It has been cut by one-third over the last 2 years. We provide support for local and State law enforcement. The money is used to support innovative, evidence-based approaches to public safety—by way of example, special courts that have new technological innovations to help reduce and fight crime in our communities.

In part, it is supported by—and this is only a partial list—the National Sheriffs' Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Narcotics Officers' Association.

I am grateful for the work that was done by so many people on this amendment—especially Senator GRASSLEY—and urge for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I hope all of us begin to think a little bit

here. We have a lot of votes that have gone forward. Each one seems to be an attempt to spend more money. It sets deficit-neutral reserve funds that require offsets. In my view, we are really thinking too much with a mindset that we have money, and I believe we are in denial about the financial condition of our country. Truly, we should be looking to have more amendments that save some money and use that money to pay down the debt rather than fund some new spending program.

This country is on an unsustainable debt path. We have to get off of it, and it cannot be done all by tax increases. Trust me, we have to have some spending reductions. Our spending rate of growth is more than two times the rate of economic growth, and that really—

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I suggest a voice vote. I appreciate my colleague's work on this amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I believe we can take this by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 442) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 273, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I believe the pending amendment is Coats amendment No. 514.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stands corrected.

AMENDMENT NO. 514

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 514, offered by Mr. COATS of Indiana.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 514. It is a bipartisan amendment with Senator MANCHIN. It clarifies that a Presidential exemption exists for utilities that despite their good-faith efforts have been unable to complete the necessary measures to comply with the standards of the EPA regarding the mercury toxic elements issue. That deadline is 2016.

This amendment does not repeal or weaken the existing standard, the MATS rule. It simply allows powerplants that qualify for a Presidential exemption additional time to finish their upgrades and provides much-needed stability and reliability to the electric grid.

It is the President's decision, and if he sees that a utility is acting in good



faith and needs a little more time to complete it to meet those standards, he can make that decision to provide that additional time.

It is a bipartisan amendment supported by both sides, and I urge our colleagues to vote for this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I strongly oppose this amendment. I agree with the Senator from California, and I yield her my time in opposition.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the Coats amendment allows open-ended exemptions to the mercury air toxic rule. This is not a 1-year extension, it is a permanent extension if any President, now or in the future, simply decides it. It doesn't even require any finding.

Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about mercury. It is dangerous. It is poison. It harms the brain, the nervous system, and childhood development. It is especially damaging to infants and pregnant women. Mercury harms a child's ability to speak, to hear, to walk, to see, and to think. Can't we protect our children?

I want to give my colleagues 11,000 reasons to oppose the Coats amendment. That is how many premature deaths will be avoided with the rule he wants to eviscerate. Just last June we held on this rule. Let's vote no on the Coats amendment.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—53

Ayotte	Blumenthal	Carper
Baldwin	Boxer	Casey
Baucus	Brown	Collins
Begich	Cantwell	Coons
Bennet	Cardin	Cowan

Durbin	Landrieu	Sanders
Feinstein	Leahy	Schatz
Franken	Levin	Schumer
Gillibrand	McCaskill	Shaheen
Hagan	Menendez	Stabenow
Harkin	Merkley	Tester
Heinrich	Mikulski	Udall (CO)
Hirono	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Johnson (SD)	Murray	Warner
Kaine	Nelson	Warren
King	Reed	Whitehouse
Kirk	Reid	Wyden
Klobuchar	Rockefeller	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 514) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 273

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 273, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this amendment would set up a deficit-neutral reserve fund.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HEINRICH be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. CARDIN. It would improve the oral health care for our children who are Medicaid-eligible. We still have major problems. The majority of our children who are Medicaid-eligible have untreated tooth decay, which affects their general health.

Let me respond to my good friend from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS, and tell him why this amendment will not add to the deficit but will save us money.

I will give the example of Deamonte Driver, a 12-year-old who died in my State of Maryland from untreated tooth decay. He needed an \$80 tooth extraction. Instead, we spent \$¼ million dollars in unnecessary operations and he lost his life.

This amendment gives us a chance to find ways to save money in order to expand oral health for our children, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator CARDIN for his hard work. He is correct that oral care for children is important. It does require that it be paid for if a new program is advanced.

I suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, hearing no opposition, I suggest we have a voice vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 273) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 373

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 373, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, under this budget, by the year 2020 we will be spending more every year on interest on our national debt than we spend on our national defense. This is alarming and ought to be a concern to every one of us. This amendment creates a point of order that would address this problem and all similar problems in the future with other budgets that have the same defect.

While we are on this note, I would like to add that I am concerned about the amendment process. I heard from our majority leader a few minutes ago a statement suggesting that he might cut off debate, cut off the amendment process—this after he promised us at the beginning of the week that there would be unlimited amendments. And he repeated that phrase twice.

It is imperative that we finish this job. Each of us was elected to do a job. Each of us deserves to have our amendments called up. We have no business taking a 2-week vacation until we have gone through every amendment that any Senator from either side of the aisle wants to present.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I too am committed to meeting the needs of our military to defend the Nation and our interests abroad. That is exactly what this budget does.

We should not be linking defense funding with unrelated benchmarks. This amendment is unnecessary. The Senate budget does fund defense above net interest in fiscal year 2014 and over both the 5- and 10-year windows.

I recommend that my colleagues oppose the amendment.

Madam President, may I just respond and say that we have been very hard at work here. We have had a number of amendments come before us. All of our staffs are working together to have as many amendments as we can put together for the next group of votes.

Really, I do want to thank all of our Senators. I know everybody has been working really hard to get their amendments up so we can have them in order. I think we are going to keep working on that, and I appreciate everybody's focus.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—46

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

NAYS—53

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 373) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Madam President, a lot of progress has been made. We are doing extremely well. I admire the progress made by the two managers of this bill.

Over the last two decades, after the expiration of debate time on those budget resolutions, the Senate has offered and the Senate disposed of an average of 35 amendments. Today, since the expiration of that debate time on this resolution, we have now disposed of 33 amendments. We have considered and disposed of 44 amendments on the resolution in total, counting those we did yesterday.

We need to continue working. There are a lot of things that people want to have offered. But, you know, there are 400 amendments that have already been filed. Senator Byrd, whom we all revere, said, and I will quote:

I once described vote-aramas as pandemonium, which was the Palace of Satan in Milton's Paradise Lost. But that term fails to describe the ignominy of the Senate when it becomes engulfed in these budget vote carnivals.

So we are doing fine. We are not at the carnival stage yet. Let's proceed and try to finish this with a lot of dignity. I again tell Senator MURRAY and Senator SESSIONS what a good job they have done. We need to proceed to see what else we can get done.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 366, 213, 455, AND 597

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: McCaskill No. 366, Johnson of Wisconsin No. 213, Brown No. 455, and Scott No. 597; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that upon disposition of Scott 597, the majority have the next amendment in order; finally, all these votes be 10-minute votes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be reported en bloc.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes amendments en bloc: for Mrs. MCCASKILL, an amendment numbered 366; for Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, an amendment numbered 213; for Mr. BROWN, an amendment numbered 455; for Mr. SCOTT, an amendment numbered 597.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 366

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to support the transition of servicemembers to the civilian workforce by streamlining the process associated with Federal and State credentialing requirements)

On page 60, line 7, insert "Federal and State" before "credentialing".

AMENDMENT NO. 213

(Purpose: To force Congress to ensure the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare programs)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERING BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT ASSUME THE INSOLVENCY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon whose revenue and outlay assumptions do not assume that Social Security and Medicare will be solvent for the seventy-five years following the year in which the budget resolution is considered.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 455

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to establish a national network for manufacturing innovation that leverages private and public sector investments for proven United States based manufacturing industries)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, advancing competitiveness, improving the speed and infrastructure with which small- and medium-sized enterprises and supply chains commercialize new processes and technologies, and informing industry-driven education and training, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 597

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the prohibition of taxpayer dollars and resources being used to automatically deduct union dues from the pay of Federal employees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROHIBITION OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS AND RESOURCES BEING USED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO AUTOMATICALLY DEDUCT UNION DUES FROM THE PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the prohibition of taxpayer dollars and resources being used by Federal agencies to automatically deduct union dues from the pay of Federal employees without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would add to what the majority leader said. Senators have been very good in helping us work through our list on both sides. We will have some more amendments to be offered in a unanimous consent in a short while once we work through these four.

Again, I would ask all Senators to please work with the leader on your side, Mr. SESSIONS on the Republican side, and myself. We need to know which amendments you have to have votes on so we can start letting Senators know where we are going to end up here. I would ask everybody to continue cooperating with us. I appreciate everybody who has been working so hard.

AMENDMENT NO. 366

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 366 offered by the Senator from Missouri, Mrs. MCCASKILL.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, the budget already includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to assist servicemembers and veterans. It contains a provision supporting the transition of our military to the workforce by recognizing the process is too cumbersome for them in terms of credentialing requirements and licensing requirements.

What my amendment does is it clarifies this section to ensure that a servicemember's military training, education, and experience shall be taken into account for both Federal and State licensing requirements.

These men and women have performed technical jobs in the most difficult circumstances imaginable. We should recognize that and accept their service and their experience and their training and allow them to be easily credentialed when they return home. It helps them so much in the search for jobs.

I would ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, hearing no opposition, I suggest we voice vote this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 366) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 213

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 213, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, I would call up my amendment No. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, this is a very simple amendment. It recognizes I think what most of us recognize; that is, the entitlement programs, Social Security and Medicare, are the primary drivers of our debt and deficit. So it is a very simple amendment. It establishes a budget point of order that any budget resolution that is brought forward that does not count or does not prepare for a 75-year solvency for both Medicare and Social Security would be considered out of order.

We in the next 20 years will be paying out \$5.1 trillion in benefits in excess of what we are bringing in in terms of dedicated revenue through the payroll tax. The unfunded liabilities of Social Security alone are \$20.5 trillion. For

Medicare the unfunded liability is \$42.8 trillion. Those programs must be reformed so they are saved for future generations.

Again, I would hope everybody would support a budget point of order for any budget that does not have a 75-year solvency for Medicare and Social Security.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, Social Security and Medicare have played a very critical role in providing a foundation of financial security and health care for millions upon millions of Americans over the decades. Democrats are committed to preserving and protecting them. When analyzing the solvency of these programs, it must be over more than just a 10-year budget window; we must measure them over a 75-year window.

This amendment, however, does nothing to protect the integrity of the Medicare and Social Security trust funds, and it does not do anything to improve their solvency. We should have a debate about the solvency of these programs but not on the budget resolution.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—46

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

NAYS—53

Baldwin	Feinstein	McCaskill
Baucus	Franken	Menendez
Begich	Gillibrand	Merkley
Bennet	Hagan	Mikulski
Blumenthal	Harkin	Murphy
Boxer	Heinrich	Murray
Brown	Heitkamp	Nelson
Cantwell	Hirono	Pryor
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Carper	Kaine	Reid
Casey	King	Rockefeller
Coons	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cowan	Landrieu	Schatz
Donnelly	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Levin	Shaheen

Stabenow	Udall (NM)	Whitehouse
Tester	Warner	Wyden
Udall (CO)	Warren	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 213) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion upon the table.

The motion to lay upon the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 455

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to amendment No. 455, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise and join with Senator BLUNT in a bipartisan amendment, No. 455, in support of a national network for manufacturing innovation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from the National Association of Manufacturers, Semiconductor Industry Association, United Auto Workers, and others.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,  
March 22, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)—the nation's largest industrial trade association—appreciates efforts in the Senate this year to advance a budget plan for fiscal year 2014 (S. Con. Res. 8). Manufacturers remain extremely concerned about the impact of the historically high levels of the federal deficit and the national debt on manufacturing and the overall U.S. economy and believe that we need a budget plan that puts us on a path to reduce the federal debt and deficits, focusing both on real and immediate spending cuts and longer term structural changes to our nation's entitlement programs. In addition to advocating for debt and deficit reduction, the NAM also supports comprehensive tax reform to promote economic growth and U.S. competitiveness.

Unfortunately, the budget blueprint approved by the Senate Budget Committee on March 15, 2013, does not adequately address needed spending cuts and also would impose roughly \$1 trillion in job-killing, anti-growth tax increases on the American economy. During the Senate's consideration of the budget plan, we strongly urge you to support the amendments described below that would improve the Senate budget and reject the amendments below that would make the plan even more anti-growth and anti-manufacturing.

PROMOTING U.S. MANUFACTURING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

NAM members strongly believe that our current tax system discourages economic growth and U.S. competitiveness and that comprehensive, revenue neutral reform of our current system is critical to our nation's economic future. In contrast, tax reform that increases the tax burden on U.S. businesses and individuals will discourage job creation, investment and economic growth. Consequently, we strongly support amendments that would eliminate provisions in S. Con. Res. 8, as approved by the Budget Committee, that call for more than \$1 trillion in tax increases on American businesses and families and allow Congress to advance pro-

growth, revenue-neutral tax reform that would spur job creation and investment. We also support an amendment offered by Senator John Cornyn (R-TX) that would require a supermajority of the Senate to increase tax rates on businesses and individuals.

In addition, it is critically important that tax reform addresses the tax treatment of both corporations and individuals. Thus, Manufacturers oppose an amendment filed by Senator Rob Portman (R-OH) that provides for corporate-only reform. About two-thirds of manufacturers are organized as “flow throughs” and pay taxes at individual rates. Any tax reform effort that includes a higher tax burden for these flow through companies would negatively impact their ability to invest in their business and create and retain jobs.

Manufacturers also have long led the business community in providing quality retirement benefits, including defined benefit and defined contribution plans to their employees. As such, we support amendments offered by Senator Richard Burr (R-NC) that would protect these benefits from being a source of revenue for additional government spending.

Innovation is the lifeblood of U.S. manufacturing and the NAM strongly supports policies to ensure that manufacturers in the United States are the world’s leading innovators. To that end, the NAM strongly supports an amendment filed by Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) that would preserve and make permanent the R&D tax credit. A strong, permanent and competitive R&D credit will allow manufacturers in the United States to continue as global leaders in technology and innovation.

Similarly, NAM strongly supports public-private partnerships that promote manufacturing research efforts focused on base-building technologies and processes. The NAM supports an amendment to the budget blueprint filed by Senators Sherrod Brown (D-OH) and Roy Blunt (R-MO) that will accelerate the development of advanced manufacturing technologies without adding to the deficit. This will result in innovative products going to market faster, providing an overall benefit to the U.S. economy.

NAM also supports an amendment filed by Senator John Thune (R-SD) that will allow for the full and permanent repeal of the estate tax. Many small and medium size manufacturers are family-owned businesses. Planning for and paying estate taxes take away important resources from these important job creators. While NAM supports the reforms of the existing system enacted at the beginning of 2013, our long term goal is full repeal of the estate tax, which is the best solution to protect family-owned businesses from the estate tax.

Manufacturers however, oppose efforts to increase taxes on U.S. global companies. Current U.S. tax laws make it difficult for U.S. companies with worldwide operations to thrive and compete in the global marketplace. If American companies cannot compete abroad, where 95 percent of the world’s consumers are located, the U.S. economy suffers from the loss of both foreign markets and domestic jobs that support foreign operations. In order to make U.S. multinationals more competitive, the NAM supports the adoption of a competitive territorial tax system. In contrast, increasing taxes on U.S. companies with overseas operations will make it even more difficult for them to compete in the world markets while reducing their ability to grow and add jobs in the United States.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

NAM members also support amendments to the budget plan that would improve our current tax system by eliminating job-kill-

ing taxes on manufacturers. In particular, amendments that would eliminate several tax increases that were included in the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Thus, we applaud the Senate for recently approving, a bipartisan amendment offered by Senators Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) that would repeal the current 2.3 percent excise tax on the gross sales of medical devices.

By increasing the costs of medical devices, the excise tax—which took effect at the beginning of 2013—hurts the device manufacturers and their workers and also stifles the research and innovation that leads to the development of medical products that contribute to the health and well-being of all Americans. The additional costs imposed by the tax make it more difficult for U.S. medical device manufacturers to compete in the global marketplace and threaten U.S. jobs, investment and our nation’s leadership in life sciences.

Manufacturers also support an amendment to repeal the Health Insurance Tax (HIT) included in ACA filed by Senator John Barrasso (R-WY). This new tax—to be levied on health insurance companies beginning in 2014—will have the unintended result of increasing costs for many small manufacturers that provide health care benefits for their employees.

Recent analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation confirms that this additional cost for insurers will be shifted to consumers in the form of higher premiums for private coverage. Manufacturers will bear a significant burden from this cost shifting. Based on a recent survey, nearly 70 percent of NAM’s small and medium-size manufacturers buy health insurance in the fully insured marketplace. Moreover, this additional cost for companies will be on top of the nearly 10 percent average health insurance premium increases experienced last year by NAM’s small and medium-size members.

The NAM also supports an amendment offered by Senator Dan Coats (R-IN) that would repeal the 3.8 percent investment income surtax also included in ACA. The investment income surtax, which took effect at the beginning of the year, will discourage savings and investment. When the surtax is added to the recent increases in the top tax rates on investment income, some taxpayers now pay a tax rate of 23.8 percent on capital gains and dividends, up from just 15 percent last year, an increase of over 50 percent. Manufacturers strongly support the repeal of this burdensome tax that would increase the tax on savings and investment and reduce the amount of capital business owners have available to invest in their companies. This tax will ultimately result in the loss of vital funds needed for business operations and job creation and for that reason we support the amendment.

Beyond the tax area, the NAM also supports amendments that address other shortcomings of the ACA. Specifically, the NAM supports amendments filed by Senator Susan Collins (R-ME) to clarify the definition of a full-time employee, Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS) to protect patients from using data collected as a part of comparative effectiveness to deny coverage under federal programs, and Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) to repeal the employer mandate.

#### REDUCING COSTS FOR MANUFACTURERS

The NAM also supports several amendments that protect manufacturers against new costs and burdens that would result from poorly-crafted proposals to regulate greenhouse gases (GHGs). It is, on average, 20 percent more expensive to manufacture in the U.S. than any of our nine largest trading partners. Placing unilateral restrictions or prices on U.S. GHG emissions, without simi-

lar regulations in operation on other major emitting nations, would further disadvantage U.S. manufacturers, costing jobs in the process. For instance, a recent NAM study performed by NERA Economic Consulting found that a carbon tax would impact millions of jobs and result in higher prices for natural gas, electricity, gasoline and other energy commodities. The resulting net negative effect on consumption, investment and jobs would lead to lower federal revenues from taxes on capital and labor. The NAM study concluded that any revenue raised by a carbon tax would be far outweighed by the negative impacts to the overall economy. Thus, the NAM supports an amendment filed by Senators Roy Blunt (R-MO) and John Thune (R-SD) opposing a carbon tax.

Manufacturers also support an amendment filed by Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) that would protect exports from being blocked by unnecessarily broad environmental reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Expanding NEPA to consider the environmental impact of the cargo could hamper exports of many products, such as cars, tractors, agricultural products, electronics, toys, steel, chemicals, pumps, air conditioners, elevators and airplanes.

The NAM also supports amendments that would enhance North American oil and gas production by expanding and accelerating onshore and offshore leasing, as well as an amendment from Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY) that would support final approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Construction of Keystone XL would create tens of thousands of jobs and keep manufacturers competitive by providing access to crude oil from Canada and the Bakken formation in North Dakota and Montana. The states along the pipeline route have signed off and the federal government has found that the project will have no significant environmental impact. The delay and red tape for this project is inexcusable; Keystone XL is shovel-ready and it is time for Washington to get out of the way.

In addition, an amendment from Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) supported by Manufacturers would encourage diversification of sources of rare earth metals. Rare earths are used in a wide range of applications, from consumer electronics to renewable energy to aerospace and defense. Until very recently, the U.S. imported 100 percent of the rare earths it used; as recently as 2009, 96 percent of this supply came from China. Senator Manchin’s amendment, would encourage research into alternative technologies, promotion of recycling, and encouragement of domestic production.

#### U.S. TRADE AND COMPETITIVENESS

The NAM also supports amendments that will strengthen America’s competitiveness in the global economy through trade agreements and export promotion. In particular, the NAM supports amendments offered by Senators Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and Rob Portman (R-OH) to renew trade promotion authority to enable the United States to negotiate and implement trade agreements eliminating barriers to greater access overseas. The NAM also supports amendments offered by Senator Hatch to maintain a strong Office of the United States Trade Representative and to strengthen U.S. government efforts promoting innovation and protecting intellectual property rights worldwide. Similarly, Manufacturers support amendments offered by Senators Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH), Kay Hagan (D-NC) and Deb Fischer (R-NE) that would make improvements in export promotion programs for small businesses to increase commercial opportunities and support and grow jobs.

In contrast, the NAM strongly opposes amendments that will undermine manufacturers’ ability to access foreign markets. In

particular, NAM opposes an amendment offered by Senator Mike Lee (R-UT) to defund the Export-Import Bank, which supported more than \$170 billion in exports in 2012. Manufacturers also oppose an amendment offered by Senator Lee to defund efforts to implement the Law of the Sea Convention that is an important framework, which the United States should ratify, to help create greater predictability for offshore resources and operations.

OVERREACH BY NLRB

Manufacturers have long been concerned about the direction of the National Labor Relations Board and recent actions taken by the NLRB have borne out this concern. In particular, manufacturers are troubled by the Board's apparent disregard for the U.S. Appeals Court decision regarding the appointments of Members Block and Griffin. The New Process Steel Supreme Court ruling made it clear that the NLRB cannot make case decisions or promulgate regulations without a properly constituted quorum of at least three members. As such, the NAM supports the amendments by Senators Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Lindsey Graham (R-SC) and Ted Cruz (R-TX) to limit funds available to the Board.

In addition, the Board's decision in the Specialty Healthcare case represents the most dramatic change in labor law in over 70 years. The decision sets forth a new standard for determining which group or "unit" of employees will vote in the union election. By establishing a new standard, a bargaining unit could now consist of as little as two employees. These "micro-unions," could cripple an employer's ability to manage operations in an effective way, and result in a facilities operating with separate unions for each job category and unnecessarily dividing employees. The NAM support, an amendment filed by Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA) to prevent funding to implement the new "micro union" standard established by the Specialty Healthcare decision.

ADDRESSING MANUFACTURERS' WORKFORCE NEEDS

World-class manufacturing demands world-class talent. Today, approximately 600,000 manufacturing jobs go unfilled because of the skills gap. Consequently, NAM members strongly support efforts to develop a more productive and skilled workforce. S.Con.Res. 8, as approved by the Budget Committee, does include provisions for improving workforce development, job training, and other reemployment programs. Manufacturers also support an amendment offered by Senator Kay Hagan (D-NC) that would also ensure that training leading to nationally recognized post-secondary credentials would be included as one of the goals of new legislation. This amendment clearly supports NAM's policy of promoting industry-recognized credentials.

CONCLUSION

Thank you in advance for considering the views of Manufacturers. Clearly our nation's fiscal challenges are of critical importance not only to the future of American manufacturers, but to the future of all Americans. NAM members firmly believe that it is critically important that any budget blueprint puts the country on a path to address these important issues without raising taxes on manufacturers and other job creators and American families. We look forward to working with you and your colleagues to advance a pro-growth, pro-manufacturing budget plan for fiscal 2014 that addresses our nation's fiscal challenges.

Sincerely,

ARIC NEWHOUSE,  
Senior Vice President.

SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY  
ASSOCIATION,  
March 22, 2013.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.  
Hon. ROY BLUNT  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN AND SENATOR BLUNT: I am writing in support of the bipartisan amendment to establish a deficit neutral reserve fund for the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation. This network could bring together industry, universities and community colleges with federal, state and local governments to accelerate manufacturing innovation.

Public-private institutes to leverage investments in industrially-relevant manufacturing technologies bridge the gap between basic research and product development, provide shared assets to help companies all along the supply chain and can stimulate manufacturing and jobs. Including students from community colleges and training facilities to build a workforce with the advanced manufacturing skills we need.

We have seen the success of regional hubs in California, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, and Texas, and we believe this model can be broadened locally and replicated nationally to create manufacturing excellence. Manufacturing is an important sector in our economy, and continued U.S. leadership in advanced manufacturing of semiconductors is in the national interest.

Given the bipartisan nature of this deficit neutral amendment, we believe it should be accepted by the Senate.

Sincerely,

BRIAN TOOHEY,  
President & CEO.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED  
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL  
IMPLEMENT WORKERS  
OF AMERICA—UAW,

March 22, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the UAW's more than one million active and retired members, I write to strongly urge you to vote in support of the Amendment to S. Con. Res. 8 to be offered by Senators Brown (D-OH) and Blunt (R-MO) when it comes to the floor. The purpose of this amendment is to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to create a national network for manufacturing innovation. This fund would bring together the best minds from both the private and public sectors. It would create joint public-private institutes that leverage investments to broadly applicable manufacturing technologies for proven manufacturing industries within the United States.

This type of partnership would help bridge the gap between basic research and product development, and provide assets to particularly help small and medium sized manufacturing businesses access cutting-edge technology and create a 21st century pipeline for the education and training of students and workers in advanced manufacturing skills.

A strong manufacturing sector is critical for our economy. The resurgence of the domestic auto industry has proven the resiliency of the U.S. manufacturing base, leading the way towards the retention and creation of tens of thousands of good-paying middle class jobs through the worst of the recession. The continued growth and prosperity of manufacturing sectors like the auto industry is directly reliant on a shared public and private commitment to developing the next generation of advanced manufacturing technologies.

In our global economy, we must invest in the next generation of workers and technologies to ensure we remain a step ahead of our international competitors. Similar pro-

grams have already been successfully deployed in other countries. The model offered by this amendment would help fill the gap between U.S. manufacturing innovation and infrastructure and we must not miss the opportunity to make a vital investment in the future of our domestic manufacturing sector. We strongly encourage you to vote in support of the Brown-Blunt amendment when it comes to the floor.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,  
Legislative Director.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR  
MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY,  
March 21, 2013.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,  
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.  
Hon. ROY BLUNT,  
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS BROWN AND BLUNT: On behalf of AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology and its over 600 member companies, I am writing in support of your efforts to establish a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation (NNMI) by offering an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2014 Senate Budget Resolution. I sit on the board of the pilot institute, the National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute, located in Youngstown.

AMT members are the innovators that make modern life possible—from lightning speed communications and efficient transportation to revolutionary medical procedures and new energy exploration. In order to continue to outpace, out-innovate and outperform the global competition, these mostly small and medium-sized companies need access to the best research tools and talent available. Public-private collaborations, such as the NNMI, that focus on providing that access and accelerating the pace of manufacturing technology innovation are the best multipliers of government R&D dollars.

AMT's Manufacturing Mandate urges a three-pronged approach to strengthening manufacturing for economic growth and job creation. First, increase global competitiveness by leveling the playing field for U.S. businesses. Next, build an educated and trained manufacturing workforce that can meet the challenges of today's workplace. AMT calls it the "Smartforce." Finally, support R&D and rapid innovation through collaborative projects like the NNMI.

Thank you again for your leadership in getting this exciting program off the ground. I am taking the liberty of letting AMT members in Ohio and Missouri know of your support for boosting American manufacturing innovation.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS K. WOODS,  
President.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,  
March 22, 2013.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,  
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of The Ohio State University, I write to express my support for your amendment to the FY 2014 Senate Budget Resolution to establish a deficit-neutral funding source for the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation (NNMI). I appreciate your continued support of manufacturing in Ohio, and of the University's role as a critical industry partner. The proposed NNMI will address critical needs facing our nation's manufacturing sector and represents a worthwhile and necessary investment by our federal government.

Manufacturing continues to be a vital sector of our economy and one that must adapt

to the evolving structures of industry, workforce, and technology on which it depends. The NNMI targets these needs by bringing together industry, government, and academia to enhance our national competitiveness and economic security. This is especially important to a state like Ohio, which is ranked third in the nation in manufacturing output and workforce, and in which nearly 18% of the state domestic product is impacted by manufacturing.

As you know, Ohio State's land-grant mission drives our faculty to engage in research that supports industry from discovery to deployment. As a national leader in industry-sponsored research, Ohio State recognizes the importance of connecting with those who will help carry scientific discoveries beyond the laboratory, and the NNMI will foster these partnerships across the country. Equally important is our commitment to training and ensuring opportunities for the next generation of manufacturing innovators. The NNMI will strengthen our manufacturing sector to better serve not only today's workforce but tomorrow's as well.

I recognize that leaders in Washington are making difficult choices regarding the federal budget. I believe this is the right time for establishing a national resource such as the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation. The Ohio State University firmly supports this effort.

Sincerely,

E. GORDON GEE,  
*President.*

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, this amendment—the NNMI—offers one commonsense approach by partnering with private industry to bring together companies, small businesses, research institutions, and community colleges so we can outinnovate the rest of the world.

I ask for its support and yield the remainder of my time to Senator BLUNT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I would just say these entities would allow basic research to come together with product development. It brings the research elements, the universities, and others together with private capital, and even some government agencies, in ways that let things happen that wouldn't otherwise.

I am pleased to join Senator BROWN in offering this to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator in Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I don't believe there is any opposition to this amendment and I ask that we take it by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 455) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ENZI. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 597

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 597

offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, my amendment is very simple. It prohibits the automatic deduction of union dues from Federal employees' paychecks.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senator has yielded back his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would speak in opposition.

Gains in quality, productivity, and efficiency year after year, in department after department, would not have been possible without the reasonable and sound use of collective bargaining and worker representation. This amendment is just another in a long line of attempts to kill public-sector unions—unions that represent and ensure quality public service.

I strongly recommend that my colleagues oppose this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—43

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

NAYS—56

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Baucus	Hagan	Moran
Begich	Harkin	Murkowski
Bennet	Heinrich	Murphy
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Murray
Boxer	Hirono	Nelson
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Cardin	King	Reid
Carper	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Casey	Landrieu	Sanders
Coons	Leahy	Schatz
Cowan	Levin	Schumer
Donnelly	Manchin	Shaheen
Durbin	McCaskey	Stabenow
Feinstein	Menendez	Tester
Franken	Merkley	

Udall (CO)	Warner	Whitehouse
Udall (NM)	Warren	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 597) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CARDIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 706, 359, 705, 614, 696, 187, 619,  
AND 152 EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: Cardin No. 706, Inhofe No. 359, Menendez No. 705, Sessions No. 614, Merkley No. 696, Roberts No. 187, Menendez No. 619, Portman No. 152; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; upon disposition of Portman No. 152, the majority have the next amendment in order; all these votes be 10 minutes; and we report them en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], proposes for Mr. CARDIN, amendment numbered 706; for Mr. INHOFE, amendment numbered 359; for Mr. MENENDEZ, amendment numbered 705; for Mr. SESSIONS, amendment numbered 614; for Mr. MERKLEY, amendment numbered 696; for Mr. ROBERTS, amendment numbered 187; for Mr. MENENDEZ, amendment numbered 619; for Mr. PORTMAN, amendment numbered 152.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 706

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that any carbon emissions standards must be cost effective, based on the best available science, and benefit low-income and middle class families)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURE THAT ANY CARBON EMISSIONS STANDARDS MUST BE COST EFFECTIVE, BASED ON THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE, AND BENEFIT LOW-INCOME AND MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to carbon emission standards, that any such standards must be cost effective, based on best available science and benefit low-income and middle class families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 359

(Purpose: To reduce spending and decrease the risk of drastic energy price increases by prohibiting further greenhouse gas regulations for the purposes of addressing climate change)

- On page 20, line 19, reduce the amount by \$26,000,000.
- On page 20, line 20, reduce the amount by \$10,000,000.
- On page 20, line 23, reduce the amount by \$26,000,000.
- On page 20, line 24, reduce the amount by \$22,000,000.
- On page 21, line 2, reduce the amount by \$27,000,000.
- On page 21, line 3, reduce the amount by \$26,000,000.
- On page 21, line 6, reduce the amount by \$27,000,000.
- On page 21, line 7, reduce the amount by \$27,000,000.
- On page 21, line 10, reduce the amount by \$28,000,000.
- On page 21, line 11, reduce the amount by \$27,000,000.
- On page 21, line 14, reduce the amount by \$28,000,000.
- On page 21, line 15, reduce the amount by \$28,000,000.
- On page 21, line 18, reduce the amount by \$29,000,000.
- On page 21, line 19, reduce the amount by \$28,000,000.
- On page 21, line 22, reduce the amount by \$29,000,000.
- On page 21, line 23, reduce the amount by \$29,000,000.
- On page 22, line 2, reduce the amount by \$30,000,000.
- On page 22, line 3, reduce the amount by \$29,000,000.
- On page 22, line 6, reduce the amount by \$30,000,000.
- On page 22, line 7, reduce the amount by \$30,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 705

(Purpose: To address the eligibility criteria for certain undocumented immigrant individuals with respect to certain health insurance plans)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR CERTAIN UNLAWFUL IMMIGRANT INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to limiting undocumented immigrants from qualifying for federally subsidized health insurance coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 614

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-reduction reserve fund to achieve savings by prohibiting illegal immigrants or illegal immigrants granted legal status from qualifying for federally subsidized health care)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS BY PROHIBITING ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS OR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS GRANTED LEGAL STATUS FROM QUALIFYING FOR FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED HEALTH CARE.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings in health care that may be related to prohibiting illegal immigrants or aliens who were unlawfully present in the United States prior to receiving a grant of legal immigration status from qualifying for Medicaid or the exchange subsidies established by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119), without raising revenues, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

AMENDMENT NO. 696

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to facilitate the criminal prosecutions of financial institutions operating in the United States, regardless of size)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE NO FINANCIAL INSTITUTION IS ABOVE THE LAW REGARDLESS OF SIZE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to criminal liability of a financial institution operating in the United States, which may include measures to address the criminal prosecution of a large financial institution operating in the United States or executives of a large financial institution operating in the United States, including for wrongdoing relating to money laundering or violation of sanctions laws, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 187

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for promotional or marketing materials promoting the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its benefits)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT MARKETING MATERIALS RELATING TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other

appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that prohibit the use of funds for promotional or marketing materials promoting the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its benefits, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 619

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to helping homeowners and small businesses mitigate against flood loss)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HELPING HOMEOWNERS AND SMALL BUSINESSES MITIGATE AGAINST FLOOD LOSS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing better coordination among flood mitigation programs to meet the unmet mitigation needs of homeowners and small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 152

(Purpose: To provide reconciliation instructions to reduce the deficit by \$63,860,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 . MEDICAL MALPRACTICE REFORM.**

- (a) MODIFICATION OF FUNCTIONAL LEVELS.—
- (1) FUNCTION 920.—The levels for function 920 in this resolution are amended by—
- (A) reducing the budget authority for each fiscal year by—
- (i) \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
- (ii) \$880,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
- (iii) \$3,070,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
- (iv) \$5,240,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
- (v) \$6,510,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
- (vi) \$6,980,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
- (vii) \$7,450,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
- (viii) \$8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
- (ix) \$8,570,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
- (x) \$9,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2023; and
- (B) reducing the outlays for each fiscal year by—
- (i) \$100,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
- (ii) \$880,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
- (iii) \$3,070,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
- (iv) \$5,240,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
- (v) \$6,510,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
- (vi) \$6,980,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
- (vii) \$7,450,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
- (viii) \$8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
- (ix) \$8,570,000,000 in fiscal year 2022;
- (x) \$9,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.
- (2) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The levels for Federal revenues in this resolution are amended by increasing the level for each fiscal year by—
- (A) \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;
- (B) \$90,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
- (C) \$350,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
- (D) \$640,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
- (E) \$730,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
- (F) \$1,010,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
- (G) \$1,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
- (H) \$1,230,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
- (I) \$1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and

(J) \$1,380,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(b) RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$110,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 and \$63,860,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 706

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 706, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have two amendments that are going to be considered, one I am offering, one Senator INHOFE is offering.

Senator INHOFE's amendment is a rather extreme amendment. It cuts the funds to the Environmental Protection Agency and basically prohibits them from regulating carbon emissions. I would hope most of us would consider that a rather extreme position to take, to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting the environment.

My amendment is an amendment that says the carbon emissions standards must be cost-effective—and we all agree they should be cost-effective—it should be based upon best-available science and benefit low-income and middle-class families. I would hope we can all agree on the amendment I would offer, and I would hope we would do that and allow the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out its critical mission on behalf of the people of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to ask one question of the author. First of all, this does not authorize the EPA to regulate in any way. This sets the standards. Is that correct?

Mr. CARDIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I support this amendment. I suggest we voice vote it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 706) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 359

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the amendment numbered 359, offered by Mr. INHOFE of Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, people at home are going out of business every day—I think everybody knows that—from the overregulation that is out there. A lot of people talk about the problem with the taxes. I contend that the imposition of these regulations is even worse than the taxes. And

this regulation does one thing: It stops the EPA from having the jurisdiction over the regulation of carbon.

Madam President, I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, Senator INHOFE's amendment will cut money from the Environmental Protection Agency that has already gone through, I think, three rounds of cuts from sequestration, and then prevents it from carrying out its mission to regulate our environment.

It is a very extreme approach. We have already approved the Cardin amendment that establishes the right standards for regulating carbon emissions.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Inhofe amendment, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, did I have 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, he has 30 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. They have been trying to regulate carbon now legislatively for 10 years and have been unable to do it. I actually had a bill up where we got 50 votes, but it took a 60-vote threshold to make it happen. So we know the votes are here and the people are concerned about the regulation.

I would only leave you with a quote from Dr. Richard Lindzen from MIT, who said that regulating carbon is the bureaucrat's dream. "If you regulate carbon, you regulate life."

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

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest you vote in favor of this amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, has all time been used on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator MURRAY has 30 seconds.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me point out that the framework that is set up to protect our health has to be based upon best science, it has to protect low-income and middle-income families, and it has to be done in a cost-effective way. That should be our mission, and that is what we have already approved.

I would urge us to reject the Inhofe amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think I had 5 seconds remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 359) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 705

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 705, offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, is my amendment called up, No. 705?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is pending.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this side-by-side with Senator SESSIONS is very straightforward. It restates current law. Let me repeat that. It restates current law, which already explicitly excludes undocumented immigrants who are in this country from obtaining benefits such as tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies when obtaining health insurance coverage.

We debated this policy at length during health care reform, and this exemption was included in the final bill to address concerns of some of our Republican colleagues that undocumented immigrants would somehow be able to



receive the benefits we included in the law. That is why we specifically and explicitly excluded them from being able to gain this type of coverage.

Finally, addressing the issues of immigrant families is currently being done in a bipartisan fashion. The last thing we need to do in this budget process is to try to muck that up.

This is not a great way to do your outreach to the Hispanic and immigrant community. I urge our colleagues just to stay with present law. Let's restate it once again, support our amendment, and reject the Sessions amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator's amendment restates current law. I have no objection to that. I would accept that. But the question is and what has been suggested in the paper from what I have seen is that if a person is in our country illegally and they are rewarded with some legal status, do they then immediately become eligible for Federal health care benefits? It is a different situation than somebody who came legally and has legal status.

So I would say I would accept a voice vote on this.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SESSIONS. My amendment will deal with the next question.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe there is no opposition. If we could take a voice vote on this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate? Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 705) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 614

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There now is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 614, offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, under current law, if a person is here unlawfully and becomes "lawfulized," in some fashion, they then become qualified for this program. That is what we are talking about. So the question is, Should they then become qualified for ObamaCare or Medicaid? I think the answer is no. I think that is what people have said they believe.

My amendment would simply say that if you are here illegally, did not enter legally, and you get a lawful status in the United States, you then do not qualify for the Federal programs of ObamaCare and Medicaid.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New Jersey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, nothing changes present law, and nothing is contemplated to change—which I think the Group of 8 wouldn't mind me saying—what the Senator is concerned about in our negotiations. It would

have to come before this body before, in fact, it could be changed.

The current law is very clear. They do not have access to any of the benefits that the Senator is worried about because present law prohibits an undocumented immigrant from having access to those benefits. That is why this is unnecessary. It is just the need of some to have an immigration amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—43

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

NAYS—56

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 614) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 696

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 696, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, under the American system of justice where Lady Justice is blindfolded, there should never be a prosecution-free zone. But that is what the Department of Justice announced there is on Tuesday, December 11 of last year. They said they would fine but they would not indict and they would not prosecute Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation for laundering \$800 million in illicit drug money; for laundering \$600 million in transactions that violated U.S. sanctions against Iran, Sudan, Cuba, and other countries against American law; and for allowing \$200 trillion to bypass the sanctions and money-laundering filters.

As the New York Times reported, the Department of Justice decided not to indict HSBC "over concerns that criminal charges could jeopardize one of the world's largest banks, ultimately destabilizing the global financial system." Our Attorney General repeated this justification on March 6, 2013, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, saying: I am concerned that the size of some of these institutions becomes so large, it does become difficult to prosecute them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 20 more seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, is there opposition?

Mr. SESSIONS. How much time?

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask for 20 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. Twenty seconds.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you.

Too-big-to-jail is wrong under our Constitution. It promises equality under the law. Let's send a strong message by supporting this.

I thank my Republican sponsors, Senators GRASSLEY, HELLER, CORNYN, and SHELBY; and Democrats TESTER, WARREN, BEGICH, and LEVIN; and our Independent Senators, SANDERS and KING.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, there may be someone else here, but I have prosecuted banks before and big institutions and put some people in jail. But we have—this is serious. I don't think the deficit reserve fund is the way to go about it, frankly, but it is an issue worthy of discussion. It should be brought up in the authorizing committee—the Judiciary Committee—and considered. And I am very inclined to believe we have had too little prosecution in these cases. But I think the right thing to do is to take this by voice vote. People can decide how they want to vote on it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe there is no opposition. We can take it by a voice vote. Senator MERKLEY has asked for a loud vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 696) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 187

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes of debate divided equally on amendment No. 187.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this amendment would prohibit funds for promotional and marketing materials that promote the affordable health care act and its benefits at taxpayer expense.

According to HHS's own documents obtained by the House Ways and Means Committee, which issued the subpoena last year, HHS spent almost \$52 million in behalf of the affordable health care act public relations work using outside contractors. That is just not right. When the media is reporting more and more problems, more costs, more regulations, more lost jobs, higher premiums, this is a gratuitous use of taxpayer dollars. It sets a very bad precedent for the Department of Health and Human Services stretching the truth, at best, at public expense.

This administration should not be using American taxpayer dollars to fund marketing and promotional campaigns promoting a law and regulations that a majority of Americans oppose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this ought to be known as the Harry Potter invisibility cloak amendment.

Anyone who has read "Harry Potter" knows he had this invisibility cloak he put over himself and people couldn't see him. They have tried 36 separate times to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. They can't do that, so now they want to put an invisibility cloak over it.

The Roberts amendment says we can't tell people, for example, that their kids can stay on their policy until they are 26; we can't tell people that now they can get coverage even though they have a preexisting condition; we can't tell people they can go on the exchange starting this October, where they can get good health care.

Let's vote down the Harry Potter invisibility cloak amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, I accept it on a voice vote. Harry Potter accepts it on a voice vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 187) was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBERTS. I respectfully ask the Parliamentarian if the official Senate decibel meter indicates that the ruling by the distinguished Parliamentarian that the count—or that the vote was not accurate on the last vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes had it.

Mr. ROBERTS. Perhaps a hearing problem.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 619

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 619, offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this amendment would allow for better coordination of our flood mitigation programs to meet the unmet needs of victims of disaster.

As homeowners along the Jersey Shore seek to recover from Superstorm Sandy, they are not just faced with the task of rebuilding, they also have to comply with new, incredibly costly elevation requirements. Seniors who have lived in their modest homes their entire lives now face tens of thousands of dollars in unanticipated costs, all in addition to the costs of rebuilding. And while there are Federal programs available to help coordination among these programs, it is incredibly poor and leads to a lot of victims never being helped. For example, there are hazard mitigation grants available, but homeowners will lose eligibility if they begin work before their application was approved, even if they complied with every other rule and regulation.

My amendment would allow coordination and fine tuning of these mitigation programs so they operate more effectively and meet the unmet needs of disaster victims. The amendment would not cost any money, nor would it add another penny to the deficit. It just encourages the use of current programs in a more wise and coordinated fashion.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think we can accept this by a voice vote.

I would note that the House has non-reserved funds. The Senate now has about 50 we have adopted already. We have reserve funds adopted for education, clean energy, infrastructure, farm payments, food stamps, health care, pensions, housing, tooth decay, and now homeowners. So these create 50 ways to pass taxes more easily. It turns the budget discipline, if we don't watch it, into mush and makes it difficult to maintain the integrity of the Budget Act and avoids really in some ways the hard work of setting priorities.

So I think we should do this by voice vote, but I did want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that reserve funds too readily used can undermine the integrity of the budget process.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 619) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 152

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 152 offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment that actually saves some money. It is an amendment that instructs the Judiciary Committee to produce savings of over \$60 billion by cutting back on frivolous lawsuits through medical malpractice reform.

Today, patients and physicians alike are held hostage by a broken medical liability system that continues to incentivize defensive medicine, which leads to a lot of wasteful spending and unnecessary tests and studies. PricewaterhouseCoopers has released a study showing that the estimated cost of this defensive medicine is about \$210 billion a year.

Comprehensive medical malpractice reform has been proposed by Simpson-Bowles, by Rivlin-Domenici, and by other bipartisan deficit-reduction groups. It has also been examined in depth as a means for deficit reduction by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In fact, CBO has told us that sensible medical malpractice reform could reduce the deficit by over \$62 billion over 10 years. CBO also points out that comprehensive reform could alleviate shortages of certain kinds of physicians around the country.

The amendment provides maximum flexibility for the Judiciary Committee in allowing the committee to determine the best way to achieve deficit reduction by reforming the current system. This flexibility, by the way, includes the ability to enact reforms that

would only come into effect if States fail to act.

ObamaCare has not only led to rising insurance premiums and loss of employer-sponsored coverage, but it has also missed this crucial opportunity to reduce costs while maintaining access to critical specialty care.

So let's set this reform in motion today as part of this budget process.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. Malpractice premiums and claims and claim payouts have all gone down in recent years, partly as a result of steps many of our States have already taken. Caps on noneconomic damages limit compensation for such harms as loss of fertility or severe disfigurement or loss of mobility or loss of a spouse or a child. Damage caps do not affect frivolous lawsuits but, rather, impact the victims who have been seriously injured and who would win in court.

Tort reform can create enormous risks and costs. Immunizing health care providers against accountability for their mistakes risks increasing the number of preventable medical errors.

So this proposal would cut losses for insurers by curbing our patients' right to sue, but there is no requirement in these proposals for insurers to pass on any savings to the doctors who pay their premiums.

So I recommend a "no" vote on this amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—43

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

NAYS—56

Baldwin	Cantwell	Donnelly
Baucus	Cardin	Durbin
Begich	Carper	Feinstein
Bennet	Casey	Franken
Blumenthal	Coburn	Gillibrand
Boxer	Coons	Graham
Brown	Cowan	Hagan

Harkin	McCaskill	Schatz
Heinrich	Menendez	Schumer
Heitkamp	Merkeley	Shaheen
Hirono	Mikulski	Stabenow
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Tester
Kaine	Murray	Udall (CO)
King	Nelson	Udall (NM)
Klobuchar	Pryor	Warner
Landrieu	Reed	Warren
Leahy	Reid	Whitehouse
Lee	Rockefeller	Wyden
Levin	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 152) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we have had very good cooperation. We are working this list down. I have another unanimous consent request. I believe most of these will go by voice vote, and I appreciate everybody's cooperation.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 624, 295, 232, 538, 412, AND 340 EN BLOC

I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: JOHANN'S No. 624, CORKER No. 295, BURR No. 232, WICKER No. 538, COBURN No. 412, and SHELBY No. 340; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments; that notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote and that all the votes be 10-minute votes; that upon disposition of the Shelby amendment No. 340, the next amendment in order be an amendment from the majority; and I ask unanimous consent they be reported en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes amendments en bloc: for Mr. JOHANN'S, amendment numbered 624; for Mr. CORKER, amendment numbered 295; for Mr. BURR, amendment numbered 232; for Mr. WICKER, amendment numbered 538; for Mr. COBURN, amendment numbered 412; for Mr. SHELBY, amendment numbered 340.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 624

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore families' health care flexibility by repealing the \$2,500 federal cap on flexible spending accounts and the requirement that individuals obtain a prescription from a physician before purchasing over-the-counter drugs with their own flexible spending account or health savings account dollars in order to safeguard families' capacity to plan ahead for the rising cost of care, make their own health care decisions, and ensure children who have special needs can receive adequate care)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE FAMILY HEALTH CARE FLEXIBILITY BY REPEALING THE HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT RESTRICTIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE LAW

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that restore families' health care flexibility, which may include repealing tax increases on tax-advantaged accounts in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; Stat. 119), without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 295

(Purpose: To end a scoring gimmick that allows changes in mandatory program spending that do not save money to offset increased spending)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ BUDGET SCORING RULE RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAM SPENDING.

In the Senate, a bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that includes a provision that reduces direct spending that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not be scored by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget as new negative budget authority if such provision does not result in net outlay savings over the total of the period of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

(Purpose: To protect the American people and strengthen our national security by fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BARDA AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may provide for full funding for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and the Special Reserve Fund under Section 319-F2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b) without raising new revenue by the amounts provided in such authorizing legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 538

(Purpose: To increase the vote threshold required to waive a budget point of order prohibiting unfunded mandates in excess of limit)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 4. SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT.**

Section 425(a)(1) and (2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be subject to the waiver and appeal requirements of subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**AMENDMENT NO. 412**

(Purpose: To create a deficit-reduction reserve fund that addresses the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

**AMENDMENT NO. 340**

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation that requires financial regulators to conduct rigorous cost-benefit analyses on all proposed rules)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE FINANCIAL REGULATORS TO CONDUCT RIGOROUS COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES ON ALL PROPOSED RULES.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that relate to the finalization of rules with positive cost-benefit analyses promulgated by a financial regulator, including the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Financial Research, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

**AMENDMENT NO. 624**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 624, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. JOHANNIS.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, this amendment restores a family's ability to plan ahead for health care costs and afford care. It eliminates a cap on flexible spending accounts.

It also eliminates the silly requirement that Americans get a doctor's

prescription to purchase over-the-counter medications with their FSA or health savings account.

In addition, the health savings account can be used for people who have disabilities, so this eliminates the possibility of doing that beyond the cap.

I ask my colleagues to support me in eliminating the cap and eliminating this crazy requirement about getting a doctor's prescription to use a common medication.

It is supported by the National Downs Syndrome Society, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, and the Chamber of Commerce. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have looked at this amendment. I do have some concerns about the implementation, but I think we can work them out. I would be willing to accept this on a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 624) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 295 WITHDRAWN**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 295 offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, we saw during this last CR that there is a process called CHIMPS where you can take money out of mandatory spending temporarily and spend more in discretionary spending, which over the last 2 years has allowed us to spend \$35 billion more than the Budget Control Act allowed. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY both agree that there is a problem here. They have agreed to try to work toward a solution to keep this gimmick from being used in the future. I will say that this came over from the House this way. It is not something that originated here in the Senate. But because they have agreed to work toward a solution, I withdraw my amendment and thank them for their cooperation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Tennessee first for consulting with Senator SHELBY and me. You are exactly right, he has identified a problem. We are concerned. I promise the Senator we will definitely work with him. I appreciate the Senator withdrawing the amendment. I am going to say publicly in front of my colleagues, we will definitely work with the Senator.

**AMENDMENT NO. 232**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to

amendment No. 232 offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe that the next amendment in order is the Burr amendment No. 232.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, very quickly, the purpose of my amendment is very simple. It is to protect the American people and strengthen our national security by fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the BioShield Reserve Fund. BARDA and Bioshield are critical components of our Nation's medical countermeasure enterprise. Today these programs ensure that we have the countermeasures necessary to protect the American people against the full range of chemical, biologic, radiological, and nuclear threats whether natural or the result of manmade attacks. After 9/11 Congress established Bioshield to encourage the development of these countermeasures. Supporting BARDA and Bioshield at their authorized levels is a matter of national security and should be a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am speaking for my counterpart. This is another deficit-neutral fund, which I know Senator SESSIONS has been expressing his concern about all evening. I am delighted to accept this amendment on a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 232) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 538**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 538 offered by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. WICKER.

Mr. WICKER. This amendment simply puts us back where we were several years ago, at a 60-vote point of order for unfunded mandates. Washington should not use extensive unfunded mandates to shove the weight of irresponsible government growth down to State and local governments. The threshold now is 51 votes to wave a point of order on unfunded mandates. This amendment would simply put it back the way it used to be in the law to 60 votes.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think this amendment is unnecessary.

We already have proper points of order. I will not hold it up. I will not oppose it if you want to do a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The nos appear to have it.

Mr. WICKER. Division. Mr. President, the Chair accepted the amendment. If we are going to start enforcing this, I will marshal my forces and we will learn to yell louder. But the Chair accepted my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe that the voice vote was a "yes" vote. I would ask my colleagues if we can redo the vote so we can hear it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 538) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 412

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 412 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, this is a simple vote. The Postal Service lost \$15.8 billion last year. Political parties contributed to that loss by our getting a discount on all of our mail. All this will do is put us at the same rate as everybody else commercially in terms of the mailing. It is probably about \$50- to \$60 million if we pass this amendment that we will increase the revenue to the Postal Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will not oppose this amendment. I am delighted to see another deficit-neutral reserve fund put into place on this bill that I know my colleagues on the other side of this aisle have not been very happy about throughout the process. But in the spirit of good will, I am happy to accept this amendment on a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 412) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 340

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 340 offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, this amendment would create a deficit-neu-

tral reserve fund for legislation that requires financial regulators to perform rigorous cost-benefit analysis of their proposals. If this analysis determines that a proposed rule's cost exceeds its benefits, the rule should not be implemented. Given the far-reaching scope many new financial rules will have on our markets, I believe it is imperative that regulators conduct thorough cost-benefit analysis to fully understand how these rules will affect our economy.

Independent final regulators operate under a patchwork of Federal laws that require varying degrees of economic analysis and provide too much discretion to regulators. As a result, American job creators are under siege from capricious rulemaking activities. Regulations should be based on solid evidence and supported by robust economic analysis, not the arbitrary preferences of bureaucrats.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to amendment No. 340. The amendment is another attempt to block Wall Street reform. This amendment would slow down rulemaking and invite Wall Street to bring lawsuits against their financial regulators.

GAO recently found that the recent financial crisis may have cost us over \$13 trillion. We should not hamstring the cops on the beat as they try to prevent another crisis. Efforts to undermine sensible regulations are opposed by many organizations, including AARP, CFA, and the AFL-CIO. I oppose this amendment and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I join my colleague in opposing this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	Collins	Hatch
Ayotte	Corker	Heller
Barrasso	Cornyn	Hoever
Blunt	Crapo	Inhofe
Boozman	Cruz	Isakson
Burr	Enzi	Johanns
Chambliss	Fischer	Johnson (WI)
Coats	Flake	King
Coburn	Graham	Kirk
Cochran	Grassley	Lee

McCain	Portman	Shelby
McCaskill	Risch	Thune
McConnell	Roberts	Toomey
Moran	Rubio	Vitter
Murkowski	Scott	Wicker
Paul	Sessions	

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 340) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 225, 329, 293, 527, 153, AND 136  
EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. I have another group of amendments for which I will ask unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent the next amendments in order to be called up will be the following: Flake amendment No. 225, Graham amendment No. 329, Heller amendment No. 293, Boozman amendment No. 527, Portman amendment No. 153, and Ayotte amendment No. 136; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes in relation to any of these amendments, but notwithstanding all time having expired on the resolution, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and that all votes be 10-minute votes; that upon the disposition of Ayotte amendment No. 136, the next amendment be an amendment from the majority.

I ask the amendments be called up en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. I would ask the chairperson of the Budget Committee how many more traunches there might be.

Mrs. MURRAY. I would answer the Senator, we are working through between the majority and minority as fast as we can. I don't think anybody here will say I have not been working very hard to get up their amendment.

We are doing our best to get everybody considered from both sides. If we keep going, I am happy to do this.

Mrs. BOXER. Parliamentary inquiry: May I ask the Chair how many amendments we have voted on in this budget, both voice and actual votes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will take some time to answer that.

Mrs. MURRAY. May I make a suggestion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I think a lot of people want to know the answer to that question. If we could move to the Flake amendment, ask me any question you have, and I will have the answer for you.

Mrs. BOXER. I have the answer. It is 61.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has a unanimous consent request. Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes amendments en bloc: for Mr. FLAKE, amendment numbered 225, for Mr. GRAHAM, amendment numbered 329, for Mr. HELLER, amendment numbered 293, for Mr. BOOZMAN, amendment numbered 527, for Mr. PORTMAN, amendment numbered 153, for Ms. AYOTTE, amendment numbered 136.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 225

(Purpose: To prohibit earmarks)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT CONTAINS EARMARKS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or resolution introduced in the Senate or the House of Representatives, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that includes an earmark.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) PROCEDURE.—Upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a) against an earmark, and such point of order being sustained, such earmark shall be deemed stricken.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT AND AMENDMENT BETWEEN THE HOUSES PROCEDURE.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable under the same conditions as was the conference report. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) EARMARK.—For the purpose of this section, the term “earmark” means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives as certified under paragraph 1(a)(1) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(A) providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process; or

(B) that—

(i)(I) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to a particular beneficiary or limited group of beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(II) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

(ii) modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SENATE.—In the event the Chair is unable to ascertain whether or not the offending provision constitutes an earmark as defined in this subsection, the question of whether the provision constitutes an earmark shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(e) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality or congressional district.

AMENDMENT NO. 329

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to broaden the effects of the sequester, including allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury during sequestration)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO BROADEN THE EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER, INCLUDING ALLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO DONATE A PORTION OF THEIR SALARIES TO CHARITY OR TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY DURING SEQUESTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to broadening the impact of the sequester, which may include allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury if the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 293

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that the Bureau of Land Management collaborates with States in efforts to promote sustainable sage-grouse populations and the conservation of sage-grouse habitat by developing and approving State plans that prevent the listing of the bird under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and preserve the way of life in, and economic health of, the impacted areas)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT COLLABORATES WITH WESTERN STATES TO PREVENT THE LISTING OF THE SAGE-GROUSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would improve the management of public land and natural resources, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 527

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-reduction reserve fund to protect private property rights by discouraging eminent domain abuse by State and local governments, while providing for continued economic development assistance eligibility where eminent domain is used for customary purposes, including to acquire property for public use, for public rights of way, to acquire abandoned property, or to remove immediate threats to public health and safety, and to provide that any savings will reduce the deficit)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE PREVENTION.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to federal economic development assistance, which may include amendments to the eligibility of a State or local government to receive benefits, including restricting benefits when eminent domain has been used to take private property and transfer it to another private use, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

AMENDMENT NO. 153

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote exports.

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPORT PROMOTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to promoting exports, which may include providing the President with trade promotion authority, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 136

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the prohibition on funding of the Medium Extended Air Defense System)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF THE MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting use of funds for defense programs not authorized by law, which may include the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 225 WITHDRAWN

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 225, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I have not yet delivered my maiden speech. I will be very brief. I plan to withdraw this amendment, and I understand there will be a point of order raised against germaneness with a 60-vote threshold I can't overcome. I just want to make the point this body has done good work in the last 2 years on a bipartisan basis to get rid of the scourge of earmarks and the abuse of earmarks which has taken place in both this Chamber and the House.

This amendment would have simply been for a point of order to be raised if earmarks were contained in legislation. I would encourage this body to continue the practice which has occurred over the past 2 years and not have congressional earmarks. I thank you for your indulgence.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

## AMENDMENT NO. 329

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 329, offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the next amendment is offered by Senator GRAHAM, amendment No. 329.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We need to vote on this.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. This amendment will get your attention.

About 500,000 or 600,000 Federal employees will be furloughed because of sequestration. They are going to miss 1 day a week of pay. We can't dock our own pay constitutionally, but I am asking through this amendment that all of us, beginning in April, take 20 percent of our salary and give it to the charity of our choice or anybody we would like so that we would feel what other people are feeling because of sequestration.

Thank you. Have a good night.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an amendment?

Mr. GRAHAM. What is the question?

I will take a voice vote, absolutely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am happy to take a voice vote on this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The Chair is in doubt.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The noes appear to have it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Wait a minute. I ask for a rollcall vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, may I have the floor for a moment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was really trying to focus on what the Senator was saying. It was very difficult for me to understand, and I think many of us were confused about the amendment. I support the amendment, and I ask for a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 329) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 293

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 293, offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, my amendment reinforces the important role of States having primary responsibility for wildlife management. If the sage-grouse is listed as an endangered species, it will hurt most States in the western portion of the country. It will make important activities, such as renewable energy and grazing, in many cases impossible.

I need help and support. I urge support for this amendment, and I appreciate the help and support I have gotten from Senators HATCH, CRAPO, and RISCH.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this actually is a commonsense approach,

and I do urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I will be happy to accept it on a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 293) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 527

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 527, offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this amendment would discourage the taking of private property to transfer to another private, nongovernmental use. It does not diminish the use of eminent domain for customary purposes, including the acquiring of property for public use, for public rights-of-way, to acquire abandoned property, or to remove immediate threats to public health or safety.

In the past, we have had significant bipartisan support in regard to protecting property rights, so I would encourage us to vote in favor of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not oppose this amendment, and I am happy to have a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further debate?

The question is agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 527) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 153

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 153, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is a jobs amendment. This is about having authority to knock down barriers to trade.

I am offering this in connection with Senator WYDEN today and also Senator HATCH. Expanding exports and enforcing our trade laws go hand in hand. That is why later I will be supporting the ENFORCE Act offered by Senator WYDEN.

The bottom line is that not since 2007 have we had trade promotion authority in this country, and without it we can't complete trade agreements. As a result, America is falling behind because other countries are completing agreements, and the people who are getting hurt the most are our workers, our farmers, and our service providers.

So if you want to give our workers in this country a fair shake, a level playing field by knocking down barriers to trade, you can vote for this amendment.

I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, very briefly, I think this is an opportunity to update our laws, particularly looking at environmental protection, labor rights, and digital trade. So I urge all colleagues to support this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am willing to accept this on a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 153) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 136

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 136, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, my amendment would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prohibit funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System, known as MEADS. This is a system our Army has said would never work. We have already spent \$3 billion on this system. It is essentially a missile to nowhere. In fact, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVIN, has said he feels strongly that it is a waste of money. We have already appropriated \$380 million in 2013 for something our troops will never use.

Some have argued there is an agreement that we have to pay termination fees. That is false. The actual agreement says the responsibility of the participants will be subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes. The language is clear.

With \$16 trillion in debt, I would urge my colleagues to stop funding the missile to nowhere and make sure our taxpayer dollars are used wisely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to suggest that the amendment being offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is unnecessary. It relates to fiscal year 2014. There will be no request for this missile system in fiscal year 2014.

I suggest that if she wants to pass this, she might, but perhaps she can do it by voice vote because her amendment won't apply to any suggested funding for this missile system in this next fiscal year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am amenable to a voice vote.

Mr. COBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the chairman be recognized. She tried to get recognition, and she couldn't.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to the rollcall vote on this, I want to turn to all my colleagues and remind all of us that what we are here trying to do is to pass a budget out of the Senate.

I have heard from so many people for so many months about how important it is that we get a budget out so we can move to the next process in this whole thing of getting our country back on track, and we are trying to do it in a responsible way.

We have had a really great debate in our committee, out here on the floor, and many Senators have participated in it. We have now had I believe 62 or 63 amendments, and I think we have a responsibility to work toward final passage.

I am aware that not every Senator had an opportunity to have an amendment, but I think many, many Senators have to say they were able to get their amendments. We have had amendments on virtually every topic here tonight, including the budget, but I would really ask all Senators to stop and think about what we are showing the American public.

What we would like the American public to think is that the Senate as a group of 100 people can have a process to move a budget forward and vote on it, whether we agree with it or we disagree with it. And I think we are pretty much there in showing the American public that we can have a good debate, have numerous amendments, have our voices heard. At the end of the day, it is a "yes" or "no" vote.

So while we have this next vote, I would really like everyone to take a second and think about how we look to the American people and how important it is that we move this process along so that we can come to a final conclusion and hopefully get bipartisan agreement to get our country back on track.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Chairman MURRAY for her leadership and for her fairness in helping us move a lot of amendments fairly and equitably tonight. We are in a situation where—no need to debate it into the night—I wish we had not been in a position where the majority leader was determined to finish this weekend. I wish we could have started earlier in the week or to come back on April 8, but that is not possible.

We have gone 4 years without a budget, and Members have been constricted in the filing of amendments this year more than any other time in probably the history of the Senate. One has to

ask or beg permission to be allowed to have an amendment. Senator AYOTTE is one of those. Senator MORAN and others had amendments. So they are frustrated, and they want their votes.

So I would just say, let's keep going. Let's keep in good humor. Let's try to get as many of these votes in as possible. I have had several Members suggest that we might vote from our chairs and not leave the Chamber and cut these rollcall votes down to a much shorter period of time. Maybe we could discuss that. But I think the list needs to be continued to be produced. A number of Senators haven't had amendments, and they really feel as though they have a right to. And this may be their only opportunity, the way things are going this year, to even get a vote on something they care about.

So that is my observation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we do have a vote that needs to occur but a final word here. I would just say that we want to get a budget passed, and I know the minority wants us to pass a budget. We have been told that time and time again. We can't pass a budget if we are filibustered by amendments for the rest of the night.

So I would urge all our colleagues to have this vote, and let's have some discussions and see if we can come to a final conclusion.

With that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, point of information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I would like to ask the distinguished budget chair through the Chair what delay or what conflict with any other event could this possibly pose until at least 6 or 7 a.m.? I don't understand what delay that would cause, to allow more votes on amendments, or what conflict that could possibly pose with any other events, including airplane flights, at least until several hours from now. None of us wants to delay the process, and none of us wants to prevent a vote. Clearly, that is not an issue for several hours. I would just ask that of the distinguished chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to respond?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I can keep on standing all night. I am sure a number of Senators can. I do have respect for a number of our Senators here who may not be able to stand as long as some of us or who are elderly, and I would ask consideration of them. That is just my request.

With that, I do think we need to get to a vote here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been a request for the yeas and nays.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.



The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Coats	King	Shaheen
Coburn	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Landrieu	Thune
Corker	Leahy	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

NAYS—5

Chambliss	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 136) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the majority has the next amendment.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have been working throughout the last vote. I am hoping we are getting to a very short list in the near future.

I recognize there are Senators who are frustrated and that want an opportunity to speak out. I know there are a number of Senators who are very tired. Everybody's patience is wearing thin. I would just ask everybody to hold your patience for just a few more minutes. I am going to put us into a quorum call. I am hoping we can get an agreement and give everybody some certainty.

I know on our side we want to get a budget passed. We have been working for a great deal of time. We want to move this process forward. We know there are Senators on the other side who may not agree with our budget but agree with us that we have to move to a process to get our country back on track.

So I would ask everybody's patience for just a short while; hopefully, we can get this resolved and we can get a budget passed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will hold the floor and yield for a question.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the Senator will yield for a question with regard to the possibility of us starting one of the votes that will probably be a rollcall vote, and let's get started on that while we work out the further details.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would be willing to get an amendment going, but I haven't seen it yet. I would like the ability to take a look at it, so I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will only be for a very few minutes—patience, please—and then we will come back in and see if we can get to a vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am proud of our Senators for having patience for exactly 30 seconds.

I yield to the Senator from Idaho to offer an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 318

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 318.

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

The clerk will report the amendment. The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] proposes an amendment numbered 318.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:  
(Purpose: To amend the reconciliation instruction to include instructions to the Committee on Finance to achieve the Budget's stated goal of \$275 billion in mandatory health care savings)

On page 50, line 1, after the number "\$975,000,000,000" insert the following: "and sufficient to reduce outlays by \$275,000,000,000"

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, there is now 2 minutes of debate.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in the budget that has been put forward, there is a reconciliation instruction for almost \$1 trillion of new taxes. On the spending side there is, I think, a relatively modest amount—not adequate—but there is an amount of health care savings in the amount of \$275 billion. Interestingly, that is not

in a reconciliation instruction. We do not have the protection and assistance of a reconciliation instruction for the economy reforms that are in the budget but we do for the tax increases that are in the budget which results in this interesting circumstance. The tax increases by this budget would be guaranteed to occur because the filibuster would be avoided through reconciliation, and the reforms of the entitlement system would be guaranteed not to occur because they would face a 60-vote margin, having been kept out of the reconciliation instructions.

What this amendment does is it would put the health care savings in the budget into a reconciliation instruction so we can at least start down the path of dealing with reforms of our entitlement system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Let me thank the Senator from Idaho, who has been very involved in a lot of discussions over time in trying to manage us toward a better place with our Federal debt and deficit. I understand his dedication, but I oppose this amendment. Over the last several years we have enacted \$1.8 trillion in spending cuts on a bipartisan basis. We do not have any trouble cutting spending in this body right now. We do seem to have trouble locking in the revenue necessary to achieve a balanced revenue reduction. I recommend our colleagues oppose this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.  
The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—52

Baldwin	Cantwell	Durbin
Baucus	Cardin	Feinstein
Begich	Carper	Franken
Bennet	Casey	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Coons	Hagan
Boxer	Cowan	Harkin
Brown	Donnelly	Heinrich

Heitkamp	Menendez	Schumer
Hirono	Merkley	Shaheen
Johnson (SD)	Mikulski	Stabenow
Kaine	Murphy	Tester
King	Murray	Udall (NM)
Klobuchar	Nelson	Warner
Landrieu	Reed	Warren
Leahy	Reid	Whitehouse
Levin	Rockefeller	Wyden
Manchin	Sanders	
McCaskill	Schatz	

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 318) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the following package of amendments, 17 Democratic and 13 Republican amendments, be considered and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 149, Blumenthal-Moran No. 577, Johnson No. 593, Manchin No. 316, Wyden No. 394, Baucus No. 267, Hagan No. 269, Franken No. 353, Cardin No. 453, Udall of New Mexico No. 192, Franken No. 479, Baucus No. 581, Casey No. 265, Sanders No. 594, Wyden-Portman No. 618, Levin No. 430, as modified, Manchin No. 499, Toomey No. 434, Coats No. 195, Hoeven No. 319, Ayotte No. 161, Kirk No. 671, Murkowski No. 672, Rubio No. 623, Alexander No. 348, Boozman No. 389, Heller No. 477, Hoeven No. 217, Enzi No. 489, and Hoeven No. 655.

This is a package that has been agreed to by both managers, and I urge the Senate to accept them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object, it is understood that we are having a side-by-side that would be on there.

No objection.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator have foreign affairs amendments there?

Mrs. MURRAY. That is different.

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

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 149

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase the capacity of Federal agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF AGENCIES TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would increase the capacity of Federal agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight, including efforts such as additional personnel and training for Inspectors General at each agency, new reporting requirements for agencies to track their responses to and actions taken

in response to Inspector General recommendations, urging the President to appoint permanent Inspectors General at agencies where there is currently a vacancy, and any other effort to ensure accountability from contractors and increase the capacity of Inspectors General to rout out waste, fraud, and abuse in all government contracting efforts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 577

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to ensure operation of all contract air traffic control towers receiving funding through the contract tower program of the Federal Aviation Administration as of March 20, 2013, and that are located at airports still in service as of the date of the introduction of such legislation)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investment in civil air traffic control services, which may include air traffic management at airport towers across the United States or at facilities of the Federal Aviation Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 593

(Purpose: To establish a scorekeeping rule to ensure that increases in guarantee fees of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be used to offset provisions that increase the deficit)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.**

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that increases in guarantee fees charged by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be used to offset provisions that increase the deficit.

(b) BUDGETARY RULE.—In the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, any previous resolution, and any subsequent budget resolution, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases any guarantee fees of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

## AMENDMENT NO. 316

(Purpose: To address prescription drug abuse in the United States)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to addressing prescription drug abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 394

(Purpose: To ensure that chronic illness is addressed as part of health care improvement)

On page, 62, line 12, insert “focus on chronic illness,” after “efficiency.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 267

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to support rural schools and districts)

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and districts, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 269

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to textile and apparel articles)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS RELATING TO TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to strengthening the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to textile and apparel articles, which may include increased training with respect to, and monitoring and verification of, textile and apparel articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 353

(Purpose: To amend section 308 relating to broadband infrastructure investments in rural areas)

On page 59, line 1, after “telecommunications,” insert “including promoting investments in broadband infrastructure to expedite deployment of broadband to rural areas.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 453

(Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund on health care improvement)

On page 62, line 13, insert “improve overall population health, promote health equity or reduce health disparities,” after “nation.”

AMENDMENT NO. 192

(Purpose: To modify the deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's servicemembers and veterans to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas)

On page 60, strike line 7 and insert the following:

credentialing requirements; or

(6) supporting additional efforts to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas through telehealth and other programs that reduce the need for such veterans to travel long distances to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

AMENDMENT NO. 479

(Purpose: To provide an additional use for the deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education)

On page 60, line 22, insert "standardize financial aid award letters," after "students,".

AMENDMENT NO. 581

(Purpose: To exempt remote sales of business inputs)

On page 2, line 10, insert "and provided that such legislation may include requirements that States recognize the value of small businesses to the United States economy by exempting the remote sales of business inputs from sales and use taxes" after "2023".

AMENDMENT NO. 265

(Purpose: To prohibit certain revisions of allocations for workforce investment measures that lack program integrity controls for the Job Corps program)

On page 76, line 18, strike "reduce" and all that follows through "job training," on lines 19 and 20 and insert "ensure effective administration, reduce inefficient overlap, improve access, and enhance outcomes of Federal workforce development, youth and adult job training,".

AMENDMENT NO. 594

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which may include congregate and home-delivered meals programs, or other assistance to low-income seniors)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME SENIORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which may include congregate and home-delivered meals programs, or other assistance to low-income seniors, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 618

(Purpose: To provide for the enforcement of the trade remedy laws of the United States)

On page 52, line 18, strike ", or international" and insert "(including requiring timely and time-limited investigations into the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties), or international".

AMENDMENT NO. 430, AS MODIFIED

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. . RESERVE FUND TO END OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a

committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax abuses used by large corporations, or measures providing for comprehensive tax reform that ensures a revenue structure that is more efficient, leads to a more competitive business environment, and may result in additional rate or deficit reductions, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023".

AMENDMENT NO. 499

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that abundant domestic energy sources and technologies can meet present and future greenhouse gas emissions rules)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT DOMESTIC ENERGY SOURCES CAN MEET EMISSIONS RULES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to the research, development, and demonstration necessary for domestically abundant energy sources and current energy technologies to comply with present and future greenhouse gas emissions rules while still remaining economically competitive, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 434

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increasing funding for the inland waterways system)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the inland waterways system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

(Purpose: To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of any budget submitted by the President)

At the end of title V, add the following:

**SEC. 5 . TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF ANY BUDGET SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT.**

When the Congressional Budget Office submits its report to Congress relating to a budget submitted by the President for a fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, such report shall contain—

(1) an estimate of the pro rata cost for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such

fiscal year of any deficit that would result from the budget; and

(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects described in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 319

(Purpose: To provide additional resources to Criminal Investigations and Police Services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs)

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,500,000.

On page 28, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,500,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by \$3,500,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by \$3,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 161

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for achieving full auditability of the financial statements of the Department of Defense by 2017)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACHIEVING FULL AUDITABILITY OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BY 2017.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving full auditability of the financial statements Department of Defense by 2017, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 671

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to sanctions with respect to Iran)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to clarify that the clearance and settlement of euro-denominated transactions through European Union financial institutions may not result in the evasion of or otherwise undermine the impact of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by the United States and the European Union (including provisions designed to strictly limit the access of the Government of Iran to its foreign exchange reserves and the facilitation of transactions on behalf of sanctioned entities), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 672

(Purpose: To permit a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide assistance for fishery disasters declared during 2012)

On page 58, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(10) to provide assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce during 2012;

## AMENDMENT NO. 623

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on underutilized facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and their potential use)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF SENATE ON UNDERUTILIZED FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR POTENTIAL USE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is the ninth largest real property holder of the Federal Government, with more than 124,000 acres and more than 4,900 buildings and other structures with a replacement value of more than \$30,000,000,000.

(2) The annual operation and maintenance costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have increased steadily, and, as of 2012, the Administration has more than \$2,300,000,000 in annual deferred maintenance costs.

(3) According to Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administration continues to retain real property that is underutilized, does not have identified future mission uses, or is duplicative of other assets in its real property inventory.

(4) The Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congress have identified the aging and duplicative infrastructure of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a high priority and longstanding management challenge.

(5) In the NASA Authorization Act of 2010, Congress directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to examine its real property assets and downsize to fit current and future missions and expected funding levels, paying particular attention to identifying and removing unneeded or duplicative infrastructure.

(6) The Office of Inspector General found at least 33 facilities, including wind tunnels, test stands, airfields, and launch infrastructure, that were underutilized or for which National Aeronautics and Space Administration managers could not identify a future mission use and that the need for these facilities have declined in recent years as a result of changes in the mission focus of the Administration, the condition and obsolescence of some facilities, and the advent of alternative testing methods.

(7) The Office of Inspector General found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has taken steps to minimize the costs of continuing to maintain some of these facilities by placing them in an inactive state or leasing them to other parties.

(8) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a series of initiatives underway that, in the judgment of the Office of Inspector General, are “positive steps towards ‘rightsizing’ its real property footprint”, and the Office of Inspector General has concluded that “it is imperative that NASA move forward aggressively with its infrastructure reduction efforts”.

(9) Existing and emerging United States commercial launch and exploration capabilities are providing cargo transportation to the International Space Station and offer the potential for providing crew support, access to the International Space Station, and missions to low Earth orbit while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration focuses its efforts on heavy-lift capabilities and deep space missions.

(10) National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and property that are

underutilized, duplicative, or no longer needed for Administration requirements could be utilized by commercial users and State and local entities, resulting in savings for the Administration and a reduction in the burden of the Federal Government to fund space operations.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this concurrent resolution assume—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should move forward with plans to reduce its infrastructure and, to the greatest extent practicable, make property available for lease to a government or private tenant;

(2) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should pursue opportunities for streamlined sale or lease of property and facilities, including for exclusive use, to a private entity, or expedited conveyance or transfer to a State or political subdivision, municipality, instrumentality of a State, or Department of Transportation-licensed launch site operators for the promotion of commercial or scientific space activity and for developing and operating space launch facilities; and

(3) leasing or transferring underutilized facilities and properties to commercial space entities or State or local governments will reduce operation and maintenance costs for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, save money for the Federal Government, and promote commercial space and the exploration goals of the Administration and the United States.

## AMENDMENT NO. 348

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent restrictions to public access to fishing downstream of dams owned by the Corps of Engineers)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT RESTRICTIONS TO PUBLIC ACCESS TO FISHING DOWNSTREAM OF DAMS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from restricting public access to waters downstream of a Corps of Engineers dam, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 389

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 477

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to authorize the provision of per diem payments for the provision of services to dependents of homeless veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AUTHORIZE PROVISION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES TO DEPENDENTS OF HOMELESS VETERANS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to care, services, or benefits for homeless veterans, which may include providing per diem payments for the furnishing of care for dependents of homeless veterans, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 217

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 489

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to phase-in any changes to the individual or corporate tax systems)

At the end of title III, add the following:  
**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PHASE-IN ANY CHANGES TO INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE TAX SYSTEMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the phase-in of any changes to the individual or corporate tax systems, including any changes to individual or corporate income tax exclusions, exemptions, deductions, or credits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 655

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs, including the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Program administered by the Department of Education)

On page 76, after line 25, add the following:  
**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASES IN AID FOR TRIBAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs, including the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Program administered by the Department of Education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am now going to ask for unanimous consent for a number of amendments to get to final passage. I would say to all Senators that we are going to have a number of votes. We would like to tell everyone to sit in your seat. We will get through these faster if we can have the rollcalls and be done quickly. So I encourage everyone to be in this room.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next block of amendments—we have talked to everybody who was talkable—we would vote from our desks. There would be no recapping of the votes by the tally clerks, and that they be 7 1/2-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the leader. I think it has real potential. There still would be some votes that could go by voice vote, we would hope. But if we do this pressure in this way I think it would speed up things. I thank the leader for that suggestion. I have heard it from our side for a while. I think it is a good idea.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 184, 382, 526, 338, 471, 702, 673, 521, 414, 416, 709, 154, 710, AND 139, EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order to be called up be the following: Barrasso No. 184, Paul No. 382, Vitter No. 526, Vitter No. 338, Cruz No. 471, Cruz No. 702, Lee No. 673, Lee No. 521, Coburn No. 414, Coburn No. 416, Coburn No. 709, Portman No. 154, Leahy No. 710, a side-by-side to Senator INHOFE's No. 139, and Inhofe No. 139; that there be no second-degree amendments prior to votes in relation to any of those amendments; that none of the amendments be divisible; that notwithstanding all time having expired under the resolution, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and that all votes be 10-minute votes; that

upon disposition of the Inhofe amendment No. 139, the Senate proceed immediately to vote on adoption of S. Con. Res. 8, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I do want our colleagues to understand that some of these amendments the chairwoman just asked to be put in order are incredibly fundamental important foreign policy issues that you do not do at 3 in the morning and change the dynamics of the Middle East, and change the dynamics of our national security and interests in international organizations.

That is what some of these amendments will do. You do not do it in a budget process, you do it through regular order in a committee that ultimately can hear both sides as we have succeeded so far this session in a very bipartisan way. So I will not object because of the chairwoman's effort to get us to a conclusion. But I will be urging all of our colleagues to oppose all of those amendments because this is foreign policy on the fly. It is dangerous. We send very important messages when we cast votes in certain ways that can affect the balance of stability in the Middle East, that can affect our relationships across the world, that can affect our effectiveness in institutions that we need at the end of the day to promote our national security, our national interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would hope that we would defeat these amendments. If there is no objection—

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

Mrs. MURRAY. We will then move to these amendments. Again, all Senators sit in your seats and vote. We will get through these as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I have an inquiry. I would like to make a unanimous consent request that we be able to use our electronic devices while we are sitting at our desks on the floor so that we might get any communication that we need from our staff, and also so we can be productive.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes amendments en bloc: For Mr. BARRASSO, No. 184, for Mr. PAUL No. 382, for Mr. VITTER No. 526, for Mr. VITTER No. 338, for Mr. CRUZ No. 471, for Mr. CRUZ No. 702, for Mr. LEE No. 673, for Mr. LEE No. 521, for Mr. COBURN No. 414, for Mr. COBURN No. 416, for Mr. COBURN No. 709, for Mr. PORTMAN No. 154, for Mr. LEAHY No. 710, for Mr. INHOFE No. 139.

The amendments are as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 184

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to expedite exports from the United States through reform of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in such a manner that greenhouse gas emissions produced outside the United States by any good exported from the United States are not subject to the requirements of that Act)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPEDITE EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to promoting the export of goods, including manufactured goods, from the United States through reform of environmental laws, which may include the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions produced outside the United States by goods exported from the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

## AMENDMENT NO. 382

(Purpose: To provide funding to the Department of Transportation for interstate bridge infrastructure projects and to reduce the Federal deficit by decreasing the amounts available for foreign assistance and loan guarantee programs administered by the Department of Energy)

On page 5, line 9, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 4, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, reduce the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 7, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 8, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 11, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 12, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 15, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 16, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 19, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 20, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 23, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 24, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 2, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 3, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 6, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 7, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 10, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 11, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 14, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 15, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 18, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 16, line 19, reduce the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 18, line 23, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 2, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 6, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 10, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 14, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 18, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 22, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 6, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 10, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 11, reduce the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 6, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 10, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 526

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure election integrity by requiring a valid government-issued photographic ID for voting in federal elections)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE A PHOTOGRAPHIC ID FOR VOTING IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would create a system for requiring a valid government-issued photographic ID for voting in federal elections without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 338

(Purpose: To end the mobile phone welfare program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENDING SUBSIDIES FOR MOBILE PHONE SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

houses, motions, or conference reports that would prohibit the Universal Service Fund from subsidizing commercial mobile service, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 471

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce foreign assistance to Egypt and increase funding for an east coast missile defense shield)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT AND INCREASE FUNDING FOR AN EAST COAST MISSILE DEFENSE SHIELD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing foreign assistance to Egypt and increasing funding for the Missile Defense Agency to establish a land-based missile defense capability on the east coast of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 702

(Purpose: To Create A Point of Order Against Any Legislation That Would Provide Taxpayer Funds to The United Nations While Any Member Nation Forces Citizens or Residents of that Nation to Undergo Involuntary Abortions)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION FUNDING THE UNITED NATIONS WHILE MEMBER NATIONS FORCE THEIR CITIZENS OR RESIDENTS TO UNDERGO ABORTIONS.

(a) In General—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that would make public funds available to the United Nations, or to any affiliate organization of the United Nations, while any member nation compels citizens or residents of that nation to involuntarily undergo abortions in any year covered by the budget resolution.

(b) Supermajority Waiver and Appeal in the Senate—

(1) WAIVER—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 673

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would further restrict the right of law-abiding Americans to own a firearm)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FURTHER RESTRICT THE RIGHT OF LAW-ABIDING AMERICANS TO OWN A FIREARM.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that further restricts the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm in any year covered by the budget resolution.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm” means any further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm not contained in law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget, including but not limited to any legislation that—

(1) prohibits, increases restrictions on, or regulates the manufacture or ownership of any firearm that is permitted under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) prohibits the manufacture or possession of specified categories of firearms based on the characteristics of such firearms that are permitted to be manufactured or possessed under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(3) prohibits specific firearms or categories of firearms that are permitted under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(4) limits the size of ammunition feeding devices or prohibits categories of ammunition feeding devices that are permitted under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(5) requires background checks through a Federal firearms licensee for private transfers of firearms if the transfers do not require a background check under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(6) establishes a record-keeping system for the sale of firearms not established prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(7) imposes prison sentences for sales, gifts, or raffles of firearms to veterans who are unknown to the transferor as a person prohibited from possessing a firearm that would not otherwise be imposed under Federal law prior to the consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

**(c) SUPER MAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**AMENDMENT NO. 521**

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting the reauthorization of the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to property tax revenues lost due to the presence of Federal land)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM AT LEVELS ROUGHLY EQUIVALENT TO PROPERTY TAX REVENUES LOST DUE TO THE PRESENCE OF FEDERAL LAND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to lost tax revenues due to the presence of Federal land without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

**AMENDMENT NO. 414**

(Purpose: To create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to eliminate tax loopholes and special interest tax breaks for the PGA tour, the NFL, NASCAR, Hollywood, fish tackle box manufacturers, and Eskimo whaling captains)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND CLOSING TAX EXPENDITURES FOR THE PGA TOUR, THE NFL, NASCAR, HOLLYWOOD, FISH TACKLE BOX MANUFACTURERS, AND WHALING CAPTAINS.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

**AMENDMENT NO. 416**

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to eliminate non-defense related spending by the Department of Defense)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PREVENTION OF NON-DEFENSE RELATED SPENDING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the Department of Defense, which may include measures eliminating non-defense related programs at the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

**AMENDMENT NO. 709**

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

**AMENDMENT NO. 154**

(Purpose: To require the Congressional Budget Office to include macroeconomic feedback scoring of tax legislation)

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 \_\_\_\_ . CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.**

(a) **REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.**—In the case of any legislative provision to which this section applies, the Con-

gressional Budget Office, with the assistance of the Joint Committee on Taxation, shall prepare, to the extent practicable, as a supplement to the cost estimate for legislation affecting revenues, an estimate of the revenue changes in connection with such provision that incorporates the macroeconomic effects of the policy being analyzed. Any macroeconomic impact statement under the preceding sentence shall be accompanied by a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing—

- (1) such estimate; and
- (2) the conventional estimate in connection with such provision.

(b) **LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.**—This section shall apply to any legislative provision—

(1) which proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a conventional fiscal estimate, has a revenue impact in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any fiscal year; or

(2) with respect to which the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget of either the Senate or the House of Representatives has requested an estimate described in subsection (a).

**AMENDMENT NO. 710**

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that the United States will not negotiate or support treaties that violate Americans’ Second Amendment rights under the Constitution of the United States)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT NEGOTIATE OR SUPPORT TREATIES THAT VIOLATE AMERICANS’ SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the implementation of treaties, including upholding the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States when treaties are negotiated, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

**AMENDMENT NO. 139**

(Purpose: To uphold Second Amendment rights and prevent the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM ENTERING INTO THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN.) There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, in 2010, President Obama set forth a goal of doubling our Nation's exports in 5 years. Three years later we are not on the pace to achieve that goal. One problem is the EPA is blocking exports. EPA is blocking exports on account of the greenhouse gas emissions those exports would produce outside of the United States; that is after they leave our shores.

This is a dangerous precedent. It will hurt exports of automobiles, aircraft, and heavy equipment such as tractors. This amendment prohibits Federal agencies from blocking exports on account of greenhouse gas emissions those exports would produce after they leave the United States.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to the yeas and nays, can I just say, in setting an example for the evening, I will be less than 1 minute. We believe this is current law. We will accept a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were already ordered on this amendment. Does the Senator from Wyoming seek recognition?

Mr. BARRASSO. A voice vote will be acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the yeas and nays are vitiated.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 184) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 382

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. On behalf of Senator McCONNELL and myself, I have to introduce this amendment to create a bridges fund. We have done considerable nation building abroad. I think it is time we do some nation building at home.

We have two bridges in our State, Brent Spence as well as the Sherman Minton Bridge, that need to be repaired and replaced. We do not have enough money in our highway trust fund. This would create a new bridges fund. It would come from money we are currently sending overseas to build bridges overseas. So it would bring foreign aid money back home to the United States where it is needed. It would also take some money from the Department of Energy loans, which I think can be more useful at home to build bridges.

So I urge adoption of this amendment which would allow a new creation of a bridges fund, which I think our country desperately needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senate budget resolution that is in front of us, that

we are hoping to get passed tonight, provides strong investments in transportation infrastructure. It fully funds MAP-21, the recent highway bill. It provides \$50 billion for urgent transportation needs and another \$10 billion for an infrastructure bank.

We could put more funding toward transportation projects and fund some good projects but not without making cuts to other vital programs. The amendment before us will make unnecessary and deep cuts to foreign aid and energy programs. I oppose this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 72, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Barrasso	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Cochran	Lee	Sessions
Crapo	McConnell	Shelby
Cruz	Moran	Thune
Enzi	Paul	Toomey
Grassley	Portman	Vitter
Hatch	Risch	

NAYS—72

Alexander	Feinstein	Menendez
Ayotte	Fischer	Merkley
Baldwin	Flake	Mikulski
Baucus	Franken	Murkowski
Begich	Gillibrand	Murphy
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Blumenthal	Hagan	Nelson
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Rockefeller
Burr	Hoeben	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johanns	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Kirk	Tester
Collins	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Coons	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Corker	Leahy	Warner
Cornyn	Levin	Warren
Cowan	Manchin	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Kaine Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 382) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WYDEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 526

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, there is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 526 offered by Mr. VITTER.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this amendment would require photo IDs to participate in Federal elections, which is allowed now by States. However, the Justice Department is trying to virtually shut down this practice unreasonably by opposing it in many States. This would be a clarification to mandate the Federal IDs, just as we do in many other less consequential acts such as air travel.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Voter photo identification laws are overly burdensome and have the ability to disenfranchise voters. We should not attempt to implement these policies nationwide, especially at 3:15 in the morning on a budget resolution.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—44

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—2

Kaine Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 526) was rejected.



Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 338

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two amendments equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 338 offered by Mr. VITTER.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I would just note there is nothing in a unanimous consent which precludes a Senator from withdrawing an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Washington.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I certainly thank the honorable chairwoman for that kind note, but I do wish to move forward with my amendment.

This amendment is simple. It ends the cell phone welfare entitlement. I yield back my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Access to a telephone is beneficial for anyone trying to get a job or attempting to communicate with their family or receiving help in an emergency. Since 1985, the Lifeline Program has made it easier for low-income Americans to have a phone by providing a small monthly subsidy toward basic service. The program has seen an influx in new users over the past several years after the eligibility expanded to include mobile phones.

The FCC issued an order in January 2012 to attack waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, and that order has been successful.

I recommend my colleagues oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Coburn	Fischer
Ayotte	Cochran	Flake
Barrasso	Collins	Graham
Blunt	Corker	Grassley
Boozman	Cornyn	Hatch
Burr	Crapo	Heller
Chambliss	Cruz	Hoeven
Coats	Enzi	Inhofe

Isakson	Moran	Sessions
Johanns	Murkowski	Shelby
Johnson (WI)	Paul	Thune
Kirk	Portman	Toomey
Lee	Risch	Vitter
McCain	Roberts	Wicker
McCaskill	Rubio	
McConnell	Scott	

NAYS—53

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 338) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 471 offered by Mr. CRUZ.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce foreign assistance to Egypt and to increase funding for an east coast missile defense shield.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Secretary of State announced he had freed an additional \$250 million in an unconditional economic support fund for the Government of Egypt. This was in the midst of the sequester and at the same time the American people were told there were insufficient funds to pay for police officers, firefighters and teachers, and even White House tours.

All of us are concerned about the situation in Egypt—a nation that, among other things, has repeatedly turned a blind eye to the abuse of women and to the persecution of Christians.

Last week the European Union threatened to hold its 5 million euro pledge of economic aid to Egypt absent meaningful reforms. We should do at least as well as the EU. This amendment would reduce, in an unspecified amount, the foreign aid to Egypt and allow that money to be put to vital national security ends here at home; namely, missile defense.

I ask the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from New Jersey, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, that money the Senator referred to was money that was already existing and it was at a critical time.

The United States and Egypt have a longstanding security relationship that is vital to the stability of the Middle East and the security of the region. Our aid to Egypt is tied directly to the Camp David Accord which has acted to stabilize the Middle East and has helped to serve America and Israel's security for the past 35 years. It is vital and it can't be put at risk.

We also have significant interests in Egypt in countering terrorism, addressing the deteriorating security in the Sinai, and maintaining preferential access to the Suez Canal.

We cannot give the Egyptian leaders a blank check, but we also cannot have a collapse of the Egyptian economy which Israel would face the immediate consequences of.

This is the type of amendment that does not consider the checks and balances necessary and the complexities of the issue, which we will handle in the committee.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 74, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Barrasso	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Collins	Kirk	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	Vitter
Fischer	Risch	
Grassley	Roberts	

NAYS—74

Alexander	Donnelly	Levin
Ayotte	Durbin	Manchin
Baldwin	Feinstein	McCain
Baucus	Flake	McCaskill
Begich	Franken	McConnell
Bennet	Gillibrand	Menendez
Blumenthal	Graham	Merkley
Blunt	Hagan	Mikulski
Boozman	Harkin	Murkowski
Boxer	Hatch	Murphy
Brown	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Nelson
Cardin	Hirono	Portman
Carper	Hoeven	Pryor
Casey	Isakson	Reed
Chambliss	Johanns	Reid
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kaine	Sanders
Coons	King	Schatz
Corker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cornyn	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cowan	Leahy	Stabenow

Tester	Warner	Wicker
Udall (CO)	Warren	Wyden
Udall (NM)	Whitehouse	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 471) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 702

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 702 offered by Mr. CRUZ.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this amendment would create a budget point of order prohibiting any measure that provides taxpayer funds to the United Nations while any member nation forces citizens to undergo involuntary abortions.

I recognize Members of this body have differing views on the right to life, but surely all of us can be agreed that for a woman to be forced against her will to abort her child is a horrific evil. Yet the world was shocked when photographs surfaced last year of 23-year-old Feng Jianmei and her aborted child.

China recently acknowledged under its one-child policy it has carried out 336 million abortions, more than the entire population of the United States. Those are 336 million lives that never breathed a breath of life on this Earth.

In 1997, the House passed a Forced Abortion Condemnation Act that, unfortunately, died in the Senate. This body should condemn that policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield my time to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, no one—no one—in this body supports forced abortions. No one. However, the United Nations has no authority to control the acts of any individual nation.

Instead of punishing the country that is carrying out the bad policy, this amendment would go after an entity that has no control over the policy and all the while negatively impacting our national interests because it takes away all funding to the United Nations if such a member country is engaged in such acts. It would impact funding for peacekeeping operations in the Golan Heights, in Darfur, in Congo; funding for Syrian refugees, which now exceeds 1 million and is threatening the political and economic instability of Jordan and Lebanon; funding to the International Atomic Energy Agency that we need to go after Iran.

These are all reasons this amendment should be voted against.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Manchin	

NAYS—61

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 702) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 673

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 673, offered by Mr. LEE.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, my amendment would establish a point of order for any piece of legislation brought before this body that would undermine the sacred right protected by the second amendment to bear arms. It is important that we safeguard this right so the government doesn't intrude upon it. That is why I have introduced this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment is not germane. The underlying resolution therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act for the consideration of the pending amendment No. 673 pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hagan	Pryor
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heitkamp	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Manchin	Wicker
Donnelly	McCain	

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50 and the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to, the point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 521

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, there is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 521, offered by Mr. LEE.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program was established to compensate local taxing authorities, such as counties, for the tax revenue lost due to the presence of Federal public land. Unfortunately, the funding for this program has never been offered to the degree necessary that it would, in fact, offset this revenue. In States such as mine, where most of the land is owned by the Federal Government, this is a big problem because our taxing authorities are not able to get the revenue they need from this land. As a result, programs ranging from public education to fire and safety programs—the basic services of government—are not able to be met because of inadequate revenue.

This amendment seeks to ensure that funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program is at least roughly equivalent to the actual lost property tax revenues due to the presence of Federal public land. I urge each of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. We will take this on a voice vote.

Mr. LEE. I ask for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would ask that the Senator accommodate us. We are willing to give it to him.

Mr. LEE. Let's do it. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 521) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 414 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 414, offered by Mr. COBURN.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 416

There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 416, offered by Mr. COBURN. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, with a lot of consternation, we are worried about how the sequester affects everybody—the Defense Department and all the other agencies. But in fact the Pentagon spends \$67 billion on things that have absolutely nothing to do with defense. All we will be doing is creating a deficit-neutral reserve fund to move this nondefense spending—either move it or eliminate it from the Defense Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is important to reduce wasteful spending and ensure all Federal funding is spent efficiently and effectively. The budget resolution is not the appropriate place for funding decisions at a subprogrammatic level.

I recommend we oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—43

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

NAYS—56

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 416) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THANKING THE SENATE PAGES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to the next vote, I would like to thank all the pages. They have been here all night working, and I would like to thank them: Austin Hall, Patrick Irby-Bailey, Emma Duhnke, Andrew Brennen, Stewart Maxfield, Britany Robertson, and Katie Robinson. (Applause, Senators rising.)

AMENDMENT NO. 709

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 709, offered by Mr. COBURN.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, 3½ years ago we instructed the GAO to tell us where the government problems were, what are the government programs, and where was there duplication. We have yet to pass one piece of legislation that would eliminate any of the duplication in the Federal Government—not one. What this does is combine 17 different amendments that I had offered on this budget to create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to cause us—to force us—to look at all these programs by area and consolidate them.

What this amendment would do, very specifically—it doesn't say you eliminate; it says you consolidate. You get efficiency, you get effectiveness, and you look to make sure when we are spending tax dollars that they are actually accomplishing something and they are doing it in the most efficient and effective ways.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. The budget already includes a deficit reduction reserve fund for the elimination, consolidation, and reform of Federal programs to achieve savings. Our budget goes even further to instruct committees to review the GAO report on duplication and asks committees to use this information to reduce overlap and identify efficiencies. The budget does not single out individual programs because we believe that sorting through duplication should be the role of our authorizing committees. That is why we have specifically instructed committees to review GAO's findings on duplication in their high-risk list.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Coburn	Grassley
Ayotte	Cochran	Hagan
Barrasso	Collins	Hatch
Baucus	Corker	Heller
Begich	Cornyn	Hoeven
Bennet	Crapo	Inhofe
Blunt	Cruz	Isakson
Boozman	Donnelly	Johanns
Burr	Enzi	Johnson (WI)
Casey	Fischer	Kaine
Chambliss	Flake	King
Coats	Graham	Kirk

Klobuchar	Nelson	Shaheen
Lee	Paul	Shelby
Manchin	Portman	Tester
McCain	Pryor	Thune
McCaskill	Risch	Toomey
McConnell	Roberts	Vitter
Merkley	Rubio	Warner
Moran	Scott	Wicker
Murkowski	Sessions	

## NAYS—37

Baldwin	Harkin	Reid
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rockefeller
Boxer	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cowan	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 709) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 154

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 154, offered by Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this should be an easy one. It is simply an amendment that says that here in the Senate we should have better information to be able to legislate better. By the way, it is information that the House of Representatives already has. Surely we would want to have the same information in the Senate that the House of Representatives as they pursue tax reform.

This says the Congressional Budget Office should provide the Joint Tax Committee macroeconomic analysis of tax reform. It only applies to tax bills over a certain amount, \$5 billion a year. I worked with the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office to ensure this would not require more work because the analysis is already done, but it is not provided to us.

Under a 2003 rule in the House, it is provided to the Ways and Means Committee. It is required to be provided but not to us. We heard a lot of discussion over the last several days about the need for tax reform—Democrats and Republicans agree on that—and we agree it ought to be progrowth. The President called for it. This would enable us to legislate more wisely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Chair of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the amendment requires something called dynamic scoring. The Joint Committee on Tax, which provides us with information on how to score revenue measures, uses conventional scoring, and has been doing this for years and years. And they do utilize the secondary effects when they do conventional scoring.

Dynamic scoring goes many steps farther. It tries to dissipate the macroeconomic effect down the road, which is basically what Ben Bernanke does. It is very difficult and arbitrary and very hard to do. It would cause great swings. It may be close to the mark, it may be off the mark.

In addition, this amendment required dynamic scoring only with respect to revenue measures, but not required with respect to spending measures. When CBO does spending, they use conventional scoring. I might also say that in the footnote, the Joint Committee on Tax already gives its best guess of what the dynamic scoring would be, although that is not the numbers they use when they try to estimate the revenue effect.

I think it would be a big mistake to do that at this time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Leg.]

## YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	McCain
Ayotte	Flake	McCaskill
Barrasso	Graham	McConnell
Begich	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Hagan	Murkowski
Boozman	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heitkamp	Portman
Chambliss	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Roberts
Coburn	Inhofe	Rubio
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Manchin	Wicker

## NAYS—48

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

## NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 154) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 710

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the

usual form prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 710 offered by Mr. LEAHY.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this amendment is very clear, and it anticipates another amendment coming up by another Senator. The United States negotiates treaties, for example, the Arms Trade Treaty. But under the Supreme Court, *Reid v. Covert*, 1956, our Constitution trumps any agreement made in a treaty by our government.

So all my amendment does is make clear that the United States should not agree to any arms trade treaty that would violate our second amendment rights. It is straightforward, it respects our constitutional rights, but it also gives our government the flexibility it needs to negotiate treaties.

I would be happy with a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think this is a good amendment. I want to make it very clear that this has nothing to do with my amendment No. 139, which comes up next. This is merely talking about negotiating treaties. Mine is about opposing second amendment rights.

I have no objection to taking this by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 710) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

## AMENDMENT NO. 525

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before going to the next amendment, I have one unanimous consent request. Senator SESSIONS and I have been able to clear Durbin-Moran amendment No. 525. I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 525) was agreed to, as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 525

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to Federal investments in biomedical research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

AMENDMENT NO. 139

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to our final vote on amendment No. 139 offered by Mr. INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I want to make sure that everyone understands what the United Nations trade treaty is. The trade treaty is a treaty that cedes our authority to have trade agreements with our allies in terms of trading arms.

I want to very briefly read this so nobody over there or over here misunderstands what this amendment does. This is right out of the amendment. Uphold the second amendment rights, that is one thing. And secondly, prevent the United States from entering into the United Nations arms trade treaties. I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are presently negotiating an arms trade treaty which will help to keep illicit firearms out of the hands of war criminals and terrorists. It is a humanitarian issue. We have people such as Joseph Kony who is out murdering children. He is able to do it because he is taking part in the international arms trade. We are trying to stop those things.

My earlier amendment makes it very clear, we cannot trump our own second-amendment rights, but we can stop these children from being killed because of this, and that is why I oppose the Inhofe amendment. Let our negotiators negotiate. Any treaty still has to come back here to get a two-thirds vote anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 18 seconds remaining.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, the idea that we would have to go to the international body to decide whether we would trade arms with Israel is pretty disgusting. I want to make sure everyone understands. This is the first time—probably the last time this year that we are going to have a chance, an opportunity to vote for our second amendment rights. I think my colleagues should take advantage of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 91 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Begich	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Burr	Heinrich	Risch
Chambliss	Heitkamp	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Tester
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the concurrent resolution.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, over the last two decades the average budget resolution considered 78 amendments. We have done 101. The average vote-arama is 35 amendments. We have done 70—twice as many. Doing this has been a Herculean feat, but it has been done by the leadership of Senator MURRAY, with Senator SESSIONS. I think we all should recognize how hard this has been for Senator MURRAY.

(Senators applauding.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. Yes, of course. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator MURRAY, Senator SESSIONS, and the majority leader for conducting an open and complete and full debate. I know everyone is exhausted, and people may not feel it at the moment, but this is one of the Senate's finest days in recent years, and I commend everyone who has participated in this extraordinary debate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we don't have to have a quorum call. We are not going to be voting from our desks, so everybody can go back to regular disorder.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There will now be 2 minutes for debate equally divided prior to a vote on the concurrent resolution.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. It is late—early in the morning. I want to take this oppor-

tunity to thank my colleague Senator SESSIONS for a vigorous debate and for all of our colleagues participating in this debate. I am very proud of my colleagues. I urge a "yes" vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have so enjoyed working with the chairman. She has done a great job. She has managed this group as we needed to be managed.

I am disappointed in the budget. It does not do the job for our times.

I thank the Chair and look forward to the vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), as amended, was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate has passed a budget. I want to thank all of my colleagues. I especially want to thank our staff who

have literally spent weeks and weeks and days and hours on this—Evan Schatz and Mike Spahn and John Righter and the others who are sitting behind us tonight—as well as Senator SESSIONS and all of his staff.

It is a tribute to their hard work and my lost voice that we are sitting here tonight ready to take the next step to get our country back on a better fiscal path.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I also would like to thank the staff. My group is here. And I say to Senator MURRAY, your team is fabulous.

We work hard on bills that come through the Senate, and there are a lot of challenges. But few are bigger than this, with all these amendments—hundreds of them that came through—and it was a real challenge.

I congratulate the staff, I congratulate the Senator's team, and I hope we can continue to have good relations as we go forward and work together.

I would mention Marcus Peacock, my staff director, who was fabulous. He enjoyed every minute of this. I asked him how he was doing, and he said: I am going to be sorry tomorrow when it is over. But maybe that is a sign of sickness. I do not know.

I want to express my appreciation to my staff: Dan Kowalski, Bill Beach, Greg D'Angelo, Gene Emmans, George Everly, Matt Giroux, Brittany Godwin, Tori Gorman, Graham Hixon, Andrew Herther, Chris Jackson, Cari Kelly, Joseph McCormack, Greg McNeill, Carlton Milsap, Marcus Peacock, Kim Proctor, John Selden, William Smith, Paul Winfree, Stephen Miller, Andrew Logan, Garrett Murch, and Katie Moses. I think that is everybody. Tori Gorman has been back there in the center of that zoo and did a great job for us trying to work on these amendments.

So, again, I would like to thank Senator MURRAY for her leadership, helping us get through this difficult time, and it is good to say that as of this time, 5 a.m., there has not been a day without a budget being passed in the Senate.

(Laughter.)

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, three years ago tomorrow, President Obama signed into law the Affordable Care Act. This landmark law will extend health insurance coverage to millions of uninsured Americans when the reforms are fully implemented next year. Getting to this point has been an arduous process. But in the end, this achievement proved that real reform is possible, and that the voices of so many Americans who over the years have called on their leaders to act have finally been heard.

Since its passage, Americans have seen the immediate benefits of the Affordable Care Act and 3 years later, those improvements continue. Seniors on Medicare who have high-cost prescriptions are continuing to receive help when trapped within the coverage gap known as the doughnut hole. The Affordable Care Act completely closes the coverage gap by 2020, and the new law makes it easier for seniors to afford prescription drugs in the meantime. In 2010, more than 7,000 Vermonters received a \$250 rebate to help cover the cost of their prescription drugs when they hit the doughnut hole. Last year alone, nearly 6,400 Vermonters with Medicare received a 50-percent discount on their covered brand-name prescriptions, resulting in an average savings of \$765 per person. Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, more than 5,000 young adults in Vermont have gained health insurance coverage under these reforms, which allow young adults to stay on their parents' plans until their 26th birthdays. The improvements we are seeing in Vermont go on and on: in 2011 and 2012, 71 million Americans and 151,000 Vermonters with private insurance gained access to and received preventative screening coverage with no deductible or copay, including more than 80,000 Medicare beneficiaries. These are just a few of the dozens of consumer protections included in the law that are benefiting Vermonters and all Americans every day, and in many ways.

The law goes into full swing next year as even more consumer protections are implemented and millions more Americans gain access to health insurance coverage. Beginning in January, insurance companies will no longer be allowed to deny coverage to individuals with preexisting health conditions or to charge higher premiums based on health status or gender. Unfortunately, estimates show that 44,000 Vermonters currently do not have health insurance, but with the Medicaid expansion contained in the Affordable Care Act, 84 percent of these Vermonters will qualify for Medicaid or a premium tax credit. Also important to Vermonters, to assist

Vermont with our State's work on implementing Vermont's State-based health insurance exchange—or marketplace—Vermont has received more than \$125,000,000 in grants for research and for information technology development, as well as almost \$3,480,000 for maternal health programs. These tangible initiatives help at-risk families gain the support they need to improve their children's health and ability to learn, and they help prevent child abuse.

I was proud as well to work with Senator GRASSLEY and others to include strong anti-fraud provisions in the law that already have helped prevent and detect fraudulent activities that in the past have cost American taxpayers multiple millions of dollars each year. Thanks in part to these efforts, \$4.2 billion was returned to taxpayers last year alone.

In only 3 years, Vermonters across our State have seen the many benefits of health care reform unfold in their lives. I see and hear about these improvements and pocketbook savings in visits to every corner of our State. At home in Middlesex and throughout Vermont, whether I am in the grocery store, at the gas pump, or at church, I am constantly reminded of how important access to quality affordable health care is to individuals and families. I applaud Vermont's efforts to expand the Affordable Care Act's reach even further to help every resident secure health insurance. I am proud that the Affordable Care Act offers Vermont the foundation it needs to reach this goal, and I look forward to working to see that it is met.

Regrettably, opponents of the Affordable Care Act continue to misleadingly attack the law in an attempt to undermine its implementation. The moment President Obama signed this bill into law, opponents sought to continue their political battle by challenging the landmark legislation in the courts. With the legal challenges now nearly resolved, we are now seeing amendments filed to every bill we consider on the floor, aimed at repealing or gutting the Affordable Care Act. In fact, on the budget resolution we are considering today, dozens of amendments have been filed in an effort to block the Affordable Care Act's implementation, to undermine its success in making lives better across the land, or to repeal the law completely. This is unfortunate, it is shortsighted, and it is cynical. Even more shameful is the budget resolution considered and passed by the House this week. The House-passed budget would make drastic changes to the Medicaid Program causing 14 to 20 million Americans to lose health coverage; it would replace Medicare with a voucher scheme costing seniors at least \$6000 more per year; and would completely repeal all the consumer protections included in the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but in the true interests of the